

Open Source Edition
of the
Report On The Investigation Into Russian
Interference In The 2016 Presidential
Election

Volume II of II

Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III

Submitted Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. §600.8(c)

Washington, D.C.

March 2019

<https://iandennismiller.github.io/mueller-report/>

Table of Contents - Volume II

Introduction to Volume II	1
Executive Summary to Volume II	4
A. Statutory and Constitutional Defenses	9
I. Background Legal and Evidentiary Principles	12
A. Legal Framework of Obstruction Of Justice	12
B. Investigative and Evidentiary Considerations	15
II. Factual Results of the Obstruction Investigation	20
A. The Campaign’s Response to Reports About Russian Support for Trump	20
1. Press Reports Allege Links Between the Trump Campaign and Russia	20
2. The Trump Campaign Reacts to WikiLeaks’s Release of Hacked Emails	20
3. The Trump Campaign Reacts to Allegations That Russia was Seeking to Aid Candidate Trump	20
4. After the Election, Trump Continues to Deny Any Contacts or Connections with Russia or That Russia Aided his Election	20
B. The President’s Conduct Concerning the Investigation of Michael Flynn	20
1. Incoming National Security Advisor Flynn Discusses Sanctions on Russia with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak	20
2. President-Elect Trump is Briefed on the Intelligence Community’s Assessment of Russian Interference in the Election and Congress Opens Election-Interference Investigations	20
3. Flynn Makes False Statements About his Communications with Kislyak to Incoming Administration Officials, the Media, and the FBI	20
4. DOJ Officials Notify the White House of Their Concerns About Flynn	20
5. McGahn has a Follow-Up Meeting About Flynn with Yates; President Trump has Dinner with FBI Director Comey	20
6. Flynn’s Resignation	20
7. The President Discusses Flynn with FBI Director Comey	20
8. The Media Raises Questions About the President’s Delay in Terminating Flynn	20
9. The President Attempts to Have K.T. McFarland Create a Witness Statement Denying that he Directed Flynn’s Discussions with Kislyak	20
C. The President’s Reaction to Public Confirmation of the FBI’s Russia Investigation	20

1.	Attorney General Sessions Recuses From the Russia Investigation	20
2.	FBI Director Comey Publicly Confirms the Existence of the Russia Investigation in Testimony Before HPSCI	20
3.	The President Asks Intelligence Community Leaders to Make Public Statements that he had No Connection to Russia . . .	20
4.	The President Asks Comey to "Lift the Cloud" Created by the Russia Investigation	20
D.	Events Leading Up To and Surrounding the Termination of FBI Director Comey	20
1.	Comey Testifies Before the Senate Judiciary Committee and Declines to Answer Questions About Whether the President is Under Investigation	20
2.	The President Makes the Decision to Terminate Comey	20
E.	The President's Efforts to Remove the Special Counsel	20
1.	The Appointment of the Special Counsel and the President's Reaction	20
2.	The President Asserts that the Special Counsel has Conflicts of Interest	20
3.	The Press Reports that the President is Being Investigated for Obstruction of Justice and the President Directs the White House Counsel to Have the Special Counsel Removed	20
F.	The President's Efforts to Curtail the Special Counsel Investigation .	20
1.	The President Asks Corey Lewandowski to Deliver a Message to Sessions to Curtail the Special Counsel Investigation	20
2.	The President Follows Up with Lewandowski	20
3.	The President Publicly Criticizes Sessions in a New York Times Interview	20
4.	The President Orders Priebus to Demand Sessions's Resignation	20
G.	The President's Efforts to Prevent Disclosure of Emails About the June 9, 2016 Meeting Between Russians and Senior Campaign Officials . .	20
1.	The President Learns About the Existence of Emails Concerning the June 9; 2016 Trump Tower Meeting	21
2.	The President Directs Communications Staff Not to Publicly Disclose Information About the June 9 Meeting	22
3.	The President Directs Trump Jr.'s Response to Press Inquiries About the June 9 Meeting	23
4.	The Media Reports on the June 9, 2016 Meeting	26
H.	The President's Further Efforts to Have the Attorney General Take Over the Investigation	29
1.	The President Again Seeks to Have Sessions Reverse his Recusal	29
2.	Additional Efforts to Have Sessions Unrecuse or Direct Investigations Covered by his Recusal	31

I.	The President Orders McGahn to Deny that the President Tried to Fire the Special Counsel	35
1.	The Press Reports that the President Tried to Fire the Special Counsel	36
2.	The President Seeks to Have McGahn Dispute the Press Reports	36
J.	The President's Conduct Towards Flynn, Manafort,	43
1.	Conduct Directed at Michael Flynn	43
2.	Conduct Directed at Paul Manafort	45
3.	[: Harm to Ongoing Matter]	50
K.	The President's Conduct Involving Michael Cohen	54
1.	Candidate Trump's Awareness of and Involvement in the Trump Tower Moscow Project	54
2.	Cohen Determines to Adhere to a "Party Line" Distancing Candidate Trump From Russia	58
3.	Cohen Submits False Statements to Congress Minimizing the Trump Tower Moscow Project in Accordance with the Party Line	59
4.	The President Sends Messages of Support to Cohen	65
5.	The President's Conduct After Cohen Began Cooperating with the Government	68
L.	Overarching Factual Issues	76
III. Legal Defenses to the Application of Obstruction-of-Justice Statutes to the President		80
A.	Statutory Defenses to the Application of Obstruction-Of-Justice Provisions to the Conduct Under Investigation	81
1.	The Text of Section 1512(c)(2) Prohibits a Broad Range of Obstructive Acts	81
2.	Judicial Decisions Support a Broad Reading of Section 1512(c)(2)	83
3.	The Legislative History of Section 1512(c)(2) Does Not Justify Narrowing Its Texts	86
4.	General Principles of Statutory Construction Do Not Suggest That Section 1512(c)(2) is Inapplicable to the Conduct in this Investigation	87
5.	Other Obstruction Statutes Might Apply to the Conduct in this Investigation	89
B.	Constitutional Defenses to Applying Obstruction-Of-Justice Statutes to Presidential Conduct	90
1.	The Requirement of a Clear Statement to Apply Statutes to Presidential Conduct Does Not Limit the Obstruction Statutes	91
2.	Separation-of-Powers Principles Support the Conclusion that Congress May Validly Prohibit Corrupt Obstructive Acts Carried Out Through the Presidents Official Powers	94

a.	The Supreme Courts Separation-of-Powers Balancing Test Applies In This Contexts	94
b.	The Effect of Obstruction-of-Justice Statutes on the Presidents Capacity to Perform His Article II Responsibilities is Limited	96
c.	Congress Has Power to Protect Congressional, Grand Jury, and Judicial Proceedings Against Corrupt Acts from Any Source	99
3.	Ascertaining Whether the President Violated the Obstruction Statutes Would Not Chill his Performance of his Article II Duties	101
IV.Conclusion		105

Introduction to Volume II

This report is submitted to the Attorney General pursuant to 28 C.F.R. §600.8(c), which states that, [a]t the conclusion of the Special Counsels work, he ... shall provide the Attorney General a confidential report explaining the prosecution or declination decisions [the Special Counsel] reached.

Beginning in 2017, the President of the United States took a variety of actions towards the ongoing FBI investigation into Russias interference in the 2016 presidential election and related matters that raised questions about whether he had obstructed justice. The Order appointing the Special Counsel gave this Office jurisdiction to investigate matters that arose directly from the FBI's Russia investigation, including whether the President had obstructed justice in connection with Russia-related investigations. The Special Counsels jurisdiction also covered potentially obstructive acts related to the Special Counsels investigation itself. This Volume of our report summarizes our obstruction-of-justice investigation of the President.

We first describe the considerations that guided our obstruction-of-justice investigation, and then provide an overview of this Volume:

First, a traditional prosecution or declination decision entails a binary determination to initiate or decline a prosecution, but we determined not to make a traditional prosecutorial judgment. The Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) has issued an opinion finding that the indictment or criminal prosecution of a sitting President would impermissibly undermine the capacity of the executive branch to perform its constitutionally assigned functions in violation of the constitutional separation of powers.¹ Given the role of the Special Counsel as an attorney in the Department of Justice and the framework of the Special Counsel regulations, see 28 U.S.C. §515; 28 C.F.R. §600.7(a), this Office accepted OLC's legal conclusion for the purpose of exercising prosecutorial jurisdiction. And apart from OLC's constitutional view, we recognized that a federal criminal accusation against a sitting President would place burdens on the Presidents capacity to govern and potentially preempt constitutional processes for addressing presidential misconduct.²

Second, while the OLC opinion concludes that a sitting President may not be prosecuted, it recognizes that a criminal investigation during the Presidents term is permissible.³ The OLC opinion also recognizes that a President does not have immunity after he leaves office.⁴ And if individuals other than the President

¹ *A Sitting Presidents Amenability to Indictment and Criminal Prosecution*, 24 Op. O.L.C. 222, 222, 260 (2000) (OLC Op.).

² See U.S. CONST. Art. I §2, cl. 5; §3, cl. 6; cf. OLC Op. at 257-258 (discussing relationship between impeachment and criminal prosecution of a sitting President).

³ OLC Op. at 257 n.36 (A grand jury could continue to gather evidence throughout the period of immunity).

⁴ OLC Op. at 255 (Recognizing an immunity from prosecution for a sitting President would not preclude such prosecution once the Presidents term is over or he is otherwise removed from office by

committed an obstruction offense, they may be prosecuted at this time. Given those considerations, the facts known to us, and the strong public interest in safeguarding the integrity of the criminal justice system, we conducted a thorough factual investigation in order to preserve the evidence when memories were fresh and documentary materials were available.

Third, we considered whether to evaluate the conduct we investigated under the Justice Manual standards governing prosecution and declination decisions, but we determined not to apply an approach that could potentially result in a judgment that the President committed crimes. The threshold step under the Justice Manual standards is to assess whether a persons conduct constitutes a federal offense. U.S. Dept of Justice, Justice Manual §9-27.220 (2018) (Justice Manual). Fairness concerns counseled against potentially reaching that judgment when no charges can be brought. The ordinary means for an individual to respond to an accusation is through a speedy and public trial, with all the procedural protections that surround a criminal case. An individual who believes he was wrongly accused can use that process to seek to clear his name. In contrast, a prosecutors judgment that crimes were committed, but that no charges will be brought, affords no such adversarial opportunity for public name-clearing before an impartial adjudicator.⁵

The concerns about the fairness of such a determination would be heightened in the case of a sitting President, where a federal prosecutors accusation of a crime, even in an internal report, could carry consequences that extend beyond the realm of criminal justice. OLC noted similar concerns about sealed indictments. Even if an indictment were sealed during the Presidents term, OLC reasoned, it would be very difficult to preserve [an indictments] secrecy, and if an indictment became public, [t]he stigma and opprobrium could imperil the Presidents ability to govern.⁶ Although a prosecutors internal report would not represent a formal public accusation akin to an indictment, the possibility of the reports public disclosure and the absence of a neutral adjudicatory forum to review its findings counseled against potentially determining that the persons conduct constitutes a federal offense. Justice Manual §9-27.220.

Fourth, if we had confidence after a thorough investigation of the facts that the President clearly did not commit obstruction of justice, we would so state. Based on the facts and the applicable legal standards, however, we are unable to reach that judgment. The evidence we obtained about the Presidents actions and intent presents difficult issues that prevent us from conclusively determining that no criminal conduct occurred. Accordingly, while this report does not conclude that the President committed a crime, it also does not exonerate him.

resignation or impeachment).

⁵For that reason, criticisms have been lodged against the practice of naming unindicted co-conspirators in an indictment. *See United States v. Briggs*, 514 F.2d 794, 802 (5th Cir. 1975) (The courts have struck down with strong language efforts by grand juries to accuse persons of crime while affording them no forum in which to vindicate themselves.); *see also* Justice Manual 9-11.130.

⁶OLC Op. at 259 & n.38 (citation omitted).

This report on our investigation consists of four parts. Section I provides an overview of obstruction-of-justice principles and summarizes certain investigatory and evidentiary considerations. Section II sets forth the factual results of our obstruction investigation and analyzes the evidence. Section III addresses statutory and constitutional defenses. Section IV states our conclusion.

Executive Summary to Volume II

Factual Results of the Obstruction Investigation

The Campaigns response to reports about Russian support for Trump.

During the 2016 presidential campaign, questions arose about the Russian governments apparent support for candidate Trump. After WikiLeaks released politically damaging Democratic Party emails that were reported to have been hacked by Russia, Trump publicly expressed skepticism that Russia was responsible for the hacks at the same time that he and other Campaign officials privately sought information about any further planned WikiLeaks releases. Trump also denied having any business in or connections to Russia, even though as late as June 2016 the Trump Organization had been pursuing a licensing deal for a skyscraper to be built in Russia called Trump Tower Moscow. After the election, the President expressed concerns to advisors that reports of Russias election interference might lead the public to question the legitimacy of his election.

Conduct involving FBI Director Comey and Michael Flynn.

In mid-January 2017, incoming National Security Advisor Michael Flynn falsely denied to the Vice President, other administration officials, and FBI agents that he had talked to Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak about Russias response to U.S. sanctions on Russia for its election interference. On January 27, the day after the President was told that Flynn had lied to the Vice President and had made similar statements to the FBI, the President invited FBI Director Comey to a private dinner at the White House and told Comey that he needed loyalty. On February 14, the day after the President requested Flynns resignation, the President told an outside advisor, Now that we fired Flynn, the Russia thing is over. The advisor disagreed and said the investigations would continue.

Later that afternoon, the President cleared the Oval Office to have a one-on-one meeting with Comey. Referring to the FBIs investigation of Flynn, the President said, I hope you can see your way clear to letting this go, to letting Flynn go. He is a good guy. I hope you can let this go. Shortly after requesting Flynns resignation and speaking privately to Comey, the President sought to have Deputy National Security Advisor K.T. McFarland draft an internal letter stating that the President had not directed Flynn to discuss sanctions with Kislyak. McFarland declined because she did not know whether that was true, and a White House Counsels Office attorney thought that the request would look like a quid pro quo for an ambassadorship she had been offered.

The Presidents reaction to the continuing Russia investigation.

In February 2017, Attorney General Jeff Sessions began to assess whether he had to recuse himself from campaign related investigations because of his role in the Trump Campaign. In early March, the President told White House Counsel Donald McGahn to stop Sessions from recusing. And after Sessions announced his recusal on March 2, the President expressed anger at the decision and told advisors that he should have an Attorney General who would protect him. That weekend, the President took Sessions aside at an event and urged him to unrecuse. Later in March, Comey publicly disclosed at a congressional hearing that the FBI was investigating the Russian governments efforts to interfere in the 2016 presidential election, including any links or coordination between the Russian government and the Trump Campaign. In the following days, the President reached out to the Director of National Intelligence and the leaders of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the National Security Agency (NSA) to ask them what they could do to publicly dispel the suggestion that the President had any connection to the Russian election-interference effort. The President also twice called Comey directly, notwithstanding guidance from McGahn to avoid direct contacts with the Department of Justice. Comey had previously assured the President that the FBI was not investigating him personally, and the President asked Comey to lift the cloud of the Russia investigation by saying that publicly.

The Presidents termination of Comey.

On May 3, 2017, Comey testified in a congressional hearing, but declined to answer questions about whether the President was personally under investigation. Within days, the President decided to terminate Comey. The President insisted that the termination letter, which was written for public release, state that Comey had informed the President that he was not under investigation. The day of the firing, the White House maintained that Comeys termination resulted from independent recommendations from the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General that Comey should be discharged for mishandling the Hillary Clinton email investigation. But the President had decided to fire Comey before hearing from the Department of Justice. The day after firing Comey, the President told Russian officials that he had faced great pressure because of Russia, which had been taken off by Comeys firing. The next day, the President acknowledged in a television interview that he was going to fire Comey regardless of the Department of Justices recommendation and that when he decided to just do it, he was thinking that this thing with Trump and Russia is a made-up story. In response to a question about whether he was angry with Comey about the Russia investigation, the President said, As far as Im concerned, I want that thing to be absolutely done properly, adding that firing Comey might even lengthen out the investigation.

The appointment of a Special Counsel and efforts to remove him.

On May 17, 2017, the Acting Attorney General for the Russia investigation appointed a Special Counsel to conduct the investigation and related matters. The President reacted to news that a Special Counsel had been appointed by telling advisors that it was the end of his presidency and demanding that Sessions resign. Sessions submitted his resignation, but the President ultimately did not accept it. The President told aides that the Special Counsel had conflicts of interest and suggested that the Special Counsel therefore could not serve. The Presidents advisors told him the asserted conflicts were meritless and had already been considered by the Department of Justice.

On June 14, 2017, the media reported that the Special Counsels Office was investigating whether the President had obstructed justice. Press reports called this a major turning point in the investigation: while Comey had told the President he was not under investigation, following Comeys firing, the President now was under investigation. The President reacted to this news with a series of tweets criticizing the Department of Justice and the Special Counsels investigation. On June 17, 2017, the President called McGahn at home and directed him to call the Acting Attorney General and say that the Special Counsel had conflicts of interest and must be removed. McGahn did not carry out the direction, however, deciding that he would resign rather than trigger what he regarded as a potential Saturday Night Massacre.

Efforts to curtail the Special Counsels investigation.

Two days after directing McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed, the President made another attempt to affect the course of the Russia investigation. On June 19, 2017, the President met one-on-one in the Oval Office with his former campaign manager Corey Lewandowski, a trusted advisor outside the government, and dictated a message for Lewandowski to deliver to Sessions. The message said that Sessions should publicly announce that, notwithstanding his recusal from the Russia investigation, the investigation was very unfair to the President, the President had done nothing wrong, and Sessions planned to meet with the Special Counsel and let [him] move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections. Lewandowski said he understood what the President wanted Sessions to do.

One month later, in another private meeting with Lewandowski on July 19, 2017, the President asked about the status of his message for Sessions to limit the Special Counsel investigation to future election interference. Lewandowski told the President that the message would be delivered soon. Hours after that meeting, the President publicly criticized Sessions in an interview with the New York Times, and then issued a series of tweets making it clear that Sessions job was in jeopardy. Lewandowski did not want to deliver the Presidents message personally, so he asked senior White House official Rick Dearborn to deliver it to Sessions. Dearborn was uncomfortable with the task and did not follow through.

Efforts to prevent public disclosure of evidence.

In the summer of 2017, the President learned that media outlets were asking questions about the June 9, 2016 meeting at Trump Tower between senior campaign officials, including Donald Trump Jr., and a Russian lawyer who was said to be offering damaging information about Hillary Clinton as part of Russia and its governments support for Mr. Trump. On several occasions, the President directed aides not to publicly disclose the emails setting up the June 9 meeting, suggesting that the emails would not leak and that the number of lawyers with access to them should be limited. Before the emails became public, the President edited a press statement for Trump Jr. by deleting a line that acknowledged that the meeting was with an individual who [Trump Jr.] was told might have information helpful to the campaign and instead said only that the meeting was about adoptions of Russian children. When the press asked questions about the Presidents involvement in Trump Jr.s statement, the Presidents personal lawyer repeatedly denied the President had played any role.

Further efforts to have the Attorney General take control of the investigation.

In early summer 2017, the President called Sessions at home and again asked him to reverse his recusal from the Russia investigation. Sessions did not reverse his recusal. In October 2017, the President met privately with Sessions in the Oval Office and asked him to take [a] look at investigating Clinton. In December 2017, shortly after Flynn pleaded guilty pursuant to a cooperation agreement, the President met with Sessions in the Oval Office and suggested, according to notes taken by a senior advisor, that if Sessions unrecused and took back supervision of the Russia investigation, he would be a hero. The President told Sessions, Im not going to do anything or direct you to do anything. I just want to be treated fairly. In response, Sessions volunteered that he had never seen anything improper on the campaign and told the President there was a whole new leadership team in place. He did not unrecuse.

Efforts to have McGahn deny that the President had ordered him to have the Special Counsel removed.

In early 2018, the press reported that the President had directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed in June 2017 and that McGahn had threatened to resign rather than carry out the order. The President reacted to the news stories by directing White House officials to tell McGahn to dispute the story and create a record stating he had not been ordered to have the Special Counsel removed. McGahn told those officials that the media reports were accurate in stating that the President had directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed. The President then met with McGahn in the Oval Office and again pressured him to deny the reports. In the same meeting, the President also asked McGahn why he had told the Special Counsel

about the Presidents effort to remove the Special Counsel and why McGahn took notes of his conversations with the President. McGahn refused to back away from what he remembered happening and perceived the President to be testing his mettle.

Conduct towards Flynn, Manafort, [REDACTED]: HOM]

After Flynn withdrew from a joint defense agreement with the President and began cooperating with the government, the Presidents personal counsel left a message for Flynns attorneys reminding them of the Presidents warm feelings towards Flynn, which he said still remains, and asking for a heads up if Flynn knew information that implicates the President. When Flynns counsel reiterated that Flynn could no longer share information pursuant to a joint defense agreement, the Presidents personal counsel said he would make sure that the President knew that Flynns actions reflected hostility towards the President. During Manaforts prosecution and when the jury in his criminal, trial was deliberating, the President praised Manafort in public, said that Manafort was being treated unfairly, and declined to rule out a pardon. After Manafort was convicted, the President called Manafort a brave man for refusing to break and said that flipping almost ought to be outlawed. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Conduct involving Michael Cohen.

The Presidents conduct towards Michael Cohen, a former Trump Organization executive, changed from praise for Cohen when he falsely minimized the Presidents involvement in the Trump Tower Moscow project, to castigation of Cohen when he became a cooperating witness. From September 2015 to June 2016, Cohen had pursued the Trump Tower Moscow project on behalf of the Trump Organization and had briefed candidate Trump on the project numerous times, including discussing whether Trump should travel to Russia to advance the deal. In 2017, Cohen provided false testimony to Congress about the project, including stating that he had only briefed Trump on the project three times and never discussed travel to Russia with him, in an effort to adhere to a party line that Cohen said was developed to minimize the Presidents connections to Russia. While preparing for his congressional testimony, Cohen had extensive discussions with the Presidents personal counsel, who, according to Cohen, said that Cohen should stay on message and not contradict the President. After the FBI searched Cohens home and office in April 2018, the President publicly asserted that Cohen would not flip, contacted him directly to tell him to stay strong, and privately passed messages of support to him. Cohen also discussed pardons with the Presidents personal counsel and believed that if he stayed on message he would be taken care of. But after Cohen began cooperating with the government in the summer of 2018, the President publicly criticized him, called him a rat, and suggested that his family members had committed crimes.

Overarching factual issues.

We did not make a traditional prosecution decision about these facts, but the evidence we obtained supports several general statements about the Presidents conduct.

Several features of the conduct we investigated distinguish it from typical obstruction-of-justice cases. First, the investigation concerned the President, and some of his actions, such as firing the FBI director, involved facially lawful acts within his Article II authority, which raises constitutional issues discussed below. At the same time, the Presidents position as the head of the Executive Branch provided him with unique and powerful means of influencing official proceedings, subordinate officers, and potential witnesses - all of which is relevant to a potential obstruction-of-justice analysis. Second, unlike cases in which a subject engages in obstruction of justice to cover up a crime, the evidence we obtained did not establish that the President was involved in an underlying crime related to Russian election interference. Although the obstruction statutes do not require proof of such a crime, the absence of that evidence affects the analysis of the Presidents intent and requires consideration of other possible motives for his conduct. Third, many of the Presidents acts directed at witnesses, including discouragement of cooperation with the government and suggestions of possible future pardons, took place in public view. That circumstance is unusual, but no principle of law excludes public acts from the reach of the obstruction laws. If the likely effect of public acts is to influence witnesses or alter their testimony, the harm to the justice systems integrity is the same.

Although the series of events we investigated involved discrete acts, the overall pattern of the Presidents conduct towards the investigations can shed light on the nature of the Presidents acts and the inferences that can be drawn about his intent. In particular, the actions we investigated can be divided into two phases, reflecting a possible shift in the Presidents motives. The first phase covered the period from the Presidents first interactions with Comey through the Presidents firing of Comey. During that time, the President had been repeatedly told he was not personally under investigation. Soon after the firing of Comey and the appointment of the Special Counsel, however, the President became aware that his own conduct was being investigated in an obstruction-of-justice inquiry. At that point, the President engaged in a second phase of conduct, involving public attacks on the investigation, non-public efforts to control it, and efforts in both public and private to encourage witnesses not to cooperate with the investigation. Judgments about the nature of the Presidents motives during each phase would be informed by the totality of the evidence.

A. Statutory and Constitutional Defenses

The Presidents counsel raised statutory and constitutional defenses to a possible obstruction-of-justice analysis of the conduct we investigated. We concluded that none of those legal defenses provided a basis for declining to investigate the facts.

Statutory defenses.

Consistent with precedent and the Department of Justices general approach to interpreting obstruction statutes, we concluded that several statutes could apply here. See 18 U.S.C. §§1503, 1505, 1512(b)(3), 1512(c)(2). Section 1512(c)(2) is an omnibus obstruction-of-justice provision that covers a range of obstructive acts directed at pending or contemplated official proceedings. No principle of statutory construction justifies narrowing the provision to cover only conduct that impairs the integrity or availability of evidence. Sections 1503 and 1505 also offer broad protection against obstructive acts directed at pending grand jury, judicial, administrative, and congressional proceedings, and they are supplemented by a provision in Section 1512(b) aimed specifically at conduct intended to prevent or hinder the communication to law enforcement of information related to a federal crime.

Constitutional defenses.

As for constitutional defenses arising from the Presidents status as the head of the Executive Branch, we recognized that the Department of Justice and the courts have not definitively resolved these issues. We therefore examined those issues through the framework established by Supreme Court precedent governing separation-of-powers issues. The Department of Justice and the Presidents personal counsel have recognized that the President is subject to statutes that prohibit obstruction of justice by bribing a witness or suborning perjury because that conduct does not implicate his constitutional authority. With respect to whether the President can be found to have obstructed justice by exercising his powers under Article II of the Constitution, we concluded that Congress has authority to prohibit a Presidents corrupt use of his authority in order to protect the integrity of the administration of justice.

Under applicable Supreme Court precedent, the Constitution does not categorically and permanently immunize a President for obstructing justice through the use of his Article II powers. The separation-of-powers doctrine authorizes Congress to protect official proceedings, including those of courts and grand juries, from corrupt, obstructive acts regardless of their source. We also concluded that any inroad on presidential authority that would occur from prohibiting corrupt acts does not undermine the Presidents ability to fulfill his constitutional mission. The term corruptly sets a demanding standard. It requires a concrete showing that a person acted with an intent to obtain an improper advantage for himself or someone else, inconsistent with official duty and the rights of others. A preclusion of corrupt official action does not diminish the Presidents ability to exercise Article II powers. For example, the proper supervision of criminal law does not demand freedom for the President to act with a corrupt intention of shielding himself from criminal punishment, avoiding financial liability, or preventing personal embarrassment. To the contrary, a statute that prohibits official action undertaken for such corrupt

purposes furthers, rather than hinders, the impartial and evenhanded administration of the law. It also aligns with the Presidents constitutional duty to faithfully execute the laws. Finally, we concluded that in the rare case in which a criminal investigation of the Presidents conduct is justified, inquiries to determine whether the President acted for a corrupt motive should not impermissibly chill his performance of his constitutionally assigned duties. The conclusion that Congress may apply the obstruction laws to the Presidents corrupt exercise of the powers of office accords with our constitutional system of checks and balances and the principle that no person is above the law.

Conclusion

Because we determined not to make a traditional prosecutorial judgment, we did not draw ultimate conclusions about the Presidents conduct. The evidence we obtained about the Presidents actions and intent presents difficult issues that would need to be resolved if we were making traditional prosecutorial judgment. At the same time, if we had confidence after a thorough investigation of the facts that the President clearly did not commit obstruction of justice, we would so state. Based on the facts and the applicable legal standards, we are unable to reach that judgment. Accordingly, while this report does not conclude that the President committed a crime, it also does not exonerate him.

I. Background Legal and Evidentiary Principles

A. Legal Framework of Obstruction Of Justice

The May 17, 2017 Appointment Order and the Special Counsel regulations provide this Office with jurisdiction to investigate federal crimes committed in the course of, and with intent to interfere with, the Special Counsel's investigation, such as perjury, obstruction of justice, destruction of evidence, and intimidation of witnesses. 28 C.F.R. §600.4(a). Because of that description of our jurisdiction, we sought evidence for our obstruction-of-justice investigation with the elements of obstruction offenses in mind. Our evidentiary analysis is similarly focused on the elements of such offenses, although we do not draw conclusions on the ultimate questions that govern a prosecutorial decision under the Principles of Federal Prosecution. See Justice Manual §9-27.000 et seq. (2018).

Here, we summarize the law interpreting the elements of potentially relevant obstruction statutes in an ordinary case. This discussion does not address the unique constitutional issues that arise in an inquiry into official acts by the President. Those issues are discussed in a later section of this report addressing constitutional defenses that the Presidents counsel have raised. See Volume II, Section III.B, *infra*.

Three basic elements are common to most of the relevant obstruction statutes: (1) an obstructive act; (2) a nexus between the obstructive act and an official proceeding; and (3) a corrupt intent. See, e.g., 18 U.S.C. §§1503, 1505, 1512(c)(2). We describe those elements as they have been interpreted by the courts. We then discuss a more specific statute aimed at witness tampering, see 18 U.S.C. §1512(b), and describe the requirements for attempted offenses and endeavors to obstruct justice, see 18 U.S.C. §§1503, 1512(c)(2).

Obstructive act.

Obstruction-of-justice law reaches all corrupt conduct capable of producing an effect that prevents justice from being duly administered, regardless of the means employed. *United States v. Silverman*, 745 F.2d 1386, 1393 (11th Cir. 1984) (interpreting 18 U.S.C. §1503). An effort to influence a proceeding can qualify as an endeavor to obstruct justice even if the effort was subtle or circuitous and however cleverly or with whatever cloaking of purpose it was made. *United States v. Roe*, 529 F.2d 629, 632 (4th Cir. 1975); see also *United States v. Quattrone*, 441 F.3d 153, 173 (2d Cir. 2006). The verbs obstruct or impede are broad and can refer to anything that blocks, makes difficult, or hinders. *Marinello v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1101, 1106 (2018) (internal brackets and quotation marks omitted).

An improper motive can render an actors conduct criminal even when the conduct would otherwise be lawful and within the actors authority. See *United States v. Cueto*, 151 F.3d 620, 631 (7th Cir. 1998) (affirming obstruction conviction of a criminal defense attorney for litigation related conduct); *United States v. Cintolo*,

818 F.2d 980, 992 (1st Cir. 1987) (any act by any party - whether lawful or unlawful on its face - may abridge §1503 if performed with a corrupt motive).

Nexus to a pending or contemplated official proceeding.

Obstruction-of-justice law generally requires a nexus, or connection, to an official proceeding. In Section 1503, the nexus must be to pending judicial or grand jury proceedings. *United States v. Aguilar*, 515 U.S. 593, 599 (1995). In Section 1505, the nexus can include a connection to a pending federal agency proceeding or a congressional inquiry or investigation. Under both statutes, the government must demonstrate a relationship in time, causation, or logic between the obstructive act and the proceeding or inquiry to be obstructed. *Jd.* at 599; see also *Arthur Andersen LLP v. United States*, 544 U.S. 696, 707-708 (2005). Section 1512(c) prohibits obstructive efforts aimed at official proceedings including judicial or grand jury proceedings. 18 U.S.C. §1515(a)(1)(A). For purposes of Section 1512, an official proceeding need not be pending or about to be instituted at the time of the offense. 18 U.S.C. §1512(f)(1). Although a proceeding need not already be in progress to trigger liability under Section 1512(c), a nexus to a contemplated proceeding still must be shown. *United States v. Young*, 916 F.3d 368, 386 (4th Cir. 2019); *United States v. Petruk*, 781 F.3d 438, 445 (8th Cir. 2015); *United States v. Phillips*, 583 F.3d 1261, 1264 (10th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reich*, 479 F.3d 179, 186 (2d Cir. 2007). The nexus requirement narrows the scope of obstruction statutes to ensure that individuals have fair warning of what the law proscribes. *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 600 (internal quotation marks omitted).

The nexus showing has subjective and objective components. As an objective matter, a defendant must act in a manner that is likely to obstruct justice, such that the statute excludes defendants who have an evil purpose but use means that would only unnaturally and improbably be successful. *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 601-602 (emphasis added; internal quotation marks omitted). (T]he endeavor must have the natural and probable effect of interfering with the due administration of justice. *Jd.* at 599 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). As a subjective matter, the actor must have contemplated a particular, foreseeable proceeding. *Petruk*, 781 F.3d at 445-446. A defendant need not directly impede the proceeding. Rather, a nexus exists if discretionary actions of a third person would be required to obstruct the judicial proceeding if it was foreseeable to the defendant that the third party would act on the [defendants] communication in such a way as to obstruct the judicial proceeding. *United States v. Martinez*, 862 F.3d 223, 238 (2d Cir. 2017) (brackets, ellipses, and internal quotation marks omitted).

Corruptly.

The word corruptly provides the intent element for obstruction of justice and means acting knowingly and dishonestly or with an improper motive. *United States v.*

Richardson, 676 F.3d 491, 508 (5th Cir. 2012); *United States v. Gordon*, 710 F.3d 1124, 1151 (10th Cir. 2013) (to act corruptly means to act[] with an improper purpose and to engage in conduct knowingly and dishonestly with the specific intent to subvert, impede or obstruct the relevant proceeding) (some quotation marks omitted); see 18 U.S.C. §1515(b) (As used in section 1505, the term corruptly means acting with an improper purpose, personally or by influencing another.); see also *Arthur Andersen*, 544 U.S. at 705-706 (interpreting corruptly to mean wrongful, immoral, depraved, or evil and holding that acting knowingly ... corruptly in 18 U.S.C. §1512(b) requires consciousness of wrongdoing). The requisite showing is made when a person acted with an intent to obtain an improper advantage for [him]self or someone else, inconsistent with official duty and the rights of others. *BALLENTINES LAW DICTIONARY* 276 (3d ed. 1969); see *United States v. Pasha*, 797 F.3d 1122, 1132 (D.C. Cir. 2015); *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 616 (Scalia, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (characterizing this definition as the longstanding and well-accepted meaning of corruptly).

Witness tampering.

A more specific provision in Section 1512 prohibits tampering with a witness. See 18 U.S.C. §1512(b)(1), (3) (making it a crime to knowingly use[] intimidation ... or corruptly persuade[] another person, or engage[] in misleading conduct towards another person, with the intent to influence, delay, or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding or to hinder, delay, or prevent the communication to a law enforcement officer... of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense). To establish corrupt persuasion, it is sufficient that the defendant asked a potential witness to lie to investigators in contemplation of a likely federal investigation into his conduct. *United States v. Edlind*, 887 F.3d 166, 174 (4th Cir. 2018); *United States v. Sparks*, 791 F.3d 1188, 1191-1192 (10th Cir. 2015); *United States v. Byrne*, 435 F.3d 16, 23-26 (1st Cir. 2006); *United States v. LaShay*, 417 F.3d 715, 718-719 (7th Cir. 2005); *United States v. Burns*, 298 F.3d 523, 539-540 (6th Cir. 2002); *United States v. Pennington*, 168 F.3d 1060, 1066 (8th Cir. 1999). The persuasion need not be coercive, intimidating, or explicit; it is sufficient to urge, induce, ask[], argu[e], giv[e] reasons, *Sparks*, 791 F.3d at 1192, or coach[] or remind[] witnesses by planting misleading facts, *Edlind*, 887 F.3d at 174. Corrupt persuasion is shown where a defendant tells a potential witness a false story as if the story were true, intending that the witness believe the story and testify to it. *United States v. Rodolitz*, 786 F.2d 77, 82 (2d Cir. 1986); see *United States v. Gabriel*, 125 F.3d 89, 102 (2d Cir. 1997). It also covers urging a witness to recall a fact that the witness did not know, even if the fact was actually true. See *LaShay*, 417 F.3d at 719. Corrupt persuasion also can be shown in certain circumstances when a person, with an improper motive, urges a witness not to cooperate with law enforcement. See *United States v. Shotts*, 145 F.3d 1289, 1301 (11th Cr. 1998) (telling Secretary not

to [say] anything [to the FBI] and [she] would not be bothered).

When the charge is acting with the intent to hinder, delay, or prevent the communication of information to law enforcement under Section 1512(b)(3), the nexus to a proceeding inquiry articulated in *Aguilar* - that an individual have knowledge that his actions are likely to affect the judicial proceeding, 515 U.S. at 599 - does not apply because the obstructive act is aimed at the communication of information to investigators, not at impeding an official proceeding.

Acting knowingly . . . corruptly requires proof that the individual was conscious of wrongdoing. *Arthur Andersen*, 544 U.S. at 705-706 (declining to explore [t]he outer limits of this element but indicating that an instruction was infirm where it permitted conviction even if the defendant honestly and sincerely believed that [the] conduct was lawful). It is an affirmative defense that the conduct consisted solely of lawful conduct and that the defendants sole intention was to encourage, induce, or cause the other person to testify truthfully. 18 U.S.C. §1512(e).

Attempts and endeavors.

Section 1512(c)(2) covers both substantive obstruction offenses and attempts to obstruct justice. Under general principles of attempt law, a person is guilty of an attempt when he has the intent to commit a substantive offense and takes an overt act that constitutes a substantial step towards that goal. See *United States v. Resendiz-Ponce*, 549 U.S. 102, 106-107 (2007). [T]he act [must be] substantial, in that it was strongly corroborative of the defendants criminal purpose. *United States v. Pratt*, 351 F.3d 131, 135 (4th Cir. 2003). While mere abstract talk does not suffice, any concrete and specific acts that corroborate the defendants intent can constitute a substantial step. *United States v. Irving*, 665 F.3d 1184, 1198- 1205 (10th Cir. 2011). Thus, soliciting an innocent agent to engage in conduct constituting an element of the crime may qualify as a substantial step. Model Penal Code §5.01(2)(g); see *United States v. Lucas*, 499 F.3d 769, 781 (8th Cir. 2007).

The omnibus clause of 18 U.S.C. §1503 prohibits an endeavor to obstruct justice, which sweeps more broadly than Section 1512s attempt provision. See *United States v. Sampson*, 898 F.3d 287, 302 (2d Cir. 2018); *United States v. Leisure*, 844 F.2d 1347, 1366-1367 (8th Cir. 1988) (collecting cases). It is well established that a[n] [obstruction-of-justice] offense is complete when one corruptly endeavors to obstruct or impede the due administration of justice; the prosecution need not prove that the due administration of justice was actually obstructed or impeded. *United States v. Davis*, 854 F.3d 1276, 1292 (11th Cir. 2017) (internal quotation marks omitted).

B. Investigative and Evidentiary Considerations

After the appointment of the Special Counsel, this Office obtained evidence about the following events relating to potential issues of obstruction of justice involving the President:

1. The Presidents January 27, 2017 dinner with former FBI Director James Comey in which the President reportedly asked for Comeys loyalty, one day after the White House had been briefed by the Department of Justice on contacts between former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn and the Russian Ambassador;
2. The Presidents February 14, 2017 meeting with Comey in which the President reportedly asked Comey not to pursue an investigation of Flynn;
3. The Presidents private requests to Comey to make public the fact that the President was not the subject of an FBI investigation and to lift what the President regarded as a cloud;
4. The Presidents outreach to the Director of National Intelligence and the Directors of the National Security Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency about the FBIs Russia investigation;
5. The Presidents stated rationales for terminating Comey on May 9, 2017, including statements that could reasonably be understood as acknowledging that the FBIs Russia investigation was a factor in Comeys termination; and
6. The Presidents reported involvement in issuing a statement about the June 9, 2016 Trump Tower meeting between Russians and senior Trump Campaign officials that said the meeting was about adoption and omitted that the Russians had offered to provide the Trump Campaign with derogatory information about Hillary Clinton.

Taking into account that information and our analysis of applicable statutory and constitutional principles (discussed below in Volume I], Section III, *infra*), we determined that there was a sufficient factual and legal basis to further investigate potential obstruction-of-justice issues involving the President.

Many of the core issues in an obstruction-of-justice investigation turn on an individuals actions and intent. We therefore requested that the White House provide us with documentary evidence in its possession on the relevant events. We also sought and obtained the White Houses concurrence in our conducting interviews of White House personnel who had relevant information. And we interviewed other witnesses who had pertinent knowledge, obtained documents on a voluntary basis when possible, and used legal process where appropriate. These investigative steps allowed us to gather a substantial amount of evidence.

We also sought a voluntary interview with the President. After more than a year of discussion, the President declined to be interviewed. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] During the course of our discussions, the President did agree to answer written questions on certain Russia-related topics, and he provided us with answers. He did not similarly agree to provide written answers to questions on obstruction topics or questions on events during the transition. Ultimately, while we believed that we had the authority and

legal justification to issue a grand jury subpoena to obtain the Presidents testimony, we chose not to do so. We made that decision in view of the substantial delay that such an investigative step would likely produce at a late stage in our investigation. We also assessed that based on the significant body of evidence we had already obtained of the Presidents actions and his public and private statements describing or explaining those actions, we had sufficient evidence to understand relevant events and to make certain assessments without the Presidents testimony. The Offices decision-making process on this issue is described in more detail in Appendix C, *infra*, in a note that precedes the Presidents written responses.

In assessing the evidence we obtained, we relied on common principles that apply in any investigation. The issue of criminal intent is often inferred from circumstantial evidence. See, e.g., *United States v. Croteau*, 819 F.3d 1293, 1305 (11th Cir. 2016) ([G]uilty knowledge can rarely be established by direct evidence.... Therefore, mens rea elements such as knowledge or intent may be proved by circumstantial evidence.) (internal quotation marks omitted); *United States v. Robinson*, 702 F.3d 22, 36 (2d Cir. 2012) (The governments case rested on circumstantial evidence, but the mens rea elements of knowledge and intent can often be proved through circumstantial evidence and the reasonable inferences drawn therefrom.) (internal quotation marks omitted). The principle that intent can be inferred from circumstantial evidence is a necessity in criminal cases, given the right of a subject to assert his privilege against compelled self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment and therefore decline to testify. Accordingly, determinations on intent are frequently reached without the opportunity to interview an investigatory subject.

Obstruction-of-justice cases are consistent with this rule. See, e.g., *Edlind*, 887 F.3d at 174, 176 (relying on significant circumstantial evidence that [the defendant] was conscious of her wrongdoing in an obstruction case; [b]ecause evidence of intent will almost always be circumstantial, a defendant may be found culpable where the reasonable and foreseeable consequences of her acts are the obstruction of justice) (internal quotation marks, ellipses, and punctuation omitted); *Quattrone*, 441 F.3d at 173-174. Circumstantial evidence that illuminates intent may include a pattern of potentially obstructive acts. Fed. R. Evid. 404(b) (Evidence of a crime, wrong, or other act ... may be admissible ... [to] prov[e] motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, or lack of accident.); see, e.g., *United States v. Frankhauser*, 80 F.3d 641, 648-650 (1st Cir. 1996); *United States v. Arnold*, 773 F.2d 823, 832-834 (7th Cir. 1985); *Cintolo*, 818 F.2d at 1000.

Credibility judgments may also be made based on objective facts and circumstantial evidence. Standard jury instructions highlight a variety of factors that are often relevant in assessing credibility. These include whether a witness had a reason not to tell the truth; whether the witness had a good memory; whether the witness had the opportunity to observe the events about which he testified; whether the witnesss testimony was corroborated by other witnesses; and whether anything the witness said or wrote previously contradicts his testimony. See, e.g.,

First Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions §1.06 (2018); Fifth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions (Criminal Cases) §1.08 (2012); Seventh Circuit Pattern Jury Instruction §3.01 (2012).

In addition to those general factors, we took into account more specific factors in assessing the credibility of conflicting accounts of the facts. For example, contemporaneous written notes can provide strong corroborating evidence. See *United States v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 232 (1975) (the fact that a statement appeared in the contemporaneously recorded report . . . would tend strongly to corroborate the investigators version of the interview). Similarly, a witnesss recitation of his account before he had any motive to fabricate also supports the witnesss credibility. See *Tome v. United States*, 513 U.S. 150, 158 (1995) (A consistent statement that predates the motive is a square rebuttal of the charge that the testimony was contrived as a consequence of that motive.). Finally, a witnesss false description of an encounter can imply consciousness of wrongdoing. See *Al-Adahi v. Obama*, 613 F.3d 1102, 1107 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (noting the well-settled principle that false exculpatory statements are evidence - often strong evidence - of guilt). We applied those settled legal principles in evaluating the factual results of our investigation.

I. BACKGROUND LEGAL AND EVIDENTIARY PRINCIPLES

II. Factual Results of the Obstruction Investigation

A. The Campaign's Response to Reports About Russian Support for Trump

1. Press Reports Allege Links Between the Trump Campaign and Russia
2. The Trump Campaign Reacts to WikiLeaks's Release of Hacked Emails
3. The Trump Campaign Reacts to Allegations That Russia was Seeking to Aid Candidate Trump
4. After the Election, Trump Continues to Deny Any Contacts or Connections with Russia or That Russia Aided his Election

B. The President's Conduct Concerning the Investigation of Michael Flynn

1. Incoming National Security Advisor Flynn Discusses Sanctions on Russia with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak
2. President-Elect Trump is Briefed on the Intelligence Community's Assessment of Russian Interference in the Election and Congress Opens Election-Interference Investigations
3. Flynn Makes False Statements About his Communications with Kislyak to Incoming Administration Officials, the Media, and the FBI
4. DOJ Officials Notify the White House of Their Concerns About Flynn
5. McGahn has a Follow-Up Meeting About Flynn with Yates; President Trump has Dinner with FBI Director Comey
6. Flynn's Resignation
7. The President Discusses Flynn with FBI Director Comey
8. The Media Raises Questions About the President's Delay in Terminating Flynn
9. The President Attempts to Have K.T. McFarland Create a Witness Statement Denying that he Directed Flynn's Discussions with Kislyak

C. The President's Reaction to Public Confirmation of the FBI's Russia Investigation

1. Attorney General Sessions Recuses From the Russia Investigation
2. FBI Director Comey Publicly ²⁰Confirms the Existence of the Russia Investigation in Testimony Before HPSCI
3. The President Asks Intelligence Community Leaders to Make Public Statements that he had No Connection to Russia

By June 2017, the President became aware of emails setting up the June 9, 2016 meeting between senior campaign officials and Russians who offered derogatory information on Hillary Clinton as "part of Russia and its government's support for Mr. Trump." On multiple occasions in late June and early July 2017, the President directed aides not to publicly disclose the emails, and he then dictated a statement about the meeting to be issued by Donald Trump Jr. describing the meeting as about adoption.

1. The President Learns About the Existence of Emails Concerning the June 9, 2016 Trump Tower Meeting

In mid-June 2017 the same week that the President first asked Lewandowski to pass a message to senior Administration officials became aware of emails exchanged during the campaign arranging a meeting between Donald Trump Jr., Paul Manafort, Jared Kushner, and a Russian attorney.⁷ As described in Volume I, Section IV.A.5, *supra*, the emails stated that the "Crown [P]rosecutor of Russia" had offered "to provide the Trump campaign with some official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary and her dealings with Russia" as part of "Russia and its government's support for Mr. Trump."⁸ Trump Jr. responded, "[I]f it's what you say I love it,"⁹ and he, Kushner, and Manafort met with the Russian attorney and several other Russian individuals at Trump Tower on June 9, 2016.¹⁰ At the meeting, the Russian attorney claimed that funds derived from illegal activities in Russia were provided to Hillary Clinton and other Democrats, and the Russian attorney then spoke about the Magnitsky Act, a 2012 U.S. statute that imposed financial and travel sanctions on Russian officials and that had resulted in a retaliatory ban in Russia on U.S. adoptions of Russian children.¹¹

According to written answers submitted by the President in response to questions from this Office, the President had no recollection of learning of the meeting or the emails setting it up at the time the meeting occurred or at any other time before the election.¹²

The Trump Campaign had previously received a document request from SSCI that called for the production of various information, including, "[a] list and a description of all meetings" between any "individual affiliated with the Trump campaign" and "any individual formally or informally affiliated with the Russian government or

⁷Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 1; Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 2.

⁸RG000061 (6/3/16 Email, Goldstone to Trump Jr.); DonaldJTrumpJR 7/11/17 (11:01 a.m. ET) Tweet.

⁹RG000061 (6/3/16 Email, Trump Jr. to Goldstone); DonaldJTrumpJR 7/11/17 (11:01 am. ET) Tweet.

¹⁰Samochornov 7/12/17 302, at 4.

¹¹See Volume I, Section IV.A.5, *supra* (describing meeting in detail).

¹²Written Responses of Donald J. Trump (Nov. 20, 2018), at 8 (Response to Question I, Parts (a) through (c)). The President declined to answer questions about his knowledge of the June 9 meeting or other events after the election.

Russian business interests which took place between June 16, 2015, and 12 pm on January 20, 2017,” and associated records.¹³ Trump Organization attorneys became aware of the June 9 meeting no later than the first week of June 2017, when they began interviewing the meeting participants, and the Trump Organization attorneys provided the emails setting up the meeting to the President’s personal counsel.¹⁴ Mark Corallo, who had been hired as a spokesman for the President’s personal legal team, recalled that he learned about the June 9 meeting around June 21 or 22, 2017.¹⁵ Priebus recalled learning about the June 9 meeting from Fox News host Sean Hannity in late June 2017.¹⁶ Priebus notified one of the President’s personal attorneys, who told Priebus he was already working on it.¹⁷ By late June, several advisors recalled receiving media inquiries that could relate to the June 9 meeting.¹⁸

2. The President Directs Communications Staff Not to Publicly Disclose Information About the June 9 Meeting

Communications advisors Hope Hicks and Josh Raffel recalled discussing with Jared Kushner and Ivanka Trump that the emails were damaging and would inevitably be leaked.¹⁹ Hicks and Raffel advised that the best strategy was to proactively release the emails to the press.²⁰ On or about June 22, 2017, Hicks attended a meeting in the White House residence with the President, Kushner, and Ivanka Trump.²¹ According to Hicks, Kushner said that he wanted to fill the President in on something that had been discovered in the documents he was to provide to the congressional committees involving a meeting with him, Manafort, and Trump Jr.²² Kushner brought a folder of documents to the meeting and tried to show them to the President, but the President stopped Kushner and said he did not want to know about it, shutting the conversation down.²³

On June 28, 2017, Hicks viewed the emails at Kushner’s attorney’s office.²⁴ She

¹³DJTFP_SCO_PDF.00000001-02 (5/17/17 Letter, SSCI to Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.).

¹⁴Goldstone 2/8/18 302, at 12; 6/2/17 and 6/5/17 Emails, Goldstone & Garten; Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 3; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2.

¹⁵Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 3.

¹⁶Priebus 4/3/18 302, at 7.

¹⁷Priebus 4/3/18 302, at 7.

¹⁸Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 3; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 8; Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 3.

¹⁹Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 2-3; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2.

²⁰Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 2-3, 5; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 8.

²¹Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 6-7; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 1.

²²Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 7; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 1.

²³Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 7; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 1. Counsel for Ivanka Trump provided an attorney proffer that is consistent with Hicks account and with the other events involving Ivanka Trump set forth in this section of the report. Kushner said that he did not recall talking to the President at this time about the June 9 meeting or the underlying emails. Kushner 4/11/18 302, at 30.

²⁴Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 1-2.

recalled being shocked by the emails because they looked "really bad."²⁵ The next day, Hicks spoke privately with the President to mention her concern about the emails, which she understood were soon going to be shared with Congress.²⁶ The President seemed upset because too many people knew about the emails and he told Hicks that just one lawyer should deal with the matter.²⁷ The President indicated that he did not think the emails would leak, but said they would leak if everyone had access to them.²⁸

Later that day, Hicks, Kushner, and Ivanka Trump went together to talk to the President.²⁹ Hicks recalled that Kushner told the President the June 9 meeting was not a big deal and was about Russian adoption, but that emails existed setting up the meeting.³⁰ Hicks said she wanted to get in front of the story and have Trump Jr. release the emails as part of an interview with "softball questions."³¹ The President said he did not want to know about it and they should not go to the press.³² Hicks warned the President that the emails were "really bad" and the story would be "massive" when it broke, but the President was insistent that he did not want to talk about it and said he did not want details.³³ Hicks recalled that the President asked Kushner when his document production was due.³⁴ Kushner responded that it would be a couple of weeks and the President said, "then leave it alone."³⁵ Hicks also recalled that the President said Kushner's attorney should give the emails to whomever he needed to give them to, but the President did not think they would be leaked to the press.³⁶ Raffel later heard from Hicks that the President had directed the group not to be proactive in disclosing the emails because the President believed they would not leak.³⁷

3. The President Directs Trump Jr.'s Response to Press Inquiries About the June 9 Meeting

The following week, the President departed on an overseas trip for the G20 summit in Hamburg, Germany, accompanied by Hicks, Raffel, Kushner, and Ivanka Trump, among others.³⁸ On July 7, 2017, while the President was overseas, Hicks and Raffel

²⁵Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2.

²⁶Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 8.

²⁷Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2-3; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 8.

²⁸Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 8.

²⁹Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 8; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2.

³⁰Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 9.

³¹Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2-3.

³²Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 2-3; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 9.

³³Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 9.

³⁴Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3.

³⁵Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3.

³⁶Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 9.

³⁷Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 5.

³⁸Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 6.

learned that the New York Times was working on a story about the June 9 meeting.³⁹ The next day, Hicks told the President about the story and he directed her not to comment.⁴⁰ Hicks thought the President's reaction was odd because he usually considered not responding to the press to be the ultimate sin.⁴¹ Later that day, Hicks and the President again spoke about the story.⁴² Hicks recalled that the President asked her what the meeting had been about, and she said that she had been told the meeting was about Russian adoption.⁴³ The President responded, "then just say that."⁴⁴

On the flight home from the G20 on July 8, 2017, Hicks obtained a draft statement about the meeting to be released by Trump Jr. and brought it to the President.⁴⁵ The draft statement began with a reference to the information that was offered by the Russians in setting up the meeting: "I was asked to have a meeting by an acquaintance I knew from the 2013 Miss Universe pageant with an individual who I was told might have information helpful to the campaign."⁴⁶ Hicks again wanted to disclose the entire story, but the President directed that the statement not be issued because it said too much.⁴⁷ The President told Hicks to say only that Trump Jr. took a brief meeting and it was about Russian adoption.⁴⁸ After speaking with the President, Hicks texted Trump Jr. a revised statement on the June 9 meeting that read:

It was a short meeting. I asked Jared and Paul to stop by. We discussed a program about the adoption of Russian children that was active and popular with American families years ago and was since ended by the Russian government, but it was not a campaign issue at that time and there was no follow up.⁴⁹

Hicks's text concluded, "Are you ok with this? Attributed to you."⁵⁰ Trump Jr. responded by text message that he wanted to add the word "primarily" before "discussed" so that the statement would read, "We primarily discussed a program about the adoption of Russian children."⁵¹ Trump Jr. texted that he wanted the change because "[t]hey started with some Hillary thing which was bs and some other nonsense which we shot down fast."⁵² Hicks texted back, "I think that's right too

³⁹Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 6-7; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3.

⁴⁰Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 10; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3.

⁴¹Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 10.

⁴²Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3.

⁴³Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 10.

⁴⁴Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 3; *see* Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 10.

⁴⁵Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 4.

⁴⁶Hicks 7/8/17 Notes.

⁴⁷Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 4-5; Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 11.

⁴⁸Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 11.

⁴⁹SCRO11a_000004 (7/8/17 Text Message, Hicks to Trump Jr.).

⁵⁰SCRO11a_000004 (7/8/17 Text Message, Hicks to Trump Jr.).

⁵¹SCRO11a_000005 (7/8/17 Text Message, Trump Jr. to Hicks).

⁵²SCRO11a_000005 (7/8/17 Text Message, Trump Jr. to Hicks).

but boss man worried it invites a lot of questions[.] [U]ltimately [d]efer to you and [your attorney] on that word Be I know it's important and I think the mention of a campaign issue adds something to it in case we have to go further."⁵³ Trump Jr. responded, "If I don't have it in there it appears as though I'm lying later when they inevitably leak something."⁵⁴ Trump Jr.'s statement adding the word "primarily" and making other minor additions was then provided to the New York Times.⁵⁵ The full statement provided to the Times stated:

It was a short introductory meeting. I asked Jared and Paul to stop by. We primarily discussed a program about the adoption of Russian children that was active and popular with American families years ago and was since ended by the Russian government, but it was not a campaign issue at the time and there was no follow up. I was asked to attend the meeting by an acquaintance, but was not told the name of the person I would be meeting with beforehand.⁵⁶

The statement did not mention the offer of derogatory information about Clinton or any discussion of the Magnitsky Act or U.S. sanctions, which were the principal subjects of the meeting, as described in Volume I, Section IV.A.5, *supra*.

A short while later, while still on Air Force One, Hicks learned that Priebus knew about the emails, which further convinced her that additional information about the June 9 meeting would leak and the White House should be proactive and get in front of the story.⁵⁷ Hicks recalled again going to the President to urge him that they should be fully transparent about the June 9 meeting, but he again said no, telling Hicks, "You've given a statement. We're done."⁵⁸

Later on the flight home, Hicks went to the President's cabin, where the President was on the phone with one of his personal attorneys.⁵⁹ At one point the President handed the phone to Hicks, and the attorney told Hicks that he had been working with Circa News on a separate story, and that she should not talk to the New York Times.⁶⁰

⁵³SCRO11a_000005 (7/8/17 Text Message, Trump Jr. to Hicks).

⁵⁴SCRO11a_000006 (7/8/17 Text Message, Trump Jr. to Hicks).

⁵⁵Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 6; see Jo Becker et al., *Trump Team Met With Lawyer Linked to Kremlin During Campaign*, New York Times (July 8, 2017).

⁵⁶See Jo Becker et al., *Trump Team Met With Lawyer Linked to Kremlin During Campaign*, New York Times (July 8, 2017).

⁵⁷Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 6; Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 9-10.

⁵⁸Hicks 12/7/17 302, at 12; Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 10.

⁵⁹Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 7.

⁶⁰Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 7.

4. The Media Reports on the June 9, 2016 Meeting

Before the President's flight home from the G20 landed, the New York Times published its story about the June 9, 2016 meeting.⁶¹ In addition to the statement from Trump Jr., the Times story also quoted a statement from Corallo on behalf of the President's legal team suggesting that the meeting might have been a setup by individuals working with the firm that produced the Steele reporting.⁶² Corallo also worked with Circa News on a story published an hour later that questioned whether Democratic operatives had arranged the June 9 meeting to create the appearance of improper connections between Russia and Trump family members.⁶³ Hicks was upset about Corallo's public statement and called him that evening to say the President had not approved the statement.⁶⁴

The next day, July 9, 2017, Hicks and the President called Corallo together and the President criticized Corallo for the statement he had released.⁶⁵ Corallo told the President the statement had been authorized and further observed that Trump Jr.'s statement was inaccurate and that a document existed that would contradict it.⁶⁶ Corallo said that he purposely used the term "document" to refer to the emails setting up the June 9 meeting because he did not know what the President knew about the emails.⁶⁷ Corallo recalled that when he referred to the "document" on the call with the President, Hicks responded that only a few people had access to it and said "it will never get out."⁶⁸ Corallo took contemporaneous notes of the call that say: "Also mention existence of doc. Hope says 'only a few people have it. It will never get out.'"⁶⁹ Hicks later told investigators that she had no memory of making that comment and had always believed the emails would eventually be leaked, but she might have been channeling the President on the phone call because it was clear to her throughout her conversations with the President that he did not think the emails would leak.⁷⁰

On July 11, 2017, Trump Jr. posted redacted images of the emails setting up the June 9 meeting on Twitter; the New York Times reported that he did so "[a]fter being

⁶¹See Jo Becker et al., *Trump Team Met With Lawyer Linked to Kremlin During Campaign*, New York Times (July 8, 2017); Raffel 2/8/18 302, at 10.

⁶²See Jo Becker et al., *Trump Team Met With Lawyer Linked to Kremlin During Campaign*, New York Times (July 8, 2017).

⁶³See *Donald Trump Jr. gathered members of campaign for meeting with Russian lawyer before election*, Circa News (July 8, 2017).

⁶⁴Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 8; Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 6-7.

⁶⁵Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 7.

⁶⁶Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 7.

⁶⁷Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 7-9.

⁶⁸Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 8.

⁶⁹Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 8; Corallo 7/9/17 Notes (Sunday 9th - Hope calls w/ POTUS on line). Corallo said he is 100% confident that Hicks said It will never get out on the call. Corallo 2/15/18 302, at 9.

⁷⁰Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 9.

told that The Times was about to publish the content of the emails.”⁷¹ Later that day, the media reported that the President had been personally involved in preparing Trump Jr.’s initial statement to the New York Times that had claimed the meeting “primarily” concerned “a program about the adoption of Russian children.”⁷² Over the next several days, the President’s personal counsel repeatedly and inaccurately denied that the President played any role in drafting Trump Jr.’s statement.⁷³ After consulting with the President on the issue, White House Press Secretary Sarah Sanders told the media that the President “certainly didn’t dictate” the statement, but that “he weighed in, offered suggestions like any father would do.”⁷⁴ Several months later, the President’s personal counsel stated in a private communication to the Special Counsel’s Office that “the President dictated a short but accurate response to the New York Times article on behalf of his son, Donald Trump, Jr.”⁷⁵ The President later told the press that it was “irrelevant” whether he dictated the statement and said, “It’s a statement to the New York Times.... judges.”⁷⁶ That’s not a statement to a high tribunal of

On July 12, 2017, the Special Counsel’s Office ██████████ ██████████ Trump Jr. ██████████ ██████████ related to the June 9 meeting and those who attended the June 9 meeting.⁷⁷

On July 19, 2017, the President had his follow-up meeting with Lewandowski and then met with reporters for the New York Times. In addition to criticizing Sessions in his Times interview, the President addressed the June 9, 2016 meeting and said he “didn’t know anything about the meeting” at the time.”⁷⁸ The President added, “As I’ve said most other people, you know, when they call up and say, ‘By the way, we have information on your opponent,’ I think most politicians I was just with a lot of

⁷¹DonaldJTrumpJR 7/11/17 (11:01 a.m. ET) Tweet; Jo Becker et al., *Russian Dirt on Clinton? ‘I Love It,’ Donald Trump Jr. Said*, New York Times (July 11, 2017).

⁷²See, e.g., Peter Baker & Maggie Haberman, *Rancor at White House as Russia Story Refuses to Let the Page Turn*, New York Times (July 11, 2017) (reporting that the President “signed off” on Trump Jr.’s statement).

⁷³See, e.g., David Wright, *Trump lawyer: President was aware of nothing*, CNN (July 12, 2017) (quoting the President’s personal attorney as saying, “I wasn’t involved in the statement drafting at all nor was the President.”); see also Good Morning America, ABC (July 12, 2017) (“The President didn’t sign off on anything... The President wasn’t involved in that.”); Meet the Press, NBC (July 16, 2017) (“I do want to be clear the President was not involved in the drafting of the statement.”).

⁷⁴Sarah Sanders, *White House Daily Briefing*, C-SPAN (Aug. 1, 2017); Sanders 7/3/18 302, at 9 (the President told Sanders he weighed in, as any father would and knew she intended to tell the press what he said).

⁷⁵1/29/18 Letter, President’s Personal Counsel to Special Counsel’s Office, at 18.

⁷⁶Remarks by President Trump in Press Gaggle (June 15, 2018).

⁷⁷██████████ ██████████

⁷⁸Peter Baker et al., *Excerpts From The Times Interview With Trump*, New York Times (July 19, 2017).

people, they said... , 'Who wouldn't have taken a meeting like that?'"⁷⁹

Analysis

In analyzing the President's actions regarding the disclosure of information about the June 9 meeting, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice:

Obstructive act. On at least three occasions between June 29, 2017, and July 9, 2017, the President directed Hicks and others not to publicly disclose information about the June 9, 2016 meeting between senior campaign officials and a Russian attorney. On June 29, Hicks warned the President that the emails setting up the June 9 meeting were "really bad" and the story would be "massive" when it broke, but the President told her and Kushner to "leave it alone." Early on July 8, after Hicks told the President the New York Times was working on a story about the June 9 meeting, the President directed her not to comment, even though Hicks said that the President usually considered not responding to the press to be the ultimate sin. Later that day, the President rejected Trump Jr.'s draft statement that would have acknowledged that the meeting was with "an individual who I was told might have information helpful to the campaign." The President then dictated a statement to Hicks that said the meeting was about Russian adoption (which the President had twice been told was discussed at the meeting). The statement dictated by the President did not mention the offer of derogatory information about Clinton.

Each of these efforts by the President involved his communications team and was directed at the press. They would amount to obstructive acts only if the President, by taking these actions, sought to withhold information from or mislead congressional investigators or the Special Counsel. On May 17, 2017, the President's campaign received a document request from SSCI that clearly covered the June 9 meeting and underlying emails, and those documents also plainly would have been relevant to the Special Counsel's investigation.

But the evidence does not establish that the President took steps to prevent the emails or other information about the June 9 meeting from being provided to Congress or the Special Counsel. The series of discussions in which the President sought to limit access to the emails and prevent their public release occurred in the context of developing a press strategy. The only evidence we have of the President discussing the production of documents to Congress or the Special Counsel is the conversation on June 29, 2017, when Hicks recalled the President acknowledging that Kushner's attorney should provide emails related to the June 9 meeting to whomever he needed to give them to. We do not have evidence of what the President discussed with his own lawyers at that time.

Nexus to an official proceeding. As described above, by the time of the President's attempts to prevent the public release of the emails regarding the June 9 meeting,

⁷⁹Peter Baker et al., *Excerpts From The Timess Interview With Trump*, New York Times (July 19, 2017).

the existence of a grand jury investigation supervised by the Special Counsel was public knowledge, and the President had been told that the emails were responsive to congressional inquiries. To satisfy the nexus requirement, however, it would be necessary to show that preventing the release of the emails to the public would have the natural and probable effect of impeding the grand jury proceeding or congressional inquiries. As noted above, the evidence does not establish that the President sought to prevent disclosure of the emails in those official proceedings.

Intent. The evidence establishes the President's substantial involvement in the communications strategy related to information about his campaign's connections to Russia and his desire to minimize public disclosures about those connections. The President became aware of the emails no later than June 29, 2017, when he discussed them with Hicks and Kushner, and he could have been aware of them as early as June 2, 2017, when lawyers for the Trump Organization began interviewing witnesses who participated in the June 9 meeting. The President thereafter repeatedly rejected the advice of Hicks and other staffers to publicly release information about the June 9 meeting. The President expressed concern that multiple people had access to the emails and instructed Hicks that only one lawyer should deal with the matter. And the President dictated a statement to be released by Trump Jr. in response to the first press accounts of the June 9 meeting that said the meeting was about adoption.

But as described above, the evidence does not establish that the President intended to prevent the Special Counsel's Office or Congress from obtaining the emails setting up the June 9 meeting or other information about that meeting. The statement recorded by Corallo that the emails "will never get out" can be explained as reflecting a belief that the emails would not be made public if the President's press strategy were followed, even if the emails were provided to Congress and the Special Counsel.

H. The President's Further Efforts to Have the Attorney General Take Over the Investigation

Overview

From summer 2017 through 2018, the President attempted to have Attorney General Sessions reverse his recusal, take control of the Special Counsel's investigation, and order an investigation of Hillary Clinton.

Evidence

1. The President Again Seeks to Have Sessions Reverse his Recusal

After returning Sessions's resignation letter at the end of May 2017, but before the President's July 19, 2017 New York Times interview in which he publicly criticized Sessions for recusing from the Russia investigation, the President took additional steps to have Sessions reverse his recusal. In particular, at some point after the

May 17, 2017 appointment of the Special Counsel, Sessions recalled, the President called him at home and asked if Sessions would "unrecuse" himself.⁸⁰ According to Sessions, the President asked him to reverse his recusal so that Sessions could direct the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute Hillary Clinton, and the "gist" of the conversation was that the President wanted Sessions to unrecuse from "all of it," including the Special Counsel's Russia investigation.⁸¹ Sessions listened but did not respond, and he did not reverse his recusal or order an investigation of Clinton.⁸²

In early July 2017, the President asked Staff Secretary Rob Porter what he thought of Associate Attorney General Rachel Brand.⁸³ Porter recalled that the President asked him if Brand was good, tough, and "on the team."⁸⁴ The President also asked if Porter thought Brand was interested in being responsible for the Special Counsel's investigation and whether she would want to be Attorney General one day.⁸⁵ Because Porter knew Brand, the President asked him to sound her out about taking responsibility for the investigation and being Attorney General.⁸⁶ Contemporaneous notes taken by Porter show that the President told Porter to "Keep in touch with your friend," in reference to Brand.⁸⁷ Later, the President asked Porter a few times in passing whether he had spoken to Brand, but Porter did not reach out to her because he was uncomfortable with the task.⁸⁸ In asking him to reach out to Brand, Porter understood the President to want to find someone to end the Russia investigation or fire the Special Counsel, although the President never said so explicitly.⁸⁹ Porter did not contact Brand because he was sensitive to the implications of that action and did not want to be involved in a chain of events associated with an effort to end the investigation or fire the Special Counsel.⁹⁰

McGahn recalled that during the summer of 2017, he and the President discussed the fact that if Sessions were no longer in his position the Special Counsel would report directly to a non-recused Attorney General.⁹¹ McGahn told the President that things

⁸⁰Sessions 1/17/18 302, at 15. That was the second time that the President asked Sessions to reverse his recusal from campaign-related investigations. *See* Volume II, Section II.C.1, *supra* (describing Presidents March 2017 request at Mar-a-Lago for Sessions to unrecuse).

⁸¹Sessions 1/17/18 302, at 15.

⁸²Sessions 1/17/18 302, at 15.

⁸³Porter 4/13/18 302, at 11; Porter 5/8/18 302, at 6.

⁸⁴Porter 4/13/18 302, at 11; Porter 5/8/18 302, at 6.

⁸⁵Porter 4/13/18 302, at 11; Porter 5/8/18 302, at 6. Because of Sessions's recusal, if Rosenstein were no longer in his position, Brand would, by default, become the DOJ official in charge of supervising the Special Counsel's investigation, and if both Sessions and Rosenstein were removed, Brand would be next in line to become Acting Attorney General for all DOJ matters. *See* 28 U.S.C. §508.

⁸⁶Porter 4/13/18 302, at 11; Porter 5/8/18 302, at 6.

⁸⁷SC_RRP000020 (Porter 7/10/17 Notes).

⁸⁸Porter 4/13/18 302, at 11-12.

⁸⁹Porter 4/13/18 302, at 11-12.

⁹⁰Porter 4/13/18 302, at 11-12. Brand confirmed that no one ever raised with her the prospect of taking over the Russia investigation or becoming Attorney General. Brand 1/29/19 302, at 2.

⁹¹McGahn 12/14/17 302, at 11.

might not change much under a new Attorney General.⁹² McGahn also recalled that in or around July 2017, the President frequently brought up his displeasure with Sessions.⁹³ Hicks recalled that the President viewed Sessions's recusal from the Russia investigation as an act of disloyalty.⁹⁴ In addition to criticizing Sessions's recusal, the President raised other concerns about Sessions and his job performance with McGahn and Hicks.⁹⁵

2. Additional Efforts to Have Sessions Unrecuse or Direct Investigations Covered by his Recusal

Later in 2017, the President continued to urge Sessions to reverse his recusal from campaign-related investigations and considered replacing Sessions with an Attorney General who would not be recused.

On October 16, 2017, the President met privately with Sessions and said that the Department of Justice was not investigating individuals and events that the President thought the Department should be investigating.⁹⁶ According to contemporaneous notes taken by Porter, who was at the meeting, the President mentioned Clinton's emails and said, "Don't have to tell us, just take [a] look."⁹⁷ Sessions did not offer any assurances or promises to the President that the Department of Justice would comply with that request.⁹⁸ Two days later, on October 18, 2017, the President tweeted, "Wow, FBI confirms report that James Comey drafted letter exonerating Crooked Hillary Clinton long before investigation was complete. Many people not interviewed, including Clinton herself. Comey stated under oath that he didn't do this-obviously a fix? Where is Justice Dept?"⁹⁹ On October 29, 2017, the President tweeted that there was "ANGER & UNITY" over a "lack of investigation" of Clinton and "the Comey fix," and concluded: "DO SOMETHING!"¹⁰⁰

On December 6, 2017, five days after Flynn pleaded guilty to lying about his contacts with the Russian government, the President asked to speak with Sessions in the Oval Office at the end of a cabinet meeting.¹⁰¹ During that Oval Office

⁹²McGahn 12/14/17 302, at 11.

⁹³McGahn 12/14/17 302, at 9.

⁹⁴Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 10.

⁹⁵McGahn 12/14/17 302, at 9; Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 10.

⁹⁶Porter 5/8/18 302, at 10.

⁹⁷SC_RRP000024 (Porter 10/16/17 Notes); see Porter 5/8/18 302, at 10.

⁹⁸Porter 5/8/18 302, at 10.

⁹⁹realDonaldTrump 10/18/17 (6:21 a.m. ET) Tweet;realDonaldTrump 10/18/17 (6:27 a.m. ET) Tweet.

¹⁰⁰realDonaldTrump 10/29/17 (9:53 a.m. ET) Tweet;realDonaldTrump 10/29/17 (10:02 a.m. ET) Tweet;realDonaldTrump 10/29/17 (10:17 a.m. ET) Tweet.

¹⁰¹Porter 4/13/18 302, at 5-6; see SC_RRP000031 (Porter 12/6/17 Notes) (12:45pm With the President, Gen. Kelly, and Sessions (who I pulled in after the Cabinet meeting)); SC_RRP000033 (Porter 12/6/17 Notes) (Post-cabinet meeting POTUS asked me to get AG Sessions. Asked me to stay. Also COS Kelly.).

meeting, which Porter attended, the President again suggested that Sessions could “unrecuse,” which Porter linked to taking back supervision of the Russia investigation and directing an investigation of Hillary Clinton.¹⁰² According to contemporaneous notes taken by Porter, the President said, “I don’t know if you could un-recuse yourself. You’d be a hero. Not telling you to do anything. Dershowitz says POTUS can get involved. Can order AG to investigate. I don’t want to get involved. I’m not going to get involved. I’m not going to do anything or direct you to do anything. I just want to be treated fairly.”¹⁰³ According to Porter’s notes, Sessions responded, “We are taking steps; whole new leadership team. Professionals; will operate according to the law.”¹⁰⁴ Sessions also said, “I never saw anything that was improper,” which Porter thought was noteworthy because it did not fit with the previous discussion about Clinton.¹⁰⁵ Porter understood Sessions to be reassuring the President that he was on the President’s team.¹⁰⁶

At the end of December, the President told the New York Times it was “too bad” that Sessions had recused himself from the Russia investigation.¹⁰⁷ When asked whether Holder had been a more loyal Attorney General to President Obama than Sessions was to him, the President said, “I don’t want to get into loyalty, but I will tell you that, I will say this: Holder protected President Obama. Totally protected him. When you look at the things that they did, and Holder protected the president. And I have great respect for that, I’ll be honest.”¹⁰⁸ Later in January, the President brought up the idea of replacing Sessions and told Porter that he wanted to “clean house” at the Department of Justice.¹⁰⁹ In a meeting in the White House residence that Porter attended on January 27, 2018, Porter recalled that the President talked about the great attorney she had in the past with successful win records, such as Roy Cohn and Jay Goldberg, and said that one of his biggest failings as President was that he had not surrounded himself with good attorneys, citing Sessions as an example.¹¹⁰ The President raised Sessions’s recusal and brought up and criticized the Special Counsel’s investigation.¹¹¹

Over the next several months, the President continued to criticize Sessions in tweets and media interviews and on several occasions appeared to publicly encourage

¹⁰²Porter 5/8/18 302, at 12; Porter 4/13/18 302, at 5-6.

¹⁰³SC_RRP000033 (Porter 12/6/17 Notes); see Porter 4/13/18 302, at 6; Porter 5/8/18 302, at 12.

¹⁰⁴SC_RRP000033 (Porter 12/6/17 Notes); see Porter 4/13/18 302, at 6.

¹⁰⁵SC_RRP000033 (Porter 12/6/17 Notes); Porter 4/13/18 302, at 6.

¹⁰⁶Porter 4/13/18 302, at 6-7.

¹⁰⁷Michael S. Schmidt & Michael D. Shear, *Trump Says Russia Inquiry Makes U.S. “Look Very Bad”*, New York Times (Dec. 28, 2017).

¹⁰⁸Michael S. Schmidt & Michael D. Shear, *Trump Says Russia Inquiry Makes U.S. “Look Very Bad”*, New York Times (Dec. 28, 2017).

¹⁰⁹Porter 4/13/18 302, at 14.

¹¹⁰Porter 5/8/18 302, at 15. Contemporaneous notes Porter took of the conversation state, Roy Cohn (14-0) / Jay Goldberg (12-0). SC_RRP000047 (Porter 1/27/18 Notes).

¹¹¹Porter 5/8/18 302, at 15-16.

him to take action in the Russia investigation despite his recusal.¹¹² On June 5, 2018, for example, the President tweeted, "The Russian Witch Hunt Hoax continues, all because Jeff Sessions didn't tell me he was going to recuse himself.... I would have quickly picked someone else. So much time and money wasted, so many lives ruined ... and Sessions knew better than most that there was No Collusion!"¹¹³ On August 1, 2018, the President tweeted that "Attorney General Jeff Sessions should stop this Rigged Witch Hunt right now."¹¹⁴ On August 23, 2018, the President publicly criticized Sessions in a press interview and suggested that prosecutions at the Department of Justice were politically motivated because Paul Manafort had been prosecuted but Democrats had not.¹¹⁵ The President said, "I put in an Attorney General that never took control of the Justice Department, Jeff Sessions."¹¹⁶ That day, Sessions issued a press statement that said, "I took control of the Department of Justice the day I was sworn in.... While I am Attorney General, the actions of the Department of Justice will not be improperly influenced by political considerations."¹¹⁷ The next day, the President tweeted a response: "'Department of Justice will not be improperly influenced by political considerations.' Jeff, this is GREAT, what everyone wants, so look into all of the corruption on the 'other side' including deleted Emails, Comey lies & leaks, Mueller conflicts, McCabe, Strzok, Page, Ohr, FISA abuse, Christopher Steele & his phony and corrupt Dossier, the Clinton Foundation, illegal surveillance of Trump campaign, Russian collusion by Dems and so much more. Open up the papers & documents without redaction? Come on Jeff, you can do it, the country is waiting!"¹¹⁸

On November 7, 2018, the day after the midterm elections, the President replaced Sessions with Sessions's chief of staff as Acting Attorney General.¹¹⁹

Analysis

In analyzing the President's efforts to have Sessions unrecuse himself and regain

¹¹²See, e.g.,realDonaldTrump 2/28/18 (9:34a.m.ET) Tweet (Why is A.G. Jeff Sessions asking the Inspector General to investigate potentially massive FISA abuse. Will take forever, has no prosecutorial power and already late with reports on Comey etc. Isn't the I.G. an Obama guy? Why not use Justice Department lawyers? DISGRACEFUL!);realDonaldTrump 4/7/18 (4:52 p.m. ET) Tweet (Lawmakers of the House Judiciary Committee are angrily accusing the Department of Justice of missing the Thursday Deadline for turning over UNREDACTED Documents relating to FISA abuse, FBI, Comey, Lynch, McCabe, Clinton Emails and much more. Slow walking what is going on? BAD!);realDonaldTrump 4/22/18 (8:22 a.m. ET) Tweet (GOP Lawmakers asking Sessions to Investigate Comey and Hillary Clinton. FoxNews Goodluck with that request!);realDonaldTrump 12/16/18 (3:37 p.m. ET) Tweet (Jeff Sessions should be ashamed of himself for allowing this total HOAX to get started in the first place!).

¹¹³realDonaldTrump 6/5/18 (7:31 a.m. ET) Tweet.

¹¹⁴realDonaldTrump 8/1/18 (9:24 a.m. ET) Tweet.

¹¹⁵Fox & Friends Interview of President Trump, Fox News (Aug. 23, 2018).

¹¹⁶Fox & Friends Interview of President Trump, Fox News (Aug. 23, 2018).

¹¹⁷Sessions 8/23/18 Press Statement.

¹¹⁸realDonaldTrump 8/24/18 (6:17 a.m. ET) Tweet;realDonaldTrump 8/24/18 (6:28 a.m. ET) Tweet.

¹¹⁹realDonaldTrump 11/7/18 (2:44 p.m. ET) Tweet.

control of the Russia investigation, the following considerations and evidence are relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice:

Obstructive act. To determine if the President's efforts to have the Attorney General unrecuse could qualify as an obstructive act, it would be necessary to assess evidence on whether those actions would naturally impede the Russia investigation. That inquiry would take into account the supervisory role that the Attorney General, if unrecused, would play in the Russia investigation. It also would have to take into account that the Attorney General's recusal covered other campaign-related matters. The inquiry would not turn on what Attorney General Sessions would actually do if unrecused, but on whether the efforts to reverse his recusal would naturally have had the effect of impeding the Russia investigation.

On multiple occasions in 2017, the President spoke with Sessions about reversing his recusal so that he could take over the Russia investigation and begin an investigation and prosecution of Hillary Clinton. For example, in early summer 2017, Sessions recalled the President asking him to unrecuse, but Sessions did not take it as a directive. When the President raised the issue again in December 2017, the President said, as recorded by Porter, "Not telling you to do anything.... I'm not going to get involved. I'm not going to do anything or direct you to do anything. I just want to be treated fairly." The duration of the President's efforts which spanned from March 2017 to August 2018 and the fact that the President repeatedly criticized Sessions in public and in private for failing to tell the President that he would have to recuse is relevant to assessing whether the President's efforts to have Sessions unrecuse could qualify as obstructive acts.

Nexus to an official proceeding. As described above, by mid-June 2017, the existence of a grand jury investigation supervised by the Special Counsel was public knowledge. In addition, in July 2017, a different grand jury supervised by the Special Counsel was empaneled in the District of Columbia, and the press reported on the existence of this grand jury in early August 2017.¹²⁰ Whether the conduct towards the Attorney General would have a foreseeable impact on those proceedings turns on much of the same evidence discussed above with respect to the obstructive-act element.

Intent. There is evidence that at least one purpose of the President's conduct toward Sessions was to have Sessions assume control over the Russia investigation and supervise it in a way that would restrict its scope. By the summer of 2017, the President was aware that the Special Counsel was investigating him personally for obstruction of justice. And in the wake of the disclosures of emails about the June 9 meeting between Russians and senior members of the campaign, see Volume II, Section II.G, *supra*, it was evident that the investigation into

¹²⁰Eg., Del Quentin Wilbur & Byron Tau, *Special Counsel Robert Mueller Impanels Washington Grand Jury in Russia Probe*, Wall Street Journal (Aug. 3, 2017); Carol D. Leonnig et al., *Special Counsel Mueller using grand jury in federal court in Washington as part of Russia investigation*, Washington Post (Aug. 3, 2017).

the campaign now included the President's son, son-in-law, and former campaign manager. The President had previously and unsuccessfully sought to have Sessions publicly announce that the Special Counsel investigation would be confined to future election interference. Yet Sessions remained recused. In December 2017, shortly after Flynn pleaded guilty, the President spoke to Sessions in the Oval Office with only Porter present and told Sessions that he would be a hero if he unrecused. Porter linked that request to the President's desire that Sessions take back supervision of the Russia investigation and direct an investigation of Hillary Clinton. The President said in that meeting that he "just want[ed] to be treated fairly," which could reflect his perception that it was unfair that he was being investigated while Hillary Clinton was not. But a principal effect of that act would be to restore supervision of the Russia investigation to the Attorney General a position that the President frequently suggested should be occupied by someone like Eric Holder and Bobby Kennedy, who the President described as protecting their presidents. A reasonable inference from those statements and the President's actions is that the President believed that an unrecused Attorney General would play a protective role and could shield the President from the ongoing Russia investigation.

I. The President Orders McGahn to Deny that the President Tried to Fire the Special Counsel

Overview

In late January 2018, the media reported that in June 2017 the President had ordered McGahn to have the Special Counsel fired based on purported conflicts of interest but McGahn had refused, saying he would quit instead. After the story broke, the President, through his personal counsel and two aides, sought to have McGahn deny that he had been directed to remove the Special Counsel. Each time he was approached, McGahn responded that he would not refute the press accounts because they were accurate in reporting on the President's effort to have the Special Counsel removed. The President later personally met with McGahn in the Oval Office with only the Chief of Staff present and tried to get McGahn to say that the President never ordered him to fire the Special Counsel. McGahn refused and insisted his memory of the President's direction to remove the Special Counsel was accurate. In that same meeting, the President challenged McGahn for taking notes of his discussions with the President and asked why he had told Special Counsel investigators that he had been directed to have the Special Counsel removed.

Evidence

1. The Press Reports that the President Tried to Fire the Special Counsel

On January 25, 2018, the New York Times reported that in June 2017, the President had ordered McGahn to have the Department of Justice fire the Special Counsel.¹²¹ According to the article, "[a]mid the first wave of news media reports that Mr. Mueller was examining a possible obstruction case, the president began to argue that Mr. Mueller had three conflicts of interest that disqualified him from overseeing the investigation."¹²² The article further reported that "[a]fter receiving the president's order to fire Mr. Mueller, the White House counsel ... Justice Department to dismiss the special counsel, saying he would quit instead."¹²³ The article stated that the president "ultimately backed down after the White House counsel threatened to resign rather than carry out the directive."¹²⁴ After the article was published, the President refused to ask the dismissed the story when asked about it by reporters, saying, "Fake news, folks. Fake news. A typical New York Times fake story."¹²⁵

The next day, the Washington Post reported on the same event but added that McGahn had not told the President directly that he intended to resign rather than carry out the directive to have the Special Counsel terminated.¹²⁶ In that respect, the Post story clarified the Times story, which could be read to suggest that McGahn had told the President of his intention to quit, causing the President to back down from the order to have the Special Counsel fired.¹²⁷

2. The President Seeks to Have McGahn Dispute the Press Reports

On January 26, 2018, the President's personal counsel called McGahn's attorney and said that the President wanted McGahn to put out a statement denying that he had been asked to fire the Special Counsel and that he had threatened to quit in

¹²¹Michael S. Schmidt & Maggie Haberman, *Trump Ordered Mueller Fired, but Backed Off When White House Counsel Threatened to Quit*, New York Times (Jan. 25. 2018).

¹²²Michael S. Schmidt & Maggie Haberman, *Trump Ordered Mueller Fired, but Backed Off When White House Counsel Threatened to Quit*, New York Times (Jan. 25. 2018).

¹²³Michael S. Schmidt & Maggie Haberman, *Trump Ordered Mueller Fired, but Backed Off When White House Counsel Threatened to Quit*, New York Times (Jan. 25. 2018).

¹²⁴Michael S. Schmidt & Maggie Haberman, *Trump Ordered Mueller Fired, but Backed Off When White House Counsel Threatened to Quit*, New York Times (Jan. 25. 2018).

¹²⁵Sophie Tatum & Kara Scannell, *Trump denies he called for Muellers firing*, CNN (Jan. 26, 2018); Michael S. Schmidt & Maggie Haberman, *Trump Ordered Mueller Fired, but Backed Off When White House Counsel Threatened to Quit*, New York Times (Jan. 25, 2018).

¹²⁶The Post article stated, Despite internal objections, Trump decided to assert that Mueller had unacceptable conflicts of interest and moved to remove him from his position.... In response, McGahn said he would not remain at the White House if Trump went through with the move.... McGahn did not deliver his resignation threat directly to Trump but was serious about his threat to leave. Rosalind S. Helderman & Josh Dawsey, *Trump moved to fire Mueller in June, bringing White House counsel to the brink of leaving*, Washington Post (Jan. 26, 2018).

¹²⁷Rosalind S. Helderman & Josh Dawsey, *Trump moved to fire Mueller in June, bringing White House counsel to the brink of leaving*, Washington Post (Jan. 26, 2018); see McGahn 3/8/17 302, at 3-4.

protest.¹²⁸ McGahn's attorney spoke with McGahn about that request and then called the President's personal counsel to relay that McGahn would not make a statement.¹²⁹ McGahn's attorney informed the President's personal counsel that the Times story was accurate in reporting that the President wanted the Special Counsel removed.¹³⁰ Accordingly, McGahn's attorney said, although the article was inaccurate in some other respects, McGahn could not comply with the President's request to dispute the story.¹³¹ Hicks recalled relaying to the President that one of his attorneys had spoken to McGahn's attorney about the issue.¹³²

Also on January 26, 2017, Hicks recalled that the President asked Sanders to contact McGahn about the story.¹³³ McGahn told Sanders there was no need to respond and indicated that some of the article was accurate.¹³⁴ Consistent with that position, McGahn did not correct the Times story.

On February 4, 2018, Priebus appeared on Meet the Press and said he had not heard the President say that he wanted the Special Counsel fired.¹³⁵ After Priebus's appearance, the President called Priebus and said he did a great job on Meet the Press.¹³⁶ The President also told Priebus that the President had "never said any of those things about" the Special Counsel.¹³⁷

The next day, on February 5, 2018, the President complained about the Times article to Porter.¹³⁸ The President told Porter that the article was "bullshit" and

¹²⁸MicGahn 3/8/18 302, at 3 (agent note).

¹²⁹MicGahn 3/8/18 302, at 3 (agent note).

¹³⁰MicGahn 3/8/18 302, at 3-4 (agent note).

¹³¹MicGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4 (agent note).

¹³²Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 11. Hicks also recalled that the President spoke on the phone that day with Chief of Staff John Kelly and that the President said Kelly told him that McGahn had totally refuted the story and was going to put out a statement. Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 11. But Kelly said that he did not speak to McGahn when the article came out and did not tell anyone he had done so. Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 1-2.

¹³³Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 11. Sanders did not recall whether the President asked her to speak to McGahn or if she did it on her own. Sanders 7/23/18 302, at 2.

¹³⁴Sanders 7/23/18 302, at 1-2.

¹³⁵Meet the Press Interview with Reince Priebus, NBC (Feb.4, 2018).

¹³⁶Priebus 4/3/18 302, at 10.

¹³⁷Priebus 4/3/18 302, at 10.

¹³⁸Porter 4/13/18 302, at 16-17. Porter did not recall the timing of this discussion with the President. Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17. Evidence indicates it was February 5, 2018. On the back of a pocket card dated February 5, 2018, Porter took notes that are consistent with his description of the discussion: COS: (1) Letter from DM Never threatened to quit DJT never told him to fire M. SC.RRP000053 (Porter Undated Notes). Porter said it was possible he took the notes on a day other than February 5. Porter 4/13/18302, at 17. But Porter also said that COS referred to matters he wanted to discuss with Chief of Staff Kelly, Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17, and Kelly took notes dated February 5, 2018, that state POTUS Don McGahn letter Mueller + resigning. WH000017684 (Kelly 2/5/18 Notes). Kelly said he did not recall what the notes meant, but thought the President may have mused about having McGahn write a letter. Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 3. McGahn recalled that Porter spoke with him about the President's request about two weeks after the New York Times story was published, which is consistent with the discussion taking place on or about February 5.

he had not sought to terminate the Special Counsel.¹³⁹ The President said that McGahn leaked to the media to make himself look good.¹⁴⁰ The President then directed Porter to tell McGahn to create a record to make clear that the President never directed McGahn to fire the Special Counsel.¹⁴¹ Porter thought the matter should be handled by the White House communications office, but the President said he wanted McGahn to write a letter to the file "for our records" and wanted something beyond a press statement to demonstrate that the reporting was inaccurate.¹⁴² The President referred to McGahn as a "lying bastard" and said that he wanted a record from him.¹⁴³ Porter recalled the President saying something to the effect of, "If he doesn't write a letter, then maybe I'll have to get rid of him."¹⁴⁴

Later that day, Porter spoke to McGahn to deliver the President's message.¹⁴⁵ Porter told McGahn that he had to write a letter to dispute that he was ever ordered to terminate the Special Counsel.¹⁴⁶ McGahn shrugged off the request, explaining that the media reports were true.¹⁴⁷ McGahn told Porter that the President had been insistent on firing the Special Counsel and that McGahn had planned to resign rather than carry out the order, although he had not personally told the President he intended to quit.¹⁴⁸ Porter told McGahn that the President suggested that McGahn would be fired if he did not write the letter.¹⁴⁹ McGahn dismissed the threat, saying that the optics would be terrible if the President followed through with firing him on that basis.¹⁵⁰ McGahn said he would not write the letter the President had requested.¹⁵¹ Porter said that to his knowledge the issue of McGahn's letter never came up with the President again, but Porter did recall telling Kelly about his conversation with McGahn.¹⁵²

The next day, on February 6, 2018, Kelly scheduled time for McGahn to meet with him and the President in the Oval Office to discuss the Times article.¹⁵³ The morning of the meeting, the President's personal counsel called McGahn's attorney and said that the President was going to be speaking with McGahn and McGahn

McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹³⁹Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17.

¹⁴⁰Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17.

¹⁴¹Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17.

¹⁴²Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17; Porter 5/8/18 302, at 18.

¹⁴³Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17; Porter 5/8/18 302, at 18.

¹⁴⁴Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17.

¹⁴⁵Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17; McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁴⁶Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17; McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁴⁷Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17; McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁴⁸Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17; McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁴⁹Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17; McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁵⁰Porter 4/13/18 302, at 17-18; McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁵¹McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁵²Porter 4/13/18 302, at 18.

¹⁵³McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4; WH000017685 (Kelly 2/6/18 Notes). McGahn recalled that, before the Oval Office meeting, he told Kelly that he was not inclined to fix the article. McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

could not resign no matter what happened in the meeting.¹⁵⁴

The President began the Oval Office meeting by telling McGahn that the New York Times story did not "look good" and McGahn needed to correct it.¹⁵⁵ McGahn recalled the President said, "I never said to fire Mueller. I never said 'fire.' This story doesn't look good. You need to correct this. You're the White House counsel."¹⁵⁶

In response, McGahn acknowledged that he had not told the President directly that he planned to resign, but said that the story was otherwise accurate.¹⁵⁷ The President asked McGahn, "Did I say the word 'fire'?"¹⁵⁸ McGahn responded, "What you said is, 'Call Rod [Rosenstein], tell Rod that Mueller has conflicts and can't be the Special Counsel.'" ¹⁵⁹ The President responded, "I never said that."¹⁶⁰ The President said he merely wanted McGahn to raise the conflicts issue with Rosenstein and leave it to him to decide what to do.¹⁶¹ McGahn told the President he did not understand the conversation that way and instead had heard, "Call Rod. There are conflicts. Mueller has to go."¹⁶² The President asked McGahn whether he would "do a correction," and McGahn said no.¹⁶³ McGahn thought the President was testing his mettle to see how committed McGahn was to what happened.¹⁶⁴ Kelly described the meeting as "a little tense."¹⁶⁵

The President also asked McGahn in the meeting why he had told Special Counsel's Office investigators that the President had told him to have the Special Counsel removed.¹⁶⁶ McGahn responded that he had to and that his conversations with the President were not protected by attorney-client privilege.¹⁶⁷ The President then asked, "What about these notes? Why do you take notes? Lawyers don't take notes. I never had a lawyer who took notes."¹⁶⁸ McGahn responded that he keeps notes because he is a "real lawyer" and explained that notes create a record and are not a bad thing.¹⁶⁹ The President said, "I've had lot of great lawyers, like Roy Cohn. He did not take notes."¹⁷⁰

¹⁵⁴McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5 (agent note); 2/26/19 Email, Counsel for Don McGahn to Special Counsels Office (confirming February 6, 2018 date of call from the Presidents personal counsel).

¹⁵⁵McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4; Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 2.

¹⁵⁶McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4; Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 2.

¹⁵⁷McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4.

¹⁵⁸McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 4; Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 2.

¹⁵⁹McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶⁰McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶¹McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶²McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶³McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5; Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 2.

¹⁶⁴McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶⁵Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 2.

¹⁶⁶McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶⁷McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶⁸McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5. McGahn said the President was referring to Donaldsons notes, which the President thought of as McGahns notes. McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁶⁹McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

¹⁷⁰McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5.

After the Oval Office meeting concluded, Kelly recalled McGahn telling him that McGahn and the President "did have that conversation" about removing the Special Counsel.¹⁷¹ McGahn recalled that Kelly said that he had pointed out to the President after the Oval Office that McGahn had not backed down and would not budge.¹⁷² Following the Oval Office meeting, the President's personal counsel called McGahn's counsel and relayed that the President was "fine" with McGahn.¹⁷³

Analysis

In analyzing the President's efforts to have McGahn deny that he had been ordered to have the Special Counsel removed, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice:

a. Obstructive act. The President's repeated efforts to get McGahn to create a record denying that the President had directed him to remove the Special Counsel would qualify as an obstructive act if it had the natural tendency to constrain McGahn from testifying truthfully or to undermine his credibility as a potential witness if he testified consistently with his memory, rather than with what the record said.

There is some evidence that at the time the New York Times and Washington Post stories were published in late January 2018, the President believed the stories were wrong and that he had never told McGahn to have Rosenstein remove the Special Counsel. The President correctly understood that McGahn had not told the President directly that he planned to resign. In addition, the President told Priebus and Porter that he had not sought to terminate the Special Counsel, and in the Oval Office meeting with McGahn, the President said, "I never said to fire Mueller. I never said 'fire.'"" That evidence could indicate that the President was not attempting to persuade McGahn to change his story but was instead offering his own but different recollection of the substance of his June 2017 conversations with McGahn and McGahn's reaction to them.

Other evidence cuts against that understanding of the President's conduct. As previously described, see Volume II, Section III, *supra*, substantial evidence supports McGahn's account that the President had directed him to have the Special Counsel removed, including the timing and context of the President's directive; the manner in which McGahn reacted; and the fact that the President had been told the conflicts were insubstantial, were being considered by the Department of Justice, and should be raised with the President's personal counsel rather than brought to McGahn. In addition, the President's subsequent denials that he had told McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed were carefully worded. When first asked about the New York Times story, the President said, "Fake news, folks. Fake news. A typical New York Times fake story." And when the President spoke with McGahn in the Oval

¹⁷¹Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 2.

¹⁷²McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5. Kelly did not recall discussing the Oval Office meeting with the President after the fact. Kelly 8/2/18 302, at 2. Handwritten notes taken by Kelly state, Don[:] Mueller discussion in June. - Bannon Priebus - came out okay. WH000017685 (Kelly 2/6/18 Notes).

¹⁷³McGahn 3/8/18 302, at 5 (agent note).

Office, he focused on whether he had used the word "fire," saying, "I never said to fire Mueller. I never said 'fire'" and "Did I say the word 'fire'?" The President's assertion in the Oval Office meeting that he had never directed McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed thus runs counter to the evidence.

In addition, even if the President sincerely disagreed with McGahn's memory of the June 17, 2017 events, the evidence indicates that the President knew by the time of the Oval Office meeting that McGahn's account differed and that McGahn was firm in his views. Shortly after the story broke, the President's counsel told McGahn's counsel that the President wanted McGahn to make a statement denying he had been asked to fire the Special Counsel, but McGahn responded through his counsel that that aspect of the story was accurate and he therefore could not comply with the President's request. The President then directed Sanders to tell McGahn to correct the story, but McGahn told her he would not do so because the story was accurate in reporting on the President's order. Consistent with that position, McGahn never issued a correction. More than a week later, the President brought up the issue again with Porter, made comments indicating the President thought McGahn had leaked the story, and directed Porter to have McGahn create a record denying that the President had tried to fire the Special Counsel. At that point, the President said he might "have to get rid of" McGahn if McGahn did not comply. McGahn again refused and told Porter, as he had told Sanders and as his counsel had told the President's counsel, that the President had in fact ordered him to have Rosenstein remove the Special Counsel. That evidence indicates that by the time of the Oval Office meeting the President was aware that McGahn did not think the story was false and did not want to issue a statement or create a written record denying facts that McGahn believed to be true. The President nevertheless persisted and asked McGahn to repudiate facts that McGahn had repeatedly said were accurate.

b. Nexus to an official proceeding. By January 2018, the Special Counsel's use of a grand jury had been further confirmed by the return of several indictments. The President also was aware that the Special Counsel was investigating obstruction-related events because, among other reasons, on January 8, 2018, the Special Counsel's Office provided his counsel with a detailed list of topics for a possible interview with the President.¹⁷⁴ The President knew that McGahn had personal knowledge of many of the events the Special Counsel was investigating and that McGahn had already been interviewed by Special Counsel investigators. And in the Oval Office meeting, the President indicated he knew that McGahn had told the Special Counsel's Office about the President's effort to remove the Special Counsel. The President challenged McGahn for disclosing that information and for taking notes that he viewed as creating unnecessary legal exposure. That evidence indicates the

¹⁷⁴1/29/18 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 1-2 (In our conversation of January 8, your office identified the following topics as areas you desired to address with the President in order to complete your investigation on the subjects of alleged collusion and obstruction of justice; listing 16 topics).

President's awareness that the June 17, 2017 events were relevant to the Special Counsel's investigation and any grand jury investigation that might grow out of it.

To establish a nexus, it would be necessary to show that the President's actions would have the natural tendency to affect such a proceeding or that they would hinder, delay, or prevent the communication of information to investigators. Because McGahn had spoken to Special Counsel investigators before January 2018, the President could not have been seeking to influence his prior statements in those interviews. But because McGahn had repeatedly spoken to investigators and the obstruction inquiry was not complete, it was foreseeable that he would be interviewed again on obstruction-related topics. If the President were focused solely on a press strategy in seeking to have McGahn refute the New York Times article, a nexus to a proceeding or to further investigative interviews would not be shown. But the President's efforts to have McGahn write a letter "for our records" approximately ten days after the stories had come out well past the typical time to issue a correction for a news story indicates the President was not focused solely on a press strategy, but instead likely contemplated the ongoing investigation and any proceedings arising from it.

; Intent. Substantial evidence indicates that in repeatedly urging McGahn to dispute that he was ordered to have the Special Counsel terminated, the President acted for the purpose of influencing McGahn's account in order to deflect or prevent further scrutiny of the President's conduct towards the investigation.

inquiry. Several facts support that conclusion. The President made repeated attempts to get McGahn to change his story. As described above, by the time of the last attempt, the evidence suggests that the President had been told on multiple occasions that McGahn believed the President had ordered him to have the Special Counsel terminated. McGahn interpreted his encounter with the President in the Oval Office as an attempt to test his mettle and see how committed he was to his memory of what had occurred. The President had already laid the groundwork for pressing McGahn to alter his account by telling Porter that it might be necessary to fire McGahn if he did not deny the story, and Porter relayed that statement to McGahn. Additional evidence of the President's intent may be gleaned from the fact that his counsel was sufficiently alarmed by the prospect of the President's meeting with McGahn that he called McGahn's counsel and said that McGahn could not resign no matter what happened in the Oval Office that day. The President's counsel was well aware of McGahn's resolve not to issue what he believed to be a false account of events despite the President's request. Finally, as noted above, the President brought up the Special Counsel investigation in his Oval Office meeting with McGahn and criticized him for telling this Office about the June 17, 2017 events. The President's statements reflect his understanding and his displeasure that those events would be part of an obstruction-of-justice

J. The President's Conduct Towards Flynn, Manafort,

Overview

In addition to the interactions with McGahn described above, the President has taken other actions directed at possible witnesses in the Special Counsel's investigation, including Flynn, Manafort, Gea and as described in the next section, Cohen. When Flynn withdrew from a joint defense agreement with the President, the President's personal counsel stated that Flynn's actions would be viewed as reflecting "hostility" towards the President. During Manafort's prosecution and while the jury was deliberating, the President repeatedly stated that Manafort was being treated unfairly and made it known that Manafort could receive a pardon.

Evidence

1. Conduct Directed at Michael Flynn

As previously noted, see Volume II, Section II.B, *supra*, the President asked for Flynn's resignation on February 13, 2017. Following Flynn's resignation, the President made positive public comments about Flynn, describing him as a "wonderful man," "a fine person," and a "very good person."¹⁷⁵ The President also privately asked advisors to pass messages to Flynn conveying that the President still cared about him and encouraging him to stay strong.¹⁷⁶

In late November 2017, Flynn began to cooperate with this Office. On November 22, 2017, Flynn withdrew from a joint defense agreement he had with the President.¹⁷⁷ Flynn's counsel told the President's personal counsel and counsel for the White House that Flynn could no longer have confidential communications with the White House or the President.¹⁷⁸ Later that night, the President's personal counsel left a voicemail for Flynn's counsel that said:

¹⁷⁵See, e.g., *Remarks by President Trump in Press Conference*, White House (Feb. 16, 2018) (stating that Flynn is a fine person and I don't think [Flynn] did anything wrong. If anything, he did something right... You know, he was just doing his job); Interview of Donald J. Trump, NBC (May 11, 2017) (stating that Flynn is a very good person).

¹⁷⁶See Priebus 1/18/17 302, at 9-10 (the President asked Priebus to contact Flynn the week he was terminated to convey that the President still cared about him and felt bad about what happened to him; Priebus thought the President did not want Flynn to have a problem with him); McFarland 12/22/17 302, at 18 (about a month or two after Flynn was terminated, the President asked McFarland to get in touch with Flynn and tell him that he was a good guy, he should stay strong, and the President felt bad for him); Flynn 1/19/18 302, at 9 (recalling the call from Priebus and an additional call from Hicks who said she wanted to relay on behalf of the President that the President hoped Flynn was okay); Christie 2/13/19 302, at 3 (describing a phone conversation between Kushner and Flynn the day after Flynn was fired where Kushner said, You know the President respects you. The President cares about you. I'll get the President to send out a positive tweet about you later, and the President nodded his assent to Kushners comment promising a tweet).

¹⁷⁷Counsel for Flynn 3/1/18 302, at 1.

¹⁷⁸Counsel for Flynn 3/1/18 302, at 1.

I understand your situation, but let me see if I can't state it in starker terms.... [I]t wouldn't surprise me if you've gone on to make a deal with... the government.... [I]f ... there's information that implicates the President, then we've got a national security issue, ... so, you know, ... we need some kind of heads up. Um, just for the sake of protecting all our interests if we can.... [R]emember what we've always said about the President and his feelings toward Flynn and, that still remains ... ¹⁷⁹

On November 23, 2017, Flynn's attorneys returned the call from the President's personal counsel to acknowledge receipt of the voicemail.¹⁸⁰ Flynn's attorneys reiterated that they were no longer in a position to share information under any sort of privilege.¹⁸¹ According to Flynn's attorneys, the President's personal counsel was indignant and vocal in his disagreement.¹⁸² The President's personal counsel said that he interpreted what they said to him as a reflection of Flynn's hostility towards the President and that he planned to inform his client of that interpretation.¹⁸³ Flynn's attorneys understood that statement to be an attempt to make them reconsider their position because the President's personal counsel believed that Flynn would be disturbed to know that such a message would be conveyed to the President.¹⁸⁴

On December 1, 2017, Flynn pleaded guilty to making false statements pursuant to a cooperation agreement.¹⁸⁵ The next day, the President told the press that he was not concerned about what Flynn might tell the Special Counsel.¹⁸⁶ In response to a question about whether the President still stood behind Flynn, the President responded, "We'll see what happens."¹⁸⁷ Over the next several days, the President made public statements expressing sympathy for Flynn and indicating he had not been treated fairly.¹⁸⁸ On December 15, 2017, the President responded to a press inquiry about whether he was considering a pardon for Flynn by saying, "I don't

¹⁷⁹1 1/22/17 Voicemail Transcript, Presidents Personal Counsel to Counsel for Michael Flynn.

¹⁸⁰Counsel for Flynn 3/1/18 302, at 1.

¹⁸¹Counsel for Flynn 3/1/18 302, at 1.

¹⁸²Counsel for Flynn 3/1/18 302, at 1.

¹⁸³Counsel for Flynn 3/1/18 302, at 2. Because of attorney-client privilege issues, we did not seek to interview the Presidents personal counsel about the extent to which he discussed his statements to Flynn's attorneys with the President.

¹⁸⁴Counsel for Flynn 3/1/18 302, at 2.

¹⁸⁵Information, *United States v. Michael T. Flynn*, 1:17-cr-232 (D.D.C.Dec.1,2017), Doc. 1; Plea Agreement, *United States v. Michael T. Flynn*, 1:17-cr-232 (D.D.C.Dec. 1, 2017), Doc. 3.

¹⁸⁶*President Trump Remarks on Tax Reform and Michael Flynn's Guilty Plea*, C-SPAN (Dec. 2, 2017).

¹⁸⁷*President Trump Remarks on Tax Reform and Michael Flynn's Guilty Plea*, C-SPAN (Dec. 2, 2017).

¹⁸⁸*See*realDonaldTrump12/2/17 (9:06 p.m. ET) Tweet (So General Flynn lies to the FBI and his life is destroyed, while Crooked Hillary Clinton, on that now famous FBI holiday interrogation with no swearing in and no recording, lies many times ... and nothing happens to her? Rigged system, or just a double standard?); President Trump Departure Remarks, C-SPAN (Dec. 4, 2017) (Well, I feel badly for General Flynn. I feel very badly. Hes led a very strong life. And I feel very badly.).

want to talk about pardons for Michael Flynn yet. We'll see what happens. Let's see. I can say this: When you look at what's gone on with the FBI and with the Justice Department, people are very, very angry.”¹⁸⁹

2. Conduct Directed at Paul Manafort

On October 27, 2017, a grand jury in the District of Columbia indicted Manafort and former deputy campaign manager Richard Gates on multiple felony counts, and on February 22, 2018, a grand jury in the Eastern District of Virginia indicted Manafort and Gates on additional felony counts.¹⁹⁰ The charges in both cases alleged criminal conduct by Manafort that began as early as 2005 and continued through 2018.¹⁹¹

In January 2018, Manafort told Gates that he had talked to the President's personal counsel and they were "going to take care of us."¹⁹² Manafort told Gates it was stupid to plead, saying that he had been in touch with the President's personal counsel and repeating that they should "sit tight" and "we'll be taken care of."¹⁹³ Gates asked Manafort outright if anyone mentioned pardons and Manafort said no one used that word.¹⁹⁴

As the proceedings against Manafort progressed in court, the President told Porter that he never liked Manafort and that Manafort did not know what he was doing on the campaign.¹⁹⁵ The President discussed with aides whether and in what way

¹⁸⁹President Trump White House Departure, C-SPAN (Dec. 15, 2017).

¹⁹⁰Indictment, *United States v. Paul J. Manafort, Jr. and Richard W. Gates III*, 1:17-cr-201 (D.D.C. Oct. 27, 2017), Doc. 13 (Manafort and Gates D.D.C. Indictment); Indictment, *United States v. Paul J. Manafort, Jr. and Richard W. Gates III*, 1:18-cr-83 (E.D. Va. Feb. 22, 2018), Doc. 9 (Manafort and Gates E.D. Va. Indictment)

¹⁹¹*Manafort and Gates* D.D.C. Indictment; *Manafort and Gates* E.D. Va. Indictment.

¹⁹²Gates 4/18/18 302, at 4. In February 2018, Gates pleaded guilty, pursuant to a cooperation plea agreement, to a superseding criminal information charging him with conspiring to defraud and commit multiple offenses (i.e., tax fraud, failure to report foreign bank accounts, and acting as an unregistered agent of a foreign principal) against the United States, as well as making false statements to our Office. Superseding Criminal Information, *United States v. Richard W. Gates III*, 1:17-cr-201 (D.D.C. Feb. 23, 2018), Doc. 195; Plea Agreement, *United States v. Richard W. Gates III*, 1:17-cr-201 (D.D.C. Feb. 23, 2018), Doc. 205. Gates has provided information and in-court testimony that the Office has deemed to be reliable.

¹⁹³Gates 4/18/18 302, at 4.

¹⁹⁴Gates 4/18/18 302, at 4. Manafort told this Office that he never told Gates that he had talked to the President's personal counselor suggested that they would be taken care of. Manafort also said he hoped for a pardon but never discussed one with the President, although he noticed the President's public comments about pardons. Manafort 10/1/18 302, at 11. As explained in Volume I, Section IV.A.8, *supra*, Manafort entered into a plea agreement with our Office. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia determined that he breached the agreement by being untruthful in proffer sessions and before the grand jury. Order, *United States v. Manafort*, 1:17-cr-201 (D.D.C. Feb. 13, 2019), Doc. 503.

¹⁹⁵Porter 5/8/18 302, at 11. Priebus recalled that the President never really liked Manafort. *See* Priebus 4/3/18 302, at 11. Hicks said that candidate Trump trusted Manafort's judgment while he worked on the Campaign, but she also once heard Trump tell Gates to keep an eye on Manafort.

Manafort might be cooperating with the Special Counsel's investigation, and whether Manafort knew any information that would be harmful to the President.¹⁹⁶

In public, the President made statements criticizing the prosecution and suggesting that Manafort was being treated unfairly. On June 15, 2018, before a scheduled court hearing that day on whether Manafort's bail should be revoked based on new charges that Manafort had tampered with witnesses while out on bail, the President told the press, "I feel badly about a lot of them because I think a lot of it is very unfair. I mean, I look at some of them where they go back 12 years. Like Manafort has nothing to do with our campaign. But I feel so I tell you, I feel little badly about it. They went back 12 years to get things that he did 12 years ago? ... I feel badly for some people, because they've gone back 12 years to find things about somebody, and I don't think it's right."¹⁹⁷ In response to a question about whether he was considering a pardon for Manafort or other individuals involved in the Special Counsel's investigation, the President said, "I don't want to talk about that. No, I don't want to talk about that.... But look, I do want to see people treated fairly. That's what it's all about."¹⁹⁸ Hours later, Manafort's bail was revoked and the President tweeted, "Wow, what a tough sentence for Paul Manafort, who has represented Ronald Reagan, Bob Dole and many other top political people and campaigns. Didn't know Manafort was the head of the Mob. What about Comey and Crooked Hillary and all the others? Very unfair!"¹⁹⁹

Immediately following the revocation of Manafort's bail, the President's personal lawyer, Rudolph Giuliani, gave a series of interviews in which he raised the possibility of a pardon for Manafort. Giuliani told the New York Daily News that "[w]hen the whole thing is over, things might get cleaned up with some presidential pardons."²⁰⁰ Giuliani also said in an interview that, although the President should not pardon anyone while the Special Counsel's investigation was ongoing, "when the investigation is concluded, he's kind of on his own, right?"²⁰¹ In a CNN interview two days later, Giuliani said, "I guess I should clarify this once and for all.... The president has issued no pardons in this investigation. The president is not going to issue pardons in this investigation.... When it's over, hey, he's the president of the United States. He retains his pardon power. Nobody is taking that away from him."²⁰² Giuliani rejected

Hicks 3/13/18 302, at 16.

¹⁹⁶Porter 5/8/18 302, at 11; McGahn 12/14/17 302, at 14.

¹⁹⁷Remarks by President Trump in Press Gaggle, White House (June 15, 2018).

¹⁹⁸Remarks by President Trump in Press Gaggle, White House (June 15, 2018).

¹⁹⁹realDonaldTrump 6/15/18 (1:41 p.m. ET) Tweet.

²⁰⁰Chris Sommerfeldt, *Rudy Giuliani says Mueller probe might get cleaned up with presidential pardons in light of Paul Manafort going to jail*, New York Daily News (June 15, 2018).

²⁰¹Sharon LaFraniere, *Judge Orders Paul Manafort Jailed Before Trial, Citing New Obstruction Charges*, New York Times (June 15, 2018) (quoting Giuliani).

²⁰²*State of the Union with Jake Tapper Transcript*, CNN (June 17, 2018); see Karoun Demirjian, *Giuliani suggests Trump may pardon Manafort after Mueller's probe*, Washington Post (June 17, 2018).

the suggestion that his and the President's comments could signal to defendants that they should not cooperate in a criminal prosecution because a pardon might follow, saying the comments were "certainly not intended that way."²⁰³ Giuliani said the comments only acknowledged that an individual involved in the investigation would not be "excluded from [a pardon], if in fact the president and his advisors come to the conclusion that you have been treated unfairly."²⁰⁴ Giuliani observed that pardons were not unusual in political investigations but said, "That doesn't mean they're going to happen here. Doesn't mean that anybody should rely on it.... Big signal is, nobody has been pardoned yet."²⁰⁵

On July 31, 2018, Manafort's criminal trial began in the Eastern District of Virginia, generating substantial news coverage.²⁰⁶ The next day, the President tweeted, "This is a terrible situation and Attorney General Jeff Sessions should stop this Rigged Witch Hunt right now, before it continues to stain our country any further. Bob Mueller is totally conflicted, and his 17 Angry Democrats that are doing his dirty work are a disgrace to USA!"²⁰⁷ Minutes later, the President tweeted, "Paul Manafort worked for Ronald Reagan, Bob Dole and many other highly prominent and respected political leaders. He worked for me for a very short time. Why didn't government tell me that he was under investigation. These old charges have nothing to do with Collusion Hoax!"²⁰⁸ Later in the day, the President tweeted, "Looking back on history, who was treated worse, Alfonse Capone, legendary mob boss, killer and 'Public Enemy Number One,' or Paul Manafort, political operative & Reagan/Dole darling, now serving solitary confinement although convicted of nothing? Where is the Russian Collusion?"²⁰⁹ The President's tweets about the Manafort trial were widely covered by the press.²¹⁰ When asked about the President's tweets, Sanders told the press, "Certainly, the President's been clear. He thinks Paul Manafort's been treated unfairly."²¹¹

On August 16, 2018, the Manafort case was submitted to the jury and deliberations began. At that time, Giuliani had recently suggested to reporters

²⁰³ *State of the Union with Jake Tapper Transcript*, CNN (June 17, 2018).

²⁰⁴ *State of the Union with Jake Tapper Transcript*, CNN (June 17, 2018).

²⁰⁵ *State of the Union with Jake Tapper Transcript*, CNN (June 17, 2018).

²⁰⁶ See, e.g., Katelyn Polantz, *Takeaways from day one of the Paul Manafort trial*, CNN (July 31, 2018); Frank Bruni, *Paul Manafort's Trial Is Donald Trump's, Too*, New York Times Opinion (July 31, 2018); Rachel Weiner et al., *Paul Manafort trial Day 2: Witnesses describe extravagant clothing purchases, home remodels, lavish cars paid with wire transfers*, Washington Post (Aug. 1, 2018).

²⁰⁷realDonaldTrump 8/1/18 (9:24 a.m. ET) Tweet. Later that day, when Sanders was asked about the President's tweet, she told reporters, "It's not an order. It's the President's opinion." Sarah Sanders, *White House Daily Briefing*, C-SPAN (Aug. 1, 2018).

²⁰⁸realDonaldTrump 8/1/18 (9:34 a.m. ET) Tweet.

²⁰⁹realDonaldTrump 8/1/18 (11:35 a.m. ET) Tweet.

²¹⁰ See, e.g., Carol D. Leonnig et al., *Trump calls Manafort prosecution a hoax, says Sessions should stop Mueller investigation right now*, Washington Post (Aug. 1, 2018); Louis Nelson, *Trump claims Manafort case has nothing to do with collusion*, Politico (Aug. 1, 2018).

²¹¹ Sarah Sanders, *White House Daily Briefing*, C-SPAN (Aug. 1, 2018).

that the Special Counsel investigation needed to be "done in the next two or three weeks,"²¹² and media stories reported that a Manafort acquittal would add to criticism that the Special Counsel investigation was not worth the time and expense, whereas a conviction could show that ending the investigation would be premature.²¹³

On August 17, 2018, as jury deliberations continued, the President commented on the trial from the South Lawn of the White House. In an impromptu exchange with reporters that lasted approximately five minutes, the President twice called the Special Counsel's investigation a "rigged witch hunt."²¹⁴ When asked whether he would pardon Manafort if he was convicted, the President said, "I don't talk about that now. I don't talk about that."²¹⁵ The President then added, without being asked a further question, "I think the whole Manafort trial is very sad when you look at what's going on there. I think it's a very sad day for our country. He worked for me for a very short period of time. But you know what, he happens to be a very good person. And I think it's very sad what they've done to Paul Manafort."²¹⁶ The President did not take further questions.²¹⁷ In response to the President's statements, Manafort's attorney said, "Mr. Manafort really appreciates the support of President Trump."²¹⁸

On August 21, 2018, the jury found Manafort guilty on eight felony counts. Also on August 21, Michael Cohen pleaded guilty to eight offenses, including a campaign-finance violation that he said had occurred "in coordination with, and at the direction of, a candidate for federal office."²¹⁹ The President reacted to Manafort's convictions that day by telling reporters, "Paul Manafort's a good man" and "it's a very sad thing that happened."²²⁰ The President described the Special Counsel's investigation as "a witch hunt that ends in disgrace."²²¹ The next day, the President tweeted, "I feel very badly for Paul Manafort and his wonderful family. 'Justice' took a 12 year old tax case, among other things, applied tremendous pressure on him and, unlike Michael Cohen, he refused to 'break' make up stories in order to get a 'deal.'"

²¹²Chris Strohm & Shannon Pettypiece, *Mueller Probe Doesn't Need to Shut Down Before Midterms, Officials Say*, Bloomberg (Aug. 15, 2018).

²¹³See, e.g., Katelyn Polantz et al., *Manafort jury ends first day of deliberations without a verdict*, CNN (Aug. 16, 2018); David Voreacos, *What Mueller's Manafort Case Means for the Trump Battle to Come*, Bloomberg (Aug. 2, 2018); Gabby Morrongiello, *What a guilty verdict for Manafort would mean for Trump and Mueller*, Washington Examiner (Aug. 18, 2018).

²¹⁴President Trump Remarks on John Brennan and Mueller Probe, C-SPAN (Aug. 17, 2018).

²¹⁵President Trump Remarks on John Brennan and Mueller Probe, C-SPAN (Aug. 17, 2018).

²¹⁶President Trump Remarks on John Brennan and Mueller Probe, C-SPAN (Aug. 17, 2018).

²¹⁷President Trump Remarks on John Brennan and Mueller Probe, C-SPAN (Aug. 17, 2018).

²¹⁸*Trump calls Manafort very good person*, All In with Chris Hayes (Aug. 17, 2018) (transcript); *Manafort lawyer: We appreciate Trump's support*, CNN (Aug. 17, 2018) (<https://www.cnn.com/videos/politics/2018/08/17/paul-manafort-attorney-trump-jury-deliberations-schneider-lead-vpx.cnn>).

²¹⁹Transcript at 23, *United States v. Michael Cohen*, 1:18-cr-602 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 21, 2018), Doc. 7 (Cohen 8/21/18 Transcript).

²²⁰*President Trump Remarks on Manafort Trial*, C-SPAN (Aug. 21, 2018).

²²¹*President Trump Remarks on Manafort Trial*, C-SPAN (Aug. 21, 2018).

Such respect for a brave man!”²²²

In a Fox News interview on August 22, 2018, the President said: “[Cohen] make a better deal when he uses me, like everybody else. And one of the reasons I respect Paul Manafort so much is he went through that trial you know they make up stories. People make up stories. This whole thing about flipping, they call it, I know all about flipping.”²²³ The President said that flipping was “not fair” and “almost ought to be outlawed.”²²⁴ In response to a question about whether he was considering a pardon for Manafort, the President said, “I have great respect for what he’s done, in terms of what he’s gone through.... He worked for many, many people many, many years, and I would say what he did, some of the charges they threw against him, every consultant, every lobbyist in Washington probably does.”²²⁵ Giuliani told journalists that the President “really thinks Manafort has been horribly treated” and that he and the President had discussed the political fallout if the President pardoned Manafort.²²⁶ The next day, Giuliani told the Washington Post that the President had asked his lawyers for advice on the possibility of a pardon for Manafort and other aides, and had been counseled against considering a pardon until the investigation concluded.²²⁷

On September 14, 2018, Manafort pleaded guilty to charges in the District of Columbia and signed a plea agreement that required him to cooperate with investigators.²²⁸ Giuliani was reported to have publicly said that Manafort remained in a joint defense agreement with the President following Manafort’s guilty plea and agreement to cooperate, and that Manafort’s attorneys regularly briefed the President’s lawyers on the topics discussed and the information Manafort had provided in interviews with the Special Counsel’s Office.²²⁹ On November 26, 2018,

²²²realDonaldTrump 8/22/18 (9:21 a.m. ET) Tweet.

²²³Fox & Friends Exclusive Interview with President Trump, Fox News (Aug. 23, 2018) (recorded the previous day).

²²⁴Fox & Friends Exclusive Interview with President Trump, Fox News (Aug. 23, 2018) (recorded the previous day).

²²⁵Fox & Friends Exclusive Interview with President Trump, Fox News (Aug. 23, 2018) (recorded the previous day).

²²⁶Maggie Haberman & Katie Rogers, *How Did We End Up Here? Trump Wonders as the White House Soldiers On*, New York Times (Aug. 22, 2018).

²²⁷Carol D. Leonnig & Josh Dawsey, *Trump recently sought his lawyers advice on possibility of pardoning Manafort, Giuliani says*, Washington Post (Aug. 23, 2018).

²²⁸Plea Agreement, *United States v. Paul J. Manafort, Jr.*, 1:17-cr-201 (D.D.C. Sept. 14, 2018), Doc. 422.

²²⁹Karen Freifeld & Nathan Layne, *Trump lawyer: Manafort said nothing damaging in Mueller interviews*, Reuters (Oct. 22, 2018); Michael S. Schmidt et al., *Manafort’s Lawyer Said to Brief Trump Attorneys on What He Told Mueller*, New York Times (Nov. 27, 2018); Dana Bash, *Manafort team briefed Giuliani on Mueller meetings*, CNN, Posted 11/28/18, available at <https://www.cnn.com/videos/politics/2018/11/28/manafort-lawyers-keeping-trump-lawyers-giuliani-updated-mueller-probe-bash-sot-nr-vpx.cnn>; see Sean Hannity, *Interview with Rudy Giuliani*, Fox News (Sept. 14, 2018) (Giuliani: [T]here was a quote put out by a source close to Manafort that the plea agreement has, and cooperation agreement has, nothing to do with the Trump campaign.... Now, I know that because Ive been privy to lot of facts I cant repeat.).

the Special Counsel's Office disclosed in a public court filing that Manafort had breached his plea agreement by lying about multiple subjects.²³⁰ The next day, Giuliani said that the President had been "upset for weeks" about what he considered to be "the un-American, horrible treatment of Manafort."²³¹ In an interview on November 28, 2018, the President suggested that it was "very brave" that Manafort did not "flip":

If you told the truth, you go to jail. You know this flipping stuff is terrible. You flip and you lie and you get the prosecutors will tell you 99 percent of the time they can get people to flip. It's rare that they can't. But I had three people: Manafort, Corsi - I don't know Corsi, but he refuses to say what they demanded.²³² Manafort, Corsi, [REDACTED]. It's actually very brave.²³³

In response to a question about a potential pardon for Manafort, the President said, "It was never discussed, but I wouldn't take it off the table. Why would I take it off the table?"²³⁴

3. [Harm to Ongoing Matter]

[REDACTED]²³⁵ [REDACTED]²³⁶ [REDACTED]²³⁷
[REDACTED]²³⁸ [REDACTED]²³⁹ [REDACTED]²⁴⁰

²³⁰Joint Status Report, *United States v. Paul J. Manafort, Jr.*, (D.D.C Nov. 26, 2018), Doc. 455.

²³¹Stephen Collinson, *Trump appears consumed by Mueller investigation as details emerge*, CNN (Nov. 29, 2018).

²³²Corsi is a reference to Jerome Corsi, [REDACTED] who was involved in efforts to coordinate with WikiLeaks and Assange, and who stated publicly at that time that he had refused a plea offer from the Special Counsels Office because he was not going to sign a lie. Sara Murray & Eli Watkins, [REDACTED] *says he won't agree to plea deal*, CNN (Nov. 26, 2018).

²³³Marisa Schultz & Nikki Schwab, *Oval Office Interview with President Trump: Trump says pardon for Paul Manafort still a possibility*, New York Post (Nov. 28, 2018). That same day, the President tweeted: While the disgusting Fake News is doing everything within their power not to report it that way, at least 3 major players are intimating that the Angry Mueller Gang of Dems is viciously telling witnesses to lie about facts & they will get relief. This is our Joseph McCarthy Era!realDonaldTrump 11/28/18 (8:39 a.m. ET) Tweet.

²³⁴Marisa Schultz & Nikki Schwab, *New York Post Oval Office Interview with President Trump: Trump says pardon for Paul Manafort still a possibility*, New York Post (Nov. 28, 2018).

²³⁵[REDACTED]
²³⁶[REDACTED]
²³⁷[REDACTED]
²³⁸[REDACTED]
²³⁹[REDACTED]
²⁴⁰[REDACTED]

II. FACTUAL RESULTS OF THE OBSTRUCTION INVESTIGATION

Category	Count
241	10
242	10
243	10
244	10
245	10
246	10
247	10
248	10
249	10
250	10
251	10
252	10

Analysis

In analyzing the President's conduct towards Flynn, Manafort, ██████ ██████ ██████ ██████ ██████ ██████, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice:

Obstructive act. The President's actions towards witnesses in the Special Counsel's investigation would qualify as obstructive if they had the natural tendency to prevent particular witnesses from testifying truthfully, or otherwise would have the probable effect of influencing, delaying, or preventing their testimony to law enforcement.

With regard to Flynn, the President sent private and public messages to Flynn encouraging him to stay strong and conveying that the President still cared about him before he began to cooperate with the government. When Flynn's attorneys withdrew him from a joint defense agreement with the President, signaling that Flynn was potentially cooperating with the government, the President's personal counsel initially reminded Flynn's counsel of the President's warm feelings towards Flynn and said "that still remains." But when Flynn's counsel reiterated that Flynn could no longer share information under a joint defense agreement, the President's personal counsel stated that the decision would be interpreted as reflecting Flynn's hostility towards the President. That sequence of events could have had the potential to affect Flynn's decision to cooperate, as well as the extent of that cooperation. Because of privilege issues, however, we could not determine whether the President was personally involved in or knew about the specific message his counsel delivered to Flynn's counsel.

With respect to Manafort, there is evidence that the President's actions had the

II. FACTUAL RESULTS OF THE OBSTRUCTION INVESTIGATION

potential to influence Manafort's decision whether to cooperate with the government. The President and his personal counsel made repeated statements suggesting that a pardon was a possibility for Manafort, while also making it clear that the President did not want Manafort to "flip" and cooperate with the government. On June 15, 2018, the day the judge presiding over Manafort's D.C. case was considering whether to revoke his bail, the President said that he "felt badly" for Manafort and stated, "I think a lot of it is very unfair." And when asked about a pardon for Manafort, the President said, "I do want to see people treated fairly. That's what it's all about." Later that day, after Manafort's bail was revoked, the President called it a "tough sentence" that was "Very unfair!" Two days later, the President's personal counsel stated that individuals involved in the Special Counsel's investigation could receive a pardon "if in fact the [P]resident and his advisors ... come to the conclusion that you have been treated unfairly" using language that paralleled how the President had already described the treatment of Manafort. Those statements, combined with the President's commendation of Manafort for being a "brave man" who "refused to break'," suggested that a pardon was a more likely possibility if Manafort continued not to cooperate with the government. And while Manafort eventually pleaded guilty pursuant to a cooperation agreement, he was found to have violated the agreement by lying to investigators.

The President's public statements during the Manafort trial, including during jury deliberations, also had the potential to influence the trial jury. On the second day of trial, for example, the President called the prosecution a "terrible situation" and a "hoax" that "continues to stain our country" and referred to Manafort as a "Reagan/Dole darling" who was "serving solitary confinement" even though he was "convicted of nothing." Those statements were widely picked up by the press. While jurors were instructed not to watch or read news stories about the case and are presumed to follow those instructions, the President's statements during the trial generated substantial media coverage that could have reached jurors if they happened to see the statements or learned about them from others. And the President's statements during jury deliberations that Manafort "happens to be a very good person" and that "it's very sad what they've done to Paul Manafort" had the potential to influence jurors who learned of the statements, which the President made just as jurors were considering whether to convict or acquit Manafort.

Nexus to an official proceeding. The President's actions towards Flynn, Manafort, appear to have been connected to pending or anticipated official proceedings involving each individual. The President's conduct towards Flynn principally occurred when both were under criminal investigation by the Special Counsel's Office and press reports speculated about whether they would cooperate with the Special Counsel's investigation. And the President's conduct towards Manafort was directly connected to the official proceedings involving him. The President made statements about Manafort and the charges against him during Manafort's criminal trial. And the

President's comments about the prospect of Manafort "flipping" occurred when it was clear the Special Counsel continued to oversee grand jury proceedings.

Intent. Evidence concerning the President's intent related to Flynn as a potential witness is inconclusive. As previously noted, because of privilege issues we do not have evidence establishing whether the President knew about or was involved in his counsel's communications with Flynn's counsel stating that Flynn's decision to withdraw from the joint defense agreement and cooperate with the government would be viewed as reflecting "hostility" towards the President. And regardless of what the President's personal counsel communicated, the President continued to express sympathy for Flynn after he pleaded guilty pursuant to a cooperation agreement, stating that Flynn had "led a very strong life" and the President "fe[lt] very badly" about what had happened to him.

Evidence concerning the President's conduct towards Manafort indicates that the President intended to encourage Manafort to not cooperate with the government. Before Manafort was convicted, the President repeatedly stated that Manafort had been treated unfairly. One day after Manafort was convicted on eight felony charges and potentially faced a lengthy prison term, the President said that Manafort was "a brave man" for refusing to "break" and that "flipping" "almost ought to be outlawed." At the same time, although the President had privately told aides he did not like Manafort, he publicly called Manafort "a good man" and said he had a "wonderful family." And when the President was asked whether he was considering a pardon for Manafort, the President did not respond directly and instead said he had "great respect for what [Manafort]'s done, in terms of what he's gone through." The President added that "some of the charges they threw against him, every consultant, every lobbyist in Washington probably does." In light of the President's counsel's previous statements that the investigations "might get cleaned up with some presidential pardons" and that a pardon would be possible if the President "come[s] to the conclusion that you have been treated unfairly," the evidence supports the inference that the President intended Manafort to believe that he could receive a pardon, which would make cooperation with the government as a means of obtaining a lesser sentence unnecessary.

We also examined the evidence of the President's intent in making public statements about Manafort at the beginning of his trial and when the jury was deliberating. Some evidence supports a conclusion that the President intended, at least in part, to influence the jury. The trial generated widespread publicity, and as the jury began to deliberate, commentators suggested that an acquittal would add to pressure to end the Special Counsel's investigation. By publicly stating on the second day of deliberations that Manafort "happens to be a very good person" and that "it's very sad what they've done to Paul Manafort" right after calling the Special Counsel's investigation a "rigged witch hunt," the President's statements could, if they reached jurors, have the natural tendency to engender sympathy for Manafort among jurors, and a fact finder could infer that the President intended that result. But there are

alternative explanations for the President's comments, including that he genuinely felt sorry for Manafort or that his goal was not to influence the jury but to influence public opinion. The President's comments also could have been intended to continue sending a message to Manafort that a pardon was possible. As described above, the President made his comments about Manafort being "a very good person" immediately after declining to answer a question about whether he would pardon Manafort.

K. The President's Conduct Involving Michael Cohen

The President's conduct involving Michael Cohen spans the full period of our investigation. During the campaign, Cohen pursued the Trump Tower Moscow project on behalf of the Trump Organization. Cohen briefed candidate Trump on the project numerous times, including discussing whether Trump should travel to Russia to advance the deal. After the media began questioning Trump's connections to Russia, Cohen promoted a "party line" that publicly distanced Trump from Russia and asserted he had no business there. Cohen continued to adhere to that party line in 2017, when Congress asked him to provide documents and testimony in its Russia investigation. In an attempt to minimize the President's connections to Russia, Cohen submitted a letter to Congress falsely stating that he only briefed Trump on the Trump Tower Moscow project three times, that he did not consider asking Trump to travel to Russia, that Cohen had not received a response to an outreach he made to the Russian government, and that the project ended in January 2016, before the first Republican caucus or primary. While working on the congressional statement, Cohen had extensive discussions with the President's personal counsel, who, according to Cohen, said that Cohen should not contradict the President and should keep the statement short and "tight." After the FBI searched Cohen's home and office in April 2018, the President publicly asserted that Cohen would not "flip" and privately passed messages of support to him. Cohen also discussed pardons with the President's personal counsel and believed that if he stayed on message, he would get a pardon or the President would do "something else" to make the investigation end. But after Cohen began cooperating with the government in July 2018, the President publicly criticized him, called him a "rat," and suggested his family members had committed crimes.

1. Candidate Trump's Awareness of and Involvement in the Trump Tower Moscow Project

As described in detail in Volume I, Section IV.A.1, *supra*, from September 2015 until at least June 2016, the Trump Organization pursued a Trump Tower Moscow project in Russia, with negotiations conducted by Cohen, then-executive vice president of the Trump Organization and special counsel to Donald J. Trump.²⁵³ The Trump Organization had previously and unsuccessfully pursued a building project in Moscow.²⁵⁴ According to Cohen, in approximately September 2015 he obtained internal approval from Trump to negotiate on behalf of the Trump Organization to have a Russian corporation build a tower in Moscow that licensed the Trump name and brand.²⁵⁵ Cohen thereafter had numerous brief conversations with Trump about the project.²⁵⁶ Cohen recalled that Trump wanted to be updated on any developments with Trump Tower Moscow and on several occasions brought the project up with Cohen to ask what was happening on it.²⁵⁷ Cohen also discussed the project on multiple occasions with Donald Trump Jr. and Ivanka Trump.²⁵⁸

In the fall of 2015, Trump signed a Letter of Intent for the project that specified highly lucrative terms for the Trump Organization.²⁵⁹ In December 2015, Felix Sater,

²⁵³In August 2018 and November 2018, Cohen pleaded guilty to multiple crimes of deception, including making false statements to Congress about the Trump Tower Moscow project, as described later in this section. When Cohen first met with investigators from this Office, he repeated the same lies he told Congress about the Trump Tower Moscow project. Cohen 8/7/18 302, at 12-17. But after Cohen pleaded guilty to offenses in the Southern District of New York on August 21, 2018, he met with investigators again and corrected the record. The Office found Cohens testimony in these subsequent proffer sessions to be consistent with and corroborated by other information obtained in the course of the Offices investigation. The Offices sentencing submission in Cohens criminal case stated: Starting with his second meeting with the [Special Counsels Office] in September 2018, the defendant has accepted responsibility not only for his false statements concerning the [Trump Tower] Moscow Project, but also his broader efforts through public statements and testimony before Congress to minimize his role in, and what he knew about, contacts between the [Trump Organization] and Russian interests during the course of the campaign.... The information provided by Cohen about the [Trump Tower] Moscow Project in these proffer sessions is consistent with and corroborated by other information obtained in the course of the [Special Counsels Offices] investigation.... The defendant, without prompting by the [Special Counsels Office], also corrected other false and misleading statements that he had made concerning his outreach to and contacts with Russian officials during the course of the campaign. Govt Sentencing Submission at 4, *United States v. Michael Cohen*, 1:18-cr-850 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 7, 2018), Doc. 14. At Cohens sentencing, our Office further explained that Cohen had provided valuable information ... while taking care and being careful to note what he knows and what he doesnt know. Transcript at 19, *United States v. Michael Cohen*, 1:18-cr-850 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 12, 2018), Doc. 17 (Cohen 12/12/18 Transcript).

²⁵⁴See Volume I, Section IV.A.1, *supra* (noting that starting in at least 2013, several employees of the Trump Organization, including then-president of the organization Donald J. Trump, pursued a Trump Tower Moscow deal with several Russian counterparties).

²⁵⁵Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 1-4; Cohen 8/7/18 302, at 15.

²⁵⁶Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 2, 4.

²⁵⁷Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 4.

²⁵⁸Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 4, 10.

²⁵⁹MDC-H-000618-25 (10/28/15 Letter of Intent, signed by Donald J. Trump, Trump Acquisition, LLC and Andrey Rozov, I.C. Expert Investment Company); Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 3; Written Responses of Donald J. Trump (Nov. 20, 2018), at 15 (Response to Question III, Parts (a) through

who was handling negotiations between Cohen and the Russian corporation, asked Cohen for a copy of his and Trump's passports to facilitate travel to Russia to meet with government officials and possible financing partners.²⁶⁰ Cohen recalled discussing the trip with Trump and requesting a copy of Trump's passport from Trump's personal secretary, Rhona Graff.²⁶¹

By January 2016, Cohen had become frustrated that Sater had not set up a meeting with Russian government officials, so Cohen reached out directly by email to the office of Dmitry Peskov, who was Putin's deputy chief of staff and press secretary.²⁶² On January 20, 2016, Cohen received an email response from Elena Poliakova, Peskov's personal assistant, and phone records confirm that they then spoke for approximately twenty minutes, during which Cohen described the Trump Tower Moscow project and requested assistance in moving the project forward.²⁶³ Cohen recalled briefing candidate Trump about the call soon afterwards.²⁶⁴ Cohen told Trump he spoke with a woman he identified as "someone from the Kremlin," and Cohen reported that she was very professional and asked detailed questions about the project.²⁶⁵ Cohen recalled telling Trump he wished the Trump Organization had assistants who were as competent as the woman from the Kremlin.²⁶⁶

Cohen thought his phone call renewed interest in the project.²⁶⁷ The day after Cohen's call with Poliakova, Sater texted Cohen, asking him to "[c]all me when you have a few minutes to chat ...It's about Putin they called today."²⁶⁸ Sater told Cohen that the Russian government liked the project and on January 25, 2016, sent an invitation for Cohen to visit Moscow "for a working visit."²⁶⁹ After the outreach from Sater, Cohen recalled telling Trump that he was waiting to hear back on moving the project forward.²⁷⁰

After January 2016, Cohen continued to have conversations with Sater about Trump Tower Moscow and continued to keep candidate Trump updated about those discussions and the status of the project.²⁷¹ Cohen recalled that he and Trump

(g)).

²⁶⁰MDC-H-000600 (12/19/15 Email, Sater to Cohen).

²⁶¹Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 5.

²⁶²See FS00004 (12/30/15 Text Message, Cohen to Sater), TRUMPORG_MC_000233 (1/11/16 Email, Cohen to pr_peskovaprpress.gof.ru); MDC-H-000690 (1/14/16 Email, Cohen to infoprpress.gov.ru); TRUMPORG_MC_000235 (1/16/16 Email, Cohen to pr_peskovaprpress.gov.ru).

²⁶³1/20/16 Email, Poliakova to Cohen; Call Records of Michael Cohen. (Showing a 22-minute call on January 20, 2016, between Cohen and the number Poliakova provided in her email); Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 2-3. After the call, Cohen saved Poliakova's contact information in his Trump Organization Outlook contact list. 1/20/16 Cohen Microsoft Outlook Entry (6:22 a.m.).

²⁶⁴Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

²⁶⁵Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5-6; Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 4.

²⁶⁶Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

²⁶⁷Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 5.

²⁶⁸FS00011 (1/21/16 Text Messages, Sater & Cohen).

²⁶⁹Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 5; 1/25/16 Email, Sater to Cohen (attachment).

²⁷⁰Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

²⁷¹Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 6. In later congressional testimony, Cohen stated that he briefed Trump

wanted Trump Tower Moscow to succeed and that Trump never discouraged him from working on the project because of the campaign.²⁷² In March or April 2016, Trump asked Cohen if anything was happening in Russia.²⁷³ Cohen also recalled briefing Donald Trump Jr. in the spring a conversation that Cohen said was not "idle chit chat" because Trump Tower Moscow was potentially a \$1 billion deal.²⁷⁴

Cohen recalled that around May 2016, he again raised with candidate Trump the possibility of a trip to Russia to advance the Trump Tower Moscow project.²⁷⁵ At that time, Cohen had received several texts from Sater seeking to arrange dates for such a trip.²⁷⁶ On May 4, 2016, Sater wrote to Cohen, "I had a chat with Moscow. ASSUMING the trip does happen the question is before or after the convention.... Obviously the pre meeting trip (you only) can happen any time you want but the 2 big guys[is] the question. I said I would confirm and revert."²⁷⁷ Cohen responded, "My trip before Cleveland. Trump once he becomes the nominee after the convention."²⁷⁸ On May 5, 2016, Sater followed up with a text that Cohen thought he probably read to Trump:

Peskov would like to invite you as his guest to the St. Petersburg Forum which is Russia's Davos it's June 16-19. He wants to meet there with you and possibly introduce you to either Putin or Medvedev.... This is perfect. The entire business class of Russia will be there as well. He said anything you want to discuss including dates and subjects are on the table to discuss.²⁷⁹

Cohen recalled discussing the invitation to the St. Petersburg Economic Forum with candidate Trump and saying that Putin or Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev might be there.²⁸⁰ Cohen remembered that Trump said that he would be willing to travel to Russia if Cohen could "lock and load" on the deal.²⁸¹ In June 2016, Cohen decided not to attend the St. Petersburg Economic Forum because Sater had not obtained a formal invitation for Cohen from Peskov.²⁸² Cohen said he had a quick conversation with Trump at that time but did not tell him that the project was

on the project approximately six times after January 2016. *Hearing on Issues Related to Trump Organization Before the House Oversight and Reform Committee*, 116th Cong. (Feb. 27, 2019) (CQ Cong. Transcripts, at 24) (testimony of Michael Cohen).

²⁷²Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 6.

²⁷³Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 4.

²⁷⁴Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 10.

²⁷⁵Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 7.

²⁷⁶Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 7.

²⁷⁷FS00015 (5/4/16 Text Message, Sater to Cohen).

²⁷⁸FS00015 (5/4/16 Text Message, Cohen to Sater).

²⁷⁹FS00016-17 (5/5/16 Text Messages, Sater & Cohen).

²⁸⁰Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 7.

²⁸¹Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 7.

²⁸²Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 7-8.

over because he did not want Trump to complain that the deal was on-again-off-again if it were revived.²⁸³

During the summer of 2016, Cohen recalled that candidate Trump publicly claimed that he had nothing to do with Russia and then shortly afterwards privately checked with Cohen about the status of the Trump Tower Moscow project, which Cohen found "interesting."²⁸⁴ At some point that summer, Cohen recalled having a brief conversation with Trump in which Cohen said the Trump Tower Moscow project was going nowhere because the Russian development company had not secured a piece of property for the project.²⁸⁵ Trump said that was "too bad," and Cohen did not recall talking with Trump about the project after that.²⁸⁶ Cohen said that at no time during the campaign did Trump tell him not to pursue the project or that the project should be abandoned.²⁸⁷

2. Cohen Determines to Adhere to a "Party Line" Distancing Candidate Trump From Russia

As previously discussed, see Volume II, Section II.A, *supra*, when questions about possible Russian support for candidate Trump emerged during the 2016 presidential campaign, Trump denied having any personal, financial, or business connection to Russia, which Cohen described as the "party line" or "message" to follow for Trump and his senior advisors.²⁸⁸

After the election, the Trump Organization sought to formally close out certain deals in advance of the inauguration.²⁸⁹ Cohen recalled that Trump Tower Moscow was on the list of deals to be closed out.²⁹⁰ In approximately January 2017, Cohen began receiving inquiries from the media about Trump Tower Moscow, and he recalled speaking to the President-Elect when those inquiries came in.²⁹¹ Cohen was concerned that truthful answers about the Trump Tower Moscow project might not be consistent with the "message" that the President-Elect had no relationship with Russia.²⁹²

In an effort to "stay on message," Cohen told a New York Times reporter that the Trump Tower Moscow deal was not feasible and had ended in January 2016.²⁹³

²⁸³Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 8.

²⁸⁴Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 2.

²⁸⁵Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 2. Cohen could not recall the precise timing of this conversation, but said he thought it occurred in June or July 2016. Cohen recalled that the conversation happened at some point after candidate Trump was publicly stating that he had nothing to do with Russia. Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 2.

²⁸⁶Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 2.

²⁸⁷Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 2.

²⁸⁸Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 1; Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 3, 5; Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 9.

²⁸⁹Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 1-2; *see also* Rtskhiladze 4/4/18 302, at 8-9.

²⁹⁰Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 1-2.

²⁹¹Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 3.

²⁹²Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 4.

²⁹³Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 5. The article was published on February 19, 2017, and reported that

Cohen recalled that this was part of a "script" or talking point she had developed with President-Elect Trump and others to dismiss the idea of a substantial connection between Trump and Russia.²⁹⁴ Cohen said that he discussed the talking points with Trump but that he did not explicitly tell Trump he thought they were untrue because Trump already knew they were untrue.²⁹⁵ Cohen thought it was important to say the deal was done in January 2016, rather than acknowledge that talks continued in May and June 2016, because it limited the period when candidate Trump could be alleged to have a relationship with Russia to an early point in the campaign, before Trump had become the party's presumptive nominee.²⁹⁶

3. Cohen Submits False Statements to Congress Minimizing the Trump Tower Moscow Project in Accordance with the Party Line

In early May 2017, Cohen received requests from Congress to provide testimony and documents in connection with congressional investigations of Russian interference in the 2016 election.²⁹⁷ At that time, Cohen understood Congress's interest in him to be focused on the allegations in the Steele reporting concerning a meeting Cohen allegedly had with Russian officials in Prague during the campaign.²⁹⁸ Cohen had never traveled to Prague and was not concerned about those allegations, which he believed were provably false.²⁹⁹ On May 18, 2017, Cohen met with the President to discuss the request from Congress, and the President instructed Cohen that he should cooperate because there was nothing there.³⁰⁰

Cohen eventually entered into a joint defense agreement (JDA) with the President and other individuals who were part of the Russia investigation.³⁰¹ In the months leading up to his congressional testimony, Cohen frequently spoke with the President's personal counsel.³⁰² Cohen said that in those conversations the President's personal

Sater and Cohen had been working on plan for a Trump Tower Moscow as recently as the fall of 2015 but had come to a halt because of the presidential campaign. Consistent with Cohens intended party line message, the article stated, Cohen said the Trump Organization had received a letter of intent for a project in Moscow from a Russian real estate developer at that time but determined that the project was not feasible. Megan Twohey & Scott Shane, *A Back-Channel Plan for Ukraine and Russia, Courtesy of Trump Associates*, New York Times (Feb. 19, 2017).

²⁹⁴Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 5-6.

²⁹⁵Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 6.

²⁹⁶Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 10.

²⁹⁷P-SCO-000000328 (5/9/17 Letter, HPSCI to Cohen); P-SCO-000000331 (5/12/17 Letter, SSCI to Cohen).

²⁹⁸Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 2-3.

²⁹⁹Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 2-3.

³⁰⁰Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 2; Cohen 11/20/19 302, at 3.

³⁰¹Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 2.

³⁰²Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 2-3; Cohen 11/20/18, at 2-6. Cohen told investigators about his conversations with the Presidents personal counsel after waiving any privilege of his own and after this Office advised his counsel not to provide any communications that would be covered by any other privilege, including communications protected by a joint defense or common interest privilege. As

counsel would sometimes say that he had just been with the President.³⁰³ Cohen recalled that the President's personal counsel told him the JDA was working well together and assured him that there was nothing there and if they stayed on message the investigations would come to an end soon.³⁰⁴ At that time, Cohen's legal bills were being paid by the Trump Organization,³⁰⁵ and Cohen was told not to worry because the investigations would be over by summer or fall of 2017.³⁰⁶ Cohen said that the President's personal counsel also conveyed that, as part of the JDA, Cohen was protected, which he would not be if he "went rogue."³⁰⁷ Cohen recalled that the President's personal counsel reminded him that "the President loves you" and told him that if he stayed on message, the President had his back.³⁰⁸

In August 2017, Cohen began drafting a statement about Trump Tower Moscow to submit to Congress along with his document production.³⁰⁹ The final version of the statement contained several false statements about the project.³¹⁰ First, although the Trump Organization continued to pursue the project until at least June 2016, the statement said, "The proposal was under consideration at the Trump Organization from September 2015 until the end of January 2016. By the end of January 2016, I determined that the proposal was not feasible for a variety of business reasons and should not be pursued further. Based on my business determinations, the Trump

a result, most of what Cohen told us about his conversations with the Presidents personal counsel concerned what Cohen had communicated to the Presidents personal counsel, and not what was said in response. Cohen described certain statements made by the Presidents personal counsel, however, that are set forth in this section. Cohen and his counsel were better positioned than this Office to evaluate whether any privilege protected those statements because they had knowledge of the scope of their joint defense agreement and access to privileged communications that may have provided context for evaluating the statements they shared. After interviewing Cohen about these matters, we asked the Presidents personal counsel if he wished to provide information to us about his conversations with Cohen related to Cohens congressional testimony about Trump Tower Moscow. The Presidents personal counsel declined and, through his own counsel, indicated that he could not disaggregate information he had obtained from Cohen from information he had obtained from other parties in the JDA. In view of the admonition this Office gave to Cohens counsel to withhold communications that could be covered by privilege, the Presidents personal counsels uncertainty about the provenance of his own knowledge, the burden on a privilege holder to establish the elements to support a claim of privilege, and the substance of the statements themselves, we have included relevant statements Cohen provided in this report. If the statements were to be used in a context beyond this report, further analysis could be warranted.

³⁰³Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 6.

³⁰⁴Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 2, 4.

³⁰⁵Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 4.

³⁰⁶Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 8; Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 3-4.

³⁰⁷Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 4.

³⁰⁸Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 11; Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 2.

³⁰⁹P-SCO-000003680 and P-SCO-0000003687 (8/16/17 Email and Attachment, Michael Cohens Counsel to Cohen). Cohen said it was not his idea to write a letter to Congress about Trump Tower Moscow. Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 7.

³¹⁰P-SCO-00009478 (Statement of Michael D. Cohen, Esq. (Aug. 28, 2017)).

Organization abandoned the proposal.”³¹¹ Second, although Cohen and candidate Trump had discussed possible travel to Russia by Trump to pursue the venture, the statement said, “Despite overtures by Mr. Sater, I never considered asking Mr. Trump to travel to Russia in connection with this proposal. I told Mr. Sater that Mr. Trump would not travel to Russia unless there was a definitive agreement in place.”³¹² Third, although Cohen had regularly briefed Trump on the status of the project and had numerous conversations about it, the statement said, “Mr. Trump was never in contact with anyone about this proposal other than me on three occasions, including signing a non-binding letter of intent in 2015.”³¹³ Fourth, although Cohen’s outreach to Peskov in January 2016 had resulted in a lengthy phone call with a representative from the Kremlin, the statement said that Cohen did “not recall any response to my email [to Peskov], nor any other contacts by me with Mr. Peskov or other Russian government officials about the proposal.”³¹⁴

Cohen’s statement was circulated in advance to, and edited by, members of the JDA.³¹⁵ Before the statement was finalized, early drafts contained a sentence stating, “The building project led me to make limited contacts with Russian government officials.”³¹⁶ In the final version of the statement, that line was deleted.³¹⁷ Cohen though the was told that it was a decision of the JDA to take out that sentence, and he did not push back on the deletion.³¹⁸ Cohen recalled that he told the President’s personal counsel that he would not contest a decision of the JDA.³¹⁹

Cohen also recalled that in drafting his statement for Congress, he spoke with the President’s personal counsel about a different issue that connected candidate Trump to Russia: Cohen’s efforts to set up a meeting between Trump and Putin in New York during the 2015 United Nations General Assembly.³²⁰ In September 2015, Cohen had suggested the meeting to Trump, who told Cohen to reach out to Putin’s office about

³¹¹P-SCO-00009478 (Statement of Michael D. Cohen, Esq. (Aug. 28, 2017)).

³¹²P-SCO-00009478 (Statement of Michael D. Cohen, Esq. (Aug. 28, 2017)).

³¹³P-SCO-00009478 (Statement of Michael D. Cohen, Esq. (Aug. 28, 2017)).

³¹⁴P-SCO-00009478 (Statement of Michael D. Cohen, Esq. (Aug. 28, 2017)).

³¹⁵Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 8-9. Cohen also testified in Congress that the Presidents counsel reviewed and edited the statement. *Hearing on Issues Related to Trump Organization Before the House Oversight and Reform Committee*, 116th Cong. (Feb. 27, 2019) (CQ Cong. Transcripts, at 24-25) (testimony by Michael Cohen). Because of concerns about the common interest privilege, we did not obtain or review all drafts of Cohens statement. Based on the drafts that were released through this Offices filter process, it appears that the substance of the four principal false statements described above were contained in an early draft prepared by Cohen and his counsel. P-SCO-0000003680 and P-SCO-0000003687 (8/16/17 Email and Attachment, Cohens counsel to Cohen).

³¹⁶P-SCO-0000003687 (8/16/17 Draft Statement of Michael Cohen); Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 4.

³¹⁷Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 4. A different line stating that Cohen did not recall any response to my email [to Peskov in January 2016], nor any other contacts by me with Mr. Peskov or other Russian government officials about the proposal remained in the draft. *See* P-SCO-0000009478 (Statement of Michael D. Cohen, Esq. (Aug. 28, 2017)).

³¹⁸Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 4.

³¹⁹Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

³²⁰Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 10-11.

it.³²¹ Cohen spoke and emailed with a Russian official about a possible meeting, and recalled that Trump asked him multiple times for updates on the proposed meeting with Putin.³²² When Cohen called the Russian official a second time, she told him it would not follow proper protocol for Putin to meet with Trump, and Cohen relayed that message to Trump.³²³ Cohen anticipated he might be asked questions about the proposed Trump- Putin meeting when he testified before Congress because he had talked about the potential meeting on Sean Hannity's radio show.³²⁴ Cohen recalled explaining to the President's personal counsel the "whole story" of the attempt to set up a meeting between Trump and Putin and Trump's role in it.³²⁵ Cohen recalled that he and the President's personal counsel talked about keeping Trump out of the narrative, and the President's personal counsel told Cohen the story was not relevant and should not be included in his statement to Congress.³²⁶

Cohen said that his "agenda" in submitting the statement to Congress with false representations about the Trump Tower Moscow project was to minimize links between the project and the President, give the false impression that the project had ended before the first presidential primaries, and shut down further inquiry into Trump Tower Moscow, with the aim of limiting the ongoing Russia investigations.³²⁷ Cohen said he wanted to protect the President and be loyal to him by not contradicting anything the President had said.³²⁸ Cohen recalled he was concerned that if he told the truth about getting a response from the Kremlin or speaking to candidate Trump about travel to Russia to pursue the project, he would contradict the message that no connection existed between Trump and Russia, and he rationalized his decision to provide false testimony because the deal never happened.³²⁹ He was not concerned that the story would be contradicted by individuals who knew it was false because he was sticking to the party line adhered to by the whole group.³³⁰ Cohen wanted the support of the President and the White House, and he believed that following the party line would help put an end to the Special Counsel and congressional investigations.³³¹

Between August 18, 2017, when the statement was in an initial draft stage, and August 28, 2017, when the statement was submitted to Congress, phone records reflect

³²¹Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 11; Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 4.

³²²Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 11; Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 5.

³²³Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 5.

³²⁴Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 11.

³²⁵Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 2.

³²⁶Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 2; *see* Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 11 (recalling that he was told that if he stayed on message and kept the President out of the narrative, the President would have his back).

³²⁷Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 8; Information at 4-5, *United States v. Michael Cohen*, 1:18-cr-850 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 29, 2018), Doc. 2 (*Cohen* Information).

³²⁸Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 4.

³²⁹Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 4; Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 2-3, 4, 6.

³³⁰Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 9.

³³¹Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 8-9.

that Cohen spoke with the President's personal counsel almost daily.³³² On August 27, 2017, the day before Cohen submitted the statement to Congress, Cohen and the President's personal counsel had numerous contacts by phone, including calls lasting three, four, six, eleven, and eighteen minutes.³³³ Cohen recalled telling the President's personal counsel, who did not have first-hand knowledge of the project, that there was more detail on Trump Tower Moscow that was not in the statement, including that there were more communications with Russia and more communications with candidate Trump than the statement reflected.³³⁴ Cohen stated that the President's personal counsel responded that it was not necessary to elaborate or include those details because the project did not progress and that Cohen should keep his statement short and "tight" and the matter would soon come to an end.³³⁵ Cohen recalled that the President's personal counsel said "his client" appreciated Cohen, that Cohen should stay on message and not contradict the President, that there was no need to muddy the water, and that it was time to move on.³³⁶ Cohen said he agreed because it was what he was expected to do.³³⁷ After Cohen later pleaded guilty to making false statements to Congress about the Trump Tower Moscow project, this Office sought to speak with the President's personal counsel about these conversations with Cohen, but counsel declined, citing potential privilege concerns.³³⁸

At the same time that Cohen finalized his written submission to Congress, he served as a source for a Washington Post story published on August 27, 2017, that reported in depth for the first time that the Trump Organization was "pursuing a plan to develop a massive Trump Tower in Moscow" at the same time as candidate Trump was "running for president in late 2015 and early 2016."³³⁹ The article reported that "the project was abandoned at the end of January 2016, just before the presidential

³³²Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 2-3; Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5; Call Records of Michael Cohen (Reflecting three contacts on August 18, 2017 (24 seconds; 5 minutes 25 seconds; and 10 minutes 58 seconds); two contacts on August 19 (23 seconds and 24 minutes 26 seconds); three contacts on August 23 (8 seconds; 20 minutes 33 seconds; and 5 minutes 8 seconds); one contact on August 24 (11 minutes 59 seconds); 14 contacts on August 27 (28 seconds; 4 minutes 37 seconds; 1 minute 16 seconds; 1 minutes 35 seconds; 6 minutes 16 seconds; 1 minutes 10 seconds; 3 minutes 5 seconds; 18 minutes 55 seconds; 4 minutes 56 seconds; 11 minutes 6 seconds; 8 seconds; 3 seconds; 2 seconds; 2 seconds)).

³³³Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5; Call Records of Michael Cohen. (Reflecting 14 contacts on August 27, 2017 (28 seconds; 4 minutes 37 seconds; 1 minute 16 seconds; 1 minutes 35 seconds; 6 minutes 16 seconds; 1 minutes 10 seconds; 3 minutes 5 seconds; 18 minutes 55 seconds; 4 minutes 56 seconds; 11 minutes 6 seconds; 8 seconds; 3 seconds; 2 seconds; 2 seconds)).

³³⁴Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

³³⁵Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5. Cohen also vaguely recalled telling the President's personal counsel that he spoke with a woman from the Kremlin and that the President's personal counsel responded to the effect of so what? because the deal never happened. Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

³³⁶Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

³³⁷Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 5.

³³⁸9/8/19 email, Counsel for personal counsel to the President to Special Counsels Office.

³³⁹Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 7; Carol D. Leonnig et al., *Trump's business sought deal on a Trump Tower in Moscow while he ran for president*, Washington Post (Aug. 27, 2017).

primaries began, several people familiar with the proposal said.”³⁴⁰ Cohen recalled that in speaking to the Post, he held to the false story that negotiations for the deal ceased in January 2016.³⁴¹

On August 28, 2017, Cohen submitted his statement about the Trump Tower Moscow project to Congress.³⁴² Cohen did not recall talking to the President about the specifics of what the statement said or what Cohen would later testify to about Trump Tower Moscow.³⁴³ He recalled speaking to the President more generally about how he planned to stay on message in his testimony.³⁴⁴ On September 19, 2017, in anticipation of his impending testimony, Cohen orchestrated the public release of his opening remarks to Congress, which criticized the allegations in the Steele material and claimed that the Trump Tower Moscow project “was terminated in January of 2016; which occurred before the Iowa caucus and months before the very first primary.”³⁴⁵ Cohen said the release of his opening remarks was intended to shape the narrative and let other people who might be witnesses know what Cohen was saying so they could follow the same message.³⁴⁶ Cohen said his decision was meant to mirror Jared Kushner’s decision to release a statement in advance of Kushner’s congressional testimony, which the President’s personal counsel had told Cohen the President liked.³⁴⁷ Cohen recalled that on September 20, 2017, after Cohen’s opening remarks had been printed by the media, the President’s personal counsel told him that the President was pleased with the Trump Tower Moscow statement that had gone out.³⁴⁸

On October 24 and 25, 2017, Cohen testified before Congress and repeated the false statements he had included in his written statement about Trump Tower Moscow.³⁴⁹ Phone records show that Cohen spoke with the President’s personal counsel immediately after his testimony on both days.³⁵⁰

³⁴⁰Carol D. Leonnig et al., *Trump’s business sought deal on a Trump Tower in Moscow while he ran for president*, Washington Post (Aug. 27, 2017).

³⁴¹Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 7.

³⁴²P-SCO-000009477 - 9478 (8/28/17 Letter and Attachment, Cohen to SSCI).

³⁴³Cohen 11/12/18 302, at 2; Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 9.

³⁴⁴Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 9.

³⁴⁵Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 7; *see, e.g., READ: Michael Cohens statementto the Senate intelligence committee*, CNN (Sept. 19, 2017).

³⁴⁶Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 7.

³⁴⁷Cohen 9/18/18 302, at 7; Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 6.

³⁴⁸Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 6. Phone records show that the Presidents personal counsel called Cohen on the morning of September 20, 2017, and they spoke for approximately 11 minutes, and that they had two more contacts that day, one of which lasted approximately 18 minutes. Call Records of Michael Cohen.(Reflecting three contacts on September 20, 2017, with calls lasting for 11 minutes 3 seconds; 2 seconds; and 18 minutes 38 seconds).

³⁴⁹*Cohen* Information, at 4; Executive Session, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, U.S. House of Representatives, Interview of Michael Cohen (Oct. 24, 2017), at 10-11, 117-119.

³⁵⁰Call Records of Michael Cohen. (Reflecting two contacts on October 24, 2017 (12 minutes 8 seconds and 8 minutes 27 seconds) and three contacts on October 25, 2017 (1 second; 4 minutes 6 seconds; and 6 minutes 6 seconds)).

4. The President Sends Messages of Support to Cohen

In January 2018, the media reported that Cohen had arranged a \$130,000 payment during the campaign to prevent a woman from publicly discussing an alleged sexual encounter she had with the President before he ran for office.³⁵¹ This Office did not investigate Cohen's campaign- period payments to women.³⁵² However, those events, as described here, are potentially relevant to the President's and his personal counsel's interactions with Cohen as a witness who later began to cooperate with the government.

On February 13, 2018, Cohen released a statement to news organizations that stated, "In a private transaction in 2016, I used my own personal funds to facilitate a payment of \$130,000 to [the woman]. Neither the Trump Organization nor the Trump campaign was a party to the May-Contain- transaction with [the woman], and neither reimbursed me for the payment, either directly or indirectly."³⁵³ In congressional testimony on February 27, 2019, Cohen testified that he had discussed what to say about the payment with the President and that the President had directed Cohen to say that the President "was not knowledgeable ... of [Cohen's] actions" in making the payment.³⁵⁴ On February 19, 2018, the day after the New York Times wrote a detailed story attributing the payment to Cohen and describing Cohen as the President's "fixer," Cohen received a text message from the President's personal counsel that stated, "Client says thanks for what you do."³⁵⁵

On April 9, 2018, FBI agents working with the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York executed search warrants on Cohen's home, hotel room, and office.³⁵⁶ That day, the President spoke to reporters and said that he had

³⁵¹ See, e.g., Michael Rothfeld & Joe Palazzolo, *Trump Lawyer Arranged \$130,000 Payment for Adult-Film Stars Silence*, Wall Street Journal (Jan. 12, 2018).

³⁵² The Office was authorized to investigate Cohens establishment and use of Essential Consultants LLC, which Cohen created to facilitate the \$130,000 payment during the campaign, based on evidence that the entity received funds from Russian-backed entities. Cohens use of Essential Consultants to facilitate the \$130,000 payment to the woman during the campaign was part of the Offices referral of certain Cohen-related matters to the U.S. Attorneys Office for the Southern District of New York.

³⁵³ See, e.g., Mark Berman, *Longtime Trump attorney says he made \$130,000 payment to Stormy Daniels with his money*, Washington Post (Feb. 14, 2018).

³⁵⁴ *Hearing on Issues Related to Trump Organization Before the House Oversight and Reform Committee*, 116th Cong. (Feb. 27, 2019) (CQ Cong. Transcripts, at 147-148) (testimony of Michael Cohen). Toll records show that Cohen was connected to a White House phone number for approximately five minutes on January 19, 2018, and for approximately seven minutes on January 30, 2018, and that Cohen called Melania Trumps cell phone several times between January 26, 2018, and January 30, 2018. Call Records of Michael Cohen.

³⁵⁵ 9/19/18 Text Message, Presidents personal counsel to Cohen; see Jim Rutenberg et al., *Tools of Trump's Fixer: Payouts, Intimidation and the Tabloids*, New York Times (Feb. 18, 2018).

³⁵⁶ Govt Opp. to Def. Mot. for Temp. Restraining Order, *In the Matter of Search Warrants Executed on April 9, 2018*, 18-mj-3161 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 13, 2018), Doc. 1 (On April 9, 2018, agents from the New York field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation... executed search warrants for Michael Cohens residence, hotel room, office, safety deposit box, and electronic devices.).

"just heard that they broke into the office of one of my personal attorneys a good man."³⁵⁷ The President called the searches "a real disgrace" and said, "It's an attack on our country, in a true sense. It's an attack on what we all stand for."³⁵⁸ Cohen said that after the searches he was concerned that he was "an open book," that he did not want issues arising from the payments to women to "come out," and that his false statements to Congress were "a big concern."³⁵⁹

A few days after the searches, the President called Cohen.³⁶⁰ According to Cohen, the President said he wanted to "check in" and asked if Cohen was okay, and the President encouraged Cohen to "hang in there" and "stay strong."³⁶¹ Cohen also recalled that following the searches he heard from individuals who were in touch with the President and relayed to Cohen the President's support for him.³⁶² Cohen recalled that [REDACTED], a friend of the President's, reached out to say that he was with "the Boss" in Mar-a-Lago and the President had said "he loves you" and not to worry.³⁶³ Cohen recalled that [REDACTED] for the Trump Organization, told him, "the boss loves you."³⁶⁴ And Cohen said that [REDACTED], a friend of the President's, told him, "everyone knows the boss has your back."³⁶⁵

On or about April 17, 2018, Cohen began speaking with an attorney, Robert Costello, who had a close relationship with Rudolph Giuliani, one of the President's personal lawyers.³⁶⁶ Costello told Cohen that he had a "back channel of communication" to Giuliani, and that Giuliani had said the "channel" was "crucial" and "must be maintained."³⁶⁷ On April 20, 2018, the New York Times published an article about the President's relationship with and treatment of Cohen.³⁶⁸ The President responded with a series of tweets predicting that Cohen would not "flip":

The New York Times and a third rate reporter ... are going out of their way to destroy Michael Cohen and his relationship with me in the hope that he will 'flip.' They use non-existent 'sources' and a drunk/drugged up loser who hates Michael, a fine person with a wonderful family. Michael is a businessman for his own account/lawyer who I have always liked &

³⁵⁷Remarks by President Trump Before Meeting with Senior Military Leadership, White House (Apr. 9, 2018).

³⁵⁸Remarks by President Trump Before Meeting with Senior Military Leadership, White House (Apr. 9, 2018).

³⁵⁹Cohen, 10/17/18 302, at 11.

³⁶⁰Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 4.

³⁶¹Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 4.

³⁶²Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 11.

³⁶³Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 11.

³⁶⁴Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 11.

³⁶⁵Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 11.

³⁶⁶4/17/18 Email, Citron to Cohen; 4/19/18 Email, Costello to Cohen; MC-SCO-001 (7/7/18 redacted billing statement from Davidoff, Hutcher & Citron to Cohen).

³⁶⁷4/21/18 Email, Costello to Cohen.

³⁶⁸See Maggie Haberman et al., *Michael Cohen Has Said He Would Take a Bullet for Trump. Maybe Not Anymore.*, New York Times (Apr.20, 2018).

respected. Most people will flip if the Government lets them out of trouble, even if it means lying or making up stories. Sorry, I don't see Michael doing that despite the horrible Witch Hunt and the dishonest media!³⁶⁹

In an email that day to Cohen, Costello wrote that he had spoken with Giuliani.³⁷⁰ Costello told Cohen the conversation was "Very Very Positive[.] You are 'loved' ... they are in our corner Sleep well tonight[], you have friends in high places."³⁷¹

Cohen said that following these messages he believed he had the support of the White House if he continued to toe the party line, and he determined to stay on message and be part of the team.³⁷² At the time, Cohen understood that his legal fees were still being paid by the Trump Organization, which he said was important to him.³⁷³ Cohen believed he needed the power of the President to take care of him, so he needed to defend the President and stay on message.³⁷⁴

Cohen also recalled speaking with the President's personal counsel about pardons after the searches of his home and office had occurred, at a time when the media had reported that pardon discussions were occurring at the White House.³⁷⁵ Cohen told the President's personal counsel he had been a loyal lawyer and servant, and he said that after the searches he was in an uncomfortable position and wanted to know what was in it for him.³⁷⁶ According to Cohen, the President's personal counsel responded that Cohen should stay on message, that the investigation was a witch hunt, and that everything would be fine.³⁷⁷ Cohen understood based on this conversation and previous conversations about pardons with the President's personal counsel that as long as he stayed on message, he would be taken care of by the President, either through a pardon or through the investigation being shut down.³⁷⁸

On April 24, 2018, the President responded to a reporter's inquiry whether he would consider a pardon for Cohen with, "Stupid question."³⁷⁹ On June 8, 2018, the President said he "hadn't even thought about" pardons for Manafort or Cohen, and

³⁶⁹realDonaldTrump 4/21/18 (9:10 a.m. ET) Tweets.

³⁷⁰4/91/18 Email, Costello to Cohen.

³⁷¹4/21/18 Email, Costello to Cohen. [REDACTED]

³⁷²Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 11.

³⁷³Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 10.

³⁷⁴Cohen 9/12/18 302, at 10.

³⁷⁵Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 7. At a White House press briefing on April 23, 2018, in response to a question about whether the White House had close[d] the door one way or the other on the President pardoning Michael Cohen, Sanders said, Its hard to close the door on something that hasnt taken place. I dont like to discuss or comment on hypothetical situations that may or may not ever happen. I would refer you to personal attorneys to comment on anything specific regarding that case, but we dont have anything at this point. Sarah Sanders, *White House Daily Briefing*, C-SPAN (Apr. 23, 2018).

³⁷⁶Cohen 11/20/18 302, at 7; Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 3.

³⁷⁷Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 3.

³⁷⁸Cohen 3/19/19 302, at 3-4.

³⁷⁹Remarks by President Trump and President Macron of France Before Restricted Bilateral Meeting, The White House (Apr. 24, 2018).

continued, "It's far too early to be thinking about that. They haven't been convicted of anything. There's nothing to pardon."³⁸⁰ And on June 15, 2018, the President expressed sympathy for Cohen, Manafort, and Flynn in a press interview and said, "I feel badly about a lot of them, because I think lot of it is very unfair."³⁸¹

5. The President's Conduct After Cohen Began Cooperating with the Government

On July 2, 2018, ABC News reported based on an "exclusive" interview with Cohen that Cohen "strongly signaled his willingness to cooperate with special counsel Robert Mueller and federal prosecutors in the Southern District of New York even if that puts President Trump in jeopardy."³⁸² That week, the media reported that Cohen had added an attorney to his legal team who previously had worked as a legal advisor to President Bill Clinton.³⁸³

Beginning on July 20, 2018, the media reported on the existence of a recording Cohen had made of a conversation he had with candidate Trump about a payment made to a second woman who said she had had an affair with Trump.³⁸⁴ On July 21, 2018, the President responded: "Inconceivable that the government would break into a lawyer's office (early in the morning) almost unheard of. Even more inconceivable that a lawyer would tape a client totally unheard of & perhaps illegal. The good news is that your favorite President did nothing wrong!"³⁸⁵ On July 27, 2018, after the media reported that Cohen was willing to inform investigators that Donald Trump Jr. told his father about the June 9, 2016 meeting to get "dirt" on Hillary Clinton,³⁸⁶ the President tweeted: "[S]o the Fake News doesn't waste my time with dumb questions, NO, I did NOT know of the meeting with my son, Don jr. Sounds to me like someone is trying to make up stories in order to get himself out of an unrelated jam (Taxi cabs maybe?). He even retained Bill and Crooked Hillary's lawyer. Gee, I wonder if they helped him make the choice!"³⁸⁷

³⁸⁰ *President Donald Trump Holds Media Availability Before Departing for the G-7 Summit*, CQ Newsmaker Transcripts (June 8, 2018).

³⁸¹ Remarks by President Trump in Press Gaggle, The White House (June 15, 2018).

³⁸² *EXCLUSIVE: Michael Cohen says family and country, not President Trump, is his first loyalty*, ABC (July 2, 2018). Cohen said in the interview, To be crystal clear, my wife, my daughter and my son, and this country have my first loyalty.

³⁸³ See e.g., Darren Samuelsohn, *Michael Cohen hires Clinton scandal veteran Lanny Davis*, Politico (July 5, 2018).

³⁸⁴ See, e.g., Matt Apuzzo et al., *Michael Cohen Secretly Taped Trump Discussing Payment to Playboy Model*, New York Times (July 20, 2018).

³⁸⁵ realDonaldTrump 7/21/18 (8:10 a.m. ET) Tweet.

³⁸⁶ See, e.g., Jim Sciutto, *Cuomo Prime Time Transcript*, CNN (July 26, 2018).

³⁸⁷ realDonaldTrump 7/27/18 (7:26 a.m. ET) Tweet; realDonaldTrump 7/27/18 (7:38 a.m. ET) Tweet; realDonaldTrump 7/27/18 (7:56 a.m. ET) Tweet. At the time of these tweets, the press had reported that Cohens financial interests in taxi cab medallions were being scrutinized by investigators. See, e.g., Matt Apuzzo et al., *Michael Cohen Secretly Taped Trump Discussing Payment to Playboy Model*, New York Times (July 20, 2018).

On August 21, 2018, Cohen pleaded guilty in the Southern District of New York to eight felony charges, including two counts of campaign-finance violations based on the payments he had made during the final weeks of the campaign to women who said they had affairs with the President.³⁸⁸ During the plea hearing, Cohen stated that he had worked "at the direction of" the candidate in making those payments.³⁸⁹ The next day, the President contrasted Cohen's cooperation with Manafort's refusal to cooperate, tweeting, "I feel very badly for Paul Manafort and his wonderful family. 'Justice' took a 12 year old tax case, among other things, applied tremendous pressure on him and, unlike Michael Cohen, he refused to 'break' make up stories in order to get a 'deal.' Such respect for a brave man!"³⁹⁰

On September 17, 2018, this Office submitted written questions to the President that included questions about the Trump Tower Moscow project and attached Cohen's written statement to Congress and the Letter of Intent signed by the President.³⁹¹ Among other issues, the questions asked the President to describe the timing and substance of discussions he had with Cohen about the project, whether they discussed a potential trip to Russia, and whether the President "at any time direct[ed] or suggest[ed] that discussions about the Trump Moscow project should cease," or whether the President was "informed at any time that the project had been abandoned."³⁹²

On November 20, 2018, the President submitted written responses that did not answer those questions about Trump Tower Moscow directly and did not provide any information about the timing of the candidate's discussions with Cohen about the project or whether he participated in any discussions about the project being abandoned or no longer pursued.³⁹³ Instead, the President's answers stated in relevant part:

I had few conversations with Mr. Cohen on this subject. As I recall, they were brief, and they were not memorable. I was not enthused about the proposal, and I do not recall any discussion of travel to Russia in connection with it. I do not remember discussing it with anyone else at the Trump Organization, although it is possible. I do not recall being aware at the time of any communications between Mr. Cohen and Felix Sater and any Russian government official regarding the Letter of Intent.³⁹⁴

³⁸⁸ *Cohen* Information.

³⁸⁹ *Cohen* 8/21/18 Transcript, at 23.

³⁹⁰realDonaldTrump 8/22/18 (9:21 a.m. ET) Tweet.

³⁹¹ 9/17/18 Letter, Special Counsels Office to Presidents Personal Counsel (attaching written questions for the President, with attachments).

³⁹² 9/17/18 Letter, Special Counsels Office to Presidents Personal Counsel (attaching written questions for the President), Question III, Parts (a) through (g).

³⁹³ Written Responses of Donald J. Trump (Nov. 20, 2018).

³⁹⁴ Written Responses of Donald J. Trump (Nov. 20, 2018), at 15 (Response to Question III, Parts (a) through (g)).

On November 29, 2018, Cohen pleaded guilty to making false statements to Congress based on his statements about the Trump Tower Moscow project.³⁹⁵ In a plea agreement with this Office, Cohen agreed to "provide truthful information regarding any and all matters as to which this Office deems relevant."³⁹⁶ Later on November 29, after Cohen's guilty plea had become public, the President spoke to reporters about the Trump Tower Moscow project, saying:

I decided not to do the project.... I decided ultimately not to do it. There would have been nothing wrong if I did do it. If I did do it, there would have been nothing wrong. That May - Certain - It was an option that I decided not to do.... I decided not to do it. I was running my was my business... The primary reason... I was focused on running for President... business while I was campaigning. There was a good chance that I wouldn't have won, in which case I would've gone back into the business. And why should I lose lots of opportunities?³⁹⁷

The President also said that Cohen was "a weak person. And by being weak, unlike other people that you watch he is a weak person. And what he's trying to do is get a reduced sentence. So he's lying about a project that everybody knew about."³⁹⁸ The President also brought up Cohen's written submission to Congress regarding the Trump Tower Moscow project: "So here's the story: Go back and look at the paper that Michael Cohen wrote before he testified in the House and/or Senate. It talked about his position."³⁹⁹ The President added, "Even if [Cohen] was right, it doesn't matter because I was allowed to do whatever I wanted during the campaign."⁴⁰⁰

In light of the President's public statements following Cohen's guilty plea that he "decided not to do the project," this Office again sought information from the President about whether he participated in any discussions about the project being abandoned or no longer pursued, including when he "decided not to do the project," who he spoke to about that decision, and what motivated the decision.⁴⁰¹ The Office also again asked for the timing of the President's discussions with Cohen about Trump Tower Moscow and asked him to specify "what period of the campaign" he was

³⁹⁵ *Cohen* Information; *Cohen* 8/21/18 Transcript.

³⁹⁶ Plea Agreement at 4, *United States v. Michael Cohen*, 1:18-cr-850 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 29, 2018).

³⁹⁷ *President Trump Departure Remarks*, C-SPAN (Nov. 29, 2018). In contrast to the Presidents remarks following Cohens guilty plea, Cohens August 28, 2017 statement to Congress stated that Cohen, not the President, decided to abandon the proposal in late January 2016; that Cohen did not ask or brief Mr. Trump.... before I made the decision to terminate further work on the proposal; and that the decision to abandon the proposal was unrelated to the Campaign. P-SCO-000009477 (Statement of Michael D. Cohen, Esq. (Aug. 28, 2017)).

³⁹⁸ *President Trump Departure Remarks*, C-SPAN (Nov. 29, 2018).

³⁹⁹ *President Trump Departure Remarks*, C-SPAN (Nov. 29, 2018).

⁴⁰⁰ *President Trump Departure Remarks*, C-SPAN (Nov. 29, 2018).

⁴⁰¹ 1/23/19 Letter, Special Counsels Office to Presidents Personal Counsel.

II. FACTUAL RESULTS OF THE OBSTRUCTION INVESTIGATION

involved in discussions concerning the project.⁴⁰² In response, the President's personal counsel declined to provide additional information from the President and stated that "the President has fully answered the questions at issue."⁴⁰³

In the weeks following Cohen's plea and agreement to provide assistance to this Office, the President repeatedly implied that Cohen's family members were guilty of crimes. On December 3, 2018, after Cohen had filed his sentencing memorandum, the President tweeted, "Michael Cohen asks judge for no Prison Time.' You mean he can do all of the TERRIBLE, unrelated to Trump, things having to do with fraud, big loans, Taxis, etc., and not serve a long prison term? He makes up stories to get a GREAT & ALREADY reduced deal for himself, and get his wife and father-in-law (who has the money?) off Scott Free. He lied for this outcome and should, in my opinion, serve a full and complete sentence."⁴⁰⁴ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]⁴⁰⁵

On December 12, 2018, Cohen was sentenced to three years of imprisonment.⁴⁰⁶ The next day, the President sent a series of tweets that said:

I never directed Michael Cohen to break the law.... Those charges were just agreed to by him in order to embarrass the president and get a much reduced prison sentence, which he did including the fact that his family was temporarily let off the hook. As a lawyer, Michael has great liability to me!⁴⁰⁷

On December 16, 2018, the President tweeted, "Remember, Michael Cohen only became a 'Rat' after the FBI did something which was absolutely unthinkable & unheard of until the Witch Hunt was illegally started. They **BROKE INTO AN ATTORNEY'S OFFICE!** Why didn't they break into the DNC to get the Server, or Crooked's office?"⁴⁰⁸

In January 2019, after the media reported that Cohen would provide public testimony in a congressional hearing, the President made additional public comments suggesting that Cohen's family members had committed crimes. In an interview on Fox on January 12, 2019, the President was asked whether he was worried about Cohen's testimony and responded:

[I]n order to get his sentence reduced, [Cohen] says "I have an idea, I'll ah, tell I'll give you some information on the president." Well, there is no information. But he should give information may be on his father-in-law because that's the one that people want to look at because where does

⁴⁰²1/23/19 Letter, Special Counsels Office to Presidents Personal Counsel.

⁴⁰³2/6/19 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office.

⁴⁰⁴realDonaldTrump 12/3/18 (10:24 a.m. ET and 10:29 a.m. ET) Tweets (emphasis added).

⁴⁰⁵realDonaldTrump 12/3/18 (10:48 a.m. ET) Tweet.

⁴⁰⁶ *Cohen* 12/12/18 Transcript.

⁴⁰⁷realDonaldTrump 12/13/18 (8:17 a.m. ET, 8:25 a.m. ET, and 8:39 a.m. ET) Tweets (emphasis added).

⁴⁰⁸realDonaldTrump 12/16/18 (9:39 a.m. ET) Tweet.

that money that's the money in the family. And I guess he didn't want to talk about his father-in-law, he's trying to get his sentence reduced. So it's ah, pretty sad. You know, it's weak and it's very sad to watch a thing like that.⁴⁰⁹

On January 18, 2019, the President tweeted, "Kevin Corke, FoxNews 'Don't forget, Michael Cohen has already been convicted of perjury and fraud, and as recently as this week, the Wall Street Journal has suggested that he may have stolen tens of thousands of dollars....'- Lying to reduce his jail time! Watch father-in-law!"⁴¹⁰

On January 23, 2019, Cohen postponed his congressional testimony, citing threats against his family.⁴¹¹ The next day, the President tweeted, "So interesting that bad lawyer Michael Cohen, who sadly will not be testifying before Congress, is using the lawyer of Crooked Hillary Clinton to represent him Gee, how did that happen?"⁴¹²

Also in January 2019, Giuliani gave press interviews that appeared to confirm Cohen's account that the Trump Organization pursued the Trump Tower Moscow project well past January 2016. Giuliani stated that "it's our understanding that [discussions about the Trump Moscow project] went on throughout 2016. Weren't a lot of them, but there were conversations. Can't be sure of the exact date. But the president can remember having conversations with him about it. The president also remembers yeah, probably up could be up to as far as October, November."⁴¹³ In an interview with the New York Times, Giuliani quoted the President as saying that the discussions regarding the Trump Moscow project were "going on from the day I announced to the day I won."⁴¹⁴ On January 21, 2019, Giuliani issued a statement that said: "My recent statements about discussions during the 2016 campaign between Michael Cohen and candidate Donald Trump about a potential Trump Moscow 'project' were hypothetical and not based on conversations I had with the president."⁴¹⁵

Analysis

In analyzing the President's conduct related to Cohen, the following evidence is relevant to the elements of obstruction of justice.

Obstructive act. We gathered evidence of the President's conduct related to Cohen on two issues: (i) whether the President or others aided or participated in Cohen's

⁴⁰⁹ Jeanine Pirro *Interview with President Trump*, Fox News (Jan. 12, 2019) (emphasis added).

⁴¹⁰realDonaldTrump 1/18/19 (10:02 a.m. ET) Tweet (emphasis added).

⁴¹¹Statement by Lanny Davis, Cohens personal counsel (Jan. 23, 2019).

⁴¹²realDonaldTrump 1/24/19 (7:48 a.m. ET) Tweet.

⁴¹³Meet the Press Interview with Rudy Giuliani, NBC (Jan. 20, 2019).

⁴¹⁴Mark Mazzetti et al., *Moscow Skyscraper Talks Continued Through the Day I Won, Trump Is Said to Acknowledge*, New York Times (Jan. 20, 2019).

⁴¹⁵Maggie Haberman, *Giuliani Says His Moscow Trump Tower Comments Were Hypothetical*, New York Times (Jan. 21, 2019). In a letter to this Office, the Presidents counsel stated that Giulianis public comments were not intended to suggest nor did they reflect knowledge of the existence or timing of conversations beyond that contained in the Presidents [written responses to the Special Counsels Office]. 2/6/19 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office.

false statements to Congress, and (ii) whether the President took actions that would have the natural tendency to prevent Cohen from providing truthful information to the government.

First, with regard to Cohen's false statements to Congress, while there is evidence, described below, that the President knew Cohen provided false testimony to Congress about the Trump Tower Moscow project, the evidence available to us does not establish that the President directed or aided Cohen's false testimony.

Cohen said that his statements to Congress followed a "party line" that developed within the campaign to align with the President's public statements distancing the President from Russia. Cohen also recalled that, in speaking with the President in advance of testifying, he made it clear that he would stay on message which Cohen believed they both understood would require false testimony. But Cohen said that he and the President did not explicitly discuss whether Cohen's testimony about the Trump Tower Moscow project would be or was false, and the President did not direct him to provide false testimony. Cohen also said he did not tell the President about the specifics of his planned testimony. During the time when his statement to Congress was being drafted and circulated to members of the JDA, Cohen did not speak directly to the President about the statement, but rather communicated with the President's personal counsel as corroborated by phone records showing extensive communications between Cohen and the President's personal counsel before Cohen submitted his statement and when he testified before Congress.

Cohen recalled that in his discussions with the President's personal counsel on August 27, 2017 the day before Cohen's statement was submitted to Congress Cohen said that there were more communications with Russia and more communications with candidate Trump than the statement reflected. Cohen recalled expressing some concern at that time. According to Cohen, the President's personal counsel who did not have first-hand knowledge of the project responded by saying that there was no need to muddy the water, that it was unnecessary to include those details because the project did not take place, and that Cohen should keep his statement short and tight, not elaborate, stay on message, and not contradict the President. Cohen's recollection of the content of those conversations is consistent with direction about the substance of Cohen's draft statement that appeared to come from members of the JDA. For example, Cohen omitted any reference to his outreach to Russian government officials to set up a meeting between Trump and Putin during the United Nations General Assembly, and Cohen believed it was a decision of the JDA to delete the sentence, "The building project led me to make limited contacts with Russian government officials."

The President's personal counsel declined to provide us with his account of his conversations with Cohen, and there is no evidence available to us that indicates that the President was aware of the information Cohen provided to the President's personal counsel. The President's conversations with his personal counsel were presumptively protected by attorney-client privilege, and we did not seek to obtain the contents

of any such communications. The absence of evidence about the President and his counsel's conversations about the drafting of Cohen's statement precludes us from assessing what, if any, role the President played.

Second, we considered whether the President took actions that would have the natural tendency to prevent Cohen from providing truthful information to criminal investigators or to Congress.

Before Cohen began to cooperate with the government, the President publicly and privately urged Cohen to stay on message and not "flip." Cohen recalled the President's personal counsel telling him that he would be protected so long as he did not go "rogue." In the days and weeks that followed the April 2018 searches of Cohen's home and office, the President told reporters that Cohen was a "good man" and said he was "a fine person with a wonderful family ... who I have always liked & respected." Privately, the President told Cohen to "hang in there" and "stay strong." People who were close to both Cohen and the President passed messages to Cohen that "the President loves you," "the boss loves you," and "everyone knows the boss has your back." Through the President's personal counsel, the President also had previously told Cohen "thanks for what you do" after Cohen provided information to the media about payments to women that, according to Cohen, both Cohen and the President knew was false. At that time, the Trump Organization continued to pay Cohen's legal fees, which was important to Cohen. Cohen also recalled discussing the possibility of a pardon with the President's personal counsel, who told him to stay on message and everything would be fine. The President indicated in his public statements that a pardon had not been ruled out, and also stated publicly that "[m]ost people will flip if the Government lets them out of trouble" but that he "d[idn't] see Michael doing that."

After it was reported that Cohen intended to cooperate with the government, however, the President accused Cohen of "mak[ing] up stories in order to get himself out of an unrelated jam (Taxi cabs maybe?)," called Cohen a "rat," and on multiple occasions publicly suggested that Cohen's family members had committed crimes. The evidence concerning this sequence of events could support an inference that the President used inducements in the form of positive messages in an effort to get Cohen not to cooperate, and then turned to attacks and intimidation to deter the provision of information or undermine Cohen's credibility once Cohen began cooperating.

Nexus to an official proceeding. The President's relevant conduct towards Cohen occurred when the President knew the Special Counsel's Office, Congress, and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York were investigating Cohen's conduct. The President acknowledged through his public statements and tweets that Cohen potentially could cooperate with the government investigations.

Intent. In analyzing the President's intent in his actions towards Cohen as a potential witness, there is evidence that could support the inference that the President intended to discourage Cohen from cooperating with the government because Cohen's information would shed adverse light on the President's campaign-period conduct and

statements.

Cohen's false congressional testimony about the Trump Tower Moscow project was designed to minimize connections between the President and Russia and to help limit the congressional and DOJ Russia investigations a goal that was in the President's interest, as reflected by the President's own statements. During and after the campaign, the President made repeated statements that he had "no business" in Russia and said that there were "no deals that could happen in Russia, because we've stayed away." As Cohen knew, and as he recalled communicating to the President during the campaign, Cohen's pursuit of the Trump Tower Moscow project cast doubt on the accuracy or completeness of these statements.

In connection with his guilty plea, Cohen admitted that he had multiple conversations with candidate Trump to give him status updates about the Trump Tower Moscow project, that the conversations continued through at least June 2016, and that he discussed with Trump possible travel to Russia to pursue the project. The conversations were not off-hand, according to Cohen, because the project had the potential to be so lucrative. In addition, text messages to and from Cohen and other records further establish that Cohen's efforts to advance the project did not end in January 2016 and that in May and June 2016, Cohen was considering the timing for possible trips to Russia by him and Trump in connection with the project.

The evidence could support an inference that the President was aware of these facts at the time of Cohen's false statements to Congress. Cohen discussed the project with the President in early 2017 following media inquiries. Cohen recalled that on September 20, 2017, the day after he released to the public his opening remarks to Congress which said the project "was terminated in January of 2016" the President's personal counsel told him the President was pleased with what Cohen had said about Trump Tower Moscow. And after Cohen's guilty plea, the President told reporters that he had ultimately decided not to do the project, which supports the inference that he remained aware of his own involvement in the project and the period during the Campaign in which the project was' being pursued.

The President's public remarks following Cohen's guilty plea also suggest that the President may have been concerned about what Cohen told investigators about the Trump Tower Moscow project. At the time the President submitted written answers to questions from this Office about the project and other subjects, the media had reported that Cohen was cooperating with the government but Cohen had not yet pleaded guilty to making false statements to Congress. Accordingly, it was not publicly known what information about the project Cohen had provided to the government. In his written answers, the President did not provide details about the timing and substance of his discussions with Cohen about the project and gave no indication that he had decided to no longer pursue the project. Yet after Cohen pleaded guilty, the President publicly stated that he had personally made the decision to abandon the project. The President then declined to clarify the seeming discrepancy to our Office or answer additional questions. The content and timing of

the President's provision of information about his knowledge and actions regarding the Trump Tower Moscow project is evidence that the President may have been concerned about the information that Cohen could provide as a witness.

The President's concern about Cohen cooperating may have been directed at the Southern District of New York investigation into other aspects of the President's dealings with Cohen rather than an investigation of Trump Tower Moscow. There also is some evidence that the President's concern about Cohen cooperating was based on the President's stated belief that Cohen would provide false testimony against the President in an attempt to obtain a lesser sentence for his unrelated criminal conduct. The President tweeted that Manafort, unlike Cohen, refused to "break" and "make up stories in order to get a 'deal.'" And after Cohen pleaded guilty to making false statements to Congress, the President said, "what [Cohen]'s trying to do is get a reduced sentence. So he's lying about a project that everybody knew about." But the President also appeared to defend the underlying conduct, saying, "Even if [Cohen] was right, it doesn't matter because I was allowed to do whatever I wanted during the campaign." As described above, there is evidence that the President knew that Cohen had made false statements about the Trump Tower Moscow project and that Cohen did so to protect the President and minimize the President's connections to Russia during the campaign.

Finally, the President's statements insinuating that members of Cohen's family committed crimes after Cohen began cooperating with the government could be viewed as an effort to retaliate against Cohen and chill further testimony adverse to the President by Cohen or others. It is possible that the President believes, as reflected in his tweets, that Cohen "ma[d]e up stories" in order to get a deal for himself and "get his wife and father-in-law ... off Scott Free." It also is possible that the President's mention of Cohen's wife and father-in-law were not intended to affect Cohen as a witness but rather were part of a public-relations strategy aimed at discrediting Cohen and deflecting attention away from the President on Cohen-related matters. But the President's suggestion that Cohen's family members committed crimes happened more than once, including just before Cohen was sentenced (at the same time as the President stated that Cohen "should, in my opinion, serve a full and complete sentence") and again just before Cohen was scheduled to testify before Congress. The timing of the statements supports an inference that they were intended at least in part to discourage Cohen from further cooperation.

L. Overarching Factual Issues

Although this report does not contain a traditional prosecution decision or declination decision, the evidence supports several general conclusions relevant to analysis of the facts concerning the President's course of conduct.

Three features of this case render it atypical compared to the heartland obstruction-of-justice prosecutions brought by the Department of Justice.

First, the conduct involved actions by the President. Some of the conduct did not implicate the President's constitutional authority and raises garden-variety obstruction-of-justice issues. Other events we investigated, however, drew upon the President's Article II authority, which raised constitutional issues that we address in Volume II, Section III-B, *infra*. A factual analysis of that conduct would have to take into account both that the President's acts were facially lawful and that his position as head of the Executive Branch provides him with unique and powerful means of influencing official proceedings, subordinate officers, and potential witnesses.

Second, many obstruction cases involve the attempted or actual cover-up of an underlying crime. Personal criminal conduct can furnish strong evidence that the individual had an improper obstructive purpose, see, e.g., *United States v. Willoughby*, 860 F.2d 15, 24 (2d Cir. 1988), or that he contemplated an effect on an official proceeding, see, e.g., *United States v. Binday*, 804 F.3d 558, 591 (2d Cir. 2015). But proof of such a crime is not an element of an obstruction offense. See *United States v. Greer*, 872 F.3d 790, 798 (6th Cir. 2017) (stating, in applying the obstruction sentencing guideline, that "obstruction of a criminal investigation is punishable even if the prosecution is ultimately unsuccessful or even if the investigation ultimately reveals no underlying crime"). Obstruction of justice can be motivated by a desire to protect non-criminal personal interests, to protect against investigations where underlying criminal liability falls into a gray area, or to avoid personal embarrassment. The injury to the integrity of the justice system is the same regardless of whether a person committed an underlying wrong.

In this investigation, the evidence does not establish that the President was involved in an underlying crime related to Russian election interference. But the evidence does point to a range of other possible personal motives animating the President's conduct. These include concerns that continued investigation would call into question the legitimacy of his election and potential uncertainty about whether certain events—such as advance notice of WikiLeaks's release of hacked information or the June 9, 2016 meeting between senior campaign officials and Russians—could be seen as criminal activity by the President, his campaign, or his family.

Third, many of the President's acts directed at witnesses, including discouragement of cooperation with the government and suggestions of possible future pardons, occurred in public view. While it may be more difficult to establish that public-facing acts were motivated by a corrupt intent, the President's power to influence actions, persons, and events is enhanced by his unique ability to attract attention through use of mass communications. And no principle of law excludes public acts from the scope of obstruction statutes. If the likely effect of the acts is to intimidate witnesses or alter their testimony, the justice system's integrity is equally threatened.

Although the events we investigated involved discrete acts—e.g., the President's statement to Comey about the Flynn investigation, his termination of Comey, and his efforts to remove the Special Counsel—it is important to view the President's pattern

of conduct as a whole. That pattern sheds light on the nature of the President's acts and the inferences that can be drawn about his intent.

Our investigation found multiple acts by the President that were capable of exerting undue influence over law enforcement investigations, including the Russian-interference and obstruction investigations. The incidents were often carried out through one-on-one meetings in which the President sought to use his official power outside of usual channels. These actions ranged from efforts to remove the Special Counsel and to reverse the effect of the Attorney General's recusal; to the attempted use of official power to limit the scope of the investigation; to direct and indirect contacts with witnesses with the potential to influence their testimony. Viewing the acts collectively can help to illuminate their significance. For example, the President's direction to McGahn to have the Special Counsel removed was followed almost immediately by his direction to Lewandowski to tell the Attorney General to limit the scope of the Russia investigation to prospective election - interference only a temporal connection that suggests that both acts were taken with a related purpose with respect to the investigation.

The President's efforts to influence the investigation were mostly unsuccessful, but that is largely because the persons who surrounded the President declined to carry out orders or accede to his requests. Comey did not end the investigation of Flynn, which ultimately resulted in Flynn's prosecution and conviction for lying to the FBI. McGahn did not tell the Acting Attorney General that the Special Counsel must be removed, but was instead prepared to resign over the President's order. Lewandowski and Dearborn did not deliver the President's message to Sessions that he should confine the Russia investigation to future election meddling only. And McGahn refused to recede from his recollections about events surrounding the President's direction to have the Special Counsel removed, despite the President's multiple demands that he do so. Consistent with that pattern, the evidence we obtained would not support potential obstruction charges against the President's aides and associates beyond those already filed.

In considering the full scope of the conduct we investigated, the President's actions can be divided into two distinct phases reflecting a possible shift in the President's motives. In the first phase, before the President fired Comey, the President had been assured that the FBI had not opened an investigation of him personally. The President deemed it critically important to make public that he was not under investigation, and he included that information in his termination letter to Comey after other efforts to have that information disclosed were unsuccessful.

Soon after he fired Comey, however, the President became aware that investigators were conducting an obstruction-of-justice inquiry into his own conduct. That awareness marked a significant change in the President's conduct and the start of a second phase of action. The President launched public attacks on the investigation and individuals involved in it who could possess evidence adverse to the President, while in private, the President engaged in a series of targeted efforts to control

the investigation. For instance, the President attempted to remove the Special Counsel; he sought to have Attorney General Sessions unrecuse himself and limit the investigation; he sought to prevent public disclosure of information about the June 9, 2016 meeting between Russians and campaign officials; and he used public forums to attack potential witnesses who might offer adverse information and to praise witnesses who declined to cooperate with the government. Judgments about the nature of the President's motives during each phase would be informed by the totality of the evidence.

III. Legal Defenses to the Application of Obstruction-of-Justice Statutes to the President

The Presidents personal counsel has written to this Office to advance statutory and constitutional defenses to the potential application of the obstruction-of-justice statutes to the Presidents conduct.⁴¹⁶ As a statutory matter, the Presidents counsel has argued that a core obstruction-of-justice statute, 18 U.S.C. §1512(c)(2), does not cover the Presidents actions.⁴¹⁷ As a constitutional matter, the Presidents counsel argued that the President cannot obstruct justice by exercising his constitutional authority to close Department of Justice investigations or terminate the FBI Director.⁴¹⁸ Under that view, any statute that restricts the Presidents exercise of those powers would impermissibly intrude on the Presidents constitutional role. The Presidents counsel has conceded that the President may be subject to criminal laws that do not directly involve exercises of his Article II authority, such as laws prohibiting bribing witnesses or suborning perjury.⁴¹⁹ But counsel has made a categorical argument that the Presidents exercise of his constitutional authority here to terminate an FBI Director and to close investigations cannot constitutionally constitute obstruction of justice.⁴²⁰

In analyzing counsels statutory arguments, we concluded that the Presidents proposed interpretation of Section 1512(c)(2) is contrary to the litigating position of the Department of Justice and is not supported by principles of statutory construction.

As for the constitutional arguments, we recognized that the Department of Justice and the courts have not definitively resolved these constitutional issues. We therefore analyzed the Presidents position through the framework of Supreme Court precedent addressing the separation of powers. Under that framework, we concluded, Article II

⁴¹⁶6/23/17 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office; see also 1/29/18 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office; 2/6/18 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office; 8/8/18 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 4.

⁴¹⁷9/6/18 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 2-9. Counsel has also noted that other potentially applicable obstruction statutes, such as 18 U.S.C. 1505, protect only pending proceedings. 6/23/17 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 7-8. Section 1512(c)(2) is not limited to pending proceedings, but also applies to future proceedings that the person contemplated. See Volume II, Section III.A, *supra*.

⁴¹⁸6/23/17 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 1 ([T]he President cannot obstruct ... by simply exercising these inherent Constitutional powers.).

⁴¹⁹6/23/17 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 2 n. 1.

⁴²⁰6/23/17 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 2 n.1 (dashes omitted); see also 8/8/18 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 4 ([T]he obstruction-of-justice statutes cannot be read so expansively as to create potential liability based on facially lawful acts undertaken by the President in furtherance of his core Article II discretionary authority to remove principal officers or carry out the prosecution function.).

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

of the Constitution does not categorically and permanently immunize the President from potential liability for the conduct that we investigated. Rather, our analysis led us to conclude that the obstruction-of-justice statutes can validly prohibit a Presidents corrupt efforts to use his official powers to curtail, end, or interfere with an investigation.

A. Statutory Defenses to the Application of Obstruction-Of-Justice Provisions to the Conduct Under Investigation

The obstruction-of-justice statute most readily applicable to our investigation is 18 U.S.C. §1512(c)(2). Section 1512(c) provides:

(c) Whoever corruptly -

(1) alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the objects integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding; or

(2) otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so,

shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

The Department of Justice has taken the position that Section 1512(c)(2) states a broad, independent, and unqualified prohibition on obstruction of justice.⁴²¹ While defendants have argued that subsection (c)(2) should be read to cover only acts that would impair the availability or integrity of evidence because that is subsection (c)(1)s focus, strong arguments weigh against that proposed limitation. The text of Section 1512(c)(2) confirms that its sweep is not tethered to Section 1512(c)(1); courts have so interpreted it; its history does not counsel otherwise; and no principle of statutory construction dictates a contrary view. On its face, therefore, Section 1512(c)(2) applies to all corrupt means of obstructing a proceeding, pending or contemplated - including by improper exercises of official power. In addition, other statutory provisions that are potentially applicable to certain conduct we investigated broadly prohibit obstruction of proceedings that are pending before courts, grand juries, and Congress. *See* 18 U.S.C. §§1503, 1505. Congress has also specifically prohibited witness tampering. *See* 18 U.S.C. §1512(b).

1. The Text of Section 1512(c)(2) Prohibits a Broad Range of Obstructive Acts

Several textual features of Section 1512(c)(2) support the conclusion that the provision broadly prohibits corrupt means of obstructing justice and is not limited

⁴²¹See U.S. Br., *United States v. Kumar*, Nos. 06-5482-cr(L), 06-5654cr(CON) (2d Cir. filed Oct. 26, 2007), at pp.15-28; *United States v. Singleton*, Nos. H-04-CR-514SS, H-06-cr-80 (S.D. Tex. filed June 5, 2006).

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

by the more specific prohibitions in Section 1512(c)(1), which focus on evidence impairment.

First, the text of Section 1512(c)(2) is unqualified: it reaches acts that obstruct[], influence[], or impede[] any official proceeding when committed corruptly. Nothing in Section 1512(c)(2)s text limits the provision to acts that would impair the integrity or availability of evidence for use in an official proceeding. In contrast, Section 1512(c)(1) explicitly includes the requirement that the defendant act with the intent to impair the objects integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding, a requirement that Congress also included in two other sections of Section 1512. *See* 18 U.S.C. §§1512(a)(2)(B)(ii) (use of physical force with intent to cause a person to destroy an object with intent to impair the integrity or availability of the object for use in an official proceeding); 1512(b)(2)(B) (use of intimidation, threats, corrupt persuasion, or misleading conduct with intent to cause a person to destroy an object with intent to impair the integrity or availability of the object for use in an official proceeding). But no comparable intent or conduct element focused on evidence impairment appears in Section 1512(c)(2). The intent element in Section 1512(c)(2) comes from the word corruptly. *See, e.g., United States v. McKibbins*, 656 F.3d 707, 711 (7th Cir. 2011) (The intent element is important because the word corruptly is what serves to separate criminal and innocent acts of obstruction.) (internal quotation marks omitted). And the conduct element in Section 1512(c)(2) is obstruct[ing], influenc[ing], or imped[ing] a proceeding. Congress is presumed to have acted intentionally in the disparate inclusion and exclusion of evidence-impairment language. *See Loughrin v. United States*, 573 U.S. 351, 358 (2014) ([W]hen Congress includes particular language in one section of a statute but omits it in another - let alone in the very next provision - this Court presume[s] that Congress intended a difference in meaning) (quoting *Russello v. United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23 (1983)); *accord Digital Realty Trust, Inc. v. Somers*, 138 S. Ct. 767, 777 (2018).

Second, the structure of Section 1512 supports the conclusion that Section 1512(c)(2) defines an independent offense. Section 1512(c)(2) delineates a complete crime with different elements from Section 1512(c)(1) - and each subsection of Section 1512(c) contains its own attempt prohibition, underscoring that they are independent prohibitions. The two subsections of Section 1512(c) are connected by the conjunction or, indicating that each provides an alternative basis for criminal liability. *See Loughrin*, 573 U.S. at 357 (ordinary use [of or] is almost always disjunctive, that is, the words it connects are to be given separate meanings) (internal quotation marks omitted). In *Loughrin*, for example, the Supreme Court relied on the use of the word or to hold that adjacent and overlapping subsections of the bank fraud statute, 18 U.S.C. §1344, state distinct offenses and that subsection 1344(2) therefore should not be interpreted to contain an additional element specified only in subsection 1344(1). *Id.*; *see also Shaw v. United States*, 137 S. Ct. 462, 465-469 (2016) (recognizing that the subsections of the bank fraud statute overlap substantially but identifying

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

distinct circumstances covered by each).⁴²² And here, as in *Loughrin*, Section 1512(c)s two clauses have separate numbers, line breaks before, between, and after them, and equivalent indentation - thus placing the clauses visually on an equal footing and indicating that they have separate meanings. 573 U.S. at 359.

Third, the introductory word otherwise in Section 1512(c)(2) signals that the provision covers obstructive acts that are different from those listed in Section 1512(c)(1). See *Blacks Law Dictionary* 1101 (6th ed. 1990) (otherwise means in a different manner; in another way, or in other ways); see also, e.g., *American Heritage College Dictionary Online* (1. In another way; differently; 2. Under other circumstances); see also *Gooch v. United States*, 297 U.S. 124, 128 (1936) (characterizing otherwise as a broad term and holding that a statutory prohibition on kidnapping for ransom or reward or otherwise is not limited by the words ransom and reward to kidnappings for pecuniary benefits); *Collazos v. United States*, 368 F.3d 190, 200 (2d Cir. 2004) (construing otherwise in 28 U.S.C. §2466(1)(C) to reach beyond the specific examples listed in prior subsections, thereby covering the myriad means that human ingenuity might devise to permit a person to avoid the jurisdiction of a court); cf. *Begay v. United States*, 553 U.S. 137, 144 (2006) (recognizing that otherwise is defined to mean in a different way or manner, and holding that the word otherwise introducing the residual clause in the Armed Career Criminal Act, 18 U.S.C. §924(e)(2)(B)(ii), can, but need not necessarily, refer to a crime that is similar to the listed examples in some respects but different in others).⁴²³ The purpose of the word otherwise in Section 1512(c)(2) is therefore to clarify that the provision covers obstructive acts *other* than the destruction of physical evidence with the intent to impair its integrity or availability, which is the conduct addressed in Section 1512(c)(1). The word otherwise does not signal that Section 1512(c)(2) has less breadth in covering obstructive conduct than the language of the provision implies.

2. Judicial Decisions Support a Broad Reading of Section 1512(c)(2)

Courts have not limited Section 1512(c)(2) to conduct that impairs evidence, but instead have read it to cover obstructive acts in any form.

As one court explained, [t]his expansive subsection operates as a catch-all to cover

⁴²²The Office of Legal Counsel recently relied on several of the same interpretive principles in concluding that language that appeared in the first clause of the Wire Act, 18 U.S.C. §1084, restricting its prohibition against certain betting or wagering activities to any sporting event or contest, did not apply to the second clause of the same statute, which reaches other betting or wagering activities. See *Reconsidering Whether the Wire Act Applies to Non-Sports Gambling* (Nov. 2, 2018), slip op. 7 (relying on plain language); *id.* at 11 (finding it not tenable to read into the second clause the qualifier on any sporting event or contest that appears in the first clause); *id.* at 12 (relying on *Digital Realty*).

⁴²³In *Sykes v. United States*, 564 U.S. 1, 15 (2011), the Supreme Court substantially abandoned Begays reading of the residual clause, and in *Johnson v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015), the Court invalidated the residual clause as unconstitutionally vague. Begays analysis of the word otherwise is thus of limited value.

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

otherwise obstructive behavior that might not constitute a more specific offense like document destruction, which is listed in (c)(1). *United States v. Volpendesto*, 746 F.3d 273, 286 (7th Cir. 2014) (some quotation marks omitted). For example, in *United States v. Ring*, 628 F. Supp. 2d 195 (D.D.C. 2009), the court rejected the argument that §1512(c)(2)s reference to conduct that otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding is limited to conduct that is similar to the type of conduct proscribed by subsection (c)(1) - namely, conduct that impairs the integrity or availability of record[s], documents[s], or other object[s] for use in an official proceeding. *Id.* at 224. The court explained that the meaning of §1512(c)(2) is plain on its face. *Id.* (alternations in original), And courts have upheld convictions under Section 1512(c)(2) that did not involve evidence impairment, but instead resulted from conduct that more broadly thwarted arrests or investigations. *See, e.g., United States v. Martinez*, 862 F.3d 223, 238 (2d Cir. 2017) (police officer tipped off suspects about issuance of arrest warrants before outstanding warrants could be executed, thereby potentially interfering with an ongoing grand jury proceeding); *United States v. Ahrensfield*, 698 F.3d 1310, 1324-1326 (10th Cir. 2012) (officer disclosed existence of an undercover investigation to its target); *United States v. Phillips*, 583 F.3d 1261, 1265 (10th Cir. 2009) (defendant disclosed identity of an undercover officer thus preventing him from making controlled purchases from methamphetamine dealers). Those cases illustrate that Section 1512(c)(2) applies to corrupt acts - including by public officials - that frustrate the commencement or conduct of a proceeding, and not just to acts that make evidence unavailable or impair its integrity.

Section 1512(c)(2)s breadth is reinforced by the similarity of its language to the omnibus clause of 18 U.S.C. §1503, which covers anyone who corruptly ... obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice. That clause of Section 1503 follows two more specific clauses that protect jurors, judges, and court officers. The omnibus clause has nevertheless been construed to be far more general in scope than the earlier clauses of the statute. *United States v. Aguilar*, 515 U.S. 593, 599 (1995). The omnibus clause is essentially a catch-all provision which generally prohibits conduct that interferes with the due administration of justice. *United States v. Brenson*, 104 F.3d 1267, 1275 (11th Cir. 1997). Courts have accordingly given it a non-restrictive reading. *United States v. Kumar*, 617 F.3d 612, 620 (2d Cir. 2010); *id.*, at 620 n.7 (collecting cases from the Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eleventh Circuits). As one court has explained, the omnibus clause prohibits acts that are similar in result, rather than manner, to the conduct described in the first part of the statute. *United States v. Howard*, 569 F.2d 1331, 1333 (5th Cir. 1978). While the specific clauses forbid certain means of obstructing justice ... the omnibus clause aims at obstruction of justice itself, regardless of the means used to reach that result. *Id.* (collecting cases). Given the similarity of Section 1512(c)(2) to Section 1503s omnibus clause, Congress would have expected Section 1512(c)(2) to cover acts that produced a similar result to the evidence-impairment provisions - i.e., the result of obstructing justice - rather than

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

covering only acts that were similar in manner. Read this way, Section 1512(c)(2) serves a distinct function in the federal obstruction-of-justice statutes: it captures corrupt conduct, other than document destruction, that has the natural tendency to obstruct contemplated as well as pending proceedings.

Section 1512(c)(2) overlaps with other obstruction statutes, but it does not render them superfluous. Section 1503, for example, which covers pending grand jury and judicial proceedings, and Section 1505, which covers pending administrative and congressional proceedings, reach endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the proceedings - a broader test for inchoate violations than Section 1512(c)(2)'s attempt standard, which requires a substantial step towards a completed offense. *See United States v. Sampson*, 898 F.3d 287, 302 (2d Cir. 2018) ([E]fforts to witness tamper that rise to the level of an endeavor yet fall short of an attempt cannot be prosecuted under §1512.); *United States v. Leisure*, 844 F.2d 1347, 1366-1367 (8th Cir. 1988) (collecting cases recognizing the difference between the endeavor and attempt standards). And 18 U.S.C. §1519, which prohibits destruction of documents or records in contemplation of an investigation or proceeding, does not require the nexus showing under Aguilar, which Section 1512(c)(2) demands. *See, e.g., United States v. Yielding*, 657 F.3d 688, 712 (8th Cir. 2011) (The requisite knowledge and intent [under Section 1519] can be present even if the accused lacks knowledge that he is likely to succeed in obstructing the matter.); *United States v. Gray*, 642 F.3d 371, 376-377 (2d Cir. 2011) ([I]n enacting §1519, Congress rejected any requirement that the government prove a link between a defendant's conduct and an imminent or pending official proceeding.). The existence of even substantial overlap is not uncommon in criminal statutes. *Loughrin*, 573 U.S. at 359 n.4; *see Shaw*, 137 S. Ct. at 458-469; *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 616 (Scalia, J., dissenting) (The fact that there is now some overlap between §1503 and §1512 is no more intolerable than the fact that there is some overlap between the omnibus clause of §1503 and the other provision of §1503 itself.). But given that Sections 1503, 1505, and 1519 each reach conduct that Section 1512(c)(2) does not, the overlap provides no reason to give Section 1512(c)(2) an artificially limited construction. *See Shaw*, 137 S. Ct. at 469.⁴²⁴

⁴²⁴The Supreme Court's decision in *Marinello v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1101 (2018), does not support imposing a non-textual limitation on Section 1512(c)(2). *Marinello* interpreted the tax obstruction statute, 26 U.S.C. 7212(a), to require a nexus between the defendant's conduct and a particular administrative proceeding. *Id.* at 1109. The Court adopted that construction in light of the similar interpretation given to other obstruction provisions, *id.* (citing *Aguilar* and *Arthur Andersen*), as well as considerations of context, legislative history, structure of the criminal tax laws, fair warning, and lenity. *Id.* at 1106-1108. The type of nexus element the Court adopted in *Marinello* already applies under Section 1512(c)(2), and the remaining considerations the Court cited do not justify reading into Section 1512(c)(2) language that is not there. *See Bates v. United States*, 522 U.S. 23, 29 (1997) (the Court ordinarily resist[s] reading words or elements into a statute that do not appear on its face.).

3. The Legislative History of Section 1512(c)(2) Does Not Justify Narrowing Its Texts

Given the straightforward statutory command in Section 1512(c)(2), there is no reason to resort to legislative history. *United States v. Gonzales*, 520 U.S. 1, 6 (1997). In any event, the legislative history of Section 1512(c)(2) is not a reason to impose extratextual limitations on its reach.

Congress enacted Section 1512(c)(2) as part the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-204, Tit. XI, §1102, 116 Stat. 807. The relevant section of the statute was entitled *Tampering with a Record or Otherwise Impeding an Official Proceeding*. 116 Stat. 807 (emphasis added). That title indicates that Congress intended the two clauses to have independent effect. Section 1512(c) was added as a floor amendment in the Senate and explained as closing a certain loophole with respect to document shredding. *See* 148 Cong. Rec. S6545 (July 10, 2002) (Sen. Lott); *id.* at S6549-S6550 (Sen: Hatch). But those explanations do not limit the enacted text. *See Pittston Coal Group v. Sebben*, 488 U.S. 105, 115 (1988) ([I]t is not the law that a statute can have no effects which are not explicitly mentioned in its legislative history.); *see also Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro*, 138 S. Ct. 1134, 1143 (2018) (Even if Congress did not foresee all of the applications of the statute, that is no reason not to give the statutory text a fair reading.). The floor statements thus cannot detract from the meaning of the enacted text. *See Barnhart v. Sigmon Coal Co.*, 534 U.S. 438, 457 (2002) (Floor statements from two Senators cannot amend the clear and unambiguous language of a statute. We see no reason to give greater weight to the views of two Senators than to the collective votes of both Houses, which are memorialized in the unambiguous statutory text.). That principle has particular force where one of the proponents of the amendment to Section 1512 introduced his remarks as only briefly elaborat[ing] on some of the specific provisions contained in this bill. 148 Cong. Rec. S6550 (Sen. Hatch).

Indeed, the language Congress used in Section 1512(c)(2) - prohibiting corruptly ... obstruct[ing], influenc[ing], or impeded[ing] any official proceeding or attempting to do so - parallels a provision that Congress considered years earlier in a bill designed to strengthen protections against witness tampering and obstruction of justice. While the earlier provision is not a direct antecedent of Section 1512(c)(2), Congress's understanding of the broad scope of the earlier provision is instructive. Recognizing that the proper administration of justice may be impeded or thwarted by a variety of corrupt methods ... limited only by the imagination of the criminally inclined, S. Rep. No. 532, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 17-18 (1982), Congress considered a bill that would have amended Section 1512 by making it a crime, *inter alia*, when a person corruptly ... influences, obstructs, or impedes ... [t]he enforcement and prosecution of federal law, administration of a law under which an official proceeding is being or may be conducted, or the exercise of a Federal legislative power of inquiry. *Id.* at 17-19 (quoting S. 2420).

The Senate Committee explained that:

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

[T]he purpose of preventing an obstruction of or miscarriage of justice cannot be fully carried out by a simple enumeration of the commonly prosecuted obstruction offenses. There must also be protection against the rare type of conduct that is the product of the inventive criminal mind and which also thwarts justice.

Id. at 18. The report gave examples of conduct actually prosecuted under the current residual clause [in 18 U.S.C. §1503], which would probably not be covered in this series [of provisions] without a residual clause. *Id.* One prominent example was [a] conspiracy to cover up the Watergate burglary and its aftermath by having the Central Intelligence Agency seek to interfere with an ongoing FBI investigation of the burglary. *Id.* (citing *United States v. Haldeman*, 559 F.2d 31 (D.C. Cir. 1976)). The report therefore indicates a congressional awareness not only that residual-clause language resembling Section 1512(c)(2) broadly covers a wide variety of obstructive conduct, but also that such language reaches the improper use of governmental processes to obstruct justice - specifically, the Watergate cover-up orchestrated by White House officials including the President himself. *See Haldeman*, 559 F.3d at 51, 86-87, 120-129, 162.⁴²⁵

4. General Principles of Statutory Construction Do Not Suggest That Section 1512(c)(2) is Inapplicable to the Conduct in this Investigation

The requirement of fair warning in criminal law, the interest in avoiding due process concerns in potentially vague statutes, and the rule of lenity do not justify narrowing the reach of Section 1512(c)(2)'s text.⁴²⁶

a. As with other criminal laws, the Supreme Court has exercised restraint in interpreting obstruction-of-justice provisions, both out of respect for Congress's role in defining crimes and in the interest of providing individuals with fair warning of what a criminal statute prohibits. *Marinello v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1101, 1106 (2018); *Arthur Andersen*, 544 U.S. at 703; *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 599-602. In several obstruction cases, the Court has imposed a nexus test that requires that the wrongful conduct targeted by the provision be sufficiently connected to an official proceeding to ensure the requisite culpability. *Marinello*, 138 S. Ct. at 1109; *Arthur Andersen*, 544 U.S. at 707-708; *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 600-602. Section 1512(c)(2) has been interpreted to require a similar nexus. *See, e.g., United States v. Young*, 916 F.3d 368, 386 (4th

⁴²⁵The Senate ultimately accepted the House version of the bill, which excluded an omnibus clause. *See United States v. Poindexter*, 951 F.2d 369, 382-383 (D.C. Cir. 1991) (tracing history of the proposed omnibus provision in the witness-protection legislation). During the floor debate on the bill, Senator Heinz, one of the initiators and primary backers of the legislation, explained that the omnibus clause was beyond the scope of the witness-protection measure at issue and likely duplicative of other obstruction laws, 128 Cong. Rec. 26,810 (1982) (Sen. Heinz), presumably referring to Sections 1503 and 1505.

⁴²⁶In a separate section addressing considerations unique to the presidency, we consider principles of statutory construction relevant in that context. *See* Volume II, Section III.B.1, *infra*.

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

Cir. 2019); *United States v. Petruk*, 781 F.3d 438, 445 (8th Cir. 2015); *United States v. Phillips*, 583 F.3d 1261, 1264 (10th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reich*, 479 F.3d 179, 186 (2d Cir. 2007). To satisfy the nexus requirement, the government must show as an objective matter that a defendant acted in a manner that is likely to obstruct justice, such that the statute excludes defendants who have an evil purpose but use means that would only unnaturally and improbably be successful. *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 601-602 (internal quotation marks omitted); see *id.* at 599 (the endeavor must have the natural and probable effect of interfering with the due administration of justice) (internal quotation marks omitted). The government must also show as a subjective matter that the actor contemplated a particular, foreseeable proceeding. *Petruk*, 781 F.3d at 445. Those requirements alleviate fair-warning concerns by ensuring that obstructive conduct has a close enough connection to existing or future proceedings to implicate the dangers targeted by the obstruction laws and that the individual actually has the obstructive result in mind.

b. Courts also seek to construe statutes to avoid due process vagueness concerns. See, e.g., *McDonnell v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 2355, 2373 (2016); *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. 358, 368, 402-404 (2010). Vagueness doctrine requires that a statute define a crime with sufficient definiteness that ordinary people can understand what conduct is prohibited and in a manner that does not encourage arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement. *Id.* at 402-403 (internal quotation marks omitted). The obstruction statutes requirement of acting corruptly satisfies that test.

Acting corruptly within the meaning of §1512(c)(2) means acting with an improper purpose and to engage in conduct knowingly and dishonestly with the specific intent to subvert, impede or obstruct the relevant proceeding. *United States v. Gordon*, 710 F.3d 1124, 1151 (10th Cir. 2013) (some quotation marks omitted). The majority opinion in *Aguilar* did not address the defendants vagueness challenge to the word corruptly, 515 U.S. at 600 n. 1, but Justice Scalia's separate opinion did reach that issue and would have rejected the challenge, *id.* at 616-617 (Scalia, J., joined by Kennedy and Thomas, JJ., concurring in part and dissenting in part). Statutory language need not be colloquial, Justice Scalia explained, and the term corruptly in criminal laws has a longstanding and well-accepted meaning. It denotes an act done with an intent to give some advantage inconsistent with official duty and the rights of others. *Id.* at 616 (internal quotation marks omitted; citing lower court authority and legal dictionaries). Justice Scalia added that in the context of obstructing jury proceedings, any claim of ignorance of wrongdoing is incredible. *Id.* at 617. Lower courts have also rejected vagueness challenges to the word corruptly. See, e.g., *United States v. Edwards*, 869 F.3d 490, 501-502 (7th Cir. 2017); *United States v. Brenson*, 104 F.3d 1267, 1280-1281 (11th Cir. 1997); *United States v. Howard*, 569 F.2d 1331, 1336 n.9 (5th Cir. 1978). This well-established intent standard precludes the need to limit the obstruction statutes to only certain kinds of inherently wrongful conduct.⁴²⁷

⁴²⁷In *United States v. Poindexter*, 951 F.2d 369 (D.C. Cir. 1991), the court of appeals found the term corruptly in 18 U.S.C. §1505 vague as applied to a person who provided false information to

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

c. Finally, the rule of lenity does not justify treating Section 1512(c)(2) as a prohibition on evidence impairment, as opposed to an omnibus clause. The rule of lenity is an interpretive principle that resolves ambiguity in criminal laws in favor of the less-severe construction. *Cleveland v. United States*, 531 U.S. 12, 25 (2000). [A]s [the Court has] repeatedly emphasized, however, the rule of lenity applies only if, after considering text, structure, history and purpose, there remains a grievous ambiguity or uncertainty in the statute such that the Court must simply guess as to what Congress intended. *Abramski v. United States*, 573 U.S. 169, 188 n.10 (2014) (internal quotation marks omitted). The rule has been cited, for example, in adopting a narrow meaning of tangible object in an obstruction statute when the prohibitions title, history, and list of prohibited acts indicated a focus on destruction of records. *See Yates v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 1074, 1088 (2015) (plurality opinion) (interpreting tangible object in the phrase record, document, or tangible object in 18 U.S.C. §1519 to mean an item capable of recording or preserving information). Here, as discussed above, the text, structure, and history of Section 1512(c)(2) leaves no grievous ambiguity about the statutes meaning. Section 1512(c)(2) defines a structurally independent general prohibition on obstruction of official proceedings.

5. Other Obstruction Statutes Might Apply to the Conduct in this Investigation

Regardless whether Section 1512(c)(2) covers all corrupt acts that obstruct, influence, or impede pending or contemplated proceedings, other statutes would apply to such conduct in pending proceedings, provided that the remaining statutory elements are satisfied. As discussed above, the omnibus clause in 18 U.S.C. §1503(a) applies generally to obstruction of pending judicial and grand proceedings.⁴²⁸ *See Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 598 (noting that the clause is far more general in scope than preceding

Congress. After suggesting that the word corruptly was vague on its face, 951 F.2d at 378, the court concluded that the statute did not clearly apply to corrupt conduct by the person himself and the core conduct to which Section 1505 could constitutionally be applied was one person influencing another person to violate a legal duty. *Id.* at 379-386. Congress later enacted a provision overturning that result by providing that [a]s used in [S]ection 1505, the term corruptly means acting with an improper purpose, personally or by influencing another, including by making false or misleading statement, or withholding, concealing, altering, or destroying a document or other information. 18 U.S.C. §1515(b). Other courts have declined to follow *Poindexter* either by limiting it to Section 1505 and the specific conduct at issue in that case, *see Brenson*, 104 F.3d at 1280-1281; reading it as narrowly limited to certain types of conduct, *see United States v. Morrison*, 98 F.3d 619, 629-630 (D.C. Cir. 1996); or by noting that it predated *Arthur Andersens* interpretation of the term corruptly, *see Edwards*, 869 F.3d at 501-502.

⁴²⁸Section 1503(a) provides for criminal punishment of:

Whoever ... corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice.

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

provisions). Section 1503(a)s protections extend to witness tampering and to other obstructive conduct that has a nexus to pending proceedings. *See Sampson*, 898 F.3d at 298-303 & n.6 (collecting cases from eight circuits holding that Section 1503 covers witness-related obstructive conduct, and cabinining prior circuit authority). And Section 1505 broadly criminalizes obstructive conduct aimed at pending agency and congressional proceedings.⁴²⁹ *See, e.g., United States v. Rainey*, 757 F.3d 234, 241-247 (St Cir. 2014).

Finally, 18 U.S.C. §1512(b)(3) criminalizes tampering with witnesses to prevent the communication of information about a crime to law enforcement. The nexus inquiry articulated in *Aguilar* - that an individual has knowledge that his actions are likely to affect the judicial proceeding, 515 U.S. at 599 - does not apply to Section 1512(b)(3). *See United States v. Byrne*, 435 F.3d 16, 24-25 (1st Cir. 2006). The nexus inquiry turns instead on the actors intent to prevent communications to a federal law enforcement official. *See Fowler v. United States*, 563 U.S. 668, 673-678 (2011).

In sum, in light of the breadth of Section 1512(c)(2) and the other obstruction statutes, an argument that the conduct at issue in this investigation falls outside the scope of the obstruction - laws lacks merit.

B. Constitutional Defenses to Applying Obstruction-Of-Justice Statutes to Presidential Conduct

The President has broad discretion to direct criminal investigations. The Constitution vests the executive Power in the President and enjoins him to take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed. U.S. CONST. ART. II, §§1, 3. Those powers and duties form the foundation of prosecutorial discretion. *See United States v. Armstrong*, 517 U.S. 456, 464 (1996) (Attorney General and United States Attorneys have this latitude because they are designated by statute as the Presidents delegates to help him discharge his constitutional responsibility to take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.). The President also has authority to appoint officers of the United States and to remove those whom he has appointed. U.S. CONST. ART. II, §2, cl. 2 (granting authority to the President to appoint all officers with the advice and

⁴²⁹Section 1505 provides for criminal punishment of:

Whoever corruptly ... influences, obstructs, or impedes or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which any pending proceeding is being had before any department or agency of the United States, or the due and proper exercise of the power of inquiry under which any inquiry or investigation is being had by either House, or any committee of either House or any joint committee of the Congress.

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

consent of the Senate, but providing that Congress may vest the appointment of inferior officers in the President alone, the heads of departments, or the courts of law); *see also Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board*, 561 U.S. 477, 492-493, 509 (2010) (describing removal authority as flowing from the Presidents responsibility to take care that the laws be faithfully executed).

Although the President has broad authority under Article II, that authority coexists with Congresss Article I power to enact laws that protect congressional proceedings, federal investigations, the courts, and grand juries against corrupt efforts to undermine their functions. Usually, those constitutional powers function in harmony, with the President enforcing the criminal laws under Article II to protect against corrupt obstructive acts. But when the Presidents official actions come into conflict with the prohibitions in the obstruction statutes, any constitutional tension is reconciled through separation-of-powers analysis.

The Presidents counsel has argued that the Presidents exercise of his constitutional authority ... to terminate an FBI Director and to close investigations ... cannot constitutionally constitute obstruction of justice.⁴³⁰ As noted above, no Department of Justice position or Supreme Court precedent directly resolved this issue. We did not find counsels contention, however, to accord with our reading of the Supreme Court authority addressing separation-of-powers issues. Applying the Courts framework for analysis, we concluded that Congress can validly regulate the Presidents exercise of official duties to prohibit actions motivated by a corrupt intent to obstruct justice. The limited effect on presidential power that results from that restriction would not impermissibly undermine the Presidents ability to perform his Article II functions.

1. The Requirement of a Clear Statement to Apply Statutes to Presidential Conduct Does Not Limit the Obstruction Statutes

Before addressing Article II issues directly, we consider one threshold statutory construction principle that is unique to the presidency: The principle that general statutes must be read as not applying to the President if they do not expressly apply where application would arguably limit the Presidents constitutional role. OLC, *Application of 28 U.S.C. §458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges*, 19 Op. O.L.C. 350, 352 (1995). This clear statement rule, *id.*, has its source in two principles: statutes should be construed to avoid serious constitutional questions, and Congress should not be assumed to have altered the constitutional separation of powers without clear assurance that it intended that result. OLC, *The Constitutional Separation of Powers Between the President and Congress*, 20 Op. O.L.C. 124, 178 (1996).

The Supreme Court has applied that clear-statement rule in several cases. In one leading case, the Court construed the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §701 *et seq.*, not to apply to judicial review of presidential action. *Franklin v. Massachusetts*, 505 U.S. 788, 800-801 (1992). The Court explained that it would require an express

⁴³⁰6/23/17 Letter, Presidents Personal Counsel to Special Counsels Office, at 2 n. 1.

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

statement by Congress before assuming it intended the Presidents performance of his statutory duties to be reviewed for abuse of discretion. *Id.* at 801. In another case, the Court interpreted the word utilized in the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), 5 U.S.C. App., to apply only to the use of advisory committees established directly or indirectly by the government, thereby excluding the American Bar Associations advice to the Department of Justice about federal judicial candidates. *Public Citizen v. United States Department of Justice*, 491 U.S. 440, 455, 462-467 (1989). The Court explained that a broader interpretation of the term utilized in FACA would raise serious questions whether the statute infringed unduly on the Presidents Article II power to nominate federal judges and violated the doctrine of separation of powers. *Id.* at 466-467. Another case found that an established canon of statutory construction applied with special force to provisions that would impinge on the Presidents foreign-affairs powers if construed broadly. *Sale v. Haitian Centers Council*, 509 U.S. 155, 188 (1993) (applying the presumption against extraterritorial application to construe the Refugee Act of 1980 as not governing in an overseas context where it could affect foreign and military affairs for which the President has unique responsibility). See *Application of 28 U.S.C. §458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges*, 19 Op. O.L.C. at 353-354 (discussing *Franklin*, *Public Citizen*, and *Sale*).

The Department of Justice has relied on this clear-statement principle to interpret certain statutes as not applying to the President at all, similar to the approach taken in *Franklin*. See, e.g., Memorandum for Richard T. Burrell, Office of the President, from Laurence H. Silberman, Deputy Attorney General, *Re: Conflict of Interest Problems Arising out of the President's Nomination of Nelson A. Rockefeller to be Vice President under the Twenty-Fifth Amendment to the Constitution*, at 2, 5 (Aug. 28, 1974) (criminal conflict-of-interest statute, 18 U.S.C. §208, does not apply to the President). Other OLC opinions interpret statutory text not to apply to certain presidential or executive actions because of constitutional concerns. See *Application of 28 U.S.C. §458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges*, 19 Op. O.L.C. at 350-357 (consanguinity limitations on court appointments, 28 U.S.C. §458, found inapplicable to presidential appointments of judges to the federal judiciary); *Constraints Imposed by 18 U.S.C. §1913 on Lobbying Efforts*, 13 Op. O.L.C. 300, 304-306 (1989) (limitation on the use of appropriated funds for certain lobbying programs found in applicable to certain communications by the President and executive officials).

But OLC has also recognized that this clear-statement rule does not apply with respect to a statute that raises no separation of powers questions were it to be applied to the President, such as the federal bribery statute, 18 U.S.C. §201. *Application of 28 U.S.C. §458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges*, 19 Op. O.L.C. at 357 n.11. OLC explained that [a]pplication of §201 raises no separation of powers question, let alone a serious one, because [t]he Constitution confers no power in the President to receive bribes. *id.* In support of that conclusion, OLC noted constitutional provisions

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

that forbid increases in the Presidents compensation while in office, which is what a bribe would function to do, *id.* (citing U.S. CONST. ART. II, §1, cl. 7), and the express constitutional power of Congress to impeach [and convict] a President for, *inter alia*, bribery, *id.* (citing U.S. CONST. ART. II, §4).

Under OLCs analysis, Congress can permissibly criminalize certain obstructive conduct by the President, such as suborning perjury, intimidating witnesses, or fabricating evidence, because those prohibitions raise no separation-of-powers questions. *See Application of 28 U.S.C. §458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges*, 19 Op. O.L.C. at 357 n. 11. The Constitution does not authorize the President to engage in such conduct, and those actions would transgress the Presidents duty to take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed. U.S. CONST. ART. II, §§3. In view of those clearly permissible applications of the obstruction statutes to the President, Franklins holding that the President is entirely excluded from statute absent a clear statement would not apply in this context.

A more limited application of a clear-statement rule to exclude from the obstruction statutes only certain acts by the President - for example, removing prosecutors or ending investigations for corrupt reasons - would be difficult to implement as a matter of statutory interpretation. It is not obvious how a clear-statement rule would apply to an omnibus provision like Section 1512(c)(2) to exclude corruptly motivated obstructive acts only when carried out in the Presidents conduct of office. No statutory term could easily bear that specialized meaning. For example, the word corruptly has a well-established meaning that does not exclude exercises of official power for corrupt ends. Indeed, an established definition states that corruptly means action with an intent to secure an improper advantage *inconsistent with official duty* and the rights of others. *BALLENTINES LAW DICTIONARY* 276 (3d ed. 1969) (emphasis added). And it would be contrary to ordinary rules of statutory construction to adopt an unconventional meaning of a statutory term only when applied to the President. *See United States v. Santos*, 553 U.S. 507, 522 (2008) (plurality opinion of Scalia, J.) (rejecting proposal to giv[e] the same word, in the same statutory provision, different meanings in different factual contexts); *cf. Public Citizen*, 491 U.S. at 462- 467 (giving the term utilized in the FACA a uniform meaning to avoid constitutional questions). Nor could such an exclusion draw on a separate and established background interpretive presumption, such as the presumption against extraterritoriality applied in *Sale*. The principle that courts will construe a statute to avoid serious constitutional questions is not a license for the judiciary to rewrite language enacted by the legislature. *Salinas v. United States*, 522 U.S. 52, 59-60 (1997). It is one thing to acknowledge and accept ... well defined (or even newly enunciated), generally applicable, background principles of assumed legislative intent. It is quite another to espouse the broad proposition that criminal statutes do not have to be read as broadly as they are written, but are subject to case-by-case exceptions. *Brogan v. United States*, 522 U.S. 398, 406 (1998).

When a proposed construction would thus function as an extra-textual limit on

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

[a statutes] compass, thereby preventing the statute from applying to a host of cases falling within its clear terms, *Loughrin*, 573 U.S. at 357, it is doubtful that the construction would reflect Congresss intent. That is particularly so with respect to obstruction statutes, which have been given a broad and all-inclusive meaning. *Rainey*, 757 F.3d at 245 (discussing Sections 1503 and 1505) (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, since no established principle of interpretation would exclude the presidential conduct we have investigated from statutes such as Sections 1503, 1505, 1512(b), and 1512(c)(2), we proceed to examine the separation-of-powers issues that could be raised as an Article II defense to the application of those statutes.

2. Separation-of-Powers Principles Support the Conclusion that Congress May Validly Prohibit Corrupt Obstructive Acts Carried Out Through the Presidents Official Powers

When Congress imposes a limitation on the exercise of Article II powers, the limitations validity depends on whether the measure disrupts the balance between the coordinate branches. *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. 425, 443 (1977). Even when branch does not arrogate power to itself, ... the separation-of-powers doctrine requires that a branch not impair another in the performance of its constitutional duties. *Loving v. United States*, 517 U.S. 748, 757 (1996). The separation of powers does not mean, however, that the branches ought to have no partial agency in, or no control over the acts of each other. *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 703 (1997) (quoting James Madison, *The Federalist* No. 47, pp. 325-326 (J. Cooke ed. 1961) (emphasis omitted)). In this context, a balancing test applies to assess separation-of-powers issues. Applying that test here, we concluded that Congress can validly make obstruction-of-justice statutes applicable to corruptly motivated official acts of the President without impermissibly undermining his Article I functions.

a. The Supreme Courts Separation-of-Powers Balancing Test Applies In This Contexts A congressionally imposed limitation on presidential action is assessed to determine the extent to which it prevents the Executive Branch from accomplishing its constitutionally assigned functions, and, if the potential for disruption is present[,] . .. whether that impact is justified by an overriding need to promote objectives within the constitutional authority of Congress. *Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 443; see *Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 731, 753- 754 (1982); *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 706-707 (1974). That balancing test applies to a congressional regulation of presidential power through the obstruction-of-justice laws.⁴³¹

⁴³¹OLC applied such a balancing test in concluding that the President is not subject to criminal prosecution while in office, relying on many of the same precedents discussed in this section. See *A Sitting Presidents Amenability to Indictment and Criminal Prosecution*, 24 Op. O.L.C. 222, 237-

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

When an Article II power has not been explicitly assigned by the text of the Constitution to be within the sole province of the President, but rather was thought to be encompassed within the general grant to the President of the executive Power, the Court has balanced competing constitutional considerations. *Public Citizen*, 491 U.S. at 484 (Kennedy, J., concurring in the judgment, joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and O'Connor, J.). As Justice Kennedy noted in *Public Citizen*, the Court has applied a balancing test to restrictions on the Presidents power to remove Executive officers, a power[that] ... is not conferred by any explicit provision in the text of the Constitution (as is the appointment power), but rather is inferred to be a necessary part of the grant of the executive Power. *Id.* (citing *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 694 (1988), and *Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52, 115-116 (1926)). Consistent with that statement, *Morrison* sustained a good-cause limitation on the removal of an inferior officer with defined prosecutorial responsibilities after determining that the limitation did not impermissibly undermine the Presidents ability to perform his Article II functions. 487 U.S. at 691-693, 695-696. The Court has also evaluated other general executive-power claims through a balancing test. For example, the Court evaluated the Presidents claim of an absolute privilege for presidential communications about his official acts by balancing that interest against the Judicial Branchs need for evidence in a criminal case. *United States v. Nixon*, *supra* (recognizing a qualified constitutional privilege for presidential communications on official matters). The Court has also upheld a law that provided for archival access to presidential records despite a claim of absolute presidential privilege over the records. *Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 443-445, 451-455. The analysis in those cases supports applying a balancing test to assess the constitutionality of applying the obstruction-of-justice statutes to presidential exercises of executive power.

Only in a few instances has the Court applied a different framework. When the Presidents power is both exclusive and conclusive on the issue, Congress is precluded from regulating its exercise. *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, 135 S. Ct. 2076, 2084 (2015). In *Zivotofsky*, for example, the Court followed Justice Jacksons familiar tripartite framework in *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 635-638 (1952) (Jackson, J., concurring), and held that the Presidents authority to recognize foreign nations is exclusive. *Id.* at 2083, 2094. *See also Public Citizen* 491 U.S. at 485-486 (Kennedy, J., concurring in the judgment) (citing the power to grant pardons under U.S. Const., ART. II, §2, cl. 1, and the Presentment Clauses for legislation, U.S. CONST. ART. I, §7, Cls. 2, 3, as examples of exclusive presidential powers by virtue of constitutional text).

But even when a power is exclusive, Congress powers, and its central role in

238, 244-245 (2000) (relying on, *inter alia*, *United States v. Nixon*, *Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, and *Clinton v. Jones*, and quoting the legal standard from *Administrator of General Services v. Nixon* that is applied in the text), OLC recognized that [t]he balancing analysis it had initially relied on in finding that a sitting President is immune from prosecution had been adopted as the appropriate mode of analysis by the Court. *Id.* at 244.

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

making laws, give it substantial authority regarding many of the policy determinations that precede and follow the Presidents act. *Zivotofsky*, 135 S. Ct. at 2087. For example, although the Presidents power to grant pardons is exclusive and not subject to congressional regulation, *see United States v. Klein*, 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 128, 147-148 (1872), Congress has the authority to prohibit the corrupt use of anything of value to influence the testimony of another person in a judicial, congressional, or agency proceeding, 18 U.S.C. §201(b)(3) - which would include the offer or promise of a pardon to induce a person to testify falsely or not to testify at all. The offer of a pardon would precede the act of pardoning and thus be within Congresss power to regulate even if the pardon itself is not. Just as the Speech or Debate Clause, U.S. CONST. ART. I, §6, cl.1, absolutely protects legislative acts, but not a legislators taking or agreeing to take money for a promise to act in a certain way ... for it is taking the bribe, not performance of the illicit compact, that is a criminal act, *United States v. Brewster*, 408 U.S. 501, 526 (1972) (emphasis omitted), the promise of a pardon to corruptly influence testimony would not be a constitutionally immunized act. The application of obstruction statutes to such promises therefore would raise no serious separation-of-powers issue.

b. The Effect of Obstruction-of-Justice Statutes on the Presidents Capacity to Perform His Article II Responsibilities is Limited Under the Supreme Courts balancing test for analyzing separation-of-powers issues, the first task is to assess the degree to which applying obstruction-of-justice statutes to presidential actions affects the Presidents ability to carry out his Article II responsibilities. *Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 443. As discussed above, applying obstruction-of-justice statutes to presidential conduct that does not involve the Presidents conduct of office - such as influencing the testimony of witnesses - is constitutionally unproblematic. The President has no more right than other citizens to impede official proceedings by corruptly influencing witness testimony. The conduct would be equally improper whether effectuated through direct efforts to produce false testimony or suppress the truth, or through the actual, threatened, or promised use of official powers to achieve the same result.

The Presidents action in curtailing criminal investigations or prosecutions, or discharging law enforcement officials, raises different questions. Each type of action involves the exercise of executive discretion in furtherance of the Presidents duty to take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed. U.S. CONST. ART. II, §3. Congress may not supplant the Presidents exercise of executive power to supervise prosecutions or to remove officers who occupy law enforcement positions. *See Bowsher v. Synar*, 478 U.S. 714, 726-727 (1986) (Congress cannot reserve for itself the power of removal of an officer charged with the execution of the laws except by impeachment. ... [Because t]he structure of the Constitution does not permit Congress to execute the laws, ... [t]his kind of congressional control over the execution of the laws ... is constitutionally impermissible.). Yet the obstruction-of-justice statutes do not aggrandize power in

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

Congress or usurp executive authority. Instead, they impose a discrete limitation on conduct only when it is taken with the corrupt intent to obstruct justice. The obstruction statutes thus would restrict presidential action only by prohibiting the President from acting to obstruct official proceedings for the improper purpose of protecting his own interests. See Volume II, Section III.A.3, *supra*.

The direct effect on the Presidents freedom of action would correspondingly be a limited one. A preclusion of corrupt official action is not a major intrusion on Article II powers. For example, the proper supervision of criminal law does not demand freedom for the President to act with the intention of shielding himself from criminal punishment, avoiding financial liability, or preventing personal embarrassment. To the contrary, a statute that prohibits official action undertaken for such personal purposes furthers, rather than hinders, the impartial and evenhanded administration of the law. And the Constitution does not mandate that the President have unfettered authority to direct investigations or prosecutions, with no limits whatsoever, in order to carry out his Article II functions. See *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 833 (1985) (Congress may limit an agency's exercise of enforcement power if it wishes, either by setting substantive priorities, or by otherwise circumscribing an agency's power to discriminate among issues or cases it will pursue.); *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 707 ([t]o read the Art. I] powers of the President as providing an absolute privilege [to withhold confidential communications from a criminal trial]... would upset the constitutional balance of a workable government and gravely impair the role of the courts under Art. III).

Nor must the President have unfettered authority to remove all Executive Branch officials involved in the execution of the laws. The Constitution establishes that Congress has legislative authority to structure the Executive Branch by authorizing Congress to create executive departments and officer positions and to specify how inferior officers are appointed. E.g., U.S. Const., ART. I, §8, cl. 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause); ART. II, §2, cl. — (Opinions Clause); Art. II, §2, cl. 2 (Appointments Clause); see *Free Enterprise Fund*, 561 U.S. at 499. While the Presidents removal power is an important means of ensuring that officers faithfully execute the law, Congress has a recognized authority to place certain limits on removal. *Id.* at 493-495.

The Presidents removal powers are at their zenith with respect to principal officers - that is, officers who must be appointed by the President and who report to him directly. See *Free Enterprise Fund*, 561 U.S. at 493, 500. The Presidents exclusive and illimitable power of removal of those principal officers furthers the Presidents ability to ensure that the laws are faithfully executed. *Id.* at 493, 498 (internal quotation marks omitted); *Myers*, 272 U.S. at 627. Thus, there are some purely executive officials who must be removable by the President at will if he is able to accomplish his constitutional role. *Morrison*, 487 U.S. at 690; *Myers*, 272 U.S. at 134 (the Presidents cabinet officers must do his will, and [t]he moment that he loses confidence in the intelligence, ability, judgment, or loyalty of any one of them, he must have the power

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

to remove him without delay); *cf. Humphreys Executor v. United States*, 295 U.S. 602 (1935) (Congress has the power to create independent agencies headed by principal officers removable only for good cause). In light of those constitutional precedents, it may be that the obstruction statutes could not be constitutionally applied to limit the removal of a cabinet officer such as the Attorney General. *See* 5 U.S.C. §101; 28 U.S.C. §503. In that context, at least absent circumstances showing that the President was clearly attempting to thwart accountability for personal conduct while evading ordinary political checks and balances, even the highly limited regulation imposed by the obstruction statutes could possibly intrude too deeply on the Presidents freedom to select and supervise the members of his cabinet.

The removal of inferior officers, in contrast, need not necessarily be at will for the President to fulfill his constitutionally assigned role in managing the Executive Branch. [I]nferior officers are officers whose work is directed and supervised at some level by other officers appointed by the President with the Senates consent. *Free Enterprise Fund*, 561 U.S. at 510 (quoting *Edmond v. United States*, 520 U.S. 651, 663 (1997)) (internal quotation marks omitted), The Supreme Court has long recognized Congress authority to place for-cause limitations on the Presidents removal of inferior Officers whose appointment maybe vested in the head of a department. U.S. CONST. ART. II, §2, cl. 2. *See United States v. Perkins*, 116 U.S. 483, 485 (1886) (The constitutional authority in Congress to thus vest the appointment[of inferior officers in the heads of departments] implies authority to limit, restrict, and regulate the removal by such laws as Congress may enact in relation to the officers so appointed) (quoting lower court decision); *Morrison*, 487 US. at 689 n. 27 (citing *Perkins*); *accord id.* at 723-724 & n.4 (Scalia,J., dissenting) (recognizing that Perkins is established law); *see also Free Enterprise Fund*, 561 U.S. at 493- 495 (citing Perkins and Morrison). The category of inferior officers includes both the FBI Director and the Special Counsel, each of whom reports to the Attorney General. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§509, 515(a), 531; 28 C.F.R. Part 600. Their work is thus directed and supervised by a presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed officer. *See In re: Grand Jury Investigation*, __F.3d __, 2019 WL 921692, at *3-*4 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 26, 2019) (holding that the Special Counsel is an inferior officer for constitutional purposes).

Where the Constitution permits Congress to impose a good-cause limitation on the removal of an Executive Branch officer, the Constitution should equally permit Congress to bar removal for the corrupt purpose of obstructing justice. Limiting the range of permissible reasons for removal to exclude a corrupt purpose imposes a lesser restraint on the President than requiring an affirmative showing of good cause. It follows that for such inferior officers, Congress may constitutionally restrict the Presidents removal authority if that authority was exercised for the corrupt purpose of obstructing justice. And even if a particular inferior officers position might be of such importance to the execution of the laws that the President must have at-will removal authority, the obstruction-of-justice statutes could still be constitutionally applied to

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

forbid removal for a corrupt reason.⁴³² A narrow and discrete limitation on removal that precluded corrupt action would leave ample room for all other considerations, including disagreement over policy or loss of confidence in the officers judgment or commitment. A corrupt-purpose prohibition therefore would not undermine the Presidents ability to perform his Article II functions. Accordingly, because the separation-of-powers question is whether the removal restrictions are of such a nature that they impede the Presidents ability to perform his constitutional duty, *Morrison*, 487 U.S. at 691, a restriction on removing an inferior officer for a corrupt reason - a reason grounded in achieving personal rather than official ends - does not seriously hinder the Presidents performance of his duties. The President retains broad latitude to supervise investigations and remove officials, circumscribed in this context only by the requirement that he not act for corrupt personal purposes.⁴³³

c. Congress Has Power to Protect Congressional, Grand Jury, and Judicial Proceedings Against Corrupt Acts from Any Source Where a law imposes a burden on the Presidents performance of Article II functions, separation-of-powers analysis considers whether the statutory measure is justified by an overriding need to promote objectives within the constitutional authority of Congress. *Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 443. Here, Congress enacted the obstruction-of-justice statutes to protect, among other things, the integrity of its own proceedings, grand jury investigations, and federal criminal trials. Those objectives are within Congresss authority and serve strong governmental interests.

i. Congress has Article I authority to define generally applicable criminal law and apply it to all persons - including the President. Congress clearly has authority to protect its own legislative functions against corrupt efforts designed to impede legitimate fact-gathering and lawmaking efforts. *See Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187, 206-207 (1957); *Chapman v. United States*, 5 App. D.C. 122, 130 (1895). Congress also has authority to establish a system of federal courts, which

⁴³²Although the FBI director is an inferior officer, he is appointed by the President and removable by him at will, see 28 U.S.C. §532 note, and it is not clear that Congress could constitutionally provide the FBI director with good-cause tenure protection. *See OLC, Constitutionality of Legislation Extending the Term of the FBI Director*, 2011 WL2566125, at *3 (O.L.C. June 20, 2011) (tenure protection for an officer with the FBI Directors broad investigative, administrative, and policymaking responsibilities would raise a serious constitutional question whether Congress had impede[d] the Presidents ability to perform his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed) (quoting *Morrison*, 487 U.S. at 691).

⁴³³The obstruction statutes do not disqualify the President from acting in a case simply because he has a personal interest in it or because his own conduct may be at issue. As the Department of Justice has made clear, a claim of a conflict of interest, standing alone, cannot deprive the President of the ability to fulfill his constitutional function. *See, e.g., OLC, Application of 28 U.S.C. 458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges*, 19 O.L.C. Op. at 356 (citing Memorandum for Richard T. Burrell, Office of the President, from Laurence H. Silberman, Deputy Attorney General, *Re: Conflict of Interest Problems Arising out of the President's Nomination of Nelson A. Rockefeller to be Vice President under the Twenty-Fifth Amendment to the Constitution*, at 2, 5 (Aug. 28, 1974)).

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

includes the power to protect the judiciary against obstructive acts. *See* U.S. CONST. ART. I, §8, cls. 9, 18 (The Congress shall have Power ... To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court and To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers). The long lineage of the obstruction-of-justice statutes, which can be traced to at least 1831, attests to the necessity for that protection. *See An Act Declaratory of the Law Concerning Contempts of Court*, 4 Stat. 487-488 §2 (1831) (making it a crime if any person or persons shall corruptly ... endeavor to influence, intimidate, or impede any juror, witness, or officer, in any court of the United States, in the discharge of his duty, or shall, corruptly ... obstruct, or impede, or endeavor to obstruct or impede, the due administration of justice therein).

ii. The Article III courts have an equally strong interest in being protected against obstructive acts, whatever their source. As the Supreme Court explained in *United States v. Nixon*, a primary constitutional duty of the Judicial Branch is to do justice in criminal prosecutions. 418 U.S. at 707; *accord Cheney v. United States District Court for the District of Columbia*, 542 U.S. 367, 384 (2004). In *Nixon*, the Court rejected the Presidents claim of absolute executive privilege because the allowance of the privilege to withhold evidence that is demonstrably relevant in a criminal trial would cut deeply into the guarantee of due process of law and gravely impair the basic function of the courts. 407 U.S. at 712. As *Nixon* illustrates, the need to safeguard judicial integrity is a compelling constitutional interest. *See id.* at 709 (noting that the denial of full disclosure of the facts surrounding relevant presidential communications threatens (t)he very integrity of the judicial system and public confidence in the system).

iii. Finally, the grand jury cannot achieve its constitutional purpose absent protection from corrupt acts. Serious federal criminal charges generally reach the Article III courts based on an indictment issued by a grand jury. *Cobbledick v. United States*, 309 U.S. 323, 327 (1940) (The Constitution itself makes the grand jury a part of the judicial process.). And the grand juries function is enshrined in the Fifth Amendment. U.S. CONST. AMEND. V. ([n]o person shall be held to answer for a serious crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury). [T]he whole theory of [the grand juries] function is that it belongs to no branch of the institutional government, serving as a kind of buffer or referee between the Government and the people, *United States v. Williams*, 504 U.S. 36, 47 (1992), pledged to indict no one because of prejudice and to free no one because of special favor. *Costello v. United States*, 350 U.S. 359, 362 (1956). If the grand jury were not protected against corrupt interference from all persons, its function as an independent charging body would be thwarted. And an impartial grand jury investigation to determine whether probable cause exists to indict is vital to the criminal justice process.

The final step in the constitutional balancing process is to assess whether

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

the separation-of-powers doctrine permits Congress to take action within its constitutional authority notwithstanding the potential impact on Article II functions. *See Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 443; *see also Morrison*, 487 U.S. at 691-693, 695-696; *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 711-712. In the case of the obstruction-of-justice statutes, our assessment of the weighing of interests leads us to conclude that Congress has the authority to impose the limited restrictions contained in those statutes on the Presidents official conduct to protect the integrity of important functions of other branches of government.

A general ban on corrupt action does not unduly intrude on the Presidents responsibility to take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed. U.S. CONST. ART. II, §3.⁴³⁴ To the contrary, the concept of faithful execution connotes the use of power in the interest of the public, not in the office holders personal interests. *See* 1 Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* 763 (1755) (faithfully def. 3: [w]ith strict adherence to duty and allegiance). And immunizing the President from the generally applicable criminal prohibition against corrupt obstruction of official proceedings would seriously impair Congresss power to enact laws to promote objectives within [its] constitutional authority, *Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 425 - i.e., protecting the integrity of its own proceedings and the proceedings of Article III courts and grand juries.

Accordingly, based on the analysis above, we were not persuaded by the argument that the President has blanket constitutional immunity to engage in acts that would corruptly obstruct justice through the exercise of otherwise-valid Article II powers.⁴³⁵

3. Ascertaining Whether the President Violated the Obstruction Statutes Would Not Chill his Performance of his Article II Duties

Applying the obstruction statutes to the Presidents official conduct would involve determining as a factual matter whether he engaged in an obstructive act, whether the act had a nexus to official proceedings, and whether he was motivated by corrupt intent. But applying those standards to the Presidents official conduct should not hinder his ability to perform his Article II duties. *Cf. Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S.

⁴³⁴As noted above, the Presidents selection and removal of principal executive officers may have a unique constitutional status.

⁴³⁵A possible remedy through impeachment for abuses of power would not substitute for potential criminal liability after a President leaves office. Impeachment would remove a President from office, but would not address the underlying culpability of the conduct or serve the usual purposes of the criminal law. Indeed, the Impeachment Judgment Clause recognizes that criminal law plays an independent role in addressing an officials conduct, distinct from the political remedy of impeachment. *See* U.S. CONST. ART. I, §3, cl. 7. Impeachment is also a drastic and rarely invoked remedy, and Congress is not restricted to relying only on impeachment, rather than making criminal law applicable to a former President, as OLC has recognized. *A Sitting President's Amenability to Indictment and Criminal Prosecution*, 24 Op. O.L.C. at 255 (Recognizing an immunity from prosecution for a sitting President would not preclude such prosecution once the Presidents term is over or he is otherwise removed from office by resignation or impeachment.).

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

at 752-753 & n.32 (taking into account chilling effect on the President in adopting a constitutional rule of presidential immunity from private civil damages action based on official duties). Several safeguards would prevent a chilling effect: the existence of settled legal standards, the presumption of regularity in prosecutorial actions, and the existence of evidentiary limitations on probing the Presidents motives. And historical experience confirms that no impermissible chill should exist.

a. As an initial matter, the term corruptly sets a demanding standard. It requires a concrete showing that a person acted with an intent to obtain an improper advantage for [him]self or someone else, inconsistent with official duty and the rights of others. *BALLENTINES LAW DICTIONARY* 276 (3d ed. 1969); see *United States v. Pasha*, 797 F.3d 1122, 1132 (D.C. Cir. 2015); *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 616 (Scalia, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). That standard parallels the Presidents constitutional obligation to ensure the faithful execution of the laws. And virtually everything that the President does in the routine conduct of office will have a clear governmental purpose and will not be contrary to his official duty. Accordingly, the President has no reason to be chilled in those actions because, in virtually all instances, there will be no credible basis for suspecting a corrupt personal motive.

That point is illustrated by examples of conduct that would and would not satisfy the stringent corrupt-motive standard. Direct or indirect action by the President to end a criminal investigation into his own or his family members conduct to protect against personal embarrassment or legal liability would constitute a core example of corruptly motivated conduct. So too would action to halt an enforcement proceeding that directly and adversely affected the Presidents financial interests for the purpose of protecting those interests. In those examples, official power is being used for the purpose of protecting the Presidents personal interests. In contrast, the Presidents actions to serve political or policy interests would not qualify as corrupt. The Presidents role as head of the government necessarily requires him to take into account political factors in making policy decisions that affect law-enforcement actions and proceedings. For instance, the Presidents decision to curtail a law-enforcement investigation to avoid international friction would not implicate the obstruction-of-justice statutes. The criminal law does not seek to regulate the consideration of such political or policy factors in the conduct of government. And when legitimate interests animate the Presidents conduct, those interests will almost invariably be readily identifiable based on objective factors. Because the Presidents conduct in those instances will obviously fall outside the zone of obstruction law, no chilling concern should arise.

b. There is also no reason to believe that investigations, let alone prosecutions, would occur except in highly unusual circumstances when a credible factual basis exists to believe that obstruction occurred. Prosecutorial action enjoys a presumption of regularity: absent clear evidence to the contrary, courts presume that [prosecutors] have properly discharged their official duties. *Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 464 (*quoting United States v. Chemical Foundation, Inc.*, 272 U.S. 1, 14-15 (1926)). The

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

presumption of prosecutorial regularity would provide even greater protection to the President than exists in routine cases given the prominence and sensitivity of any matter involving the President and the likelihood that such matters will be subject to thorough and careful review at the most senior levels of the Department of Justice. Under OLCs opinion that a sitting President is entitled to immunity from indictment, only a successor Administration would be able to prosecute a former President. But that consideration does not suggest that a President would have any basis for fearing abusive investigations or prosecutions after leaving office. There are obvious political checks against initiating a baseless investigation or prosecution of a former President. *See Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 448 (considering political checks in separation-of-powers analysis). And the Attorney General holds the power to conduct the criminal litigation of the United States Government, *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 694 (citing 28 U.S.C. §516), which provides a strong institutional safeguard against politicized investigations or prosecutions.⁴³⁶

These considerations distinguish the Supreme Courts holding in *Nixon v. Fitzgerald* that, in part because inquiries into the Presidents motives would be highly intrusive, the President is absolutely immune from private civil damages actions based on his official conduct. 457 U.S. at 756-757. As *Fitzgerald* recognized, there is a lesser public interest in actions for civil damages than, for example, in criminal prosecutions. *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 754 n.37; see *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 384. And private actions are not subject to the institutional protections of an action under the supervision of the Attorney General and subject to a presumption of regularity. *Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 464.

c. In the rare cases in which a substantial and credible basis justifies conducting an investigation of the President, the process of examining his motivations to determine whether he acted for a corrupt purpose need not have a chilling effect. Ascertaining the Presidents motivations would turn on any explanation he provided to justify his actions, the advice he received, the circumstances surrounding the

⁴³⁶Similar institutional safeguards protect Department of Justice officers and line prosecutors against unfounded investigations into prosecutorial acts. Prosecutors are generally barred from participating in matters implicating their personal interests, *see* 28 C.F.R. 45.2, and are instructed not to be influenced by their own professional or personal circumstances, Justice Manual §9-27.260, so prosecutors would not frequently be in a position to take action that could be perceived as corrupt and personally motivated. And if such cases arise, criminal investigation would be conducted by responsible officials at the Department of Justice, who can be presumed to refrain from pursuing an investigation absent a credible factual basis. Those facts distinguish the criminal context from the common-law rule of prosecutorial immunity, which protects against the threat of suit by a defendant [who] often will transform his resentment at being prosecuted into the ascription of improper and malicious actions. *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 425 (1976). As the Supreme Court has noted, the existence of civil immunity does not justify criminal immunity. *See O'Sheay v. Littleton*, 414 U.S. 488, 503 (1974) (Whatever may be the case with respect to civil liability generally, ... we have never held that the performance of the duties of judicial, legislative, or executive officers, requires or contemplates the immunization of otherwise criminal deprivation of constitutional rights.) (citations omitted).

III. LEGAL DEFENSES TO THE APPLICATION OF OBSTRUCTION-OF-JUSTICE STATUTES TO THE PRESIDENT

actions, and the regularity or irregularity of the process he employed to make decisions. But grand juries and courts would not have automatic access to confidential presidential communications on those matters; rather, they could be presented in official proceedings only on a showing of sufficient need. *Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 712; *In re Sealed Case*, 121 F.3d 729, 754, 756-757 (D.C. Cir. 1997); *see also Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 448-449 (former President can invoke presidential communications privilege, although successors failure to support the claim detracts from [its] weight).

In any event, probing the Presidents intent in a criminal matter is unquestionably constitutional in at least one context: the offense of bribery turns on the corrupt intent to receive a thing of value in return for being influenced in official action. 18 U.S.C. §201(b)(2). There can be no serious argument against the Presidents potential criminal liability for bribery offenses, notwithstanding the need to ascertain his purpose and intent. *See* U.S. CONST. ART. I, §3; ART. II, §4; *see also Application of 28 U.S.C. §458 to Presidential Appointments of Federal Judges*, 19 Op. O.L.C. at 357 n.11 (Application of §201[to the President] raises no separation of powers issue, let alone a serious one.).

d. Finally, history provides no reason to believe that any asserted chilling effect justifies exempting the President from the obstruction laws. As a historical matter, Presidents have very seldom been the subjects of grand jury investigations. And it is rarer still for circumstances to raise even the possibility of a corrupt personal motive for arguably obstructive action through the Presidents use of official power. Accordingly, the Presidents conduct of office should not be chilled based on hypothetical concerns about the possible application of a corrupt-motive standard in this context.

In sum, contrary to the position taken by the Presidents counsel, we concluded that, in light of the Supreme Court precedent governing separation-of-powers issues, we had a valid basis for investigating the conduct at issue in this report. In our view, the application of the obstruction statutes would not impermissibly burden the Presidents performance of his Article II function to supervise prosecutorial conduct or to remove inferior law-enforcement officers. And the protection of the criminal justice system from corrupt acts by any person - including the President - accords with the fundamental principle of our government that [n]Jo [person] in this country is so high that he is above the law. *United States v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196, 220 (1882); *see also Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. at 697; *United States v. Nixon*, *supra*.

IV. Conclusion

Because we determined not to make a traditional prosecutorial judgment, we did not draw ultimate conclusions about the Presidents conduct. The evidence we obtained about the Presidents actions and intent presents difficult issues that would need to be resolved if we were making traditional prosecutorial judgment. At the same time, if we had confidence after a thorough investigation of the facts that the President clearly did not commit obstruction of justice, we would so state. Based on the facts and the applicable legal standards, we are unable to reach that judgment. Accordingly, while this report does not conclude that the President committed a crime, it also does not exonerate him.