

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

DONALD J. TRUMP; THE TRUMP ORGANIZATION, INC.; TRUMP
ORGANIZATION LLC; THE TRUMP CORPORATION; DJT HOLDINGS
LLC; THE DONALD J. TRUMP REVOCABLE TRUST; AND
TRUMP OLD POST OFFICE LLC,
Petitioners,

v.

MAZARS USA, LLP; COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM OF
THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jay Alan Sekulow
Stuart J. Roth
Jordan Sekulow
CONSTITUTIONAL LITIGATION
AND ADVOCACY GROUP, P.C.
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, NW,
Ste. 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 546-8890
jsekulow@claglaw.com

Stefan C. Passantino
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
1000 Maine Ave. SW, Ste. 400
Washington, DC 20024
(202) 747-9582
spassantino@michaelbest.com

William S. Consovoy
Counsel of Record
Jordan M. Call
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
will@consovoymccarthy.com

Patrick Strawbridge
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
Ten Post Office Square
8th Floor South PMB #706
Boston, MA 02109
patrick@consovoymccarthy.com

Counsel for Petitioners

QUESTION PRESENTED

The Committee on Oversight and Reform of the U.S. House of Representatives has issued a subpoena to the accountant for President Trump and several of his business entities. The subpoena demands private financial records belonging to the President. The D.C. Circuit upheld the subpoena as having a legitimate legislative purpose and being within the statutory authority of the Committee.

The question presented is:

Whether the Committee has the constitutional and statutory authority to issue this subpoena.

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND
RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

The parties to the proceeding below are as follows:

Petitioners are Donald J. Trump, the President of the United States of America; The Trump Organization, Inc.; Trump Organization LLC; The Trump Corporation; DJT Holdings LLC; The Donald J. Trump Revocable Trust; and Trump Old Post Office LLC. They were the plaintiffs in the district court and appellants in the court of appeals.

Respondents are Mazars USA, LLP and Committee on Oversight and Reform of the U.S. House of Representatives. Mazars was the defendant in the district court and appellee in the court of appeals. The Committee was the intervenor-defendant in the district court and intervenor-appellee in the court of appeals.

The related proceedings below are:

1. Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP, No. 19-5142 (D.C. Cir.) – Judgment entered October 11, 2019; and
2. Trump, et al. v. Committee on Oversight & Reform of the U.S. House of Representatives, No. 19-cv-01136 (APM) (D.D.C.) – Judgment entered May 20, 2019.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

In accordance with Supreme Court Rule 29, Petitioners The Trump Organization, Inc., Trump Organization LLC, The Trump Corporation, DJT Holdings LLC, and Trump Old Post Office LLC state that they have no parent companies or publicly-held companies with a 10% or greater ownership interest in them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED..... i

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND
RELATED PROCEEDINGS..... ii

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT iii

TABLE OF APPENDICES vi

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... vii

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY
PROVISIONS INVOLVED 1

INTRODUCTION..... 2

STATEMENT 4

 A. Background 4

 B. Proceedings Below 6

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION 13

 I. The validity of the Committee’s
 subpoena is an important issue of
 federal law that the Court should settle.... 13

 II. The Committee’s subpoena is invalid 17

 A. The Committee’s subpoena lacks a
 legitimate legislative purpose 17

1.	This subpoena is part of an attempted law-enforcement investigation by the Committee	19
2.	The Committee investigation that led to this subpoena could not result in constitutional legislation	25
B.	The Committee lacks the statutory authority to issue a subpoena to the President.....	31
III.	There are no vehicle issues.....	36
CONCLUSION	38

TABLE OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A — OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, DATED OCTOBER 11, 2019.....	1a
APPENDIX B — MEMORANDUM OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DATED MAY 20, 2019	158a
APPENDIX C — ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, DATED NOVEMBER 13, 2019	213a
APPENDIX D — CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS.....	222a
APPENDIX E — SUBPOENA OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DATED APRIL 15, 2019	227a
APPENDIX F — H. RES. 507.....	241a
APPENDIX G — H. RES. 660	244a
APPENDIX H — EXCERPTS OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.	251a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<i>Page(s)</i>
 CASES	
<i>Alden v. Maine</i> , 527 U.S. 706 (1999).....	20
<i>Armstrong v. Bush</i> , 924 F.2d 282 (D.C. Cir. 1991).....	27
<i>Bank Markazi v. Peterson</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1310 (2016).....	24
<i>Barenblatt v. United States</i> , 360 U.S. 109 (1959).....	14, 18, 21
<i>Campbell v. Davidson</i> , 233 F.3d 1229 (10th Cir. 2000).....	29
<i>Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for D.C.</i> , 542 U.S. 367 (2004).....	16, 17, 25
<i>Clinton v. Jones</i> , 520 U.S. 681 (1997).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Duplantier v. United States</i> , 606 F.2d 654 (5th Cir. 1979).....	27
<i>Eastland v. U.S. Servicemen’s Fund</i> , 421 U.S. 491 (1975).....	17, 18
<i>Exxon Corp. v. FTC</i> , 589 F.2d 582 (D.C. Cir. 1978).....	31

<i>Franklin v. Massachusetts</i> , 505 U.S. 788 (1992).....	15, 33
<i>Free Enter. Fund v. PCAOB</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010).....	26, 27, 28
<i>Gregory v. Ashcroft</i> , 501 U.S. 452 (1991).....	33
<i>Griffin v. Padilla</i> , 2019 WL 4863447 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2019)	29
<i>Hutchinson v. United States</i> , 369 U.S. 599 (1962).....	23, 24
<i>In re Beef Industry Antitrust Litig.</i> , 589 F.2d 786 (5th Cir. 1979).....	31
<i>Jones v. United States</i> , 529 U.S. 848 (2000).....	32
<i>Kendall v. U.S. ex rel. Stokes</i> , 37 U.S. 524 (1838).....	14-15
<i>Kilbourn v. Thompson</i> , 103 U.S. 168 (1880).....	10, 17, 21, 22
<i>McGrain v. Daugherty</i> , 273 U.S. 135 (1927).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Mistretta v. United States</i> , 488 U.S. 361 (1989).....	27
<i>Mitchell v. Forsyth</i> , 472 U.S. 511 (1985).....	20

<i>Morrison v. Olson</i> , 487 U.S. 654 (1988)	12, 27, 36
<i>NFIB v. Sebelius</i> , 567 U.S. 519 (2012)	22, 31
<i>Nixon v. Administrator of General Services</i> , 433 U.S. 425 (1977)	8, 27
<i>Nixon v. Fitzgerald</i> , 457 U.S. 731 (1982)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Powell v. McCormack</i> , 395 U.S. 486 (1969)	28
<i>Public Citizen v. U.S. Dept. of Justice</i> , 491 U.S. 440 (1989)	33
<i>Quinn v. United States</i> , 349 U.S. 155 (1955)	18
<i>Schaefer v. Townsend</i> , 215 F.3d 1031 (9th Cir. 2000)	29
<i>Senate Select Comm. on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon</i> , 498 F.2d 725 (D.C. Cir. 1974)	20
<i>Sinclair v. United States</i> , 279 U.S. 263 (1929)	23
<i>Tenney v. Brandhove</i> , 341 U.S. 367 (1951)	17
<i>Tobin v. United States</i> , 306 F.2d 270 (D.C. Cir. 1962)	37

<i>Trump v. Hawaii</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018).....	3, 6, 16
<i>U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton</i> , 514 U.S. 779 (1995).....	28, 29
<i>United States v. Munsingwear, Inc.</i> , 340 U.S. 36 (1950).....	37
<i>United States v. Nixon</i> , 418 U.S. 683 (1974).....	16, 17, 25
<i>United States v. Rumely</i> , 345 U.S. 41 (1953).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>United States v. Welden</i> , 377 U.S. 95 (1964).....	24
<i>Watkins v. United States</i> , 354 U.S. 178 (1957).....	18, 19, 31, 32
<i>Wilkinson v. United States</i> , 365 U.S. 399 (1961).....	20
<i>Yellin v. United States</i> , 374 U.S. 109 (1963).....	31

STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES

U.S. Const. art. I	8, 18
U.S. Const. art. I, §§ 2-3.....	1
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8.....	1

U.S. Const. art. I, § 9.....	31
U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 8.....	1, 30
U.S. Const. art. II.....	8
U.S. Const. art. II, § 1.....	26
U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 1.....	1, 26
U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 7.....	1, 30
U.S. Const. art. III.....	12
5 U.S.C. § 7342(a).....	31
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).....	1
6 O.L.C. Op. 156 (1982).....	31
19 O.L.C. Op. 350 (1995).....	33
<i>Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Oversight & Reform, 116th Cong. 13 (2019)</i>	4, 5
House Resolution 507.....	2, 32
House Resolution 600.....	2
Memorandum from Laurence H. Silberman, Deputy Attorney General, to Richard T. Burrell, Office of the President, <i>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 (Aug. 28, 1974)</i>	26

Memorandum of William H. Rehnquist to Egil Krogh (Apr. 1, 1969)	33
Rules of the House of Representatives, Rule X, subsection 3(i)	1
Rules of the House of Representatives, Rule X, subsection 4(c)(2).....	1-2
Sup. Ct. Rule 10(c).....	13
The Federalist No. 48 (James Madison) (Rossiter ed., 1961)	24

Donald J. Trump, the President of the United States of America, The Trump Organization, Inc., Trump Organization LLC, The Trump Corporation, DJT Holdings LLC, The Donald J. Trump Revocable Trust, and Trump Old Post Office LLC respectfully petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit is reported at 941 F.3d 710 and is reproduced at Appendix 1a-157a. The opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia is reported at 380 F. Supp. 3d 76 and is reproduced at App. 158a-212a. The order denying the petition for rehearing is reported at 941 F.3d 1180 and is reproduced at 213a-21a.

JURISDICTION

The D.C. Circuit issued its opinion on October 11, 2019, and it denied rehearing on November 13, 2019. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The constitutional and statutory provisions involved in this case are: U.S. Const. art. I, §§ 8, 9 cl. 8; U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 1, 7, §§ 2-3; Rules of the House of Representatives, Rule X, subsections 3(i),

4(c)(2); and House Resolutions 507 and 600. They are reproduced at App. 222a-26a and 241a-52a.

INTRODUCTION

This is a case of firsts. It is the first time that Congress has subpoenaed personal records of a sitting President. It is the first time that Congress has issued a subpoena, under the guise of its legislative powers, to investigate the President for illegal conduct. And, it is the first time a court has upheld any congressional subpoena for any sitting President's records of any kind. Now, under the D.C. Circuit's decision, Congress can subpoena any private records it wishes from the President on the mere assertion that it is considering legislation that might require presidents to disclose that same information. Given the obvious temptation to investigate the personal affairs of political rivals, subpoenas concerning the private lives of presidents will become routine in times of divided government.

It is unsurprising, then, that the one thing the district court, the panel, and the dissenting judges all agreed upon is this case raises important separation-of-powers issues. At its core, this controversy is about whether—and to what degree—Congress can exercise dominion and control over the Office of the President. The Committee on Oversight and Reform of the U.S. House of Representatives takes the view, supported by the D.C. Circuit, that every committee of Congress may subpoena the President's personal records, that the Necessary and Proper Clause allows Congress to investigate the President's wrongdoing so long as it also promises to consider remedial legislation, and

that Congress can statutorily require presidents to disclose their personal finances. These are profoundly serious constitutional questions that the Court should decide.

But not only are these weighty constitutional issues, the D.C. Circuit incorrectly decided them. The Committee's investigation of the President lacks a legitimate legislative purpose. It is a law-enforcement investigation about uncovering whether the President engaged in wrongdoing. Nor can the investigation result in valid legislation. The Constitution—not Congress—created the Office of the President. Congress, accordingly, cannot require the President to disclose his finances or otherwise expand or alter the office's qualifications. Yet the D.C. Circuit never should have reached these issues because the Committee lacks express statutory authorization to subpoena the President. An express statement should be required given the separation-of-powers issues that are raised by unleashing every committee to subpoena every president for his personal records.

This Court traditionally grants certiorari when the President has been subjected to novel legal process and seeks review. The Court has recognized that the President's objections merit "respectful and deliberate consideration." *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 689-90 (1997). This approach is not out of concern for any "particular President," but for the sake of "the Presidency itself." *Trump v. Hawaii*, 138 S. Ct. 2392, 2418 (2018). This case should be no exception.

STATEMENT

A. Background

On April 15, 2019, the Oversight Committee of the House of Representatives (“Committee”) issued a subpoena to Mazars USA, LLP, the accounting firm for President Trump and several Trump entities. The subpoena required Mazars to produce eight years of financial and accounting information “related to work performed for President Trump and several of his business entities both before and after he took office.” App. 2a.¹

The Mazars subpoena arose from a Committee hearing last February that featured the testimony of Michael Cohen. Cohen was then awaiting sentencing following his guilty plea to several dishonesty-based crimes (including lying to Congress). He testified that the President had “inflated” and “deflated” assets on “personal financial statements from 2011, 2012, and 2013” to obtain a bank loan for a deal “to buy the Buffalo Bills” and to “reduce his [state] real estate taxes” and insurance premiums. *Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Oversight & Reform*, 116th Cong. 13 (2019), bit.ly/2IrXTkX. Mazars prepared those financial statements.

¹ The New York County District Attorney later copied and served this same subpoena to Mazars as part of a grand jury investigation into the President. The only difference is that the District Attorney also demanded tax returns. *Trump v. Vance*, No. 19-635, Petition for Writ of Certiorari, at 8 (filed. Nov. 14, 2019).

The Committee explained why it was interested in Cohen's testimony. According to the Chairman, "Cohen's testimony raises grave questions about the legality of ... President Donald Trump's conduct." *Id.* 6. Many Committee members agreed. *See, e.g., id.* 107 (Hill: "I ask these questions to help determine whether our very own President committed felony crimes."); *id.* 163-65 (Tlaib: "[O]ur sole purpose[] is exposing the truth.... President Donald J. Trump ... commit[ed] multiple felonies, and you covered it up, correct?"); *id.* 37 (Clay: "I would like to talk to you about the President's assets, since by law these must be reported accurately."); *id.* 160-61 (Ocasio-Cortez: "[D]id the President ever provide inflated assets to an insurance company? ... Do you think we need to review his financial statements ... to compare them?"); *id.* 150-52 (Khanna: "[Y]ou have provided ... compelling evidence of Federal and State crimes, including financial fraud.... I just want the American public to understand that ... the President ... may be involved in a criminal conspiracy."); *id.* 30 (Maloney: lamenting that Cohen is "facing the consequences of going to jail" but the President "is not.>").

After the hearing, the Chairman memorialized the Committee's reasons for issuing the subpoena in two documents. The first, a March 20 letter to Mazars, explained that the subpoena would help verify Cohen's testimony that "President Trump changed the estimated value of his assets and liabilities on financial statements prepared by your company—including inflating or deflating the value of assets depending on [his] purpose." DDC Doc. 30 at 5. The letter then identified what the Chairman saw as

inconsistencies between the 2011, 2012, and 2013 statements that Cohen had shared with the Committee. The Chairman asked Mazars to “assist” in the Committee’s “review of these issues.” *Id.* 6-8.

The second, an April 12 memorandum to the Committee, once again referenced the desire to verify Cohen’s testimony, and set forth four purposes for the subpoena: whether the President (1) “may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office”; (2) “has undisclosed conflicts of interest that may impair his ability to make impartial policy decisions”; (3) “is complying with the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution”; and (4) “has accurately reported his finances to the Office of Government Ethics and other federal entities.” *Id.* at 21. “The Committee’s interest in these matters,” the memo added, “informs its review of multiple laws and legislative proposals under [its] jurisdiction.” *Id.* It did not elaborate.

B. Proceedings Below

On April 22, 2019, Petitioners sued Mazars, the Committee Chairman, and the Committee lawyer who served the subpoena. Petitioners alleged that the subpoena lacked statutory authority and it sought their private records without a “legitimate legislative purpose.” *See* App. 241a. A few days later, the Committee intervened in the place of the individual congressional defendants, and it agreed to stay enforcement of the subpoena until the district court

ruled on Petitioners' preliminary-injunction motion. App. 174a.²

The district court treated the preliminary-injunction filings as summary-judgment motions, entered final judgment for the Committee, and denied a stay pending appeal. App. 178a, 208a-12a. On appeal, the parties agreed to stay enforcement of the subpoena until the D.C. Circuit's mandate issues. CADC Doc. 1811186 at 2-3.

On October 11, 2019, the D.C. Circuit affirmed in a divided opinion. App. 1a-157a. For the subpoena to be statutorily valid, the majority explained, the House of Representatives needs to have "given the issuing committee ... authority" to demand these records. App. 20a. For it to be constitutional, the subpoena needs a "legitimate legislative purpose." App. 68a. This means the Committee is "pursuing a legislative, as opposed to a law-enforcement, objective" and "is investigating a subject on which constitutional legislation 'could be had.'" App. 24a. (quoting *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 177 (1927)).

Taking the issues "in reverse order," App. 22a, the majority upheld the subpoena as constitutional. In the majority's view, the Committee's investigation of the President was legislative. In so ruling, it relied on the Chairman's memoranda. Notwithstanding the

² Throughout the proceedings, Mazars has taken the position that "the dispute in this action is between Plaintiffs and the Committee," DDC Doc. 23 at 2, and has taken no position on the legal issues.

Chairman’s stated purpose to investigate whether the President broke the law, the majority considered “more important” the Chairman’s promise that the Committee’s “interest in these matters informs [its] review of multiple laws and legislative proposals.” App. 29a. Moreover, “that the House has pending several pieces of legislation related to the Committee’s inquiry offers highly probative evidence of the Committee’s legislative purpose.” App. 30a. This legislative justification was not, in the majority’s view, “an insubstantial, makeweight assertion of remedial purpose.” App. 32a. “Simply put,” the majority held, “an interest in past illegality can be wholly consistent with an intent to enact remedial legislation.” App 32a.

The majority further held that the subpoena sought information about a subject on which Congress “may potentially legislate or appropriate.” App. 41a (citation and quotations omitted). Laws that require presidents to “disclose financial information” are, in its view, a “category of statutes” within the legislative domain since, for example, Congress could pass laws to enforce the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution. App. 44a. The majority thought such legislation would not “prevent the President from accomplishing his constitutionally assigned functions” under Article II, add a qualification for office, or otherwise exceed Congress’s Article I legislative authority. App. 45a. To conclude otherwise, according to the majority, “would be a return to an ‘archaic view of the separation of powers’” that “is not the law.” App. 49a (quoting *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. 425, 443 (1977)). In all, the majority saw “no inherent constitutional flaw in laws requiring Presidents to

publicly disclose certain financial information.” App. 51a.

As to statutory authority, the majority would not “interpret the House Rules narrowly to deny the Committee the authority it claims” even though the House Rules do not expressly authorize it to subpoena the President. App. 63a. First, the majority rejected application of the clear-statement rule because “the House Rules have no effect whatsoever on ‘the balance *between* Congress and the President.” App. 68a. In the majority’s view, since “Congress already possesses—in fact, has previously exercised—the authority to subpoena Presidents and their information, nothing in the House Rules could in any way ‘alter the balance between’ the two political branches of government.” App. 69a.

Second, the majority held that the avoidance canon was inapplicable. It recognized the Committee’s statutory authority must be narrowly interpreted if there are any serious “doubts” as to the subpoena’s “constitutionality.” App. 69a (quoting *United States v. Rumely*, 345 U.S. 41, 46 (1953)). According to the majority, though, “the constitutional questions raised here are neither grave nor serious and difficult.” App. 70a.

Finally, the majority held that the prospect of every congressional committee issuing subpoenas to the President did not create any separation-of-powers concerns that would justify a narrowing construction. App. 71a-72a. It reasoned that a subpoena “directed at Mazars” presented no occasion to address whether

a flurry of subpoenas would interfere with the President's official duties, and, regardless, the majority could identify no argument that this one "risks unconstitutionally burdening the President's core duties." App. 75a.

Judge Rao dissented. App 77a-158a. She viewed the dispute as raising "serious separation of powers concerns about how a House committee may investigate a sitting president." App. 77a. "Congress cannot undertake a legislative investigation" of the President "if the 'gravamen' of the investigation rests on 'suspicions of criminality.'" App. 85a (quoting *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 193, 195 (1880)). Rather, "allegations of illegal conduct against the President cannot be investigated by Congress except through impeachment." App. 83a. Therefore, whether the subpoena has "a legislative purpose presents a serious conflict between Congress and the President." App. 88a-89a.

In Judge Rao's view, this was not an exercise of "legislative power" since the Committee "explicitly" expressed "a purpose of investigating illegal conduct of the President, including specific violations of ethics laws and the Constitution." App. 77a-78a. Indeed, "the Committee has emphasized repeatedly and candidly its interest in investigating allegations of illegal conduct by the President." App. 120a-21a. The subpoena is "not about administration of the laws generally or the President's incidental involvement in or knowledge of any alleged unlawful activity within the executive branch." App. 122a. Rather, "the topics ... exclusively focus on the President's possible engagement in 'illegal conduct.'" App. 122a.

Judge Rao recognized that the Committee also professes a legislative purpose. App. 126a. But “the mere statement of a legislative purpose is not ‘more important’ when a committee also plainly states its intent to investigate such conduct.” App. 127a. The “gravamen ... is the President’s wrongdoing. The Committee has ‘affirmatively and definitely avowed,’ *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 180, its suspicions of criminality against the President.” App. 135a. In sum, “questions of illegal conduct and interest in reconstructing specific financial transactions of the President are too attenuated and too tangential to” any “legislative purposes” for the subpoena to be legitimate. App. 133a (citations and quotations omitted).

Because she would invalidate the subpoena on law-enforcement grounds, Judge Rao had no need to reach the parties’ other disputes. But she did express concern with the majority’s statutory analysis. Judge Rao, in particular, rejected the notion that separation-of-powers concerns are not implicated because the subpoena was issued to a third-party custodian. App. 86a-88a. She also outlined why laws regulating the President are “rife with constitutional concerns.” App. 142a.

On November 13, 2019, the D.C. Circuit denied rehearing. App. 213a-21a. Judge Katsas, joined by Judge Henderson, dissented. He explained that “this case presents exceptionally important questions regarding the separation of powers among Congress, the Executive Branch, and the Judiciary.” App. 215a (Katsas, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc). This is only “the second time in American

history [that] an Article III court has undertaken to enforce a congressional subpoena for the records of a sitting President.” App. 215a. In upholding such a subpoena for the first time, the ruling unfortunately “creates an open season on the President’s personal records.” App. 216a. Now, “whenever Congress conceivably could pass legislation regarding the President, it also may compel the President to disclose personal records that might inform the legislation.” App. 216a. “With regard to the threat to the Presidency,” then, “this wolf comes as a wolf.” App. 217a (quoting *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 699 (1988) (Scalia, J., dissenting)).

Judge Rao, joined by Judge Henderson, also dissented because “[t]he exceptionally important constitutional questions raised by this case justify further review by our court.” App. 218a-19a (Rao, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc). “The panel’s analysis of these issues misapprehends the gravamen of the Committee’s subpoena and glosses over the difficult questions it raises for the separation of powers.” App. 218a. The fallout from upholding this “unprecedented” subpoena, Judge Rao added, will be serious because “the panel opinion has shifted the balance of power between Congress and the President and allowed a congressional committee to circumvent the careful process of impeachment.” App. 218a. “This question is one of exceptional importance,” she concluded, “both for this case as well as for the

recurring disputes between Congress and the Executive Branch.” App. 221.³

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Review is warranted because the D.C. Circuit “decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court.” Sup. Ct. Rule 10(c). This case raises important separation-of-powers questions concerning Congress’s authority to subpoena the personal records of a sitting President for legislative purposes. This unprecedented subpoena should have been invalidated, and the D.C. Circuit’s decision upholding it was mistaken.

I. The validity of the Committee’s subpoena is an important issue of federal law that the Court should settle.

The district court, before issuing a 41-page opinion, cautioned that “[t]he issues ... are serious” and that “[n]o judge would make a hasty decision involving such important issues.” DDC Doc. 33 at 4-5. The Executive Branch, in its amicus brief below, explained that the case “raises significant separation-of-powers issues” and urged the D.C. Circuit to invalidate the subpoena. CADDC Doc. 1800932 at 6-8. The D.C. Circuit’s 66-page opinion characterized the stakes as “weighty,” App. 76a, and the issues as “far” from “unimportant.” App. 70a. Judge Rao likewise emphasized the case’s importance in her dissents.

³ On November 25, the Court granted Petitioners’ motion to stay the mandate. *See* Order, *Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP*, No. 19A545 (Nov. 25, 2019).

App. 77a. Thus, it should be common ground that “this case presents exceptionally important questions regarding the separation of powers among Congress, the Executive Branch, and the Judiciary.” App. 215a (Katsas, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc).

There also can be no reasonable assertion that resolution of these important legal issues turns on the routine application of settled law. This Court has not decided whether a congressional subpoena is valid if, notwithstanding Congress’s claim that the records are being demanded for legislative reasons, the committee also has “affirmatively and definitely avowed” a law-enforcement reason that is the “primary purpose[]” for issuing the subpoena. *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 180; *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 133 (1959). To be sure, the parties have a serious dispute over how to apply decades-old, if not century-old, precedent to a congressional demand for a President’s personal records. Indeed, it took the panel over 130 pages to decide that issue. But contrary to the Committee’s argument in opposing a stay, the need for the Court’s guidance is a reason to grant certiorari—not to deny it.

The Court likewise has never decided whether Congress may legislatively require the President to disclose his finances. This also is a serious issue. “The executive power is vested in a President; and as far as his powers are derived from the constitution, he is beyond the reach of any other department, except in the mode prescribed by the constitution through the impeaching power.” *Kendall v. U.S. ex rel. Stokes*, 37

U.S. 524, 610 (1838). “Out of respect for the separation of powers and the unique constitutional position of the President,” the Court traditionally gives close review to legislative efforts to regulate the office. *Franklin v. Massachusetts*, 505 U.S. 788, 800 (1992).

Relatedly, when the Chief Executive argues, as here, that novel legal process directed at him will lead to “diversion of his energies,” the Court traditionally grants review given “the singular importance of the President’s duties.” *Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 731, 751 (1982). The Court has “long recognized the ‘unique position in the constitutional scheme’” that the Presidency occupies. *Clinton*, 520 U.S. at 698 (quoting *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 749). Whether the Committee’s statutory authority should be narrowly construed to avoid the separation-of-powers problems that this case raises—including the serious concerns triggered by unleashing every congressional committee to subpoena the President for his personal records—is an important issue warranting the Court’s review as well.

That this case raises so many serious issues is not happenstance. Everything about this dispute is “unprecedented.” App. 218a (Rao, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc). It is the first time Congress has ever subpoenaed the personal records of a sitting President, and it is the first time a congressional demand for *any* presidential records has been upheld. App. 215a (Katsas, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc). Furthermore, it is the first time a court has upheld “a targeted investigation of the President’s alleged unlawful conduct under the

legislative power.” App. 120a (Rao, J., dissenting). The subpoena, accordingly, “represents an unprecedented assertion of legislative power.” App. 120a (Rao, J., dissenting).

The fact that the President is a petitioner here heightens the need for review. The President is not an “ordinary” litigant. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367, 381-82 (2004). The Court gives the President “special solicitude,” *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 743, and “high respect,” *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 385. When the President seeks review, this Court grants certiorari because of the case’s “importance” without regard for whether it is a “one-of-a-kind” case or whether there is “any conflict among the Courts of Appeals.” *Clinton*, 520 U.S. at 689. The Court has been especially receptive when, as here, the President’s concerns are shared by the Executive Branch. *Id.* at 689-90. Again, the Court’s deferential approach is not out of concern for any “particular President,” but out of respect for “the Presidency itself.” *Hawaii*, 138 S. Ct. at 2418.

The Court should adhere to that approach and grant the petition. Indeed, review is warranted for the same reasons that it was granted in *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974)—the most famous case involving a presidential subpoena. As here, a “third-party subpoena duces tecum” for presidential records raised questions of “public importance” that justified review. *Id.* at 686-87. Only, here, the Committee has a *less* pressing need for the records than the parties had in *Nixon*, *see infra* 37-38, and this subpoena raises *more* serious legal issues than those raised by the

narrowly framed demand in *Nixon*, see *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 387. This is the kind of important dispute, in sum, that the Court has traditionally felt an institutional responsibility to hear.

II. The Committee’s subpoena is invalid.

As explained, the decision to grant certiorari in a case like this turns on the Court’s “appraisal of its importance” instead of a “judgment concerning the merits of the case.” *Clinton*, 520 U.S. at 689. But even if the ultimate merit of the President’s claims matters, certiorari is warranted just the same. The subpoena is unconstitutional.

A. The Committee’s subpoena lacks a legitimate legislative purpose.

“The powers of Congress ... are dependent solely on the Constitution,” and the subpoena power is not “found in that instrument.” *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 182. The Court has held that it is “implied” through the Necessary and Proper Clause. *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 161. But Congress is not “the final judge of its own power and privileges.” *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 199. The Court “has not hesitated” to invalidate a subpoena where “Congress was acting outside its legislative role,” *Tenney v. Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367, 377 (1951)—*i.e.*, acting without a “legitimate legislative purpose,” *Eastland v. U.S. Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 501 n.14 (1975). Whether the Committee had a legitimate legislative purpose here turns on two issues.

First, Congress cannot exercise “any of the powers of law enforcement; those powers are assigned under our Constitution to the Executive and the Judiciary.” *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 161 (1955); accord *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187 (1957). As a result, Congress “cannot inquire into matters which are within the exclusive province of one of the other branches,” *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 111-12, or otherwise “trench upon Executive or judicial prerogatives,” App. 180a.

Second, a congressional investigation cannot “extend to an area in which Congress is forbidden to legislate.” *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161. “The subject of any inquiry always must be one ‘on which legislation could be had.’” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 504 n.15. Thus, “[i]f no constitutional statute may be enacted on a subject matter, then that subject is off-limits to congressional investigators.” App. 22a.

This subpoena violates both principles. It was issued for a law-enforcement—not a legislative—purpose. And, the subject of the inquiry—legislatively requiring presidents to disclose their finances—would not be valid legislation as it would exceed Congress’s authority under Article I.

1. This subpoena is part of an attempted law-enforcement investigation by the Committee.

Congress is not “a law enforcement or trial agency. These are functions of the executive and judicial departments of government.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187. This subpoena is part of an investigation into whether the President violated the law—a non-legislative task. App. 120a-36a (Rao, J., dissenting). Therefore, this subpoena lacks a legitimate legislative purpose.

That the Committee is investigating whether the President broke the law is not seriously contested. At the Cohen hearing (the impetus for this subpoena), the Chairman and several Committee members admitted that their purpose was to assess “the legality of ... President Donald Trump’s conduct.” *Supra* 5. The Committee’s first request to Mazars stated that it wanted to investigate the accuracy of the President’s financial statements to see if he broke the law. And, in his formal memo, the Chairman’s very first stated basis for the subpoena was “to investigate whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office.” App. 32a. In short, the Committee “affirmatively and definitely avowed” an “unlawful” law-enforcement purpose. App. 134a (Rao, J., dissenting) (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 180)).⁴

⁴ The Committee also was investigating whether the President “is complying with the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution.” DDC Doc. 30 at 21. But this is law enforcement as

But the Court would not need the Committee’s admission to recognize that this is a law-enforcement subpoena. Its “dragnet” nature, *Wilkinson v. United States*, 365 U.S. 399, 412 (1961), together with its focus on “certain named individuals” and the “precise reconstruction of past events,” *Senate Select Comm. on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon*, 498 F.2d 725, 732 (D.C. Cir. 1974), show that the subpoena has all the hallmarks of grand-jury and prosecutorial investigations—not legislative inquiries. That DOJ, “the Nation’s chief law enforcement” agency, *Mitchell v. Forsyth*, 472 U.S. 511, 520 (1985), thinks this looks like law enforcement, see CADC Doc. 1800932 at 17-18, corroborates what is plain from the face of the subpoena itself.

It is no surprise, then, that the D.C. Circuit agreed that the subpoena is meant to uncover “whether and how illegal conduct has occurred.” App. 34a. That court nonetheless upheld the subpoena because it is “more important” that the Committee also expressed a “legislative purpose” for issuing the subpoena—and an “interest in past illegality can be wholly consistent with an intent to enact remedial legislation.” App. 29a, 32a. In the D.C. Circuit’s view, an avowed law-enforcement purpose did not “spoil” an

well. It matters not that the Committee wants to know whether the President is complying with a constitutional provision instead of a federal statute; “the Constitution and valid federal statutes” are both “the supreme law.” *Alden v. Maine*, 527 U.S. 706, 757 (1999). An investigation into whether the President has accepted emoluments is an effort to uncover wrongdoing.

“otherwise valid legislative inquiry” because the Committee’s explanation did not amount to an “insubstantial, makeweight assertion of remedial purpose.” App. 32a. This logic fails on every level.

The legislative explanation for the Committee’s subpoena *is* makeweight. The Chairman’s first memo did not identify a legislative agenda that led him to issue the subpoena—the D.C. Circuit and House counsel did so on the Committee’s behalf. App. 30a-31a. The memo identified four law-enforcement objectives and, at the end, dropped in a boilerplate profession of legislative purpose. The Chairman’s second memo was more of the same. That the House has passed or is proceeding with legislation allegedly “related to the Committee’s inquiry” without access to the records demanded by the subpoena only further undermines the notion that the professed “legislative purpose” is substantial. App. 30a. Congress’s power of investigation is limitless if this is what counts as “indicia of legislative purpose.” App. 31a.

But even accepting the Committee’s legislative explanation as genuine, the reviewing court still must determine whether it is the subpoena’s “real object,” “primary purpose[],” and “gravamen.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178; *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 133; *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 195. The Court does not refuse to “see what all others can see and understand” when it comes to the “congressional power of investigation.” *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 44 (cleaned up). The subpoena’s “gravamen” is “the President’s wrongdoing.” App. 135a (Rao, dissenting). It “seeks to investigate illegal conduct of the President by reconstructing past actions in

connection with alleged violations of ethics laws and the Emoluments Clauses.” App. 120a (Rao, J., dissenting). Upholding this subpoena as being primarily legislative would allow the tail to wag the dog.

The D.C. Circuit’s conclusion that a legislative subpoena is always valid—no matter what—so long as Congress has “professed that it seeks to investigate remedial legislation,” App. 34a, cannot be reconciled with first principles or precedent. The ban on congressional law enforcement is not prophylactic. It keeps Congress from deploying implied authority rooted in the Necessary and Proper Clause to usurp functions that belong to the Executive and Judiciary. It ensures, in other words, that Congress does not “overstep the just boundaries of [its] own department, and enter upon the domain of one of the others.” *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 192. Hollowing out the legitimate-legislative-purpose test permits the Necessary and Proper Clause “to undermine the structure of government established by the Constitution.” *NFIB v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519, 559 (2012) (opinion of Roberts, C.J.).

Accordingly, while a legislative investigation is not illegitimate because it might incidentally expose illegal conduct, App. 24a, a law-enforcement subpoena does not become legitimate just because it might incidentally inspire remedial legislation. Allowing mere recitation of a legislative purpose to inoculate a subpoena from challenge turns the constitutional line between a legitimate legislative pursuit and an illegitimate law-enforcement investigation into a

magic-words test. The subpoena's primary purpose or gravamen is what has to count.

The D.C. Circuit understood *Sinclair v. United States*, 279 U.S. 263 (1929), and *Hutchinson v. United States*, 369 U.S. 599 (1962), to hold otherwise. App. 33a-34a. But the claim did not fail in *Sinclair* because Congress may engage in law enforcement so long as it also professes a legislative purpose; it failed because the “contention that the investigation was *avowedly* not in aid of legislation” lacked proof. 279 U.S. at 295 (emphasis added). “The record” demonstrated that the investigation's gravamen was legislative in nature; its legitimacy, accordingly, was not defeated “because the information sought to be elicited may also be of use” to prosecutors. *Id.*

Hutchinson is the same. As in *Sinclair*, the challenge to the investigation did not fail because the Committee merely professed a legislative purpose. Instead, the “episodes” presented as evidence of a “departure from ... legitimate congressional concerns” fell “far short of sustaining what [was] sought to be made of them.” *Id.* at 619. The plurality opinion thus reiterated that a “committee which is engaged in a legitimate legislative investigation need not grind to a halt whenever responses to its inquiries might potentially be harmful to a witness in some distinct proceeding.” 369 U.S. at 618. Justice Brennan agreed. His controlling concurrence explained that the Court “will give the *closest scrutiny to assure that indeed a legislative purpose was being pursued* and that the inquiry was not aimed at aiding the criminal prosecution.” *Id.* at 625 (Brennan, J., concurring)

(emphasis added). But the fact that “the conduct under inquiry may have some relevance to the subject matter of a pending state indictment cannot absolutely foreclose congressional inquiry.” *Id.* at 624.

At base, the D.C. Circuit so thoroughly gutted the test for evaluating legitimate legislative purpose that only a committee engaged in self-sabotage could flunk it. Perhaps “a congressional committee could not subpoena the President’s high school transcripts in service of an investigation into K-12 education.” App. 43a. But it could surely subpoena an ordinary citizen’s transcripts for that purpose. If a professed interest in passing remedial legislation is all the Constitution requires, then there is no limit to the law-enforcement investigations upon which Congress can embark. The D.C. Circuit has left the Executive—to whom “law enforcement ... power is entrusted,” *United States v. Welden*, 377 U.S. 95, 117 (1964)—unarmed in his clash with “the encroaching spirit’ of legislative power.” *Bank Markazi v. Peterson*, 136 S. Ct. 1310, 1336 (2016) (Roberts, C.J., dissenting) (quoting *The Federalist* No. 48, at 308 (James Madison) (Rossiter ed., 1961)).

Usurpation of the Executive’s law-enforcement prerogative is bad enough. But the issue is even more perilous when the subpoena targets the President. *See* U.S. Amicus Brief, No. 19-635, *Trump v. Vance*, at 21 n* (filed Nov. 22, 2019). This Court has “upheld some congressional investigations that incidentally uncover unlawful action by private citizens,” but investigating alleged “wrongdoing of the President or any impeachable official [] has never been treated as

merely incidental to a legislative purpose.” App. 131a (Rao, J., dissenting). Under the D.C. Circuit’s approach, however, nothing would stop Congress from demanding any records of the President—including his high school transcripts. Congress just needs to profess an interest in legislation that would make presidents disclose the information contained in those personal records. App. 216a (Katsas, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc). That approach cannot be reconciled with the heightened showing of need the Court requires before approving subpoenas that demand presidential and White House records. *See Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 713; *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 385.

But the Mazars subpoena would be invalid even if the President were not the target. It “is not about administration of the laws generally or the President’s incidental involvement in or knowledge of any alleged unlawful activity within the executive branch. Instead the topics of investigation exclusively focus on the President’s possible engagement in ‘illegal conduct.’” App. 122a (Rao, J., dissenting). That is paradigmatic law enforcement.

2. The Committee investigation that led to this subpoena could not result in constitutional legislation.

Even though the Committee argued that there were several legislative areas to which the subpoena could pertain, the D.C. Circuit was only willing to rely on *one* of them as potentially valid: laws that require presidents to disclose personal financial information.

App. 42a-50a.⁵ But no “valid legislation could be had,” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 171, because such laws would be unconstitutional.

The office of the President is created by the Constitution—not an Act of Congress. By vesting in him “[t]he executive Power,” U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl.1, the Constitution has “entrusted” the President “with supervisory and policy responsibilities of utmost discretion and sensitivity,” *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 750. “It is *his* responsibility to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” *Free Enter. Fund v. PCAOB*, 561 U.S. 477, 493 (2010). Congress might have greater control over other executive-branch officials, but its legislative power to directly control the President is constrained. See Memorandum from Laurence H. Silberman, Deputy Attorney General, to Richard T. Burrell, Office of the President, *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 5 (Aug. 28, 1974), bit.ly/31k3rql.

The D.C. Circuit misunderstood this position as resting on an “archaic view of the separation of

⁵ The Committee asked the court “to consider whether any law ‘concerning government ethics and conflicts of interest affecting Executive Branch officials’ could pass constitutional muster.” App. 42a. But Congress may not subpoena a president’s “financial information except to facilitate an investigation into *presidential* finances.” App. 43a (citation omitted). As applied to the President, moreover, statutes “mandating divestment from financial interests or recusal from conflicted matters” would “raise difficult constitutional questions.” App. 43a.

powers” that would, contrary to Supreme Court precedent, require “three airtight departments of government.” App. 49a. The Court has employed, at times, a more “flexible understanding of separation of powers,” *Mistretta v. United States*, 488 U.S. 361, 381 (1989), under which laws eroding presidential control have been upheld so long as they do not “involve an attempt by Congress to increase its own powers at the expense of the Executive Branch,” *Morrison*, 487 U.S. at 694. Still, the Court has been firm when there is a “serious threat” to the constitutional balance. *PCAOB*, 561 U.S. at 502. A law requiring the President to disclose his personal finances falls into the latter category.

The separation-of-powers concern here is not over diffusing presidential responsibility for oversight of Executive Branch functions. The concern is instead over Congress’s attempt to exercise control over the President himself through legislation. That difference makes this case uncharted territory. The D.C. Circuit pointed to the Presidential Records Act as analogous. App. 46a-47. But the PRA left “custody of the materials in officials of the Executive Branch” and “screening of the materials” for preservation was tasked to “the Executive Branch itself” rather than “have Congress or some outside agency perform the screening function.” *GSA*, 433 U.S. at 443-44. Given that it left “implementation ... in the President’s hands,” *Armstrong v. Bush*, 924 F.2d 282, 290 (D.C. Cir. 1991), the PRA did not “trigger separation of powers analysis,” *Duplantier v. United States*, 606 F.2d 654, 667 n.27 (5th Cir. 1979). Imposing financial

disclosure requirements on the President intrudes into an area that the Constitution fences off.⁶

Such legislation also would change or expand the enumerated qualifications for serving a President. Just as Congress lacks the authority “to add to or alter the qualifications of its Members,” *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 787 (1995), it cannot add or alter the presidency’s qualifications, *id.* at 803; *see also id.* at 861-62 (Thomas, J., dissenting). Because Congress cannot adjust “the standing qualifications prescribed in the Constitution,” *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 550 (1969), requiring the President to disclose his personal finances as a condition of holding office is unconstitutional.

The D.C. Circuit disagreed because, in its view, such requirements “exclude precisely zero individuals from running for or serving as President; regardless of their financial holdings, all constitutionally eligible candidates may apply.” App. 51a. But this Court has rejected that theory of the Qualifications Clause. In *Thornton*, Arkansas defended its term-limits rule by arguing that its law barred no one from running for office or serving in Congress; it just barred long-term

⁶ The D.C. Circuit also pointed to the obligations that The Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act and the STOCK Act impose on the President. App. 46a. But neither of those laws has been tested in court. The D.C. Circuit’s reliance on the history of presidential compliance is no stronger. This history is quite recent, and, regardless, “the separation of powers does not depend on the views of individual Presidents, nor on whether the encroached-upon branch approves the encroachment.” *PCAOB*, 561 U.S. at 497 (cleaned up).

incumbents from appearing on the ballot. As Arkansas put it: “[t]hey may run as write-in candidates and, if elected, they may serve.” 514 U.S. at 828. The Court responded that because “constitutional rights would be of little value if they could be indirectly denied,” the Qualifications Clause prohibits “indirect attempt[s] to accomplish what the Constitution prohibits [parties] from accomplishing directly.” *Id.* at 829 (cleaned up). For that reason, the Constitution proscribes not only absolute bars on certain individuals from running for or serving in office, but also laws with “the likely effect of handicapping a class of candidates” in running for office. *Id.* at 836.

Courts applying *Thornton* thus have held that the ability to comply with the obligation or hold office is immaterial. *Campbell v. Davidson*, for example, invalidated a state law making candidates for federal office register to vote in order to run for office. 233 F.3d 1229, 1236 (10th Cir. 2000). *Schaefer v. Townsend* similarly invalidated a state law that required candidates to be residents of the State when filing nomination papers. 215 F.3d 1031, 1039 (9th Cir. 2000). In both of these cases, the state argued that the statute did not bar anyone from running for office. The argument was rejected both times. *Campbell*, 233 F.3d at 1234; *Schaefer*, 215 F.3d at 1037. On that understanding, a court recently held that a California law similar to the one Congress is pursuing likely “imposes an additional substantive qualification beyond the exclusive confines of the Qualifications Clause and is likely invalid.” *Griffin v. Padilla*, 2019 WL 4863447, at **6-7 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2019).

Finally, any suggestion that the Emoluments Clauses provide a foundation for legislation requiring presidents to disclose their finances is erroneous. The Domestic Emoluments Clause bars “the President from receiving ‘any ... Emolument’ from the federal or state governments other than a fixed ‘Compensation’ ‘for his Services.’” App. 45a (quoting U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 7). The Foreign Emoluments Clause “prohibits any federal official ‘holding any Office of Profit or Trust’ ... from ‘accept[ing] ... any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State’ without ‘the Consent of the Congress.’” App. 46a (quoting U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 8). “If the President may accept no domestic emoluments and must seek Congress’s permission before accepting any foreign emoluments,” the D.C. Circuit posited, “a statute facilitating the disclosure of such payments lies within constitutional limits.” App. 46a.

But such laws would not avoid the separation-of-powers problem that arises when Congress seeks to directly control the President. In fact, relying on the Emoluments Clauses raises additional constitutional doubts. The D.C. Circuit does not explain how the Domestic Emoluments Clause—a provision in Article II that states what “[t]he President ... shall not” do, U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 7—is an affirmative grant of power for Congress to enact legislation. It bypassed whether the Foreign Emoluments Clause even applies to the President. App. 143a (Rao, J., dissenting). And, the D.C. Circuit ignored that the Foreign Emoluments Clause applies to *millions* of federal workers who hold

an “Office of Profit or Trust under [the United States].” U.S. Const. art. I, § 9; *see* 5 U.S.C. § 7342(a); 6 O.L.C. Op. 156, 156-59 (1982). Under the logic of the D.C. Circuit, Congress could obtain the personal records of all these workers to see if they have accepted foreign emoluments without approval. This cannot be a legitimate legislative purpose if we are to remain “a government of limited powers.” *NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 552 (Roberts, C.J.).

B. The Committee lacks the statutory authority to issue a subpoena to the President.

The D.C. Circuit should not have decided these constitutional issues. The Committee’s statutory jurisdiction must “first be settled,” *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 43, and the House Rules did not authorize the Committee to issue this subpoena.

“Congressional committees are themselves the offspring of Congress; they have only those powers authorized by law.” *In re Beef Industry Antitrust Litig.*, 589 F.2d 786, 787-88 (5th Cir. 1979). “To issue a valid subpoena,” then, a committee “must conform strictly to the resolution establishing its investigatory powers.” *Exxon Corp. v. FTC*, 589 F.2d 582, 592 (D.C. Cir. 1978); *see Yellin v. United States*, 374 U.S. 109, 114 (1963). The Committee’s “instructions are embodied in the authorizing resolution. That document is the committee’s charter.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 201. The House Rules, which were adopted on January 9, 2019, thus establish the Committee’s jurisdiction and define its investigative powers.

The House Rules do not expressly authorize the Committee to subpoena the President—let alone for personal records. App. 67a. That should have decided the case.⁷ For at least two reasons, the D.C. Circuit should have interpreted “the House Rules narrowly to deny the Committee the authority it claims.” App. 63a.

First, “where a statute is susceptible of two constructions, by one of which grave and doubtful constitutional questions arise and by the other of which such questions are avoided,” the Court’s “duty is to adopt the latter.” *Jones v. United States*, 529 U.S. 848, 857 (2000). That rule applies with equal force to the House Rules. *See Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 46-48. The D.C. Circuit held that this case does not raise any constitutional issues weighty enough to invoke it. App. 69a-70a. That is indefensible given the serious “threat to presidential autonomy and independence” the subpoena poses, App. 216a (Katsas, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc), and the “difficult

⁷ Resolution 507, which the House approved while this case was on appeal, purports to “affirm[] the validity” of the subpoena. App. 73a. But because “the delegation of power to the committee must be clearly revealed in its charter,” *Watkins* 354 U.S. at 198, the “scope” of its statutory authority must “be ascertained as of th[e] time” of the request and “cannot be enlarged by subsequent action of Congress,” *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 48. The D.C. Circuit did not reach this issue because it rejected a narrowing construction and held that the “text of the House Rules” already “authorizes the subpoena.” App. 74a. But if Petitioners are right that the Committee needs express authority to subpoena the President, Resolution 507 does not solve the issue. It “purports neither to enlarge the Committee’s jurisdiction nor to amend the House Rules.” App. 73a.

questions it raises for the separation of powers,” App. 218a (Rao, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc). As explained above, whether this subpoena has a legitimate legislative purpose raises grave constitutional issues the court should have been reluctant to decide. That is especially true “where, as here, they concern the relative powers of coordinate branches of government.” *Public Citizen v. U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 491 U.S. 440, 466 (1989).

Second, the clear-statement rule also requires a narrowing interpretation. “In traditionally sensitive areas, ... the requirement of clear statement assures that the legislature has in fact faced, and intended to bring into issue, the critical matters involved in the judicial decision.” *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 461 (1991). That is particularly important when the political branches clash. See *Franklin*, 505 U.S. at 800-01; *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 748 n.27. Thus, laws must be “construed not to include the President unless there is a specific indication that Congress intended to cover the Chief Executive.” 19 O.L.C. Op. 350, 351-52 (1995) (quoting Memorandum of William H. Rehnquist to Egil Krogh (Apr. 1, 1969)).

In the D.C. Circuit’s view, no clear statement is needed here because “the House Rules have no effect whatsoever on the balance *between* Congress and the President.” App. 68a. That is incorrect. “Whenever constitutional limits upon the investigative power of Congress have to be drawn by this Court, it ought only to be done after Congress has demonstrated its full awareness of what is at stake by unequivocally authorizing an inquiry of dubious limits.” *Rumely*, 345

U.S. at 46. Forcing Congress to be fully aware of the consequences of giving every committee the unrestricted power to subpoena the President, and to unequivocally approve it, vindicates important separation-of-powers principles. App. 139a-40a (Rao, J., dissenting).

The D.C. Circuit confused two distinct issues in assuming that just because the House, as a *statutory* matter, “could have either issued the challenged subpoena by a vote of the full chamber or, via express statement, authorized the Committee to issue the subpoena on its behalf,” App. 68a, it could take that step without creating a serious *constitutional* issue. The majority bypassed the constitutional issue because, in its view, “Congress already possesses—in fact, has previously exercised—the authority to subpoena Presidents and their information.” App. 69a (citation omitted). But there is every reason to doubt that Congress’s power to issue subpoenas in aid of legislation extends to the President. History, in fact, points clearly in the opposite direction. App. 99a-119a (Rao, J., dissenting).

But even if the full House could subpoena the President under its legislative powers, that does not mean that authorizing every committee to do so would be constitutional. Investigative demands like this one can “distract a President from his public duties, to the detriment of not only the President and his office but also the Nation that the Presidency was designed to serve.” *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 753; *see id.* at 760-61 (Burger, C.J., concurring) (“The essential purpose of the separation of powers is to allow for independent

functioning of each coequal branch of government within its assigned sphere of responsibility, free from risk of control, interference, or intimidation by other branches.”). The full House should have to expressly delegate authority to its standing committees before they are unleashed to “issue successive subpoenas in waves, making far-reaching demands that harry the President and distract his attention.” U.S. Amicus Br., CADC Doc. 1800932 at 11.

The D.C. Circuit concluded that these concerns are hypothetical “because the only subpoena” at issue “is the one directed at Mazars,” and no argument has been made that “compliance with *that* subpoena risks unconstitutionally burdening the President’s core duties.” App. 75a. But that misunderstood Petitioners’ argument and the legal framework upon which it is built. App. 152a-56a (Rao, J., dissenting). This Court takes a categorical approach to issues of this sort. *See Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 751-53. The issue is whether “this particular [subpoena]—*as well as the potential additional [subpoenas] that an affirmance of the Court of Appeals judgment might spawn*—may impose an unacceptable burden on the ... office.” *Clinton*, 520 U.S. at 701-02 (emphasis added). It would clearly distract the President from his official duties if every standing committee of Congress had the power to “compel” him “to disclose personal records that might inform the legislation” it is considering. App. 216a (Katsas, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc).

The D.C. Circuit’s rejection of these concerns is emblematic of a misguided approach to separation-of-

powers questions. To be certain, “separation of powers does not mean that the branches ‘ought to have no *partial agency* in, or no *controul* over, the acts of each other.” App. 50a (quoting *Clinton*, 520 U.S. at 702-03). The Court vigilantly shields the President, however, from “interfere[nce] with the ... discharge of his public duties” in light of “Article II’s vesting of the entire ‘executive Power’ in a single individual, implemented through the Constitution’s structural separation of powers, and revealed both by history and case precedent.” *Clinton*, 520 U.S. at 710-11 (Breyer, J., concurring). There is thus every reason to be wary of the D.C. Circuit’s decision and the flood of presidential subpoenas it will inevitably trigger. “With regard to the threat to the Presidency, ‘this wolf comes as a wolf.’” App. 217a (Katsas, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc) (quoting *Morrison*, 487 U.S. at 699 (Scalia, J., dissenting)).

III. There are no vehicle issues.

In opposing a stay, the Committee made three arguments why review should be denied apart from its defense of the decision below. None of them justify denying certiorari.

First, the Committee incorrectly pointed to the ongoing impeachment as a reason to deny review. But the Committee concedes it “has relied consistently and exclusively on the legislative power to justify this subpoena.” App. 219a (Rao, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc). Nor does the Committee dispute that transitioning to an impeachment-based defense would raise retroactivity problems, since it is doubtful

that “a defective subpoena can be revived by after-the-fact approval.” App. 220a; *see supra* 32 n.7. Instead, the House claims that it might issue a new subpoena if certiorari is granted. If the Committee took that step, however, the petition would need to be granted, and the decision below would need to be vacated. *See United States v. Munsingwear, Inc.*, 340 U.S. 36, 39 (1950). The Court should reject any attempt by the Committee to avoid review while preserving the D.C. Circuit’s decision as precedent. Congress should not be allowed to benefit from such gamesmanship.

Second, the Committee argues that this case is a poor vehicle to decide whether Congress may validly require the President to disclose his personal finances. But the Committee fails to see that its concession—*i.e.*, deciding “broad questions of civil law” through a subpoena dispute is “not the most practical method of inducing courts to answer broad questions broadly,” *Tobin v. United States*, 306 F.2d 270, 274 (D.C. Cir. 1962)—cuts against it. The concern should have led the D.C. Circuit to narrowly interpret the Committee’s statutory authority. But it crossed the Rubicon and became the first court to hold that such regulations are constitutional. Whether it was correct to do so is, in and of itself, an important issue that warrants this Court’s review.

Finally, the Committee argued that its pressing need for these documents counsels against the delay that review would entail. The argument is meritless. The Committee has voluntarily stayed enforcement of the subpoena for more than six months, and it cannot identify any potential or pending legislation to which

the records are relevant—let alone urgently needed. Regardless, the Committee’s stay opposition notified the Court that any harm will be mitigated by deciding the case by the end the Term. To that end, Petitioners are prepared to proceed on any schedule the Court deems appropriate should it grant certiorari and hear this important case.

CONCLUSION

The Court should grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay Alan Sekulow
 Stuart J. Roth
 Jordan Sekulow
 CONSTITUTIONAL LITIGATION
 AND ADVOCACY GROUP, P.C.
 1701 Pennsylvania Ave, NW,
 Ste. 200
 Washington, DC 20006
 (202) 546-8890
 jsekulow@claglaw.com

Stefan C. Passantino
 Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
 1000 Maine Ave. SW, Ste. 400
 Washington, DC 20024
 (202) 747-9582
 spassantino@michaelbest.com

William S. Consovoy
Counsel of Record
 Jordan M. Call
 CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
 1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700
 Arlington, VA 22209
 (703) 243-9423
 will@consovoymccarthy.com

Patrick Strawbridge
 CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
 Ten Post Office Square
 8th Floor South PMB #706
 Boston, MA 02109
 patrick@consovoymccarthy.com

Counsel for Petitioners

APPENDIX

1a

**APPENDIX A — OPINION OF THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, DATED
OCTOBER 11, 2019**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5142

DONALD J. TRUMP, *et al.*,

Appellants,

v.

MAZARS USA, LLP AND COMMITTEE
ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM OF THE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Appellees.

July 12, 2019, Argued
October 11, 2019, Decided

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the District of Columbia.
(No. 1:19-cv-01136).

Before: TATEL, MILLETT and RAO, *Circuit Judges*.

Opinion for the Court filed by *Circuit Judge* TATEL.

Dissenting opinion filed by *Circuit Judge* RAO.

Appendix A

TATEL, *Circuit Judge*: On April 15, 2019, the House Committee on Oversight and Reform issued a subpoena to the accounting firm Mazars USA, LLP for records related to work performed for President Trump and several of his business entities both before and after he took office. According to the Committee, the documents will inform its investigation into whether Congress should amend or supplement current ethics-in-government laws. For his part, the President contends that the Committee’s investigation into his financial records serves no legitimate legislative purpose, and he has sued to prevent Mazars from complying with the subpoena. The district court granted summary judgment in favor of the Committee, and we affirm. Contrary to the President’s arguments, the Committee possesses authority under both the House Rules and the Constitution to issue the subpoena, and Mazars must comply.

I.

Shortly after the 116th Congress convened on January 3, 2019, the new U.S. House of Representatives debated and adopted a set of rules to govern its proceedings. *See* H.R. Res. 6, 116th Cong. (2019). Like previous Congresses, the 116th established an oversight committee, the Committee on Oversight and Reform, which it charged with “review[ing] and study[ing] on a continuing basis the operation of Government activities at all levels” and which it permitted to “conduct investigations” “at any time . . . of any matter,” “without regard to” other standing committees’ jurisdictions. Rules of the House of Representatives, 116th Cong., Rule X, cls. 3(i), 4(c)(2)

Appendix A

(2019) (“House Rules”); *see also id.*, cl. 1(n) (establishing the Committee on Oversight and Reform). To “carry[] out . . . [these] functions and duties,” the Oversight Committee may “require, by subpoena or otherwise . . . the production of such . . . documents as it considers necessary.” House Rule XI, cl. 2(m).

This case concerns one such subpoena. Issued on April 15 by the chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Representative Elijah Cummings, to President Trump’s accounting firm, the subpoena requests financial documents concerning the President and his companies covering years both before and during his presidency.

In order to explain the impetus behind the subpoena, we must go back to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978. Enacted in the wake of the Watergate scandal, that statute requires many aspiring and current government officials, including presidential candidates and sitting Presidents, to file financial disclosure reports at various times during their candidacies and incumbencies. *See* 5 U.S.C. app. 4 § 101(a), (c), (d), (f) (requiring “a candidate . . . for nomination or election to the office of President” and “the President” to “file a report containing the information described” in section 102 of the Act). In their initial reports, presidential candidates and new Presidents must provide information concerning their income, assets, liabilities, and employers. *See id.* § 102(b) (requiring “[e]ach report filed pursuant to subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 101” to contain such information). Once in office, sitting Presidents must file annual reports disclosing that same information plus

Appendix A

details about any covered gifts, real estate and securities transactions, and blind trusts. *See id.* § 102(a) (requiring “[e]ach report filed pursuant to section 101(d) and (e)” to contain such information). Presidential candidates submit their reports to the Federal Election Commission, *see id.* § 103(e), while incumbent Presidents file with the Office of Government Ethics, an “executive agency” tasked with “interpreting rules and regulations . . . governing . . . the filing of financial statements,” *id.* §§ 103(b), 401(a), 402(b)(3), 402(b)(6).

Last year, the Office of Government Ethics announced that it had identified an error in one of the several reports that President Trump had filed since he became a presidential candidate in 2015. Specifically, by letter dated May 16, 2018, the Acting Director of the Office of Government Ethics advised the Deputy Attorney General that, “based on the information provided” in President Trump’s 2018 financial disclosure report (covering calendar year 2017), he had determined that the President’s 2017 financial disclosure (covering calendar year 2016) omitted “a reportable liability under the Ethics in Government Act,” namely, “a payment made by Mr. Michael Cohen,” President Trump’s former personal lawyer, “to a third party.” Letter from David J. Apol, Acting Director, Office of Government Ethics, to Rod J. Rosenstein, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice 1 (May 16, 2018) (“Apol Letter”). Because President Trump’s 2018 filing disclosed that in 2017 the President had reimbursed Cohen for the 2016 payment, the Acting Director concluded that “the payment made by Mr. Cohen [was] required to be reported as a liability” before it was reimbursed. *Id.* at 1;

Appendix A

see also OGE Form 278e, 2017 Annual Report for Donald J. Trump, Part 8 n.3 (May 15, 2018), <https://oge.app.box.com/v/Trump2018Annual278> (disclosing that “Mr. Trump fully reimbursed Mr. Cohen in 2017”).

Several months later, then-Ranking Member Cummings wrote to White House Counsel seeking documents related to President Trump’s payments to Cohen. *See* Letter from Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, to Donald F. McGahn II, Counsel to the President, The White House, and George A. Sorial, Executive Vice President of the Trump Organization 4-5 (Sept. 12, 2018). That letter remained unanswered as of January 2019, when Representative Cummings, who in the intervening months had become Chairman Cummings, reiterated his request in a second letter. *See* Letter from Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, to Pat Cipollone, Counsel to the President, The White House 1-2 (Jan. 8, 2019). Chairman Cummings also wrote to the new Director of the Office of Government Ethics, asking him, too, for “documents related to President Donald Trump’s reporting of debts and payments to his personal attorney, Michael Cohen.” Letter from Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, to Emory A. Rounds III, Director, Office of Government Ethics 1 (Jan. 22, 2019).

In February, White House Counsel responded that the President would consider permitting the Committee to review, on a limited basis, a subset of the requested documents, but Chairman Cummings rejected this

Appendix A

proposal as inadequate. *See* Letter from Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, to Pat Cipollone, Counsel to the President, The White House 1 (Feb. 15, 2019) (“Cummings Feb. 15 Letter”) (stating that the President’s offer to “consider providing Committee staff with the ability to review limited portions of two of the six categories of documents *in camera*” would “not obviate the need . . . to fully comply” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Citing the Oversight Committee’s status as “the authorizing Committee for the Office of Government Ethics,” the President’s statutory obligation to “file . . . public financial disclosure report[s],” and Congress’s “plenary authority to legislate and conduct oversight regarding compliance with ethics laws and regulations,” Chairman Cummings urged the White House “to provide documents relevant to the Committee’s investigation of these matters.” *Id.* at 7-8. “These documents will help the Committee determine,” he explained, “why the President failed to report . . . payments and whether reforms are necessary to address deficiencies with current laws, rules, and regulations.” *Id.* at 9.

Two weeks later, Michael Cohen appeared at a hearing before the Oversight Committee. *See Hearing with Michael Cohen, Former Attorney to President Donald Trump: Hearing Before the House Committee on Oversight and Reform*, 116th Cong. (Feb. 27, 2019). He testified that he believed, based on his experience working for President Trump, that the President had “inflated his total assets when it served his purposes” in some situations and had “deflated his assets” in others.

Appendix A

Id. at 13 (testimony of Michael D. Cohen). Several Committee Members questioned Cohen’s credibility; he had, after all, recently pleaded guilty to various crimes, including lying to Congress. *See, e.g., id.* at 7 (statement of Ranking Member Jim Jordan) (“This might be the first time someone convicted of lying to Congress has appeared again so quickly in front of Congress.”); *id.* at 57 (statement of Rep. Michael Cloud) (asking Cohen to “state what you’ve been convicted of”). Seeking to support his testimony, Cohen produced to the Committee several accounting documents, all of which predated Mr. Trump’s presidency. Two of these documents—2011 and 2012 “Statements of Financial Condition” for Donald J. Trump—were prepared by Mazars. *See* “Donald J. Trump Statement of Financial Condition” dated June 30, 2011; “Donald J. Trump Statement of Financial Condition” dated June 30, 2012.

Chairman Cummings next wrote to Mazars. In a March 2019 letter, he explained that the statements of financial condition prepared by the firm and supplied by Cohen had “raise[d] questions about the President’s representations of his financial affairs,” “particularly [his] debts,” “on these forms and on other disclosures.” Letter from Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, to Victor Wahba, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Mazars USA, LLP 1 (Mar. 20, 2019) (“Cummings Mar. 20 Letter”). Chairman Cummings highlighted several “specific concerns,” including: (1) that “[t]he 2012 Statement of Financial Condition prepared by [Mazars]” intentionally omitted over \$50 million in assets and \$75 million in liabilities that “then-Candidate

Appendix A

Trump” later disclosed on his “first publicly filed financial disclosure made . . . in 2015,” (2) that read together, the 2012 statement of financial condition and 2015 financial disclosure indicated that Deutsche Bank had reduced the interest rate it was charging on a \$125 million loan to then-Candidate Trump, potentially saving him “about \$625,000” each year, and (3) that “both the 2011 and 2012 financial statements” noted that, before becoming a presidential candidate, Mr. Trump “ha[d] pledged” almost \$20 million to a “former partner in the Trump World Tower at United Nations Plaza,” who, “[a]ccording to contemporaneous reports,” was possibly “the Korean conglomerate Daewoo” or a “German financial institution.” *Id.* at 2-3. “To assist [its] review of these issues,” the Committee requested several categories of documents relating to President Trump’s accounts going back to January 2009. *Id.* at 4.

Mazars responded that it could not provide the requested documents voluntarily. *See* Letter from Jerry D. Bernstein, Partner, Blank Rome LLP, to Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform 1 (Mar. 27, 2019). So, on April 12, Chairman Cummings sent a memorandum to his fellow committee members explaining his intention to issue, pursuant to the Committee’s authority under House Rule X to “investigate ‘any matter at any time,’” a subpoena to Mazars. Memorandum from Chairman Elijah E. Cummings to Members of the Committee on Oversight and Reform 3 (Apr. 12, 2019) (“Cummings Memo”). The Chairman identified four subject matters that, in his view, “[t]he Committee has full authority to

Appendix A

investigate”: (1) “whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office,” (2) “whether [the President] has undisclosed conflicts of interest that may impair his ability to make impartial policy decisions,” (3) “whether [the President] is complying with the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution,” and (4) “whether [the President] has accurately reported his finances to the Office of Government Ethics and other federal entities.” *Id.* at 4. “The Committee’s interest in these matters,” he stated, “informs its review of multiple laws and legislative proposals under [its] jurisdiction.” *Id.*

The subpoena issued three days later. It requested, “[w]ith respect to Donald J. Trump” and several of his affiliated businesses—including the Trump Organization, the Trump Corporation, and the Trump Old Post Office LLC— “[a]ll statements of financial condition, annual statements, periodic financial reports, and independent auditors’ reports prepared, compiled, reviewed, or audited by Mazars . . . or its predecessor.” Subpoena to Mazars USA, LLP, Apr. 15, 2019 (“Subpoena”). Furthermore, with respect to Mazars’s “preparation, compilation, review, or auditing” of those documents, the subpoena requested all related “engagement agreements or contracts” “[w]ithout regard to time”; “[a]ll underlying, supporting, or source documents and records . . . or any summaries of such documents”; and all related “memoranda, notes, and communications,” including “communications related to potential concerns that . . . information . . . provided by Donald J. Trump or . . . the Trump Organization[] [was] incomplete, inaccurate, or otherwise unsatisfactory.” *Id.* Narrowed somewhat from the Chairman’s initial request

Appendix A

to Mazars, the subpoena sought documents from “calendar years 2011 through 2018” “[u]nless otherwise noted.” *Id.* The subpoena instructed Mazars to comply by April 29.

Before that date arrived, however, President Trump and several of his business entities (collectively, the “Trump Plaintiffs”) filed this lawsuit seeking a declaratory judgment invalidating the subpoena and a permanent injunction prohibiting its enforcement. *See* Complaint at 13, *Trump v. Committee on Oversight & Reform of U.S. House of Representatives*, 380 F. Supp. 3d 76 (D.D.C. 2019) (No. 19-cv-01136) (“Complaint”). The Trump Plaintiffs also moved for a preliminary injunction, and while that motion was pending, the Committee agreed to defer Mazars’s deadline to comply with the subpoena.

The district court worked quickly to provide the parties with an answer. Following the Supreme Court’s direction to “give[] the most expeditious treatment” to suits seeking to enjoin congressional subpoenas, *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 511, 95 S. Ct. 1813, 44 L. Ed. 2d 324 n.17 (1975), the court “consolidate[d] [its] hearing on the preliminary injunction” with a resolution of the merits by “treat[ing] the parties’ briefing”—which raised no disputes of material fact—“as cross-motions for summary judgment,” *Trump*, 380 F. Supp. 3d at 88, 90; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a)(2) (permitting the court, “[b]efore or after beginning the hearing on a motion for a preliminary injunction,” to “advance the trial on the merits and consolidate it with the hearing”). Then, after explaining that its “analysis must be highly deferential to the legislative branch,”

Appendix A

Trump, 380 F. Supp. 3d at 91, the court concluded that each of the four investigative topics set forth in Chairman Cummings’s April 12 memorandum represents “a subject ‘on which legislation could be had,’” *id.* at 94 (quoting *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 177, 47 S. Ct. 319, 71 L. Ed. 580 (1927)). The court thus granted summary judgment in favor of the Oversight Committee. *See id.* at 105.

The Trump Plaintiffs now appeal, challenging the district court’s grant of summary judgment to the Committee (though not its decision to treat the briefs as cross-motions for summary judgment). By agreement of the parties, Mazars need not comply with the subpoena during the pendency of this expedited appeal. *See Oral Arg. Tr.* 129. After oral argument, and at the court’s invitation, the Department of Justice filed an amicus brief, and the Trump Plaintiffs and Committee responded. Our review is de novo. *See Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. FDA*, 441 F.3d 1, 3, 370 U.S. App. D.C. 192 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (reviewing de novo “the district court’s legal determination” made after “consolidat[ing] [a] motion for a preliminary injunction with a final decision on the merits”).

II.

This is hardly the first subpoena Congress has issued—legislative subpoenas are older than our country itself—and the parties draw upon the historical record to support their claims. Accordingly, before digging into the details of this case, we think it necessary to place the challenged subpoena in historical context.

Appendix A

The story of legislative subpoenas extends all the way back to the “emergence of [the English] Parliament,” when that body, as part of its campaign to “challenge the absolute power of the monarch,” asserted “plenary authority” to hold offending parties in contempt. *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 188, 77 S. Ct. 1173, 1 L. Ed. 2d 1273, 76 Ohio Law Abs. 225 (1957). Beginning in the late seventeenth century, Parliament armed “a host of committees” with the “powers to send for persons and papers” in aid of their “investigat[ions] . . . [into] the operations of government”—from “the conduct of the war in Ireland” to “[t]he unwarranted proclamation of martial law . . . by a commissioner of the East India Company” to “the State of the Gaols of [the] Kingdom.” James M. Landis, *Constitutional Limitations on the Congressional Power of Investigation*, 40 Harv. L. Rev. 153, 162-63 (1926). Across the Atlantic, too, “[t]he privileges and powers of the [House of] Commons were naturally assumed to be an incident of the representative assemblies of the Thirteen Colonies.” *Id.* at 165.

After the Revolutionary War and the Constitutional Convention, the U.S. Congress wasted little time in asserting its power to use compulsory process to investigate matters of national—and potentially legislative—importance. The House of Representatives opened the first such investigation in 1792, when it passed a resolution appointing a committee “to inquire into the causes of the failure of the late expedition under Major General St. Clair,” whose troops had recently suffered an embarrassing defeat in the Northwest Territory, and “empowered” that committee “to call for such persons,

Appendix A

papers, and records, as may be necessary to assist [its] inquiries.” 3 Annals of Congress 493 (1792); *see also* George C. Chalou, *General St. Clair’s Defeat, 1792-93*, in 1 *Congress Investigates: A Critical and Documentary History* 1, 2 (Roger A. Bruns et al. eds., rev. ed. 2011). More investigatory committees, similarly empowered to issue subpoenas, followed. For example, in 1814, the House directed an inquiry “into the causes of the success of the enemy”—that is, the British—“in his late enterprises” in burning the Capitol, 28 Annals of Congress 310 (1814), and, in 1859, the Senate established a select committee to “inquire into the facts attending” John Brown’s raid on Harpers Ferry and to “report whether . . . and what legislation may . . . be necessary . . . for the future preservation of the peace,” Cong. Globe, 36th Cong., 1st Sess. 141 (1859).

But not until 1880 did “the first case reach[] [the Supreme] Court to challenge the use of compulsory process as a legislative device.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 193. In that case, *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 26 L. Ed. 377 (1881), the Court held that the House had exceeded its investigatory authority by opening an inquiry into the bankruptcy proceedings of a firm into which the United States had invested money. The Court explained that Congress’s sole route to a remedy in that bankruptcy proceeding, like that of all other dissatisfied creditors, was “by a resort to a court of justice.” *Id.* at 193. Accordingly, because under those circumstances the House’s investigation “could result in no valid legislation,” *id.* at 195, the Court concluded that the House had impermissibly “assumed a power which could only be

Appendix A

properly exercised by another branch of the government,” *id.* at 192.

If *Kilbourn* created any doubt about Congress’s power to conduct legislative investigations, the Supreme Court dispelled that cloud in a pair of cases arising out of alleged corruption in the administration of President Warren G. Harding. In the first, *McGrain v. Daugherty*, the Court considered a subpoena issued to the brother of then-Attorney General Harry Daugherty for bank records relevant to the Senate’s investigation into the Department of Justice. Concluding that the subpoena was valid, the Court explained that Congress’s “power of inquiry . . . is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function,” as “[a] legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change.” 273 U.S. at 174-75. It mattered not that the Senate’s authorizing resolution lacked an “avow[al] that legislative action was had in view” because, said the Court, “the subject to be investigated was . . . [p]lainly [a] subject . . . on which legislation could be had” and such legislation “would be materially aided by the information which the investigation was calculated to elicit.” *Id.* at 176-77 (internal quotation marks omitted). That was enough. Although “[a]n express avowal” of the Senate’s legislative objective “would have been better,” the Court admonished that “the presumption should be indulged that [legislation] was the real object.” *Id.* at 178.

Two years later, in *Sinclair v. United States*, 279 U.S. 263, 49 S. Ct. 268, 73 L. Ed. 692 (1929), the Court echoed

Appendix A

many of the same refrains. In this second case, Harry Sinclair, the president of an oil company, appealed his conviction for refusing to answer a Senate committee's questions regarding his company's allegedly fraudulent lease on federal oil reserves at Teapot Dome in Wyoming. The Court, acknowledging individuals' "right to be exempt from all unauthorized, arbitrary or unreasonable inquiries and disclosures in respect of their personal and private affairs," *id.* at 292, nonetheless explained that because "[i]t was a matter of concern to the United States," "the transaction purporting to lease to [Sinclair's company] the lands within the reserve cannot be said to be merely or principally . . . personal," *id.* at 294. The Court also dismissed the suggestion that the Senate was impermissibly conducting a criminal investigation. "It may be conceded that Congress is without authority to compel disclosures for the purpose of aiding the prosecution of pending suits," explained the Court, "but the authority of that body, directly or through its committees, to require pertinent disclosures in aid of its own constitutional power is not abridged because the information sought to be elicited may also be of use in such suits." *Id.* at 295.

The Court returned to the question of Congress's investigative authority during the Cold War, as "investigations into the threat of subversion of the United States Government" began to raise "novel questions [about] the appropriate limits of congressional inquiry" "into the lives and affairs of private citizens." *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 195. At first, the Court avoided these thorny First Amendment issues by resolving cases on other grounds. In *United States v. Rumely*, the Court overturned a

Appendix A

defendant's contempt-of-Congress conviction for refusing to answer a congressional committee's request for "the names of those who made bulk purchases" of "books of a particular political tendentiousness." 345 U.S. 41, 42, 73 S. Ct. 543, 97 L. Ed. 770 (1953). Rather than reach the "[g]rave" First Amendment question posed by such an inquiry, the Court interpreted the House's authorizing resolution, which instructed the committee to study "lobbying activities," as failing to permit an investigation into the sale of books. *Id.* at 45, 48. And a few years later, in *Watkins v. United States*, the Court overturned another contempt conviction, this time holding that the defendant, a labor organizer who had refused "to testify about persons who may in the past have been Communist Party members," 354 U.S. at 185, had received insufficient notice of "the 'question under inquiry'" at his congressional hearing, *id.* at 214 (quoting 2 U.S.C. § 192). In that case, the Court took the opportunity to emphasize that although "there is no congressional power to expose for the sake of exposure," courts should avoid "testing the motives of committee members for this purpose." *Id.* at 200. Rather, the crucial inquiry is whether a "legislative purpose is being served." *Id.*

The Court soon reached the First Amendment issue it had been avoiding. In *Barenblatt v. United States*, the Court considered the case of a teacher convicted of criminal contempt for refusing, when testifying before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to answer questions about his "past or present membership in the Communist Party." 360 U.S. 109, 126, 79 S. Ct. 1081, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1115 (1959). Unlike the

Appendix A

Watkins defendant, the *Barenblatt* defendant had been “sufficiently apprised of the topic under inquiry” by “other sources of . . . information,” such as the Subcommittee “Chairman’s statement as to why he had been called” to testify and the questions posed by the Subcommittee to previous witnesses. *Id.* at 124-25 (internal quotation marks omitted). Proceeding, then, to the “precise constitutional issue”—namely, “whether the Subcommittee’s inquiry . . . transgressed the provisions of the First Amendment”—the Court explained that although “Congress may not constitutionally require an individual to disclose his . . . private affairs except in relation to” “a valid legislative purpose,” such a purpose was present in that case. *Id.* at 127. Congress’s “wide power to legislate in the field of Communist activity . . . and to conduct appropriate investigations in aid thereof[] is hardly debatable,” said the Court, and “[s]o long as Congress acts in pursuance of its constitutional power, the Judiciary lacks authority to intervene on the basis of the motives which spurred the exercise of that power.” *Id.* at 127, 132. Thus, given “the governmental interests . . . at stake,” the Court concluded that “the First Amendment [had] not been offended” and affirmed the defendant’s conviction. *Id.* at 134.

Presidents, too, have often been the subjects of Congress’s legislative investigations, though fewer of these have required judicial intervention. Historical examples stretch far back in time and broadly across subject matters. In 1832, for example, the House vested a select committee with subpoena power “to inquire whether an attempt was made by the late Secretary of War . . . [to] fraudulently [award] . . . a contract for

Appendix A

supplying rations” to Native Americans and to “further . . . inquire whether the President . . . had any knowledge of such attempted fraud, and whether he disapproved or approved of the same.” H.R. Rep. No. 22-502, at 1 (1832) (internal quotation marks omitted). Shortly after World War II, Congress’s Pearl Harbor Committee published a joint report exonerating the President of “charges” that he had “tricked, provoked, incited, cajoled, or coerced Japan into attacking this Nation.” S. Doc. No. 79-244, at xiii, 251 (1946). In 1987, the House established a committee to investigate the Iran-Contra Affair, including “the role of the President.” H.R. Rep. No. 100-433, at 21 (1987). During that investigation, President Reagan declined to assert executive privilege, going so far as to furnish “relevant excerpts of his personal diaries” to Congress. Morton Rosenberg, Congressional Research Service, RL 30319, *Presidential Claims of Executive Privilege: History, Law, Practice and Recent Developments* 14 (Aug. 21, 2008) (internal quotation marks omitted). And in the 1990s, first the House and Senate Banking Committees and then a Senate special committee investigated President and Mrs. Clinton’s involvement in the Whitewater land deal and related matters. *See* Douglas L. Kriner & Eric Schickler, *Investigating the President* 56-62 (2016) (describing the “three-year congressional investigation of Whitewater”); *see also* S. Res. 120, 104th Cong. (1995) (establishing the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters). Thanks to a last-minute compromise between the White House and the Senate, the courts were kept out of a dispute over whether the special committee could subpoena meeting notes taken by President Clinton’s former lawyer. *See*

Appendix A

Louis Fisher, Congressional Research Service, RL 31836, *Congressional Investigations: Subpoenas and Contempt Power* 16-18 (Apr. 2, 2003).

Of all the historical examples, perhaps the most high-profile congressional investigation into a President—and the only one we have found that produced an appellate-level judicial opinion—was Congress’s investigation into President Nixon. The Senate created the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, better known as the Senate Watergate Committee, to investigate “illegal, improper, or unethical activities engaged in by *any* persons” involved in a campaign “conducted by . . . *any* person seeking nomination or election . . . for the office of the President of the United States” during the “Presidential election of 1972.” S. Res. 60, 119 Cong. Rec. 3255, 93rd Cong. § 1(a) (1973) (emphasis added). In *Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon*, our court was asked to decide whether President Nixon had “a legal duty to comply with” a subpoena issued by the Senate Watergate Committee for “taped recordings of five conversations . . . discussing alleged criminal acts.” 498 F.2d 725, 726-27, 162 U.S. App. D.C. 183 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (en banc). President Nixon, apparently taking no issue with the general power of congressional committees to subpoena sitting Presidents, instead asserted executive privilege over the individual tapes requested, arguing that they “[could] [not be made public consistent with the confidentiality essential to the functioning of the Office of the President.” *Id.* at 727 (internal quotation marks omitted). In the end, we agreed with the President: although the “presumptive[] privilege[]” protecting

Appendix A

“presidential conversations” could “be overcome . . . by an appropriate showing of public need,” *id.* at 730 (internal quotation marks omitted), we explained, the Committee had failed to make such a showing “in the peculiar circumstances of [that] case,” *id.* at 733. But even though the Senate Watergate Committee ultimately lost, *Senate Select Committee* strongly implies that Presidents enjoy no blanket immunity from congressional subpoenas. After all, if such immunity exists, it would have been wholly unnecessary for the court to explore the subpoena’s particulars and to weigh “the public interest [in] favor[] [of] confidentiality” against a “showing of need by another institution of government”—that is, Congress. *Id.* at 730.

All told, from Congress’s centuries-long experience issuing legislative subpoenas, and the courts’ (somewhat less frequent) experience reviewing them, a few principles emerge—principles that control our resolution of this case.

As an initial matter, “whether [a] committee [is] authorized [to] exact the information” it has subpoenaed “must first be settled before . . . consider[ing] whether Congress had the [constitutional] power to confer upon the committee the authority which it claim[s].” *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 42-43. In other words, it matters not whether the Constitution would give Congress authority to issue a subpoena if Congress has given the issuing committee no such authority.

That said, once a committee has been delegated “[t]he power of the Congress to conduct investigations,” that constitutional authority “is broad.” *Watkins*, 354

Appendix A

U.S. at 187; *accord Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 504 n.15 (“[T]he power to investigate is necessarily broad.”); *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 111 (describing Congress’s investigative power as “broad”); *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 160, 75 S. Ct. 668, 99 L. Ed. 964 (1955) (same); *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 173-74 (same). “It encompasses inquiries concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes,” “[i]t includes surveys of defects in our social, economic or political system for the purpose of enabling the Congress to remedy them,” and “[i]t comprehends probes into departments of the Federal Government to expose corruption, inefficiency or waste.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187. In short, “[a] legislative inquiry may be as broad, as searching, and as exhaustive as is necessary to make effective the constitutional powers of Congress.” *Townsend v. United States*, 95 F.2d 352, 361 (D.C. Cir. 1938). Expansive as it is, however, Congress’s subpoena power is subject to several key constraints.

First, because “the power of Congress . . . to investigate” is “co-extensive with [its] power to legislate,” *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 160, Congress may in exercising its investigative power neither usurp the other branches’ constitutionally designated functions nor violate individuals’ constitutionally protected rights. Congress may not conduct itself as “a law enforcement or trial agency,” as “[t]hese are functions of the executive and judicial departments.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187. And Congress lacks any “general power to expose where the predominant result can only be an invasion of the private rights of individuals.” *Id.* at 200.

Appendix A

Next, precisely because “[t]he scope of [Congress’s] power of inquiry . . . is as penetrating and far-reaching as the potential power to enact and appropriate under the Constitution,” *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 111, Congress may investigate only those topics on which it could legislate, *see Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161 (stating that Congress’s “power to investigate” does not “extend to an area in which Congress is forbidden to legislate”). If no constitutional statute may be enacted on a subject matter, then that subject is off-limits to congressional investigators.

And finally, congressional committees may subpoena only information “calculated to” “materially aid[]” their investigations. *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177. Even a valid legislative purpose cannot justify a subpoena demanding irrelevant material.

With these principles in mind, we proceed to the particulars of this case. The Trump Plaintiffs dispute both the Committee’s authority from the House to issue the subpoena and the House’s authority under the Constitution to confer the same. For reasons that shall become clear later, we address these questions in reverse order.

III.

At the outset, we emphasize that to resolve this case we need not decide whether the Constitution permits Congress, in the conduct of a legislative—that is, non-impeachment—investigation, to issue subpoenas to a sitting President. That issue is not presented here because, quite simply, the Oversight Committee has *not*

Appendix A

subpoenaed President Trump. Rather, the Committee has issued its subpoena to Mazars, an accounting firm with whom President Trump has voluntarily shared records from his time as a private citizen, as a candidate, and as President. Neither the Trump Plaintiffs nor the Department of Justice argues that the Constitution denies Congress authority to subpoena non-governmental custodians of the President's financial information. *Cf.* Oral Arg. Tr. 50 (stating that assuming a committee has authority from the House to issue a subpoena, the relevant inquiry is whether “the subpoena ha[s] a legitimate legislative purpose”); *id.* at 68 (denying that the President is “absolutely immune from any oversight whatsoever”); Department Br. 7-8. Nor do the Trump Plaintiffs assert any property rights in, or executive or other recognized evidentiary privilege over, the subpoenaed information. *See* Complaint (failing to assert any claim of privilege or property right in the subpoenaed materials); Oral Arg. Tr. 15 (confirming that the President asserts no claim of executive privilege or immunity); *see also Couch v. United States*, 409 U.S. 322, 335, 93 S. Ct. 611, 34 L. Ed. 2d 548 (1973) (recognizing that “no confidential accountant-client privilege exists under federal law, and no state-created privilege has been recognized in federal cases”); *Peerenboom v. Marvel Entertainment, LLC*, 148 A.D.3d 531, 532, 50 N.Y.S.3d 49 (N.Y. App. Div. 1st Dep’t 2017) (holding that “[t]here is no accountant-client privilege in [New York]”). Instead, the Trump Plaintiffs ask us to do what courts have done ever since *Kilbourn*: to determine “[w]hether the Committee’s subpoena . . . is ‘related to, and in furtherance of, a legitimate task of the Congress.’” Appellants’ Br. 5 (quoting *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187); *see also* Department Br. 10 (quoting same).

Appendix A

Taking up that question, we consider whether the Oversight Committee is pursuing a legislative, as opposed to a law-enforcement, objective; whether the Committee is investigating a subject on which constitutional legislation “could be had,” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177; and whether the challenged subpoena seeks information sufficiently relevant to the Committee’s legislative inquiry.

A.

While “[t]he power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process,” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187, that authority “must not be confused with any of the powers of law enforcement,” which “are assigned under our Constitution to the Executive and the Judiciary,” *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161. The Trump Plaintiffs contend that the Committee has crossed this constitutional line, veering from permissible legislative investigation into impermissible law enforcement. In assessing whether Congress has strayed outside its legislative lane, we face two analytical hurdles.

First, the case law is quite stingy in describing what impermissible congressional law enforcement might look like in practice. The Supreme Court has framed its primary instruction on this point in the negative: the fact that an investigation might expose criminal conduct does not transform a legislative inquiry into a law-enforcement endeavor. As the Court explained in *Sinclair*, Congress’s “authority . . . to require pertinent disclosures in aid of its own constitutional power is not abridged” merely “because the information sought to be elicited may also

Appendix A

be of use” in criminal prosecutions. 279 U.S. at 295. “Nor [is] it a valid objection,” said the Court in *McGrain*, that an investigation “might possibly disclose crime or wrongdoing.” 273 U.S. at 179-80. Indeed, thanks to the Court’s clarity on this matter, all parties here agree that “a permissible legislative investigation does not become impermissible merely because it might expose law violations.” Appellants’ Br. 33 (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also* Appellee’s Br. 44 (“The fact that the . . . underlying conduct might also be unlawful . . . does not invalidate the inquiry.”).

Second, the Supreme Court has made plain that “in determining the legitimacy of a congressional act,” courts may “not look to the motives alleged to have prompted it.” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508; *see also* *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200 (stating that “a solution to our problem is not to be found in testing the motives of committee members for [legislative] purpose”); *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 132 (“So long as Congress acts in pursuance of its constitutional power, the Judiciary lacks authority to intervene on the basis of the motives which spurred the exercise of that power.”). This is true both because “it is not for [the courts] to speculate as to the motivations that may have prompted the decision of individual [committee] members,” *Wilkinson v. United States*, 365 U.S. 399, 412, 81 S. Ct. 567, 5 L. Ed. 2d 633 (1961), and because, in any event, those “motives alone would not vitiate an investigation which had been instituted by a House of Congress if that assembly’s legislative purpose is being served,” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200. On this point, too, the parties agree. *See* Appellants’ Reply Br. 11 (“To determine whether a

Appendix A

subpoena is pursuing [the] impermissible goal” of law enforcement, “courts . . . cannot delve into legislators’ hidden motives”); Appellee’s Br. 43 (“[C]ourts cannot examine Congress’s motives to determine the validity of a subpoena.”).

Thus stranded between Charybdis and Scylla, we must determine whether Congress’s “legislative purpose is being served,” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200, without taking into account either whether the investigation *will reveal*, or whether the investigators are *motivated to reveal*, criminal conduct. According to the Committee, the way out of this dilemma is simple: just “presume Congress is acting in furtherance of its constitutional responsibility to legislate and . . . defer to congressional judgments about what Congress needs to carry out that purpose.” Appellee’s Br. 46 (quoting *Trump*, 380 F. Supp. 3d at 82). In most cases, such a presumption would be entirely appropriate. As the Court instructed in *Tenney v. Brandhove*, “[t]o find that a committee’s investigation has exceeded the bounds of legislative power it must be *obvious* that there was a usurpation of functions exclusively vested in the Judiciary or the Executive,” 341 U.S. 367, 378, 71 S. Ct. 783, 95 L. Ed. 1019 (1951) (emphasis added); or, as it said in *McGrain*, even absent an “express avowal” by Congress that the purpose of an “investigation was to aid it in legislating,” “the presumption should be indulged that this was the real object,” 273 U.S. at 178.

The trouble, however, is that this deferential presumption finds its roots in the principle that “every reasonable indulgence of legality must be accorded to

Appendix A

the actions of a coordinate branch of our Government,” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 204, and here, we arguably confront not one but two “coordinate branch[es] of our Government”—Congress and the President. We say “arguably” because it is far from obvious that President Trump, proceeding in his individual capacity, carries the mantle of the Office of the President in this case. The challenged subpoena seeks financial records totally unrelated to any of the President’s official actions; indeed, for six of the eight years covered by the subpoena, President Trump was merely Mr. Trump or Candidate Trump. *Cf. Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 697, 117 S. Ct. 1636, 137 L. Ed. 2d 945 (1997) (“[W]e have never suggested that the President . . . has an immunity that extends beyond the scope of any action taken in an official capacity.”). That said, the fact remains that the constitutional authority assigned to the Office of the President can be exercised only by the flesh-and-blood human occupying that office, so as a practical matter, a restriction on the person might constrain the branch of government. *Cf. In re Lindsey*, 158 F.3d 1263, 1286, 332 U.S. App. D.C. 357 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (“Because the Presidency is tied so tightly to the persona of its occupant[,] . . . official matters . . . often have personal implications for a President” and vice versa.) (Tatel, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). In short, although the challenged subpoena, which seeks financial documents related to President Trump in his pre-presidential, private capacities, presents no direct inter-branch dispute, separation-of-powers concerns still linger in the air. *Cf. United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 702, 94 S. Ct. 3090, 41 L. Ed. 2d 1039 (1974) (explaining that where a pretrial “subpoena is directed to a President

Appendix A

of the United States, appellate review, in deference to a coordinate branch of Government, should be particularly meticulous”).

Assuming for the moment that we owe Congress no deference, we must figure out how to assess whether the subpoena serves “a valid legislative purpose,” *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 127, without resorting to the “presumption” “that [legislation] was the real object” of Congress’s investigation, *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178. The Trump Plaintiffs, arguing that “‘purpose’ and ‘motive’” are different, suggest that we may rely upon “available evidence”—that is, “what [the Committee] is doing and what it has stated publicly”—to “discern for [ourselves] what the Committee’s *actual* purpose is.” Appellants’ Br. 29-30. Following that course, we conclude that the public record reveals legitimate legislative pursuits, not an impermissible law-enforcement purpose, behind the Committee’s subpoena. As a result, we need not decide precisely what deference we owe Congress, as we would reach the same conclusion absent any deference at all.

We start with Chairman Cummings’s April 12 memorandum, in which he laid out the “need for [the] subpoena” issued to Mazars. Cummings Memo 1. As the document most closely tied in time and subject matter to the subpoena, that memorandum offers a natural starting point for our analysis. *Cf. Shelton v. United States*, 404 F.2d 1292, 1297, 131 U.S. App. D.C. 315 (D.C. Cir. 1968) (identifying “the opening statement of the Chairman at [committee] hearings” and the “statements of the members of the committee” as “sources [that might] indicate the

Appendix A

existence of a legislative purpose” (quoting *Wilkinson*, 365 U.S. at 410)). The Trump Plaintiffs and the Committee appear to agree, as does the dissent. *See* Appellee’s Br. 30-31 (relying on Chairman Cummings’s memorandum to supply a list of the subjects of the Committee’s investigations); Appellants’ Reply Br. 20-21 (dismissing as “retroactive rationalizations” potential legislative purposes that did not “appear[] in the Chairman’s memorandum” (alterations and internal quotation marks omitted)); Dissenting Op. at 2 (tracing the “reasons” for the subpoena to Chairman Cummings’s Memo).

Chairman Cummings’s memorandum identifies four questions that the subpoena will help answer: “whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office,” “whether [the President] has undisclosed conflicts of interest that may impair his ability to make impartial policy decisions,” “whether [the President] is complying with the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution,” and “whether [the President] has accurately reported his finances to the Office of Government Ethics and other federal entities.” Cummings Memo 4. But even more important than this list, the Chairman’s very next sentence explains that “[t]he Committee’s interest in these matters informs [the Committee’s] review of multiple laws and legislative proposals under [its] jurisdiction.” *Id.* Such an “express avowal of the [Committee’s] object” offers strong evidence of the Committee’s legislative purpose. *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178.

The April memorandum does not stand alone. Just two months earlier, Chairman Cummings articulated the same

Appendix A

remedial legislative objective in his letter to White House Counsel. In that letter, he explained that obtaining the requested financial documents would “help the Committee determine why the President failed to report . . . payments and whether reforms are necessary to address deficiencies with current laws, rules, and regulations.” Cummings Feb. 15 Letter 9. “Since the earliest days of our republic,” the Chairman emphasized, “Congress has investigated how existing laws are being implemented and whether changes to the laws are necessary.” *Id.* And “[f]or decades,” he concluded, “this has included laws relating to financial disclosures required of the President.” *Id.*

What’s more, although the House is under no obligation to enact legislation after every investigation, the fact that the House has pending several pieces of legislation related to the Committee’s inquiry offers highly probative evidence of the Committee’s legislative purpose. *See In re Chapman*, 166 U.S. 661, 670, 17 S. Ct. 677, 41 L. Ed. 1154 (1897) (“[I]t is certainly not necessary” to identify future legislation “in advance.”); *see also Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 509 (“The very nature of the investigative function—like any research—is that it takes the searchers up some ‘blind alleys’ and into nonproductive enterprises.”). The House has already passed one such bill, H.R. 1, which requires Presidents to list on their financial disclosures the liabilities and assets of any “corporation, company, firm, partnership, or other business enterprise in which” they or their immediate family have “a significant financial interest.” H.R. 1, 116th Cong. § 8012 (2019). Another bill currently pending, H.R. 706, would require both sitting Presidents and presidential candidates to “submit to the

Appendix A

Federal Election Commission a copy of the individual's income tax returns" for the preceding nine or ten years, respectively. H.R. 706, 116th Cong. § 222 (2019). And still another, H.R. 745, would amend the Ethics in Government Act to make the Director of the Office of Government Ethics removable only for cause. *See* H.R. 745, 116th Cong. § 3 (2019) (making the Director "subject to removal only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office").

Despite these indicia of legislative purpose, the Trump Plaintiffs contend that "[t]he subpoena's *actual* purpose is law enforcement." Appellants' Reply Br. 9 (emphasis added). They make four principal arguments.

First, the Trump Plaintiffs question whether the Committee's avowals of legislative purpose are genuine. Quoting our court's opinion in *Shelton v. United States*, they argue that "Congress cannot cure [a] constitutional violation through 'the mere assertion of a need to consider remedial legislation.'" Appellants' Br. 34 (quoting *Shelton*, 404 F.2d at 1297). But the Trump Plaintiffs stop at a key conjunction. "[T]he mere assertion of a need to consider 'remedial legislation' may not alone justify an investigation," we explained in *Shelton*. 404 F.2d at 1297. "[B]ut," we continued, "when the purpose asserted is supported by references to specific problems which in the past have been or which in the future could be the subjects of appropriate legislation, then we cannot say that a committee of the Congress exceeds its broad power." *Id.* (emphasis added).

Appendix A

That is just this case. We do not confront an insubstantial, makeweight assertion of remedial purpose. To the contrary, Chairman Cummings’s April 12 memorandum to his colleagues lists four investigative topics; his March 20 letter to Mazars details several “specific concerns raised by the [firm’s] financial statements,” Cummings Mar. 20 Letter 2; and his February 15 letter to White House Counsel states his intent to assess whether “changes to the laws . . . relating to financial disclosures required of the President” “are necessary,” Cummings Feb. 15 Letter 9. These “references to specific problems,” *Shelton*, 404 F.2d at 1297, together with actual legislation now pending, *see supra* at 26-27, are more than sufficient to demonstrate the Committee’s interest in investigating possible remedial legislation.

Second, the Trump Plaintiffs contend that, far from “avow[ing]” a legislative intent, *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178, Chairman Cummings’s memorandum and statements by other Representatives have “affirmatively and definitely avowed an unlawful law-enforcement purpose,” Appellants’ Reply Br. 13 (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also* Dissenting Op. at 43. In particular, the Trump Plaintiffs take issue with the first investigative rationale offered in Chairman Cummings’s memorandum: “to investigate whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office.” Cummings Memo 4. But even if such an investigation would not by itself serve a legitimate legislative purpose, we can easily reject the suggestion that this rationale spoils the Committee’s otherwise valid legislative inquiry. Simply put, an interest in past illegality can be wholly consistent with an intent to enact remedial legislation.

Appendix A

Take *Hutcheson v. United States*, in which the Court considered the activities of a Senate committee tasked with “investigat[ing] . . . the extent to which criminal . . . practices or activities” were occurring “in the field of labor-management relations” and “determin[ing] whether any changes [were] required in the laws . . . to protect . . . against . . . such practices or activities.” 369 U.S. 599, 600-01, 82 S. Ct. 1005, 8 L. Ed. 2d 137 (1962) (quoting S. Res. 74, 85th Cong. (1957)). The president of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, called before the committee to testify regarding whether he had used “union funds . . . to ‘fix’ a 1957 criminal investigation . . . by a state grand jury,” *id.* at 603, refused to answer such questions and was convicted of criminal contempt, *see id.* at 605. Even though “[t]he Committee’s concern . . . was to discover whether . . . [union] funds . . . had been used . . . to bribe a state prosecutor,” and even though “[i]f these suspicions were founded, they might . . . have warranted a separate state prosecution for obstruction of justice,” the Supreme Court nonetheless affirmed the contempt conviction. *Id.* at 617-18. What mattered to the Court was that the committee’s investigation into the details of the defendant’s illegal conduct “would have supported remedial federal legislation for the future.” *Id.* at 617. “[S]urely,” the Court concluded, “a congressional committee . . . engaged in a legitimate legislative investigation need not grind to a halt whenever . . . crime or wrongdoing is disclosed.” *Id.* at 618 (internal citations omitted).

Sinclair teaches a similar lesson. Shortly before the Senate summoned the oil tycoon Sinclair to testify, it had passed a joint resolution “recit[ing] that [his company’s] leases . . . were executed under circumstances

Appendix A

indicating fraud and corruption” and “direct[ing] the President . . . to prosecute such . . . proceedings, civil and criminal, as were warranted by the facts.” 279 U.S. at 289. When Sinclair appeared for the hearing, the Senate committee considered but rejected a motion that would have prohibited “inquir[ies] . . . relat[ing] to pending controversies before any of the Federal courts in which Mr. Sinclair [was] a defendant.” *Id.* at 290. “If we do not examine Mr. Sinclair about those matters,” one committee member lamented, “there is not anything else to examine him about.” *Id.* Despite all this, the Court held that “[t]he record [did] not sustain [Sinclair’s] contention that the investigation was avowedly not in aid of legislation.” *Id.* at 295. The failed motion and the member’s statement were “not enough to show that the committee intended to depart from the purpose to ascertain whether additional legislation might be advisable,” explained the Court, because “[i]t [was] plain that investigation of the matters involved in” pending or future “suits . . . might directly aid in respect of legislative action.” *Id.*

So too here. Like the committees in *Hutcheson* and *Sinclair*, the Oversight Committee has expressed an interest in determining whether and how illegal conduct has occurred. But also like the committees in *Hutcheson* and *Sinclair*—indeed, even more so—the Oversight Committee has repeatedly professed that it seeks to investigate remedial legislation. In fact, the House has even put its legislation where its mouth is: it has passed one bill pertaining to the information sought in the subpoenas and is considering several others. *See supra* at 26-27. The Committee’s interest in alleged misconduct, therefore, is in direct furtherance of its legislative purpose.

Appendix A

Third, the Trump Plaintiffs argue that the subpoena’s “laser-focus[] on the businesses and finances of one person” evinces “a particularity that is the hallmark of executive and judicial power.” Appellants’ Br. 35. But again, Supreme Court precedent forecloses this contention. In *McGrain*, for example, the Senate authorized a select committee “to investigate . . . the alleged failure of Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute properly violators of” anti-trust laws and “further directed [the committee] to inquire into, investigate and report . . . the activities of the said Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General, and any of his assistants . . . which would in any manner tend to impair their efficiency or influence as representatives of the government of the United States.” 273 U.S. at 151-52 (internal quotation marks omitted). Untroubled by the resolution’s “direct reference to the then Attorney General by name,” the Court held that “the resolution and proceedings” of the investigatory committee “g[a]ve no warrant for thinking the Senate was attempting or intending to try the Attorney General . . . before its committee for any crime or wrongdoing.” *Id.* at 179.

The lesson of *McGrain* is that an investigation may properly focus on one individual if that individual’s conduct offers a valid point of departure for remedial legislation. Again, such is the case here. It is not at all suspicious that the Committee would focus an investigation into presidential financial disclosures on the accuracy and sufficiency of the sitting President’s filings. That the Committee began its inquiry at a logical starting point betrays no hidden law-enforcement purpose.

Appendix A

Finally, the Trump Plaintiffs detect something untoward in the Committee's interest in the President's finances. "If this subpoena is valid," they argue, "then Congress is free to investigate every detail of a President's personal life, with endless subpoenas to his accountants, bankers, lawyers, doctors, family, friends, and anyone else with information that a committee finds interesting." Appellants' Reply Br. 24.

But unlike a subpoena to, say, a doctor or an attorney, the congressional request at issue in this case implicates no material subject to a recognized legal privilege or an asserted property interest. *See supra* at 20. Moreover, as the Court explained in *Sinclair*, although Congress may not make "unauthorized, arbitrary or unreasonable inquiries" into individuals' "personal and private affairs," Congress most assuredly does possess authority "to require pertinent disclosures in aid of its . . . constitutional power" when those affairs become a "matter of [public] concern" amenable to a legislative solution. 279 U.S. at 292, 294-95; *see also Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 127 (explaining that "Congress may . . . constitutionally require an individual to disclose his political relationships or other private affairs" if "in relation to" "a valid legislative purpose"). The same rationale applies here. Whether current financial disclosure laws are successfully eliciting the right information from the sitting President, occupant of the highest elected office in the land, is undoubtedly "a matter of concern to the United States." *Sinclair*, 279 U.S. at 294; *cf. Washington Post Co. v. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services*, 690 F.2d 252, 265, 223 U.S. App. D.C. 139 (D.C. Cir. 1982) ("[T]he [Ethics in

Appendix A

Government] Act shows Congress' general belief that public disclosure of conflicts of interest is desirable despite its cost in loss of personal privacy.”).

In its amicus brief, the Justice Department argues that the subpoena is invalid for still another reason, namely that the House (or at least the Committee) failed to offer a “clear, *specific* statement . . . of the legislative purpose that it believes justifies its subpoena.” Department Br. 12 (emphasis added). In the Department’s view, general indicia of legislative purpose are not enough; the House must identify “with sufficient particularity the subject matter of potential legislation.” *Id.* at 14. In support, the Department cites *Watkins*, where, it argues, “the Supreme Court demanded just such a clear statement of purpose.” *Id.* at 13. But the *Watkins* Court demanded no such thing. That case concerned not the legitimacy of an investigative subpoena, but rather an appeal of a criminal conviction for contempt of Congress under 2 U.S.C. § 192, which makes it a misdemeanor to refuse to answer any question posed by a member of Congress “pertinent to the question under inquiry.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 207 (quoting 2 U.S.C. § 192). Because the committee’s “authorizing resolution, the remarks of the chairman or members of the committee, [and] even the nature of the proceedings themselves,” *id.* at 209, failed to articulate “the ‘question under inquiry,’” *id.* at 214, the Court reversed the conviction, holding that an individual risking criminal contempt must “have knowledge of the subject to which the interrogation is deemed pertinent . . . with the same degree of explicitness and clarity that the Due Process Clause requires in the expression of any element of a

Appendix A

criminal offense.” *Id.* at 208-09. The fact that the *Watkins* Court probed the committee’s statements in an attempt to remedy “the vice of vagueness”—present for criminal contempt of Congress, “as in all other crimes,” *id.* at 209—provides no support for the Department’s contention that Congress must identify its legislative purpose “with sufficient particularity” in order to justify an investigative subpoena. *See Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 123 (explaining that in *Watkins*, the Court “rest[ed] [its] decision on [the] ground” that “a conviction for contempt under 2 U.S.C. § 192 cannot stand unless the questions asked are pertinent to the subject matter of the investigation”).

Far from finding support in *Watkins*, the Department’s argument conflicts with binding Supreme Court precedent. Over a century ago, the Court made clear in *In re Chapman* that it is “certainly not necessary that the resolutions should declare in advance what the [Congress] meditate[s] doing when the investigation [i]s concluded.” 166 U.S. at 670. The Court has twice reiterated this holding, stating in *McGrain* that “it was not essential that the Senate declare in advance what it meditated doing,” 273 U.S. at 172, and then in *Eastland*—issued nearly two decades after *Watkins*—that “to be a valid legislative inquiry there need be no predictable end result,” 421 U.S. at 509. After all, the purpose of an investigation, as the Court explained in *McGrain*, is to gather “information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change,” 273 U.S. at 174-75; it is, as the Court added in *Eastland*, “research” that informs future Congressional action, 421 U.S. at 509. Congress’s decision whether, and if so how, to legislate in a particular area

Appendix A

will necessarily depend on what information it discovers in the course of an investigation, and its preferred path forward may shift as members educate themselves on the relevant facts and circumstances. Requiring Congress to state “with sufficient particularity” the legislation it is considering *before* it issues an investigative subpoena would turn the legislative process on its head.

Moreover, it is not at all clear what such a statement would accomplish. The Department suggests that a clear statement rule is “mandate[d]” by the “particular separation-of-powers issues that arise when Congress attempts to compel the President to produce information.” Department Br. 9. Setting aside the fact that this subpoena, which is addressed to Mazars, “compel[s] the President to produce” nothing, we still see no justification in the Department’s brief for why specificity is required in this scenario as opposed to any other. To be sure, “[t]he President occupies a unique position in the constitutional scheme.” *Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 731, 749, 102 S. Ct. 2690, 73 L. Ed. 2d 349 (1982). But that unique position has little bearing on our ability to determine whether Congress has strayed from the realm of legitimate legislation into improper law enforcement—an inquiry that, as we have just demonstrated, we can meaningfully conduct without the specific articulation the Department seeks. Nor does the Department explain how specificity would meaningfully protect the President beyond simply burdening Congress’s exercise of its own Article I power.

The Department’s argument also ignores how much Congress has already revealed about its legislative

Appendix A

objectives. In his February 15 letter and April 12 memorandum, Chairman Cummings explained that the Committee was reviewing “multiple laws and legislative proposals under [its] jurisdiction,” Cummings Memo 4, including whether “changes . . . are necessary” to “laws relating to financial disclosures required of the President,” Cummings Feb. 15 Letter 9. The House has already passed H.R. 1, which would require Presidents to disclose businesses in which they or their immediate families have significant interests, and is considering legislation which would require Presidential candidates and Presidents to submit their income tax returns to the Federal Election Commission and make the Director of the Office of Government Ethics removable only for cause. *See supra* at 26-27. To be sure, as the Department points out, the House passed H.R. 1 without the information the subpoena seeks. But House passage is far from the end of the legislative process. Information revealed by the subpoena could inform the Senate as it considers the bill, as well as any subsequent conference committee or the House itself, should it reconsider the bill post-conference.

Based on all the foregoing, we conclude that in issuing the challenged subpoena, the Committee was engaged in a “legitimate legislative investigation,” *Hutcheson*, 369 U.S. at 618, rather than an impermissible law-enforcement inquiry. We next assess whether that legislative investigation concerned a subject “on which legislation could be had.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177.

*Appendix A***B.**

Because “Congress may only investigate into those areas in which it may potentially legislate or appropriate,” *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 111, a congressional committee may issue only those subpoenas that are “intended to gather information about a subject on which legislation may be had,” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508; *see also McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177 (stating that “the subject” of investigation “was one on which legislation could be had”). The Trump Plaintiffs argue that the challenged subpoena fails this test because, in their view, “[t]he subpoena could not result in valid legislation regarding the President.” Appellants’ Reply Br. 17.

In addressing this argument, we emphasize that the relevant inquiry is whether legislation “*may* be had,” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508 (emphasis added), not whether constitutional legislation *will* be had. Accordingly, we first define the universe of possible legislation that the subpoena provides “information about,” *id.*, and then consider whether Congress could constitutionally enact any of those potential statutes.

We must, however, tread carefully. As the Committee points out, our limited judicial role gives us no authority to reach out and “[s]trik[e] down a statute before it is even enacted.” Appellee’s Br. 41; *see also Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway v. Wallace*, 288 U.S. 249, 262, 53 S. Ct. 345, 77 L. Ed. 730 (1933) (explaining that courts may not make “abstract determination[s] . . . of the validity of a statute” or issue “decision[s] advising

Appendix A

what the law would be on an uncertain or hypothetical state of facts”). That said, as the Trump Plaintiffs observe, *see* Appellants’ Br. 21 (“[b]ecause valid legislation could not ‘be had’ if it would be unconstitutional, the court ha[s] to decide whether this subpoena is designed to advance unconstitutional legislation”), the only way to determine whether the Committee’s investigation informs “a subject on which legislation may be had” is to ask, abstract as the inquiry may be, whether “legislation *may* be had” on that “subject,” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508 (emphasis added). Although we must avoid passing on the constitutionality of hypothetical statutes, we must also fulfill our responsibility to decide the case in front of us, even if the road to resolution passes through an issue of constitutional law. *See Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 404, 5 L. Ed. 257 (1821) (“The judiciary cannot, as the legislature may, avoid a measure because it approaches the confines of the [C]onstitution. . . . [W]e must decide [a case] if it be brought before us.”). Accordingly, in order to resolve *this* case, we need to identify a statutory litmus test. The Committee and the Trump Plaintiffs each offer one, but neither quite fits our needs.

The Committee urges us to consider whether any law “concerning government ethics and conflicts of interest affecting Executive Branch officials” could pass constitutional muster. Appellee’s Br. 30. But this test is too broad. The challenged subpoena—or, more specifically, the portion of the subpoena that seeks a sitting President’s financial information—would produce no relevant “information about,” *id.*, laws that apply to ordinary Executive Branch employees. Because “[t]he

Appendix A

President occupies a unique position in the constitutional scheme,” *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 749, Congress’s constitutional authority to regulate the President’s conduct is significantly more circumscribed than its power to regulate that of other federal employees, *see supra* at 35-36. Just as a congressional committee could not subpoena the President’s high school transcripts in service of an investigation into K-12 education, nor subpoena his medical records as part of an investigation into public health, it may not subpoena his financial information except to facilitate an investigation into *presidential* finances. Thus, to determine whether the records of pre-Candidate, Candidate, and President Trump provide “information about a subject on which legislation may be had,” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508, we must train our attention on laws that apply to Presidents (and presidential hopefuls).

In that vein, the Trump Plaintiffs urge us to focus on the constitutionality of laws that “impose conflict-of-interest restrictions on the President.” Appellants’ Br. 37. As the Trump Plaintiffs point out, such restrictions raise difficult constitutional questions. Statutes mandating divestment from financial interests or recusal from conflicted matters might impermissibly “disempower [Presidents] from performing some of the functions prescribed [by] the Constitution or . . . establish a qualification for . . . serving as President . . . beyond those contained in the Constitution.” Memorandum from Laurence H. Silberman, Deputy Attorney General, to Richard T. Burrell, Office of the President, Re: Conflict of Interest Problems Arising out of the President’s Nomination of Nelson A. Rockefeller

Appendix A

to be Vice President Under the Twenty-Fifth Amendment to the Constitution 5 (Aug. 28, 1974) (“Silberman Memo”). But we need not grapple with those constitutional issues because the Mazars subpoena seeks information related to a class of statutes that impose far fewer burdens than laws requiring Presidents to change their behavior based on their financial holdings. This less burdensome species of law would require the President to do nothing more than *disclose* financial information. Such statutes might amend the Ethics in Government Act, for example, to require Presidents and presidential candidates to file reports more frequently, to include information covering a longer period of time, or to provide new kinds of information such as past financial dealings with foreign businesses or current liabilities of closely held companies. We take this category of statutes as the appropriate object of our litmus test in this case.

The Trump Plaintiffs argue that the Constitution prohibits even these. Relying on Chief Justice Burger’s concurrence in *Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, they contend that financial disclosure laws unconstitutionally “impinge[] on and hence interfere[] with the independence that is imperative to the functioning of the office of a President.” Appellants’ Br. 44 (quoting *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 761 (Burger, C.J., concurring)).

But that is not the rule—at least not quite. As the Court explained in *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services* (*Nixon II*), the mere act of “regulat[ing] . . . Presidential materials,” “without more,” does not “constitute[] . . . a violation of the principle of separation of powers.” 433

Appendix A

U.S. 425, 441, 97 S. Ct. 2777, 53 L. Ed. 2d 867 (1977). Instead, rejecting “the argument that the Constitution contemplates a complete division of authority between the three branches,” the Court reaffirmed its reliance on “the more pragmatic, flexible approach of Madison in the Federalist[] Papers.” *Id.* at 442-43. “In . . . dividing and allocating the sovereign power among three coequal branches,” the Court explained, “the Framers of the Constitution” did not intend “the separate powers . . . to operate with absolute independence.” *Id.* at 443 (internal quotation marks and emphasis omitted). The Court therefore announced the following test: “in determining whether [a statute] disrupts the proper balance between the coordinate branches, the proper inquiry focuses on the extent to which it prevents the Executive Branch from accomplishing its constitutionally assigned functions.” *Id.* Applying this rule, we have no basis for concluding that complying with financial disclosure laws would in any way “prevent[] the [President] from accomplishing [his] constitutionally assigned functions.” *Id.*

The most persuasive evidence on this score comes from the Constitution itself. The very same document that “vest[s]” “[t]he executive Power . . . in [the] President,” U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 1, and directs him to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” *id.* art. II, § 3, also imposes two separate requirements pertaining to the President’s private finances. The first, the so-called Domestic Emoluments Clause, prohibits the President from receiving “any . . . Emolument” from the federal or state governments other than a fixed “Compensation” “for his Services.” *Id.* art. II, § 1, cl. 7. And the second,

Appendix A

the so-called Foreign Emoluments Clause, prohibits any federal official “holding any Office of Profit or Trust”—the President included—from “accept[ing] . . . any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State” without “the Consent of the Congress.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 8; *see also* Applicability of the Emoluments Clause & the Foreign Gifts & Decorations Act to the President’s Receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize, O.L.C., 2009 OLC LEXIS 18, 2009 WL 6365082, at *4 (Dec. 7, 2009) (“The President surely ‘hold[s] an[] Office of Profit or Trust’” (alterations in original) (quoting U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 8)). If the President may accept no domestic emoluments and must seek Congress’s permission before accepting any foreign emoluments, then surely a statute facilitating the disclosure of such payments lies within constitutional limits.

The United States Code, too, provides ample precedent for laws that regulate Presidents’ finances and records. *Cf. Nixon II*, 433 U.S. at 445 (noting the “abundant statutory precedent for the regulation and mandatory disclosure of documents in the possession of the Executive Branch”). The Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act requires all federal employees, including the President, to “file a statement” regarding any gift they receive “of more than minimal value.” 5 U.S.C. § 7342(c). The STOCK Act prohibits all “executive branch employees,” including the President, from “us[ing] nonpublic information derived from such person’s position . . . as a means for making a private profit.” Pub. L. No. 112-105, §§ 2, 9, 126 Stat. 291, 291, 297. And the Presidential Records Act—whose

Appendix A

constitutionality the Trump Plaintiffs readily concede—establishes a whole statutory scheme for “categoriz[ing],” “fil[ing],” “dispos[ing]” of, and “manag[ing]” “Presidential records.” 44 U.S.C. § 2203; *see* Appellants’ Br. 40 (“The Presidential Records Act . . . did not cause a disruption of executive functions significant enough to trigger separation of powers analysis” (internal quotation marks omitted)). History discloses no evidence that these statutes have disrupted presidential functions.

The history of past Presidents’ financial disclosures offers a particularly useful guide. As explained above, *see supra* at 3-4, the Ethics in Government Act requires Presidents to file periodic reports detailing, among other things, “[t]he source, type, and [approximate] amount or value of income . . . from any [non-federal] source,” “[t]he identity and [approximate] value of . . . total liabilities owed,” and “the date . . . and [approximate] value of any purchase, sale or exchange [of real property and securities] during the preceding calendar year.” 5 U.S.C. app. 4 § 102(a). Every President to have served since the Ethics in Government Act became law in 1978—Presidents Carter, Reagan, H.W. Bush, Clinton, W. Bush, Obama, and now Trump—has complied with these disclosure requirements. *See, e.g.*, Philip Taubman, *Carter Drops ‘Blind Trust’ Secrecy and Divulges Finances for 1978-9*, N.Y. Times, May 31, 1979, at A1; Edward T. Pound, *Reagan’s Worth Put at \$4 Million*, N.Y. Times, Feb. 23, 1981, at A1; Associated Press, *President’s Trust Grows in Value*, N.Y. Times, May 15, 1992, at A17; Stephen Labaton, *Most of Clintons’ Wealth Held by Mrs. Clinton, Disclosure Form Shows*, N.Y. Times, May 18,

Appendix A

1994, at A20; Richard W. Stevenson, *Bushes' Assets Put at \$8.8 Million in Filing*, N.Y. Times, May 16, 2003, at A22; U.S. Office of Government Ethics, *Presidential and Vice Presidential Financial Disclosure Reports*, <https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/President%20and%20Vice%20President%20Index> (financial disclosure reports of Presidents Obama and Trump); *see also* Appellants' Br. 44 (acknowledging that "President [Trump] has voluntarily complied with those statutory requirements"). In fact, Presidents Carter, Reagan, H.W. Bush, Clinton, W. Bush, and Obama exceeded statutory disclosure requirements by releasing their personal federal income tax returns to the public. *See Presidential Tax Returns, TaxNotes*, taxnotes.com/presidential-tax-returns (collecting presidential tax records).

Of course, as the Trump Plaintiffs point out, "compliance is not the measure of constitutionality." Appellants' Br. 44. But when asked to decide whether an act of Congress "disrupts the proper balance between the coordinate branches," *Nixon II*, 433 U.S. at 443, a court would be foolish to ignore those branches' prior pattern of conflict—or, as here, cooperation. *See id.* at 441 (finding it significant that "[n]either President Ford nor President Carter support[ed] [former-President Nixon's] claim" that the challenged statute's "regulation of the disposition of Presidential materials . . . constitutes, without more, a violation of the principle of separation of powers"); *cf. Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, 135 S. Ct. 2076, 2091, 192 L. Ed. 2d 83 (2015) ("In separation-of-powers cases this Court has often 'put significant weight upon historical practice.'" (quoting *NLRB v. Noel Canning*, 573 U.S. 513, 524, 134 S.

Appendix A

Ct. 2550, 189 L. Ed. 2d 538 (2014))). Though not dispositive, the fact that every President during the last four decades has filed financial disclosures offers persuasive evidence that such disclosures neither “prevent[]” nor “disrupt[],” *Nixon II*, 433 U.S. at 443, the President’s efforts to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” U.S. Const. art. II, § 3.

To be sure, it is possible that some hypothetical statute could go too far. One could certainly imagine disclosure mandates so onerous that they begin to “prevent[] the Executive Branch from accomplishing its constitutionally assigned functions.” *Nixon II*, 433 U.S. at 443; *see, e.g.*, Oral Arg. Tr. 17 (positing “a statute [requiring] the President . . . to submit 100,000 pages of financial disclosures and [to] meet with Congress once a month to discuss them”). But to accept the Trump Plaintiffs’ suggestion that Congress may impose *no* disclosure requirements whatsoever on the President, *see* Oral Arg. Tr. 51-52 (stating it is “very difficult to think of” a constitutional law Congress “could pass” with respect to the President)—or, put another way, that the challenged subpoena could result in *no* valid legislation—would be to return to an “archaic view of the separation of powers” that “requir[es] three airtight departments of government,” *Nixon II*, 433 U.S. at 443 (internal quotation marks omitted). That is not the law.

Instead, “our constitutional system imposes upon the Branches a degree of overlapping responsibility, a duty of interdependence as well as independence[,] the absence of which ‘would preclude the establishment of a Nation capable of governing itself effectively.’” *Mistretta*

Appendix A

v. United States, 488 U.S. 361, 381, 109 S. Ct. 647, 102 L. Ed. 2d 714 (1989) (quoting *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 121, 96 S. Ct. 612, 46 L. Ed. 2d 659 (1976)). As the Supreme Court has observed, “separation of powers does not mean that the branches ‘ought to have no *partial agency* in, or no *controul* over, the acts of each other.” *Clinton*, 520 U.S. at 702-03 (quoting *The Federalist* No. 47, at 325-326 (J. Cooke ed.1961) (emphasis in original)); *see also Nixon II*, 433 U.S. at 442-43 & n.5 (affirming “the more pragmatic, flexible approach of Madison in the *Federalist Papers* and later of Mr. Justice Story” to the separation of powers); *Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 703 (“In designing the structure of our Government and dividing and allocating the sovereign power among three coequal branches, the Framers of the Constitution sought to provide a comprehensive system, but the separate powers were not intended to operate with absolute independence.”). As the *Nixon* cases teach, the “proper inquiry focuses on the extent to which [another branch’s actions] prevent[] the Executive branch from accomplishing its constitutionally assigned functions.” *Nixon II*, 433 U.S. at 443 (citing *Nixon*, 418 U.S. at 711-712). Congress can require the President to make reasonable financial disclosures without upsetting this balance.

The Trump Plaintiffs challenge the constitutionality of legislation that “may be had” on another basis. *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508. Drawing on the principle announced in *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 89 S. Ct. 1944, 23 L. Ed. 2d 491 (1969), and *United States Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 115 S. Ct. 1842, 131 L. Ed. 2d 881 (1995), that “[n]either Congress nor the states can add to

Appendix A

the constitutional qualifications for holding federal elective office,” *Walker v. United States*, 800 F.3d 720, 723-24 (6th Cir. 2015), they argue that imposing conflict-of-interest laws on the President would impermissibly “change or expand the qualifications for serving as President,” Appellants’ Br. 38 (citing *Powell* and *Thornton*). But once again, we need not reach this issue. Regardless of whether Congress may require Presidents to “eliminat[e] [their] financial conflicts” through divestment or recusal, the Trump Plaintiffs offer no reason to suspect that a statute requiring nothing more than *disclosure* of such conflicts might also “establish a qualification for . . . serving as President.” Appellants’ Br. 38 (quoting Silberman Memo 5). Financial disclosure laws would not, as in *Powell*, prevent a “duly elected” official from assuming office, 395 U.S. at 550, nor, as in *U.S. Term Limits*, add a term limit to “the exclusive qualifications set forth in the text of the Constitution,” 514 U.S. at 827; *cf.* Appellants’ Br. 39 (conceding that “[t]he Presidential Records Act does not add or alter the qualifications for office”). In the end, laws requiring disclosure exclude precisely zero individuals from running for or serving as President; regardless of their financial holdings, all constitutionally eligible candidates may apply.

In sum, we detect no inherent constitutional flaw in laws requiring Presidents to publicly disclose certain financial information. And that is enough. Without treading onto any other potentially fertile grounds from which constitutional legislation could flower, we conclude that given the constitutionally permissible options open to Congress in the field of financial disclosure, the challenged

Appendix A

subpoena seeks “information about a subject on which legislation may be had.” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508.

To the dissent, however, this makes no difference. Although acknowledging that the Committee is pursuing a “valid legislative inquiry,” the dissent insists that the Mazars subpoena is nonetheless invalid because it “seeks to investigate individual suspicions of criminality against the President,” an inquiry that “may be pursued only through impeachment.” Dissenting Op. at 44. In support, the dissent claims to rely on the “text and structure of the Constitution, its original meaning and longstanding practice.” *Id.* at 3.

Of course, the Constitution always serves as our starting point, and particularly in separation-of-powers disputes, we “put significant weight upon historical practice.” *Zivotofsky*, 135 S. Ct. at 2091 (internal quotations omitted). Indeed, this is a path the Supreme Court and this court have already trod. Nearly a century of precedent has laid out an established test that resolves this inter-branch dispute in a way that, unlike the dissent, respects the co-equal status and roles of *both* the legislative and executive branches. Settled Supreme Court precedent teaches that—at least where, as here, no party argues that compliance with the subpoena would impair the President’s execution of the Article II power—the Constitution protects both branches’ prerogatives by determining whether the subpoena serves “a valid legislative purpose.” *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 127. Both the Trump Plaintiffs and the Department of Justice agree that this is the relevant inquiry. *See* Appellants’ Br. 16 (“When

Appendix A

Congress issues subpoenas in aid of valid legislation, it needs a legitimate legislative purpose”); Department Br. 10. (“The court must first determine whether the subpoena serves a ‘valid legislative purpose.’”).

To be sure, a Congress pursuing a legitimate legislative objective may, as the many examples recounted in the dissent demonstrate, choose to move from legislative investigation to impeachment. But the dissent cites nothing in the Constitution or case law—and there is nothing—that compels Congress to abandon its legislative role at the first scent of potential illegality and confine itself exclusively to the impeachment process. Nor does anything in the dissent’s lengthy recitation of historical examples dictate that result. All involved investigations targeted at individual conduct; none involved a Congressional effort to investigate the need to amend existing laws or enact remedial legislation. Instead, those examples merely demonstrate that Congress has, at various points throughout our history, debated and decided when it wishes to shift from legislating to impeaching. Where legislation may be had—and especially here, where bills are pending and no intrusion on the President’s execution of his official duties is alleged—the Constitution assigns that decision to Congress.

Unable to prevail under the test the Supreme Court has enforced for more than a century, the dissent moves the goalposts. The dissent proposes a brand-new test for the President (and other “impeachable officials,” *Dissenting Op.* at 44) that would enfeeble the legislative branch. According to the dissent, once some Members—or perhaps

Appendix A

just one Member—raise “suspicions of criminality” by an impeachable official, Congress must “end[]” all legislative investigation and either do nothing at all or “move[] that part of the investigation into impeachment.” Dissenting Op. at 19.

In other words, Congress must either initiate the grave and weighty process of impeachment or forgo any investigation in support of potential legislation. Under the dissent’s novel test, “even a valid legislative purpose” cannot “justify” the investigation. *Id.* at 19. The dissent identifies nothing in the text, structure, or original meaning of Article I or Article II of the Constitution to support such a sweeping rule of legislative paralysis. As the Trump Plaintiffs and the Department of Justice agree, the Supreme Court has said just the opposite: “a congressional committee which is engaged in a legitimate legislative investigation need not grind to a halt whenever . . . crime or wrongdoing is disclosed.” *Hutcheson*, 369 U.S. at 618.

The dissent tries to house its theory in the Supreme Court’s decision in *McGrain*. Quoting the Court’s observation that an investigation would be invalid “if the Senate was ‘attempting or intending to *try* the Attorney General at its bar or before its committee for crime or wrongdoing,’” the dissent insists that “[i]t was essential to the Court’s decision that the investigation did not target the unlawful behavior of the Attorney General,” Dissenting Op. at 49 (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 179-80) (emphasis added). But as the sentence quoted by the dissent reveals, the Court said nothing about “targeting”

Appendix A

specific conduct. Instead, the Court made clear that the investigation was not invalid because the authorizing “resolution, like the charges which prompted its adoption . . . [made] reference to [the Attorney General] by name,” nor was it “a valid objection to the investigation that it might possibly disclose crime or wrongdoing on his part.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 179-80. Indeed, the district court in *McGrain* had adopted the dissent’s view, invalidating the subpoena because the authorizing resolution alleged “specific instances of . . . neglect” and the Senate was “proposing . . . to determine the guilt of the Attorney General of the shortcomings and wrongdoings set forth in th[ose] resolutions.” *Id.* at 177. The Senate was, as the district court saw it, “exercising the judicial function,” a power “impliedly negated by th[e] Constitution, in its provision conferring the sole power of impeachment on the House of Representatives.” *Ex parte Daugherty*, 299 F. 620, 639, 2 Ohio Law Abs. 708 (S.D. Ohio 1924). The Supreme Court labeled this reasoning “wrong,” explaining “that the object of the investigation . . . was to obtain information for legislative purposes.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177.

The dissent points to *McGrain*’s language that “[i]t [wa]s not as if an inadmissible or unlawful object were affirmatively and definitely avowed,” arguing that, here, the subpoena is invalid because “[t]he Committee has ‘affirmatively and definitely avowed’ its suspicions of criminality against the President.” Dissenting Op. at 50-51 (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 180). The dissent misreads that sentence. According to the Court, the Senate resolution in *McGrain* sought “information

Appendix A

necessary as a basis for such legislative *and other action as the Senate may deem necessary and proper.*” 273 U.S. at 179 (emphasis added). But there was “no other action,” the Court explained, “which would be within the power of the Senate.” *Id.* It was the Senate’s “indefinite and untenable suggestion” of non-legislative action—not an avowal of suspicions of individual wrongdoing—that the Court held did not “invalidate[] the entire proceeding.” *Id.* *McGrain* thus squarely forecloses the dissent’s theory.

It is unsurprising that no case law supports the dissent. Under its view, Congress’s power to investigate, when it comes to the President and all other impeachable officials, would no longer be “co-extensive with [its] power to legislate.” *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 160. The dissent would reorder the very structure of the Constitution. Throughout history, the Constitution has left to Congress the judgment whether to commence the impeachment process. But the dissent’s approach would not even allow Congress to make the quintessentially legislative judgment that some concerns about potential misconduct or illegality are better addressed through oversight and legislation than impeachment. Worse still, the dissent’s novel approach would now impose upon the courts the job of ordering the cessation of the legislative function and putting Congress to the Hobson’s Choice of impeachment or nothing.

To be sure, the dissent would still allow Congress to “enact legislation.” Dissenting Op. at 64. But it would have to do so uninformed and with its oversight function informationally crippled. This would mean that, at times when oversight and legislation are most urgent, such as

Appendix A

to prevent executive branch overreach or to keep officials' behavior within ethical boundaries going forward, Congress would be legislatively hamstrung unless it were to pull the impeachment trigger. And if Congress chooses not to pursue impeachment, or if impeachment is unavailable because Congress believes the alleged misconduct falls short of a high crime or misdemeanor, then there can be no investigation of—and thus no viable legislative check on—the President at all. A proposition that so strips Congress of its power to legislate would enforce only the Executive's arrogation of power, not the separation of powers.

At bottom, this subpoena is a valid exercise of the legislative oversight authority because it seeks information important to determining the *fitness of legislation* to address potential problems within the Executive Branch and the electoral system; it does not seek to determine the President's fitness for office.

C.

Thus far we have concluded that the Committee is pursuing a legislative, non-law-enforcement purpose and that at least one kind of constitutional legislation may be had on the subject matter of the Committee's investigation. What is left to decide is whether the documents requested in *this* subpoena are relevant to *that* investigation. The Trump Plaintiffs insist that at least some are not.

As the *Watkins* Court described it, the requirement that a subpoena request only those documents that are

Appendix A

relevant to a committee's legitimate investigation "is a jurisdictional concept of pertinency drawn from the nature of a congressional committee's source of authority." 354 U.S. at 206. Though complex sounding, the relevancy requirement functions merely as a corollary to the other restraints on congressional committees' investigative powers: if a committee could subpoena information irrelevant to its legislative purpose, then the Constitution would in practice impose no real limit on congressional investigations.

The Supreme Court has used various formulations to describe the relevancy standard that applies to congressional subpoenas. In *McGrain*, the Court held that Congress could subpoena any information that would "materially aid[]" a legitimate investigation. 273 U.S. at 177. In *Watkins*, it explained that committees may subpoena information "to be used . . . in coping with a problem that falls within [their] legislative sphere." 354 U.S. at 206. And in *McPhaul v. United States*, the Court offered not one but two explanations, validating a subpoena because, in the Court's words, the subcommittee had requested records that "were not plainly incompetent or irrelevant to any lawful purpose . . . , but, on the contrary, were reasonably relevant to the inquiry." 364 U.S. 372, 381-82, 81 S. Ct. 138, 5 L. Ed. 2d 136 (1960) (alterations, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). We read all these statements, varied as they are, as conveying essentially the same straightforward proposition: Congress may subpoena only that information which is "reasonably relevant" to its legitimate investigation. *Id.*; accord Appellants' Br. 19 ("If the congressional subpoena is not 'reasonably relevant to

Appendix A

the inquiry,’ then it lacks a legitimate purpose.” (quoting *McPhaul*, 364 U.S. at 381-82)).

With this standard in mind, we turn to the challenged subpoena. Recall that it seeks four categories of documents: for “calendar years 2011 through 2018,” (1) “statements of financial condition, annual statements, periodic financial reports, and independent auditors’ reports,” (2) “underlying, supporting, or source documents and records,” and (3) related “memoranda, notes, and communications;” and, (4) “[w]ithout regard to time,” all related “engagement agreements or contracts.” Subpoena. For clarity, we label these four categories Accounting Records, Source Documents, Related Communications, and Engagement Agreements, respectively. In our view, all are reasonably relevant to remedial legislation addressing at least two of the topics listed in Chairman Cummings’s Memo: the President’s potential “undisclosed conflicts of interest” and the President’s “report[s] . . . to the Office of Government Ethics and other federal entities.” Cummings Memo 4.

We begin with Accounting Records and Source Documents for calendar years 2014 through 2018. Because then-Candidate and now-President Trump filed financial disclosure reports covering these years, financial records from this period are highly relevant to the Committee’s inquiry into whether Candidate and President Trump “accurately reported his finances to . . . federal entities,” *id.*, and, by extension, “whether reforms are necessary to address deficiencies with current laws, rules, and regulations,” Cummings Feb. 15 Letter 9. A clear line

Appendix A

connects the Office of Government Ethics’s May 2018 determination that President Trump’s financial disclosure form failed to list “a reportable liability” to Michael Cohen, Apol Letter 1; to Chairman Cummings’s January 2019 requests to the White House and the Office of Government Ethics for further information on President Trump’s payments to Cohen; to Cohen’s February 2019 production of Mazars accounting documents revealing financial information different from and additional to Candidate and President Trump’s financial disclosures; and finally to the Committee’s March 2019 request and April 2019 subpoena to Mazars. From this logical progression we discern “no indication” that the subpoena “follow[ed] from indiscriminate dragnet procedures, lacking in probable cause for belief that” Mazars “possesse[s] information which might be helpful to the” Committee. *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 134. Tellingly, the Trump Plaintiffs raise no relevance objection to this subset of subpoenaed documents.

We next consider the same two categories of records—Accounting Records and Source Documents—for years 2011 through 2013. According to the Trump Plaintiffs, these documents are irrelevant to the Committee’s investigation because they “reach[] back many years before the President was even a candidate for public office.” Appellants’ Reply Br. 16-17. This is true, but beside the point. The fact that the Ethics in Government Act *currently* requires candidates and Presidents to disclose information for “the preceding calendar year,” *e.g.*, 5 U.S.C. app. 4 § 102(b)(1)(A), hardly forecloses Congress from amending the Act to require filers to go back a

Appendix A

reasonable amount of additional time to provide a more accurate financial picture. That is especially true here because the sitting President possesses financial holdings that are arguably more complex than past Presidents held, has elected while in office to handle his finances differently than past Presidents did, and has declined to voluntarily release the sorts of tax-return information that past Presidents disclosed. *See, e.g., H.R. 1: Strengthening Ethics: Hearing Before the House Committee on Oversight and Reform*, 116th Cong. 125 (Feb. 6, 2019) (statement of Walter M. Shaub, Jr.) (describing the President’s decision not “to divest his conflicting financial interests” as a “radical departure” from previous Presidents).

Congress might therefore reasonably wonder whether the Ethics in Government Act needs an update, and even pre-candidacy documents from the President would shed light on that inquiry. Requiring presidential candidates and Presidents to disclose earlier years’ information might, for example, reveal forgiven debts, financial partnerships, or favorable deals that Congress determines should be disclosed to the public—that is, “undisclosed conflicts of interest.” Cummings Memo 4. In fact, at least one bill now pending before the House would require presidential candidates to “submit to the Federal Election Commission a copy of [their] income tax returns for the 10 most recent taxable years.” H.R. 706, 116th Cong. § 222(b)(1)(A) (2019).

Of course, the Committee may discover nothing notable in Mazars’s 2011 through 2013 records. But that is not the test for relevancy. As the Supreme Court has explained, “[t]he very nature of the investigative

Appendix A

function—like any research—is that it takes the searchers up some ‘blind alleys’ and into nonproductive enterprises.” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 509; *see also* Appellants’ Br. 32 (conceding that “Congress cannot be penalized if an otherwise valid investigation turns out to be a dead end”). To be sure, information from the past may at some point become so stale as to be irrelevant to present inquiries, but the eight-year mark falls comfortably on the relevant side of the line.

We last turn to the Committee’s request for Related Communications and Engagement Agreements. According to the Trump Plaintiffs, these documents “have nothing to do with the financial statements the Committee says it needs.” Appellants’ Reply Br. 17. But again, we think the records’ relevancy is quite clear. As the Committee explains, the import of the Mazars accounting documents hinges on the conditions under which they were prepared—for example, whether Mazars accepted documents “as a given,” whether Mazars prepared its reports intending third parties to rely upon them, and whether Mazars had the “power[] or responsibilit[y]” to conduct independent audits. Oral Arg. Tr. 108. Obviously not every “agreement[]” or “note[]” will provide this information. Subpoena. But absent foreknowledge of the documents’ contents, congressional investigators have no way to reliably determine before issuing a subpoena which specific communications might reveal relevant information. It is enough that the categories of information sought are “reasonably relevant” to the Committee’s legitimate legislative inquiry.

Appendix A

IV.

Having found no constitutional defect in the Committee’s subpoena to Mazars, we at last arrive at the question of authority: “whether the committee [is] authorized” by the full House “to exact the information” it seeks. *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 42-43; *see also Exxon Corp. v. Federal Trade Com.*, 589 F.2d 582, 592, 191 U.S. App. D.C. 59 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (“To issue a valid subpoena, . . . a committee or subcommittee must conform strictly to the resolution establishing its investigatory powers.”). The Trump Plaintiffs urge us to interpret the House Rules narrowly to deny the Committee the authority it claims. But we have no need—and most important, no authority—to do so.

A.

We start with the proposition, undisputed by the Trump Plaintiffs, that under the most natural reading of the House Rules, the full chamber has authorized the Committee to issue the challenged subpoena. *See Oral Arg. Tr.* 38-39 (Trump Plaintiffs conceding that the Rules, under a “normal reading,” authorize the subpoena). A brief tour through the Rules confirms as much.

To begin with, the Rules vest the Oversight Committee with standing authority to institute investigations and issue subpoenas without first “obtain[ing] such authority . . . by a separate resolution.” *House Rules and Manual*, 115th Cong., § 788 note (2017); *see also* Morton Rosenberg, *When Congress Comes Calling: A Study on*

Appendix A

the Principles, Practices, and Pragmatics of Legislative Inquiry 33-34 & 34 n.5 (2017) (explaining that although “[t]he required authorization from the full House . . . may take the form of a statute, a resolution, or a standing rule of the House,” “[t]his [last] mode is the most common today” (footnotes omitted)). Clause 1(b)(1) of House Rule XI permits “[e]ach committee [to] conduct at any time such investigations and studies as it considers necessary.” And Clause 2(m) of the same Rule authorizes committees—or, when the committees so choose, their chairs—to require, by subpoena or otherwise, . . . the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as [they] consider[] necessary” “[f]or the purpose of carrying out any of [their] functions and duties under . . . rule X.” House Rule XI, cl. 2(m)(1); *see also id.* cl. 2(m)(3)(A)(i) (permitting committees to “delegate[] to the[ir] chair” “[t]he power to authorize and issue subpoenas”); Rules of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, 116th Cong., Rule 12(g) (2019) (authorizing the Oversight Committee Chair to “issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee”).

Rule X, in turn, establishes the Oversight Committee’s jurisdiction, which unquestionably includes financial-disclosure and other ethics-in-government laws. Rule X, clause 1(n) assigns the Committee jurisdiction over the “[f]ederal civil service . . . and the status of officers and employees of the United States,” “[g]overnment management and accounting measures generally,” and “[p]ublic information and records.” Pursuant to this

Appendix A

clause, the Oversight Committee has for decades exercised jurisdiction over the Ethics in Government Act and served as the authorizing committee for the Office of Government Ethics. *See, e.g.*, 165 Cong. Rec. H1209 (daily ed. Jan. 24, 2019) (referring H.R. 745, a “bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for reform in the operations of the Office of Government Ethics, . . . to the Committee on Oversight and Reform”); Letter from Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Walter M. Shaub, Jr., Director, Office of Government Ethics 2 (Jan. 12, 2017) (stating that the Oversight Committee “has jurisdiction in the House of Representatives for reauthorizing the [O]ffice” of Government Ethics); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 95-642, pt. 1 (1977) (report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, predecessor to the Oversight Committee, on H.R. 6954, predecessor to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978). Furthermore, Rule X, clause 3(i) directs the Oversight Committee to “review and study on a continuing basis the operation of Government activities at all levels, including the Executive Office of the President.” And lest any confusion remain regarding the Oversight Committee’s authority to oversee, Rule X, clause 4(c) (2) states that the Committee “may at any time conduct investigations of any matter without regard to [any other] clause conferring jurisdiction over the matter to another standing committee.”

Having placed “any matter” within the Oversight Committee’s wide purview, the Rules nowhere disclose an intent to carve out the President. It would be quite strange for the Rules to permit the Oversight Committee

Appendix A

to “review and study,” House Rule X, cl. 3(i), financial disclosure laws in all their applications save for one—their application to the President. *See* 5 U.S.C. app. 4 §§ 101(a), (f)(1), 102 (requiring the President to file financial reports). So, too, would it be strange to direct the Committee to oversee “the operation of Government activities at all levels,” House Rule X, cl. 3(i), if the Rules really meant “at all levels except the President.” And although we do not read the second half of clause 3(i), which specifies that “Government . . . at all levels . . . includ[es] the Executive Office of the President,” to refer to the President himself, *cf. Kissinger v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press*, 445 U.S. 136, 156, 100 S. Ct. 960, 63 L. Ed. 2d 267 (1980) (holding that in the Freedom of Information Act, the term “‘Executive Office’ does not include the Office of the President”), neither do we take the “including” phrase to imply that “Government activities at all levels” means something less than “all,” *see Federal Land Bank of St. Paul v. Bismarck Lumber Co.*, 314 U.S. 95, 100, 62 S. Ct. 1, 86 L. Ed. 65 (1941) (“[T]he term ‘including’ is not one of all-embracing definition, but connotes simply an illustrative application of the general principle.”). Indeed, the Trump Plaintiffs urge us to draw no such negative inference. *See* Appellants’ Reply Br. 6 (“Plaintiffs do not claim that [adding the] new language [‘Executive Office of the President’] *narrowed* the Committee’s authority.”).

B.

Acknowledging that literally read, the Rules permit the Committee to issue the challenged subpoena, *see supra* at 49, the Trump Plaintiffs insist that a literal reading is

Appendix A

not enough. In their view, the Mazars subpoena alters the separation of powers and raises serious constitutional questions, so nothing less than an “unequivocal[] grant” by the House of “jurisdiction to subpoena the President’s accountant for his private financial records” could authorize the Committee to issue it. Appellants’ Reply Br. 2; *see also* Dissenting Op. at 52-58. In support, they raise three related arguments.

First, the Trump Plaintiffs contend that because “a ‘clear statement rule’ applies ‘to statutes that significantly alter the balance between Congress and the President,’” Appellants’ Br. 16 (quoting *Armstrong v. Bush*, 924 F.2d 282, 289, 288 U.S. App. D.C. 38 (D.C. Cir. 1991)), the House could have “authorized the Committee to embark on [the instant] investigation” only through “an express statement,” Appellants’ Reply Br. 3 (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also* Dissenting Op. at 54-55. For this proposition, they rely primarily on two decisions, both of which held that the President is not an “agency” subject to judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). In the first case, *Armstrong v. Bush*, our court held that “[w]hen Congress decides purposefully to enact legislation restricting or regulating presidential action, it must make its intent clear.” 924 F.2d at 289. “Although the ‘clear statement’ rule was originally articulated to guide interpretation of statutes that significantly alter the federal-state balance,” we explained, “there are similar compelling reasons to apply the rule to statutes that significantly alter the balance between Congress and the President.” *Id.* And in the second case, *Franklin v. Massachusetts*, the Supreme Court confirmed that

Appendix A

“[o]ut of respect for the separation of powers and the unique constitutional position of the President,” the Court “would require an express statement by Congress before assuming it intended the President’s performance of his statutory duties to be reviewed for abuse of discretion” under the APA. 505 U.S. 788, 800-01 (1992).

This case is nothing like *Armstrong* and *Franklin* for a simple reason: the House Rules have no effect whatsoever on “the balance *between* Congress and the President.” *Armstrong*, 924 F.2d at 289 (emphasis added). What Rules X and XI have done is delegate from the House to the Oversight Committee the authority to exercise Congress’s subpoena power without first “obtain[ing] such authority . . . by a separate resolution” of the full House. *House Rules and Manual*, 115th Cong., § 788 note (2017). The Trump Plaintiffs nowhere dispute that, assuming a legitimate legislative purpose exists, the House could have either issued the challenged subpoena by a vote of the full chamber or, via express statement, authorized the Committee to issue the subpoena on its behalf. *See* Oral Arg. Tr. 5 (conceding that the House has the power to issue the subpoena itself and arguing that the question is “whether [it] gave [that authority] to [the] Committee”); *id.* at 6 (stating that it is “a question of clarity and not a question of power”); *id.* at 130-31 (stating that, although it would be “better” for the subpoena to come from “the full House,” the full House could pass a rule that “says . . . the committee could do it”). The Rules, which establish a mechanism for exercising the House’s subpoena power, thus deal exclusively with the allocation of authority *within* the legislative branch, leaving unaltered the

Appendix A

House's subpoena power vis-à-vis the President. Because Congress already possesses—in fact, has previously exercised, *see supra* at 16-17—the authority to subpoena Presidents and their information, nothing in the House Rules could in any way “alter the balance between” the two political branches of government. *Armstrong*, 924 F.2d at 289.

The Trump Plaintiffs' second argument, containing many ingredients of their first, is similarly unavailing. Observing that “[t]he parties seriously dispute whether the subpoena has a legitimate legislative purpose,” Appellants' Reply Br. 3—and, consequently, whether the subpoena exceeds constitutional limits on Congress's subpoena power—the Trump Plaintiffs urge us to “resolve[] this case in a way that avoid[s] deciding” constitutional questions “by quashing the subpoena as beyond the Committee's . . . jurisdiction,” Appellants' Br. 23; *see also* Department Br. 14; Dissenting Op. at 52-58. They call our attention to two cases in particular: the Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Rumely* and ours in *Tobin v. United States*, 306 F.2d 270, 113 U.S. App. D.C. 110 (D.C. Cir. 1962). In *Rumely*, the Court “g[a]ve” the authorizing resolution at issue “a more restricted scope” because the government's favored interpretation, which would have permitted it “to inquire into all efforts of private individuals to influence public opinion through books and periodicals,” raised “doubts of constitutionality in view of the prohibition of the First Amendment” and thus presented a “[g]rave constitutional question[.]” *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 46-48. And in the latter, we “constru[ed] [a] resolution[] of authority narrowly

Appendix A

. . . in order to obviate the necessity of passing on” the “serious and difficult constitutional question[]” presented by that case, *Tobin*, 306 F.2d at 274-75—namely, whether Congress has “the power, under the compact clause of the Constitution, to ‘alter, amend or repeal’ its consent to an interstate compact,” *id.* at 272. Concerned that “the suspicion of even potential impermanency would be damaging to the very concept of interstate compacts,” *id.* at 273, we observed that the argument against recognizing such an implied power to alter or repeal “is not unpersuasive,” *id.* at 274.

In contrast to *Rumely* and *Tobin*, the constitutional questions raised here are neither “[g]rave,” *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 48, nor “serious and difficult,” *Tobin*, 306 F.2d at 275. We harbor no doubts that the subpoena to Mazars comports with constitutional limits, as it seeks documents reasonably relevant to a legitimate legislative inquiry into “a subject on which legislation may be had.” *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508; *see supra* Parts III.A-C. We therefore have no cause to invoke the canon of constitutional avoidance. *See Empresa Cubana Exportadora de Alimentos y Productos Varios v. U.S. Department of Treasury*, 638 F.3d 794, 801, 395 U.S. App. D.C. 19 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (“A clear statute and a weak constitutional claim are not a recipe for successful invocation of the constitutional avoidance canon.”).

That is not to say the issues presented here are unimportant—far from it. But the canon of constitutional avoidance “is not a license for the judiciary to rewrite language enacted by the legislature.” *United States v. Albertini*, 472 U.S. 675, 680, 105 S. Ct. 2897, 86 L. Ed.

Appendix A

2d 536 (1985). To adopt a restrictive interpretation of the Rules when uncompelled by constitutional concerns, “while purporting to be an exercise in judicial restraint,” would in fact be to “trench upon the legislative powers vested in Congress by [Article I] of the Constitution.” *Id.* We have no authority to avoid questions—even important ones—simply because we might prefer not to answer them. *Cf. United States v. American Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 567 F.2d 121, 126, 185 U.S. App. D.C. 254 (D.C. Cir. 1977) (“The simple fact of a conflict between the legislative and executive branches over a congressional subpoena does not preclude judicial resolution.”).

Finally, the Trump Plaintiffs argue that even if no separation-of-powers concerns demand application of the clear statement rule, and even if no constitutional questions rise to the level of serious, it would, given the “sensitive” nature of the Committee’s request, Appellants’ Reply Br. 2 (internal quotation marks omitted), still be “better,” Oral Arg. Tr. 130, for the full House to grant the Committee “express authority to subpoena the President for his personal financial records,” Appellants’ Reply Br. 5. We, however, have no authority to impose such a requirement on the House. The Constitution gives “[e]ach House” of Congress authority to “determine the Rules of its Proceedings,” U.S. Const. art. I, § 5, cl. 2, meaning that courts lack the power to invalidate a duly authorized congressional subpoena merely because it might have been “better [if] . . . the full House” had specifically authorized or issued it, Oral Arg. Tr. 130. *See Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 509 (“The wisdom of congressional approach or methodology is not open to judicial veto.”). To be sure, “the

Appendix A

courts will intervene to protect constitutional rights from infringement by Congress, including its committees and members.” *Exxon Corp.*, 589 F.2d at 590. But unless and until Congress adopts a rule that offends the Constitution, the courts get no vote in how each chamber chooses to run its internal affairs. *See id.* (“[W]here constitutional rights are not violated, there is no warrant for the judiciary to interfere with the internal procedures of Congress.”).

The trouble with clear statement rules, then, is that they both “involve[] an unwillingness to give full effect to [Congress’s] unambiguous text” as it exists now, *Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Ass’n v. U.S. Department of Transportation*, 724 F.3d 230, 237, 406 U.S. App. D.C. 299 (D.C. Cir. 2013), and offer a not-so-subtle encouragement to Congress to alter its rules in the future. Without some constitutionally compelled reason, we may do neither. As our court recently explained, “interpreting a congressional rule ‘differently than would the Congress itself,’ is tantamount to ‘making the Rules—a power that the Rulemaking Clause reserves to each House alone.’” *Barker v. Conroy*, 921 F.3d 1118, 1130 (D.C. Cir. 2019) (quoting *United States v. Rostenkowski*, 59 F.3d 1291, 1306-07, 313 U.S. App. D.C. 303 (D.C. Cir. 1995)). Accordingly, absent a substantial constitutional question pertaining to the *House’s* legislative power, we have no more authority to give a cramped interpretation to a House Rule via a clear statement requirement or the constitutional avoidance canon than we do to take out our red pens and edit the Rules ourselves.

Appendix A

But the House may. And indeed it has. On July 24, several weeks after oral argument in this case and several months after the Oversight Committee issued the challenged subpoena to Mazars, the full House adopted a resolution that in no uncertain terms “ratifie[d] and affirm[ed]” the Oversight Committee’s authority under House Rules X and XI to issue subpoenas “concerning . . . the President in his personal or official capacity [and] his immediate family, business entities, or organizations.” H.R. Res. 507, 116th Cong. (2019). Resolution 507—a resolution “[a]ffirming the validity of subpoenas duly issued and investigations undertaken by . . . committee[s] of the House . . . pursuant to authorities delegated by . . . the [House] Rules,” *id.*—purports neither to enlarge the Committee’s jurisdiction nor to amend the House Rules. Instead, the Resolution clarifies the authority that the Committee had on the day it issued the subpoena. It is “plainly incorrect,” the Resolution states, to assert that previously issued subpoenas “seeking personal, financial, banking, and tax information related to the President” “were not authorized by the full House.” *Id.*

Because the Trump Plaintiffs concede, as they must, that “[t]he Resolution does not expand the Committee’s jurisdiction,” Appellants’ July 31 Letter 1; *see also* Dissenting Op. at 55 n.18, we need not address their argument that “the ‘scope’ of a committee’s jurisdiction must ‘be ascertained as of th[e] time’ of the request,” *id.* (alteration in original) (quoting *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 48). The Trump Plaintiffs may very well be right that the authority of a congressional committee to issue subpoenas “cannot be enlarged by subsequent action of

Appendix A

Congress.” *Id.* (quoting *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 48); *but cf.* *Dombrowski v. Burbank*, 358 F.2d 821, 825, 123 U.S. App. D.C. 190 (D.C. Cir. 1966), *aff’d in part, rev’d in part on other grounds sub nom. Dombrowski v. Eastland*, 387 U.S. 82, 87 S. Ct. 1425, 18 L. Ed. 2d 577 (1967) (holding that for purposes of establishing immunity from suit, a subcommittee could ratify a subpoena previously issued “without prior authorization from the [s]ubcommittee”). Resolution 507, however, “enlarges” nothing. It merely confirms what the Trump Plaintiffs admit—that the plain text of the House Rules authorizes the subpoena, *see supra* at 46, and merely provides what the Trump Plaintiffs request—that the House “spell[] out [its] intention” by “adopt[ing] a resolution which in express terms authorizes” the challenged subpoena. Appellants’ Reply Br. 8-9 (quoting *Tobin*, 306 F.2d at 275-76). Because the House has “clearly manifest[ed] its intention of putting such a decisional burden upon us,” we have no choice but to “meet and decide” the issues presented by this case. *Tobin*, 306 F.2d at 276.

The Justice Department adds one final objection. Although conceding that the Resolution “clearly authorizes the Committee’s subpoena[,]” Department Br. 16, the Department warns that because Resolution 507 also authorizes future subpoenas, there is a “serious risk” that “[C]ongressional committees may issue successive subpoenas in waves, making far-reaching demands that harry the President and distract his attention.” Department Br. 6. Time will tell whether the Department’s prediction is accurate. At present, however, we have no need to consider that hypothetical scenario

Appendix A

because the only subpoena currently before us is the one directed at Mazars. And to be clear, neither the Trump Plaintiffs nor the Department has argued that compliance with *that* subpoena risks unconstitutionally burdening the President's core duties.

Nor could they. It is Mazars, a third-party, that will retrieve and organize the relevant information; the subpoena seeks non-confidential records in which the President has asserted no proprietary or evidentiary protections; and Mazars, not the President, risks contempt through non-compliance. To be sure, monitoring Mazars's compliance with the subpoena might require some presidential time and attention. But as the Supreme Court made clear in *Clinton v. Jones*, a "burden [on] the time and attention of the Chief Executive," standing alone, "is not sufficient to establish a violation of the Constitution." 520 U.S. at 703.

V.

Though our journey has been long, we find ourselves at the end of a familiar tale. A congressional committee, as committees have done repeatedly over the past two centuries, issued an investigative subpoena, and the target of that subpoena, questioning the committee's legislative purpose, has asked a court to invalidate it. The fact that the subpoena in this case seeks information that concerns the President of the United States adds a twist, but not a surprising one: disputes between Congress and the President are a recurring plot in our national story. And that is precisely what the Framers intended. As Justice

Appendix A

Brandeis wrote, “[t]he doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted . . . not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power.” *Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52, 293, 47 S. Ct. 21, 71 L. Ed. 160 (1926) (Brandeis, J., dissenting). “The purpose,” he explained, “was not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy.” *Id.*

Having considered the weighty interests at stake in this case, we conclude that the subpoena issued by the Committee to Mazars is valid and enforceable. We affirm the district court’s judgment in favor of the Oversight Committee and against the Trump Plaintiffs.

So ordered.

Appendix A

RAO, *Circuit Judge*, dissenting: The majority breaks new ground when it determines Congress is investigating allegations of illegal conduct against the President, yet nonetheless upholds the subpoena as part of the *legislative power*. The Committee on Oversight and Reform has consistently maintained that it seeks to determine whether the President broke the law, but it has not invoked Congress's impeachment power to support this subpoena. When Congress seeks information about the President's wrongdoing, it does not matter whether the investigation also has a legislative purpose. Investigations of impeachable offenses simply are not, and never have been, within Congress's legislative power. Throughout our history, Congress, the President, and the courts have insisted upon maintaining the separation between the legislative and impeachment powers of the House and recognized the gravity and accountability that follow impeachment. Allowing the Committee to issue this subpoena for legislative purposes would turn Congress into a roving inquisition over a co-equal branch of government. I respectfully dissent.

I.

We are asked to determine whether the Committee's subpoena is within the legislative power, a question that raises serious separation of powers concerns about how a House committee may investigate a sitting president. The constitutional questions only hinted at by the majority become clearer when the proper framework is applied. First, the Committee's subpoena and investigation explicitly state a purpose of investigating illegal conduct

Appendix A

of the President, including specific violations of ethics laws and the Constitution. Second, Congress’s power to investigate for legislative purposes, although broad, is not unlimited and cannot circumvent the distinct power to investigate for purposes of impeachment. Allegations that an impeachable official acted unlawfully must be pursued through impeachment. Finally, the subpoena targets the President and raises implications for the separation of powers that the majority cannot brush aside simply because the subpoena is addressed to the President’s accountants, Mazars USA, LLP. These preliminary matters place this novel investigation in context and frame the analysis of the substantial constitutional questions presented in this case.

The Committee, the Trump plaintiffs, and the majority all agree that the most relevant document for assessing the Committee’s reasons for issuing the subpoena is Chairman Elijah E. Cummings’s April 12 Memorandum. *See* Memorandum from Chairman Elijah E. Cummings to Members of the Committee on Oversight and Reform (Apr. 12, 2019) (“Cummings Memorandum”); Appellant Br. 32-33; Maj. Op. 25; *cf. Wilkinson v. United States*, 365 U.S. 399, 410, 81 S. Ct. 567, 5 L. Ed. 2d 633 (1961) (looking to the “Chairman’s statement at the opening of the hearings” for signs of legislative purpose); *Shelton v. United States*, 404 F.2d 1292, 1297, 131 U.S. App. D.C. 315 (D.C. Cir. 1968). The Cummings Memorandum states the Committee is investigating “whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct” and notes that this information will “inform[] its review of multiple laws and legislative proposals under our jurisdiction.” Cummings

Appendix A

Memorandum at 4. The Committee also makes an “express avowal” to investigate alleged violations of ethics laws and the Constitution by the President. *See McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 178, 47 S. Ct. 319, 71 L. Ed. 580 (1927) (noting that “[a]n express avowal of the object” of an investigation would aid the courts in reviewing the Senate’s purpose); *see also infra* Part III.A (discussing Committee’s purposes in detail).

The Committee announces two distinct investigations: one to explore allegations of illegal conduct by the President; and another to review multiple laws and legislative proposals within the Committee’s jurisdiction. The Committee justifies both inquiries under the legislative power, and the majority accepts this framework when it examines the legislative power in isolation to determine whether this investigation falls within its scope. Maj. Op. 20-54. Yet the Constitution vests the House of Representatives with more than one investigative power. Most frequently, the House investigates and issues subpoenas ancillary to its legislative powers. That investigative power is “co-extensive with the power to legislate.” *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 160, 75 S. Ct. 668, 99 L. Ed. 964 (1955); *see also Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187, 77 S. Ct. 1173, 1 L. Ed. 2d 1273, 76 Ohio Law Abs. 225 (1957) (“The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad.”).

The House, however, has a separate power to investigate pursuant to impeachment, which has always been understood as a limited judicial power to hold certain

Appendix A

impeachable officials accountable for wrongdoing.¹ *See Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 191, 26 L. Ed. 377 (1880) (“The Senate also exercises the judicial power of trying impeachments, and the House of preferring articles of impeachment.”). The text and structure of the Constitution, its original meaning, and longstanding practice demonstrate that Congress’s legislative and judicial powers are distinct and exercised through separate processes, for different purposes, and with entirely different protections for individuals targeted for investigation. *See infra* Part II.

The Committee’s investigation into alleged illegal actions of the President naturally raises the specter of impeachment. Although the Trump plaintiffs maintain that “[t]he one thing the parties agree on is that this case is not about impeachment,” Appellants Br. 14, the impeachment power unmistakably sits in the background of the legal arguments.² The Trump plaintiffs and the Department of

1. In addition to the legislative and impeachment powers, the House and the Senate have other investigative powers, not relevant here, to maintain the integrity of their proceedings and members against bribery, nuisance, and violence. *See Anderson v. Dunn*, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 204, 228-30, 5 L. Ed. 242 (1821); *Barry v. United States ex rel. Cunningham*, 279 U.S. 597, 613, 49 S. Ct. 452, 73 L. Ed. 867 (1929) (the Senate has “certain powers, which are not legislative, but judicial, in character. Among these is the power to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.” (citing U.S. CONST. art. I, § 5, cl. 1)).

2. Notably, the district court concluded that the impeachment and removal powers of the House and the Senate somehow bolster Congress’s ability to investigate the President through the

Appendix A

Justice have suggested that the impeachment power might provide a different source of authority for this subpoena, even though it was not invoked here. *See* Appellants Br. 45 (noting with regard to impeachment that “[w]hile Congress could presumably use subpoenas to advance these non-legislative powers, the Committee has not invoked them”); DOJ Br. 15 n.1 (“The House’s impeachment power is an express authority whose exercise does not require a connection to valid legislation. But the Committee has asserted neither jurisdiction over, nor an objective of pursuing, impeachment.”). Furthermore, one of the primary legal arguments raised by the Trump plaintiffs is that the Committee’s investigation is an impermissible form of “law enforcement.” Appellants Br. 33-37. While law enforcement is normally the province of the executive branch, the House has a narrowly circumscribed power to serve as the “NATIONAL INQUEST” when it acts pursuant to the impeachment power. The Federalist No. 65, at 338 (Alexander Hamilton) (George W. Carey & James McClellan eds., 2001). The Committee is “not here relying on impeachment power.” Oral Arg. at 1:34:19-22. Nevertheless, understanding the impeachment power is essential to identifying the limits of the legislative power when Congress seeks to investigate allegations of specific unlawful actions by the President.

legislative power. *See Trump v. Comm. on Oversight & Reform*, 380 F. Supp. 3d 76, 95 (D.D.C. 2019) (“It is simply not fathomable that a Constitution that grants Congress the power to remove a President for reasons including criminal behavior would deny Congress the power to investigate him for unlawful conduct—past or present—even without formally opening an impeachment inquiry.”).

Appendix A

Constitutional powers do not stand in isolation, but rather are part of a complex structure in which each power acquires specific content and meaning in relation to the others. The Supreme Court often locates the limits of one constitutional power by identifying what is at the core of another. *See, e.g., Zivotofsky ex rel. Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, 135 S. Ct. 2076, 2096, 192 L. Ed. 2d 83 (2015) (“Congress has substantial authority over passports [But] [t]o allow Congress to control the President’s communication in the context of a formal recognition determination is to allow Congress to exercise that exclusive power itself.”); *Bowsher v. Synar*, 478 U.S. 714, 722, 106 S. Ct. 3181, 92 L. Ed. 2d 583 (1986) (“The Constitution does not contemplate an active role for Congress in the supervision of officers charged with the execution of the laws it enacts.”); *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 587, 72 S. Ct. 863, 96 L. Ed. 1153, 62 Ohio Law Abs. 417 (1952) (“In the framework of our Constitution, the President’s power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker.”); *Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52, 164, 47 S. Ct. 21, 71 L. Ed. 160 (1926) (“[A]rticle 2 excludes the exercise of legislative power by Congress to provide for appointments and removals, except only as granted therein to Congress in the matter of inferior offices.”); *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 192 (the House “not only exceeded the limit of its own authority, but assumed a power which could only be properly exercised by another branch of the government, because it was in its nature clearly judicial”). This method helps illuminate the scope of the legislative power to investigate. Comparing Congress’s legislative power with its wholly distinct judicial power of impeachment demonstrates the essential difference between these powers when Congress seeks to investigate the wrongdoing of the President.

Appendix A

As explained below, allegations of illegal conduct against the President cannot be investigated by Congress except through impeachment. The House may impeach for “Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors,” U.S. CONST. art. II, § 4, and has substantial discretion to define and pursue charges of impeachment. *See* The Federalist No. 65, at 338 (impeachable offenses “are of a nature which may with peculiar propriety be denominated POLITICAL, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to the society itself”). While it is unnecessary here to determine the scope of impeachable offenses, Congress has frequently treated violations of statutes or the Constitution as meeting this threshold.³ Impeachment provides the exclusive method for Congress to investigate accusations of illegal conduct by impeachable officials, particularly with the aid of compulsory process.⁴ Thus, the key determination is

3. This discussion of the impeachment power proceeds only in relation to understanding the scope of the legislative power. As the Committee has not raised the impeachment power as a basis for this subpoena, questions regarding whether such a subpoena could issue under the impeachment power are outside the scope of this opinion, as are other questions regarding the justiciability of the impeachment power or the specific scope of impeachable offenses. Recognizing the political nature of impeachable offenses, I refer to them throughout the opinion by various terms to reflect that such offenses may include wrongdoing or illegal conduct deemed by the House to be a high crime or misdemeanor.

4. Voluntary compliance with congressional investigations is commonplace. Different concerns arise, however, when one branch invokes power over the other through compulsory process. *See, e.g., Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 215 (“It is only those investigations that are conducted by use of compulsory process that give rise to a need to protect the rights of individuals against illegal encroachment.”).

Appendix A

whether this investigation targets allegations Congress might treat as “high Crimes” or “Misdemeanors.” To make this determination requires no search for hidden motives, but simply crediting the Committee’s consistently stated purpose to investigate “illegal conduct” of the President. Cummings Memorandum at 4; *cf. Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 508, 95 S. Ct. 1813, 44 L. Ed. 2d 324 (1975) (“[I]n determining the legitimacy of a congressional act we do not look to the motives alleged to have prompted it.”).

The Committee’s stated interest in remedial legislation may support any number of investigations, including into the conduct of agencies and how officials administer the laws. Yet a legislative purpose cannot whitewash this subpoena, which—by the Committee’s own description—targets allegations of illegal conduct by the President. The most important question is not whether Congress has put forth some legitimate legislative purpose, but rather whether Congress is investigating suspicions of criminality or allegations that the President violated a law. Such investigations may be pursued exclusively through impeachment. The House may not use the legislative power to circumvent the protections and accountability that accompany the impeachment power.

The majority recognizes this subpoena concerns the Committee’s “interest in determining whether and how illegal conduct has occurred,” Maj. Op. 30, but

That protection can be readily achieved through procedures which prevent the separation of power from responsibility and which provide the constitutional requisites of fairness for witnesses.”).

Appendix A

nonetheless concludes that it is a valid exercise of the legislative power. This marks a sharp break with the few judicial precedents in this area. The Supreme Court has consistently maintained that Congress cannot undertake a legislative investigation of an impeachable official if the “gravamen” of the investigation rests on “suspicions of criminality.” *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 193, 195. In *Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon*, our court refused to enforce a legislative subpoena to President Richard Nixon by the Senate Select Committee tasked with investigating the Watergate break-in. 498 F.2d 725, 162 U.S. App. D.C. 183 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (en banc). The tapes sought by the subpoena were too “tangential” to the Committee’s asserted legislative purposes, especially because the House had commenced impeachment proceedings to ascertain the President’s role in these events. *Id.* at 733.

The majority’s holding also breaks with the longstanding historical practice of Congress and the Executive. Without analyzing the Constitution or responding to the consistent historical understanding presented below, the majority simply asserts that Congress must be able “to make the quintessentially legislative judgment that some concerns about potential misconduct or illegality are better addressed through . . . legislation than impeachment.” Maj. Op. 49. The majority’s novel holding, however, fails to explain how specific accusations of wrongdoing by impeachable officials can be pursued through legislation. The Constitution, historical practice, and our cases prohibit rolling this investigation of illegal conduct of the President into a legislative

Appendix A

investigation. Allowing Congress to use the legislative power to circumvent the impeachment process disrupts the separation of powers. By simply invoking a need for remedial legislation, Congress may now expand its control over the other branches and avoid the accountability and responsibility inherent in the impeachment power.

Finally, the inter-branch conflict in this case does not dissipate simply because the subpoena for the President's papers is strategically directed to Mazars rather than the President. In an attempt to sidestep thorny separation of powers questions, the majority reduces the conflict to a merely personal one involving the President's accountants: "[T]o resolve this case, we need not decide whether the Constitution permits Congress, in the conduct of a legislative—that is, non-impeachment—investigation, to issue subpoenas to a sitting President." *Id.* at 20. By the majority's account, the subpoena does not transgress any constitutionally prescribed boundaries between co-equal branches in part because "quite simply, the Oversight Committee has *not* subpoenaed President Trump." *Id.* The majority thus concludes that concerns about the relative powers of the President and Congress do not come into play. Yet this claim belies both precedent and common sense. Indeed, by the end of its opinion, the majority abandons even this reservation and simply asserts, "Congress already possesses . . . the authority to subpoena Presidents and their information." *Id.* at 59.

The official actions of the Chief Executive are essentially bound up in the Mazars subpoena. A subpoena's force extends beyond its recipient, which the majority has

Appendix A

implicitly acknowledged by declining to question President Trump's standing to challenge the subpoena's validity. As we have previously explained: "[T]he fortuity that documents sought by a congressional subpoena are not in the hands of a party claiming injury from the subpoena should not immunize that subpoena from challenge by that party The fact that the Executive is not in a position to assert its claim of constitutional right by refusing to comply with a subpoena does not bar the challenge." *United States v. American Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 567 F.2d 121, 129, 185 U.S. App. D.C. 254 (D.C. Cir. 1977) (citing *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 513 (Marshall, J., concurring)). Moreover, we have recognized that congressional subpoenas may create a "portentous clash between the executive and legislative branches" notwithstanding the fact that the subpoena was issued against a private party. *United States v. AT&T*, 551 F.2d 384, 385, 179 U.S. App. D.C. 198 (D.C. Cir. 1976); accord *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 498, 501 n.14 (reviewing challenge to third-party subpoena because otherwise "compliance by the third person could frustrate any judicial inquiry").

The Committee's subpoena is directed to Mazars but targets the President's papers. The form of the subpoena cannot mask the inter-branch conflict between Congress and the President. Cf. *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Secret Serv.*, 726 F.3d 208, 225-26, 406 U.S. App. D.C. 440 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (refusing to allow "end runs" around "separation-of-powers concerns" by subpoenaing the Secret Service instead of the President for presidential calendars). Despite the majority's skepticism, President Trump necessarily "carries the mantle of the Office of

Appendix A

the President in this case.” Maj. Op. 24; *cf. In re Lindsey*, 158 F.3d 1263, 1286, 332 U.S. App. D.C. 357 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (Tatel, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (“Because the Presidency is tied so tightly to the persona of its occupant . . . the line between official and personal can be both elusive and difficult to discern.”).⁵

The basic contours of the problem are straightforward—the Committee’s subpoena seeks information regarding alleged unlawful actions of the President. The direct conflict between Congress and the President cannot be evaded by treating this as an ordinary legislative inquiry involving a subpoena to an accounting firm. In pursuit of remedial legislation, the Committee may investigate broadly, but this subpoena goes too far because the legislative power cannot target whether the President violated the law.

II.

The question of whether the House may issue this subpoena for a legislative purpose presents a serious

5. As the Department of Justice points out, it is also possible that judicial resolution would not be necessary if the Committee had issued the subpoena to the President directly. DOJ Br. 7-8. Instead, the President and the House would negotiate in the “hurly-burly, the give and take of the political process between the legislative and the executive,” likely raising a mix of legal and political arguments and appealing to the public for support. *Executive Privilege - Secrecy in Government: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Intergovernmental Relations of the S. Comm. on Government Operations*, 94th Cong. 87 (1975) (statement of Antonin Scalia, Assistant Att’y Gen., Office of Legal Counsel).

Appendix A

conflict between Congress and the President. While the question has never been squarely addressed by the Supreme Court, Congress and the executive branch have regularly confronted similar problems. Accordingly, I start at the beginning. The text and structure of the Constitution are best read to provide for impeachment as the exclusive mechanism for reaching the wrongdoing of the President and other impeachable officials. The original understanding of Congress's separate legislative and impeachment powers, as well as consistent historical practice since the Founding, confirms that congressional investigations of the alleged unlawful actions of the President cannot be pursued through the legislative power. *Cf. NLRB v. Noel Canning*, 573 U.S. 513, 524-26, 134 S. Ct. 2550, 189 L. Ed. 2d 538 (2014) (“[L]ong settled and established practice is a consideration of great weight in a proper interpretation of constitutional provisions’ regulating the relationship between Congress and the President.” (quoting *The Pocket Veto Case*, 279 U.S. 655, 689, 49 S. Ct. 463, 73 L. Ed. 894, 68 Ct. Cl. 786 (1929))).

Targeting an individual officer for suspicions of criminality requires proceeding through the impeachment power, with its attendant procedural protections and accountability. The majority claims to recount a “familiar tale” of congressional subpoenas and investigations, *Maj. Op.* 65; however, its story covers only legislative investigations that involve no allegations of wrongdoing against an impeachable official. The majority’s cursory and selective use of history glosses over important distinctions carefully maintained by all three branches between Congress’s legislative and judicial powers of investigation.

*Appendix A***A.**

The text and structure of the Constitution set out with precision the process for Congress to investigate the unlawful actions of the President—namely, impeachment by the House followed by a trial in the Senate. The distinctions between the legislative and judicial powers of Congress are firmly rooted in the Constitution and reflect the fundamental differences between these powers in our system of government. The original meaning confirms that Congress acts in an exceptional judicial capacity when exercising impeachment powers. Investigating unlawful actions by impeachable officials is outside the legislative power because impeachment provides the exclusive mechanism for Congress to investigate such conduct.

Congress is vested with limited and enumerated legislative powers, and while the power to investigate is not in the text of the Constitution, it has long been recognized that Congress may investigate and issue subpoenas necessary and proper to the exercise of the legislative power. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 18. As the Court has explained, “the power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 174. Such investigations are part of the legislative power and may extend no farther than that power permits. *See Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161.

In the United States, however, the legislative power does not include the exercise of judicial power to determine

Appendix A

the guilt or innocence of individuals.⁶ The Constitution prohibits bills of attainder. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 9, cl. 3; art. I, § 10, cl. 1; *see also United States v. Brown*, 381 U.S. 437, 442, 85 S. Ct. 1707, 14 L. Ed. 2d 484 (1965) (“[T]he Bill of Attainder Clause was intended not as a narrow, technical . . . prohibition, but rather as an implementation of the separation of powers, a general safeguard against legislative exercise of the judicial function, or more simply—trial by legislature.”). The Framers understood the importance of prohibiting Congress from turning its substantial powers against an individual and possessed a “sense of a sharp necessity to separate the legislative from the judicial power.” *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc.*, 514 U.S. 211, 219, 115 S. Ct. 1447, 131 L. Ed. 2d 328 (1995); *see also Calder v. Bull*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 386, 389, 1 L. Ed. 648, 3 Dall. 386 (1798) (reviewing parliamentary abuses of bills of attainder and noting “the Federal and State Legislatures, were prohibited from passing any bill of attainder; or any ex post facto law” to prevent

6. By contrast, at the time of the Founding, the British House of Commons possessed broad powers to “impeach” not only officials but individual citizens, who could be tried by the House of Lords in a judicial capacity for any criminal offense. 4 William Blackstone, *Commentaries* *259-61. As such, Parliament could not only remove an official but also assess a broad range of punishments at the discretion of “the wisdom of the peers.” *Id.* at *121-22. Against the abuses of this practice, the Founders limited the scope of impeachable offenses and punishments for conviction. *See* Peter Hoffer & N.E.H. Hull, *Impeachment in America, 1635-1805*, at 96-98 (1984); *see also* Akhil R. Amar, *America’s Constitution: A Biography* 199-203 (2005) (describing how the “system of federal impeachment broke decisively with English impeachment practice”).

Appendix A

“acts of violence and injustice” against individuals). As Montesquieu warned, if the judicial powers were “joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control; for the judge would then be the legislator.” Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws* 157 (A. Cohler et al. eds., 1989).

Vested with the power to make the laws, Congress cannot also execute and adjudicate them. *See Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. (6 Cranch) 87, 136, 3 L. Ed. 162 (1810) (“It is the peculiar province of the legislature to prescribe general rules for the government of society; the application of those rules to individuals in society would seem to be the duty of other departments.”). Exercising the legislative power, Congress may enact general, prospective rules for the whole of society. Yet Congress cannot prosecute and decide specific cases against individuals. Such powers properly belong to the executive branch and the independent judiciary—a division essential to maintaining fundamental aspects of our separation of powers and protecting the rights of individuals accused of illegal actions.

As an exception to this separation, the Constitution confers upon the House and Senate limited judicial powers over impeachable officials. The Constitution vests the House of Representatives with the “sole Power of Impeachment,” U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 5, and the Senate with the “sole Power to try all Impeachments,” U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3, cl. 6. The Constitution creates a two-tier system, dividing limited judicial power between the House and the Senate to target individual cases

Appendix A

of wrongdoing by impeachable officials. These judicial powers were understood as exceptions to the legislative power vested in Congress. *See Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 190-91 (noting impeachment and removal as exceptions to the separation of powers because they place judicial power in Congress); *Hayburn's Case*, 2 U.S. (2 Dall.) 409, 410 (1792) (“[N]o judicial power of any kind appears to be vested [in the legislature], but the important one relative to impeachments.”).

In the context of an impeachment inquiry, the House serves as a kind of grand jury, investigating public officials for misconduct. As Hamilton noted, the “delicacy and magnitude of [this] trust” transforms the House into a “NATIONAL INQUEST.” The Federalist No. 65, at 338. The Senate acts as a “court for the trial of impeachments,” exercising the “awful discretion which a court of impeachments must necessarily have, to doom to honour or to infamy the most confidential and the most distinguished characters of the community.” *Id.* at 339. Trial by the Senate in cases of impeachment is part of the “judicial character of the Senate.” *Id.* at 337; *see also* Jefferson’s Manual of Parliamentary Practice § 619 (“The trial, though it varies in external ceremony, yet differs not in essentials from criminal prosecutions before inferior courts.”). The Constitution requires senators trying an impeachment to be on “Oath or Affirmation” and for the Chief Justice to preside when the President is tried; conviction requires “two thirds of the Members present.” U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3, cl. 6. The Constitution refers to “Judgment in Cases of Impeachment.” U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3, cl. 7.

Appendix A

As an exercise of judicial power, the impeachment process targets the individual. The Constitution's text confirms this understanding: "no Person shall be convicted," and "the Party convicted" shall be liable according to the law. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3, cls. 6-7. "The President, Vice President, and all civil Officers of the United States" are subject to impeachment. U.S. CONST. art. II, § 4. Article I makes clear that in this role, the Senate acts as a court trying impeachable offenses and renders judgment that could result in removal from office and disqualification from holding any "Office of honor, Trust, or Profit under the United States." U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3, cl. 6. The impeachable offenses enumerated in the Constitution specifically target individual wrongdoing, namely "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." U.S. CONST. art. II, § 4; *see also* The Federalist No. 65, at 339 (observing the Senate was the only body with "*confidence enough in its own situation, to preserve, unawed and uninfluenced, the necessary impartiality between an individual accused, and the representatives of the people, his accusers*").

The Founders treated impeachable offenses as wholly distinct from the subjects of investigation for legislative purposes, such as maladministration. The exact phrasing of an impeachable offense was debated at the Philadelphia Convention. After the Convention settled on "Treason, or bribery," George Mason moved to include "maladministration" as an additional ground for impeachment. 2 Records of the Federal Convention 550 (Max Farrand ed., 1937). James Madison objected, arguing that "[s]o vague a term will be equivalent to a

Appendix A

tenure during pleasure of the Senate,” and Gouverneur Morris argued that “[a]n election of every four years will prevent maladministration.” *Id.* Conceding the point, Mason withdrew “maladministration” and submitted the text eventually enacted: “other high crimes & misdemeanors.” *Id.* Thus, impeachment addresses a public official’s wrongdoing—treason, bribery, and high crimes or misdemeanors—while problems of general maladministration are left to the political process.

In addition, impeachment by the House and trial by the Senate were understood to include constitutional rights normally afforded to the accused in a criminal trial. After examining English, colonial, and early constitutional practice, Justice Story concluded that the common law rights of criminal defendants apply in the exercise of the impeachment power. *See* 3 Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* § 796 (1833) (“[I]n trials by impeachment the law differs not in essentials from criminal prosecutions before inferior courts. The same rules of evidence, the same legal notions of crimes and punishments prevail.”); *see also* 3 Asher C. Hinds, *Hinds’ Precedents of the House of Representatives* § 2486 (“Hinds”) (“In the prosecution of an impeachment, such rules must be observed as are essential to justice; and, if not exactly the same as those which are practiced in ordinary courts, they must be analogous, and as nearly similar to them as forms will permit.” (quoting Op. Att’y Gen. of May 9, 1796)).

The Supreme Court has long recognized the enhanced protections required by impeachment’s judicial function,

Appendix A

even if such matters are generally not justiciable. See *Nixon v. United States*, 506 U.S. 224, 238, 113 S. Ct. 732, 122 L. Ed. 2d 1 (1993) (concluding that judicial review of impeachment procedures would be inconsistent with the text and structure of the Constitution); *Marshall v. Gordon*, 243 U.S. 521, 547, 37 S. Ct. 448, 61 L. Ed. 881 (1917) (noting that when the congressional contempt power is “transformed into judicial authority” as when a “committee contemplate[s] impeachment,” the authority becomes “subject to all the restrictions and limitations imposed by the Constitution”); *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 190 (impeachment proceedings assume “the same manner” and employ the “same means that courts of justice can in like cases”).

Moreover, impeachment and removal ensure accountability to Congress but are not designed to give Congress direct control over the executive branch. The President is the head of a co-equal and independent branch of government. The impeachment power raised concerns for Gouverneur Morris and other Framers who feared “the prospect of impeachment would make the chief executive dependent upon the legislature.” Peter Hoffer & N.E.H. Hull, *Impeachment in America, 1635-1805*, at 100 (1984); see also *The Federalist* No. 65, at 341 (noting the risk of “persecution of an intemperate or designing majority in the House of Representatives”).

Because of the weighty responsibility of investigating and trying public officers, “the Constitution structured impeachment as a system of national accountability.” Akhil R. Amar, *America’s Constitution: A Biography* 201 (2005).

Appendix A

The Framers established a mechanism for Congress to hold even the highest officials accountable, but also required the House to take responsibility for invoking this power. *See* 3 Annals of Cong. 903 (1793) (statement of Rep. Smith) (describing the “solemnities and guards” the impeachment process offers to public officers “accused of a breach of duty”); H.R. Rep. No. 93-1305, at 182 (1974) (describing the House’s “responsibility as representatives of the people” in the Nixon impeachment process). By vesting this visible and solemn power in one institution, the Constitution forces the House to take accountability for its actions when investigating the President’s misconduct. *See* Michael J. Gerhardt, *The Federal Impeachment Process: A Constitutional and Historical Analysis* 110 (1996) (“[M]embers of Congress seeking reelection have a political incentive to avoid any abuse of the impeachment power [T]he cumbersome nature of the impeachment process makes it difficult for a faction guided by base personal or partisan motives to impeach and remove someone from office.”); Julie R. O’Sullivan, *The Interaction Between Impeachment and the Independent Counsel Statute*, 86 GEO. L.J. 2193, 2229-30 (1998) (“[E]lectorate accountability is the ultimate check by which Congress’s abuse of its otherwise externally unchecked power of impeachment may be constrained.”).

In light of the text, structure, and original meaning, the Constitution is best read to provide for impeachment as the exclusive mechanism for Congress to investigate the wrongdoing of the President and other impeachable officials. *See Kendall v. United States ex rel. Stokes*, 37 U.S. (12 Pet.) 524, 610, 9 L. Ed. 1181 (1838) (“The executive

Appendix A

power is vested in a President; and as far as his powers are derived from the constitution, he is beyond the reach of any other department, except in the mode prescribed by the constitution through the impeaching power.”). It would be wholly inconsistent with this exacting structure and its explicit safeguards if Congress could target unlawful actions by impeachable officials simply through its legislative power, thereby encroaching on the Executive without the processes, protections, and accountability of impeachment.

B.

Because “the interpretive questions before us concern the allocation of power between two elected branches of Government,” *Noel Canning*, 573 U.S. at 524, I proceed to consider the historical practice regarding congressional investigations of the executive branch and executive officials. *Cf. Zivotofsky*, 135 S. Ct. at 2084 (“To determine whether the President possesses the exclusive power of recognition the Court examines the Constitution’s text and structure, as well as precedent and history bearing on the question.”). While historical practice is relevant, it does not alter the original meaning of the Constitution. *See McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm’n*, 514 U.S. 334, 370, 115 S. Ct. 1511, 131 L. Ed. 2d 426 (1995) (Thomas, J., concurring in the judgment) (recognizing the concern with overturning longstanding state practice, but concluding that “the historical evidence from the framing outweighs recent tradition”).

Appendix A

With respect to Congress’s investigative powers, the original meaning and historical practice align—all three branches have consistently distinguished between investigations for legislative purposes and investigations targeting wrongdoing by an impeachable official. Moreover, the historical evidence demonstrates that Congress often begins an investigation into the executive branch with general questions properly pertaining to legislation; however, if an inquiry turns to suspicions of criminality, Congress moves that part of the investigation into impeachment or ends the inquiry into the impeachable official. Thus, even a valid legislative purpose has never been thought to justify probing specific accusations of wrongdoing by impeachable officials. Exercising their independent duty to interpret the Constitution, the political branches have maintained that impeachment is the exclusive mechanism for investigating impeachable offenses. This historical practice reflects and reinforces the Constitution’s text, structure, and original meaning, and is consistent with the Supreme Court’s precedents.

1.

Founding Era practice confirms the Constitution’s original meaning—investigations of unlawful actions by an impeachable official cannot proceed through the legislative power. For instance, in 1793 the House passed a broad resolution to investigate the administration of the Department of the Treasury. *See* 3 Annals of Cong. 835-40 (1793). Representative William Giles subsequently introduced a string of resolutions alleging wrongdoing and lawbreaking by Secretary Alexander Hamilton. *Id.* at 900

Appendix A

(alleging, *inter alia*, “[t]hat the Secretary of the Treasury has violated the law”). Responding to Representative Giles’s resolution, Representative William Smith argued that an investigation of whether “the Secretary violated a law” could not proceed under the guise of “an investigation of theoretic principles of Government.” *Id.* at 901. Instead, the Constitution “directs” that Congress must confront “great public functionaries . . . accused of a breach of duty” through the impeachment process, with its attendant “solemnities and guards.” *Id.* at 903; *see also id.* at 903-04 (statement of Rep. Murray); *id.* at 947-48 (statement of Rep. Boudinot) (“[The Committee] were no longer acting in a Legislative capacity, but were now exercising the important office of the grand inquest of the Nation The honor and reputation of the officer thus charged . . . required a steady, uniform, and disinterested examination of every question from us.”). Representative Giles’s resolutions were decisively defeated. *See id.* at 955-63.

Similarly, in 1796 the House requested from President George Washington documents and diplomatic correspondence related to the Jay Treaty and its ratification in order to determine whether to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Treaty. President Washington argued that because the House could not compel him to disclose the documents through an exercise of its legislative powers, it could demand the documents only through an exercise of its impeachment power: “It does not occur that the inspection of the papers asked for can be relative to any purpose under the cognizance of the House of Representatives, except that of an impeachment; which the resolution has not expressed.” *See 5 Annals*

Appendix A

of Cong. 760-62 (1796). The House passed a resolution disapproving of President Washington's message, but eventually appropriated the funds necessary to implement the Treaty without receiving the papers it demanded from the President. *See id.* at 1291.

Moreover, during the early years of the Republic, when the House sought to target individual, official misconduct, it proceeded through the impeachment power, not the legislative power. In the high profile 1805 impeachment of Associate Justice Samuel Chase, the investigation into his misconduct proceeded unambiguously under the impeachment power. *See* 3 Hinds §§ 2342-46. The House specifically defined its role as that of a grand jury and voted to authorize an impeachment investigation by a committee vested with subpoena powers. *See id.* § 2342.⁷

One early impeachment illustrates the line between general investigation and impeachment particularly well. During an investigation of the "disposition of the funds of the district court," "the conduct of the judge of the district had been somewhat implicated." 32 Annals of Cong. 1715-16 (1818) (discussing Judge William P. Van Ness of the Southern District of New York). The Judiciary Committee thought it improper to proceed under the

7. Congress conducted such investigations exclusively through the impeachment power throughout the Founding Era. *See* 3 Hinds §§ 2294-2302 (impeachment of Senator William Blount, 1797); §§ 2319-23 (impeachment of Judge John Pickering, 1803); §§ 2364-67 (impeachment of Judge James Peck, 1830, highlighting the importance of protections for the accused before the Senate trial).

Appendix A

existing resolution and sought specific authority from the House to transfer from a legislative investigation to an investigation of the judge's "official conduct." *Id.* After such authority was granted, the Committee conducted an impeachment inquiry and found no "ground for the constitutional interposition of the House." 3 Hinds § 2489.

Ignoring these Founding Era precedents, the majority touches briefly on investigations for legislative purposes that concerned only general maladministration. None of the majority's examples involve an allegation of individual wrongdoing or unlawful activity by an impeachable officer. Indeed, the majority's examples help to demonstrate the original understanding that such investigations proceed exclusively through the impeachment power.

The majority begins with the House's 1792 investigation into the failure of the expedition under General Arthur St. Clair in the Northwestern Territory. Maj. Op. 11. This investigation did not single out any particular officer for misconduct; instead, it was a general investigation into "the causes of the late defeat of the army under the command of Major-General St. Clair" and associated problems of logistics and supply. 3 Hinds § 1725. The investigation did not focus on General St. Clair, who was in any event not an impeachable officer because the impeachment power extends only to "civil Officers." U.S. CONST. art. II, § 4. Rather, the House sought to study the problems of execution in the expedition as a whole. Furthermore, at the Washington Administration's urging, Congress amended its resolution of inquiry to disclaim any intention of seeking private papers. *See* Thomas Jefferson,

Appendix A

Memoranda of Consultations with the President (11 Mar. to 9 Apr. 1792); 3 Hinds § 1726 (calling for papers only “of a public nature”). Contrast this general investigation with the investigation of Secretary Hamilton: when the inquiry began to focus on whether Hamilton had violated the law, the House insisted such inquiries could not proceed through the ongoing legislative investigation. The investigation of the St. Clair expedition never turned toward an impeachable official, and therefore remained within Congress’s legislative powers. *See* 3 Annals of Cong. 490-94 (1792).

Similarly, the majority’s reference to Congress’s investigation of the burning of Washington in 1814 offers a useful example of the line maintained throughout the Founding Era between general investigation and impeachment. Maj. Op. 12. This legislative investigation focused on the general causes of the military disaster without targeting any individual officer. *See* Herman J. Viola, “The Burning of Washington, 1814,” *in* Congress Investigates: A Critical and Documentary History 41-45 (Roger A. Bruns et al. eds., 2011). The majority’s Founding Era precedents thus buttress the rule that investigations into the causes of maladministration may proceed under the legislative power; however, the legislative power cannot support an investigation into whether an impeachable official has violated the laws. Such congressional inquiry must proceed, if at all, through the impeachment process.

*Appendix A***2.**

The Founding Era practice continued into the Jacksonian Era. For example, in 1832, Representative John Quincy Adams defeated a resolution seeking to conduct a legislative investigation into charges of public misconduct against a federal land commissioner. The matter was referred to the House Judiciary Committee after Adams argued that “[t]he resolution contained a matter of charge against a public officer. Prima facie it would lead to an expectation of an impeachment. It was alike due to the character of the officer in question, and to the reputation of the House, to investigate the matter solemnly and effectually.” 8 Reg. Deb. 2198-99 (1832).

In 1836, the House appointed a select committee to conduct a broad investigation of all departments of the Jackson Administration, empowering the committee to call for persons and papers. 3 Hinds § 1737. When the Committee’s investigation focused on particular officials, President Andrew Jackson intervened in protest of the Committee’s “illegal and unconstitutional calls for information.” *Id.* The President argued that he would fully cooperate with an investigation conducted “in the accustomed mode,” impeachment, but would not subject himself to “the establishment of a Spanish inquisition.” Letter from President Andrew Jackson to Rep. Henry A. Wise, Chairman, H. Select Comm. (Jan. 26, 1837). Chairman Wise resisted and submitted a resolution disagreeing with the doctrine expounded by the President, providing a rare contrary understanding of the scope of the legislative power to investigate. But the Chairman’s

Appendix A

position was soundly defeated by his committee, which issued a report endorsing President Jackson's position and noting that the investigation amounted to charges "against the individual officers for 'corrupt violation' of existing laws." 3 Hinds § 1740. The Committee further concluded that "the only constitutional power under which the House of Representatives, as a coordinate branch of the Government, could constitute a committee to inquire into alleged 'corrupt violations of duty' by another coordinate branch of the Government (the Executive) is the 'power of impeachment.'" *Id.*

Indeed, Congress reaffirmed that it could not censure President Jackson outside the context of impeachment. After initially voting to censure, the Senate later expunged the censure from the record on the grounds that "President Jackson was adjudged and pronounced to be guilty of an impeachable offence, and a stigma placed upon him, as a violator of his oath of office, and of the laws and constitution which he was sworn to preserve, protect, and defend, without going through the forms of an impeachment, and without allowing him the benefits of a trial, or the means of defence." 12 Reg. Deb. 878 (1836).⁸

8. The majority asserts that "Presidents, too, have often been the subject of Congress's legislative investigations." Maj. Op. 15. Its one example from the Jacksonian Era, however, fails to support its conclusion. The majority refers to the select committee appointed to investigate former Representative Samuel Houston and whether he received money from the Secretary of War with the President's knowledge. *Id.* at 15-16. Far from an investigation of the President's wrongdoing, this inquiry was part of a broader investigation of Houston's assault on a member of Congress for

Appendix A

Presidents James Polk, Ulysses Grant, and Grover Cleveland continued to vigorously defend the line between legislative and impeachment investigations, maintaining the latter included legal protections for the officer accused. In 1846, the House formed a select committee to investigate the possibility of impeaching Daniel Webster, the former Secretary of State (and then-Senator), with the power to send for papers. Cong. Globe, 29th Cong., 1st Sess. 945 (1846). While the Select Committee conducted its investigation, the House debated a resolution calling for the State Department to produce documents tending to incriminate Webster. *Id.* at 636. Some members argued that only the duly authorized Select Committee could make such a request. *Id.* at 636-43. Representative Adams maintained that an impeachable official “may not be reached by side-blows.” *Id.* at 641. The resolution passed, but President Polk refused to turn over the requested documents because the resolution did not clearly spell out Congress’s intent to obtain the documents pursuant to its impeachment power.

President Polk emphasized, however, that he would fully cooperate with a duly authorized impeachment investigation. *See* 2 Hinds § 1561 (“[T]he power of

statements made on the floor. The Committee Report never mentions the President, nor does it indicate the Committee took any steps to investigate the President. *See* 2 Hinds §§ 1616-19; 8 Reg. Deb. 2591-92 (1832) (context of inquiry); *id.* at 2595 (then-Rep. Polk proposing inquiry); *id.* at 2853 (need for resolution was to determine veracity of statement made on floor that provoked Houston’s attack); *id.* at 3022-33 (resolution forming select committee).

Appendix A

impeachment belongs to the House of Representatives, and that with a view to the exercise of this power, that House has the right to investigate the conduct of all public officers under the government.” (quoting President James K. Polk, Message to the House of Representatives, April 20, 1846)). The Select Committee “entirely concur[red] with the President of the United States” and his decision not to “communicate or make public, except with a view to an impeachment” the document sought. *Cong. Globe*, 29th Cong. 1st Sess. 946-48, 988 (1846); *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 29-684, at 4 (1846). The House approved the Select Committee’s proposal and took no further action on the matter. *See* 2 George Ticknor Curtis, *The Life of Daniel Webster* 283 (1870). President Polk and the House agreed that the House may call for documents seeking evidence of a public officer’s wrongdoing only pursuant to an impeachment investigation.⁹

This issue was raised again by the 1860 House Select Committee to Investigate Alleged Corruptions in Government (“Covode Committee”) when it investigated “whether the President of the United States, or any other officer of the Government, has, by money, patronage, or other improper means, sought to influence the action of Congress.” 2 Hinds § 1596. President Buchanan protested

9. Presidents adhered to this position throughout the Nineteenth Century without pushback from Congress. *See, e.g.*, 17 *Cong. Rec.* 1903 (1886) (statement of President Cleveland) (“I am also led unequivocally to dispute the right of the Senate, by the aid of any documents whatever, or in any way save through the judicial process of trial on impeachment, to review or reverse the acts of the Executive in the suspension . . . of Federal officials.”).

Appendix A

the attempt to circumvent the impeachment process, noting that while the House has the “wholesome prerogative” of examining administration of the departments of the government:

Should [the House] find reason to believe in the course of their examinations that any grave offense had been committed by the President . . . rendering it proper, in their judgment, to resort to impeachment, their course would be plain. They would then transfer the question from their legislative to their accusatory jurisdiction, and take care that . . . the accused should enjoy the benefit of cross-examining the witnesses and all the other safeguards with which the Constitution surrounds every American citizen.

President James Buchanan, Addendum to March 28 Message to Congress (June 22, 1860). The House asserted its power to investigate generally, but issued no subpoena seeking evidence of unlawful conduct by the President. *See* 2 Hinds § 1596; 3 Hinds § 1683.

Even the Civil War and Reconstruction Congresses, which strongly asserted congressional power, adhered to the distinction between investigations for legislative purposes and investigations of illegal conduct by an impeachable official. For example, the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War harangued non-impeachable military officers and articulated broad theories of congressional power, but never issued compulsory process to the President or sought to determine if particular

Appendix A

civil officers violated the law. *See generally* Elizabeth Joan Doyle, “The Conduct of the Civil War, 1861-65” *in* *Congress Investigates* at 160-89. The majority’s reference to the Harpers Ferry investigation, Maj. Op. 12, similarly misses the mark because that investigation never focused on the unlawful conduct of an impeachable official, but instead sought facts about the raid generally in order to determine whether legislation was necessary. *See* Roger A. Bruns, “John Brown’s Raid on Harpers Ferry, 1859-60” *in* *Congress Investigates* at 127-28.

The impeachment of President Andrew Johnson demonstrates the strength of the rule against using legislative inquiries to circumvent the impeachment process. The House rebuffed early attempts to initiate an inquiry into President Johnson’s wrongdoing under the auspices of an investigation into the executive branch’s administration. *See* Michael Les Benedict, “The Impeachment of President Andrew Johnson, 1867-68” *in* *Congress Investigates* at 263-64. While a minority of representatives would have favored using the legislative power to address President Johnson’s abuses, “the tedious job of taking testimony and searching through documents” did not begin until after a formal impeachment process was initiated. *Id.*; *see also* 3 Hinds §§ 2399-2400.

President Grant maintained the line against aggressive congressional requests in the midst of Reconstruction. The House requested detailed information regarding President Grant’s whereabouts while performing executive functions to determine whether the President was in violation of the Act of 16 July 1790, which established the District of

Appendix A

Columbia as the seat of government. *See* 3 Hinds § 1889. President Grant refused to comply with the request on separation of powers grounds. *See* 4 Cong. Rec. 2999-3000 (1876). As he explained, the investigation did not “belong to the province of legislation,” nor did it bear on any impeachment proceeding. *Id.* He therefore felt obliged under the Constitution to refuse the request in order to prevent “encroachments upon the proper powers of the office which the people of the United States have confided to me.” *Id.*; *see also* 3 Hinds § 1889 (“What the House of Representatives may require as a right in its demand upon the Executive for information is limited to what is necessary for the proper discharge of its powers of legislation or of impeachment.”). The House took no further action. *See* 3 Hinds § 1889.

In the 1879 investigation of United States Consul George Seward, the House again reaffirmed the separation between legislative and impeachment investigations. Acting under its legislative authority, the House Committee on Expenditures in the State Department attempted to hold Seward in contempt for failing to comply with a subpoena seeking certain official papers. *Id.* § 1699. Seward argued that the Committee was not authorized to conduct an impeachment inquiry and could not investigate his alleged misconduct pursuant to the legislative power. Agreeing with Seward, the House referred the matter to the Judiciary Committee. *Id.* The Judiciary Committee’s report “distinguished[ed] this case from the case of an ordinary investigation for legislative purposes,” and held that the Committee on Expenditures had acted beyond its legislative powers by attempting to circumvent the protections of the impeachment process:

Appendix A

The Executive is as independent of either House of Congress as either House of Congress is independent of him, and they cannot call for the records of his action or the action of his officers against his consent, any more than he can call for any of the journals or records of the House or Senate.

Id. §§ 1700, 2514. The Judiciary Committee maintained that the House had no right to issue compulsory process against the executive branch outside the impeachment process.¹⁰

3.

Continuing into the Twentieth Century, presidents have been vigilant against congressional attempts to circumvent the impeachment process. In 1909, the Senate attempted to subpoena documents from the Attorney General regarding the Department of Justice's failure to act against U.S. Steel Corporation. President Theodore Roosevelt refused to comply, so the Senate subpoenaed the Commissioner of Corporations, an officer within the Department of Commerce and Labor, for the same documents. *See Commissioner of Corporations—Right of Senate Committee to Ask for Information*, 27 Op.

10. The Judiciary Committee recognized that Seward could not be compelled to produce either private or public papers. His private papers were protected by the right against self-incrimination and his title to his private property, which could not be collaterally stripped by Congress. As for public papers, the Committee recognized them as within the province of executive privilege. 3 Hinds §§ 1700, 2514.

Appendix A

Att’y Gen. 150 (1909). After ordering the Commissioner to withhold the documents, the President informed the Senate that he would turn over the documents only if the Senate was acting in its capacity as an impeachment court. *See History of Refusals by Executive Branch Officials to Provide Information Demanded by Congress*, 6 Op. O.L.C. 751, 769 (1982) (citing Edward S. Corwin, *The President: Office and Powers* 429-30 (1957)). The Senate took no further action.¹¹

Investigations of Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon similarly demonstrate the executive branch’s resistance to releasing documents demanded for legislative purposes in relation to an impeachable official’s wrongdoing. In 1925, President Calvin Coolidge refused to hand over Mellon’s tax returns to a Senate committee tasked with a legislative investigation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, noting that “the attack which is being made on the Treasury Department goes beyond any . . . legitimate requirements.” 65 Cong. Rec. 6087-88 (1924).¹² In 1929, the Senate Judiciary Committee

11. President Roosevelt’s handling of the matter was recorded by his personal aide: “I told [Senator Clark] that the Senate should not have those papers and that [the Commissioner] turned them over to me. The only way the Senate or the committee can get those papers now is through my impeachment.” Archibald Willingham Butt & Lawrence F. Abbott, *The Letters of Archie Butt, Personal Aide to President Roosevelt* 305-06 (1924).

12. Congress did not attempt to enforce the subpoena in court but instead engaged in negotiations with the executive branch, which resulted in a compromise and Congress passing legislation regarding the disclosure of tax returns. *See* George K. Yin, *James*

Appendix A

investigated Mellon's alleged violations of financial conflicts of interest laws. The Committee determined it did not have the power to issue compulsory process because "it would be a judicial inquiry and [] not in aid of any legislative function of the Senate" and could be reached only through "duly instated criminal proceedings or impeachment proceedings originating in the House of Representatives." S. Rep. No. 71-7, at 3 (1929). In 1932, the House Judiciary Committee was authorized to conduct a formal impeachment investigation, with subpoena power, into the same allegations of Mellon's alleged lawbreaking. 3 Deschler's Precedents, Ch. 14, § 14.1 ("Deschler").¹³

4.

In the modern era, Congress has investigated allegations of illegal conduct by Presidents Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, and Bill Clinton. The majority cites these as examples of presidents being "the subject of Congress's legislative investigations." Maj. Op. 16-18. Contrary to the majority's characterization, these investigations reinforce that Congress may launch

Couzens, Andrew Mellon, the 'Greatest Tax Suit in the History of the World,' and Creation of the Joint Committee on Taxation and Its Staff, 66 TAX L. REV. 787, 857 (2013).

13. The majority's citation to the Pearl Harbor investigation, Maj. Op. 16, is of limited value, as President Franklin Roosevelt passed away on April 12, 1945, nearly five months before Congress authorized the investigation on September 6, 1945, placing the former President beyond the reach of Congress's subpoena power. See Wayne Thompson, "The Pearl Harbor Committee, 1945-46" in *Congress Investigates* at 670.

Appendix A

legislative investigations into administration generally, including the President's involvement in discretionary decisionmaking and purported scandals, but when wrongdoing by the President is targeted or uncovered the House transfers allegations of such conduct to an impeachment inquiry.

For example, the congressional inquiry into the break-in at the Democratic National Committee's headquarters in the Watergate Hotel began with the creation of a Senate Select Committee to investigate the incident and determine whether new legislation on electoral safeguards might be needed. *See* S. Res. 60, 93d Cong. § 1(a) (1973). The inquiry centered on whether any actions—"illegal, improper, or unethical"—took place, but the inquiry did not target any specific persons. *Id.* President Nixon initially rebuffed the Select Committee's informal requests for information. *See* Letter from President Richard M. Nixon to Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., Chairman, Sen. Select Comm. on Presidential Campaign Activities (July 6, 1973). The Committee, acting pursuant to its legislative power, later issued two subpoenas to the President. Those subpoenas were eventually quashed by this court. *See Senate Select*, 498 F.2d at 733.¹⁴

14. When the Supreme Court upheld the grand jury request for President Nixon's tapes, it specifically confined its decision to the context of criminal investigations and noted it was not concerned with how these issues might be resolved in the context of "congressional demands for information." *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 712 n.19, 94 S. Ct. 3090, 41 L. Ed. 2d 1039 (1974).

Appendix A

While litigation was pending, the House Judiciary Committee determined that the evidence gathered through both the Senate and special counsel investigations had shifted the focus so heavily toward allegations of wrongdoing by President Nixon that a formal impeachment investigation was necessary to proceed any further:

We have reached the point when it is important that the House explicitly confirm our responsibility under the Constitution.

We are asking the House of Representatives, by this resolution, to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the conduct of the President of the United States, to determine whether or not evidence exists that the President is responsible for any acts that in the contemplation of the Constitution are grounds for impeachment

[W]e are asking the House to give the Judiciary Committee the power of subpoena in its investigations. Such a resolution has always been passed by the House. . . . It is a necessary step if we are to meet our obligations.

³ Deschler Ch. 14, § 6.2. Only after the House passed a resolution explicitly invoking its authority under the impeachment power did the Judiciary Committee subpoena the President. *See* H.R. Res. 803, 93d Cong. (1974); H.R. Rep. No. 93-1305, at 6 (1974).

Appendix A

The House Judiciary Committee took responsibility for commencing an impeachment investigation and thereafter accorded robust procedural protections to ensure that documents obtained in the course of that process remained confidential. H.R. Rep. No. 93-1305, at 8-9. The Committee also determined that the President must comply only with subpoenas issued “relative to the impeachment inquiry.” 3 Deschler Ch. 14, § 6.12. Notably, one of the grounds in the resulting articles of impeachment was President Nixon’s failure to comply with subpoenas, but only those issued after formal authorization of the impeachment investigation. *Id.* § 15.13. The majority neglects this institutional history and focuses only on the Select Committee’s unsuccessful attempt to subpoena the President for legislative purposes. Maj. Op. 17-18. In the 1970s, as in the 1790s, the House recognized the importance of invoking the impeachment power when an investigation shifts from a legislative inquiry to an investigation of the illegal action of an impeachable official.

Regarding the Iran-Contra Affair in 1987, the majority asserts that the House committee established to inquire into illegal arms sales to Iran to finance Nicaraguan rebels sought to “investigate . . . the role of the President” in those events. *Id.* at 16. This misrepresents the broad scope of the investigation, which inquired into whether and how the National Security Council staff and other agency officials were involved. The House resolution forming the Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran refers to the President only in relation to assessing the need for legislation regarding “authorization and supervision or lack thereof of the

Appendix A

matters in this section by the President and other White House personnel.” H.R. Res. 12, 100th Cong. § 1(e) (1987). The corresponding Senate resolution does not mention the President at all. *See* S. Res. 23, 100th Cong. (1987). Reflecting the general focus on the process of national security decisionmaking, the joint report issued by the House and Senate select committees sought to “explain what happened in the Iran-Contra Affair” rather than target the actions of any individual official. H.R. Rep. No. 100-433, at xv-xvi (1987). The Committees obtained over one million pages of documents, in part through subpoenas, but only accessed the President’s personal papers through his voluntary cooperation.

Similarly, the majority mischaracterizes the lessons of Congress’s investigation of the Whitewater Development Corporation and the eventual impeachment trial of President Clinton. Congressional involvement began several years after a United States Attorney forwarded a criminal investigation of the failure of Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association to the Department of Justice and, ultimately, an independent counsel. From 1994 to 1998, various House and Senate committees gathered facts on Madison Guaranty’s failure and whether agencies and administration officials cooperated with the independent counsel. *See* S. Res. 120, 104th Cong. (1995). The committees investigated with a wide lens, but stopped well short of targeting offenses by particular officers. *See, e.g.*, S. Rep. No. 104-191, at 1-3 (1995). Then-Governor Clinton’s involvement in Whitewater was parsed in relation to public ethics, good governance, and the regulation of financial institutions. *See The Failure*

Appendix A

of Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association and Related Matters: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Banking and Fin. Servs., 104th Cong. 1-5 (1995) (opening statement of Rep. James A. Leach, Chairman) (purpose of Whitewater hearings was to “shed light on the character of modern political leadership rather than simply spotlight flaws in a particular leader; . . . [and] to draw lessons for oversight of our banking laws rather than simply critique what went wrong with one institution”). While the President received subpoenas from the independent counsel, other federal investigators, and a federal grand jury, the majority points to no examples of either house of Congress issuing a subpoena to the President prior to impeachment.

Once President Clinton’s alleged misconduct became the target, the House, citing much of the history discussed above, formally invoked the impeachment power. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 105-795, at 24 (1998) (“Because impeachment is delegated solely to the House of Representatives by the Constitution, the full House of Representatives should be involved in critical decision making regarding various stages of impeachment.”). The House proceeded to a full floor vote to authorize an impeachment inquiry. *See* H.R. Res. 581, 105th Cong. (1998) (authorizing the Judiciary Committee to subpoena persons and things).

The House also declined to issue a censure resolution because it would circumvent the Impeachment and Bill of Attainder Clauses. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 105-830, at 137 (1998) (“[F]or the President or any other civil officer, censure as a shaming punishment by the legislature is precluded by the Constitution, since the impeachment

Appendix A

provisions permit Congress only to remove an officer . . . and disqualify him from office. Not only would [censure] undermine the separation of powers by punishing the President . . . in a manner other than expressly provided for in the Constitution, but it would violate the Constitution's prohibition on Bills of Attainder.”).

The text, structure, and original meaning of the Constitution are best understood to provide for impeachment as the exclusive mechanism for Congress to investigate the illegal conduct of the President and other impeachable officials. The majority presents no evidence from the Constitution, our cases, or the consistent interpretation of the political branches to refute these conclusions. From the Founding to the present, interactions between the political branches demonstrate a consistent practice that confirms the original meaning regarding the separation of the legislative and judicial powers of the House. The Constitution and our history reinforce several principles. First, the House cannot investigate the illegal conduct of an impeachable officer pursuant to the legislative power. Second, the investigation of the illegal conduct of an impeachable officer can be pursued only under the impeachment power, which transforms the House from a legislative body into the grand inquest of the nation and affords procedural and constitutional protections to the accused. Third, the House may not circumvent the weighty accountability of the impeachment process simply by proceeding through a legislative investigation.

*Appendix A***III.**

With these constitutional and historical principles as guideposts, I reach the question at hand: whether the Committee’s subpoena is a valid exercise of the legislative power. I examine the subpoena and conclude that it seeks to investigate illegal conduct of the President by reconstructing past actions in connection with alleged violations of ethics laws and the Emoluments Clauses. Such an inquiry exceeds Congress’s legislative power. The remedial legislative purposes offered by the Committee might authorize any number of other investigations, but cannot authorize this subpoena, which seeks to determine whether the President violated the law. Moreover, this subpoena represents an unprecedented assertion of legislative power and is readily distinguished from our previous cases. Neither the Constitution, nor longstanding interpretation by all three branches, supports the majority’s conclusion, which upholds—for the first time—a targeted investigation of the President’s alleged unlawful conduct under the legislative power.

A.

As the above history makes clear, the House’s legislative and judicial powers are wholly distinct and the House cannot target conduct that could constitute a high crime or misdemeanor through the legislative power. Discerning the line between the legislative and impeachment powers does not require a search for the Committee’s motives because the Committee has emphasized repeatedly and candidly its interest in investigating allegations of illegal

Appendix A

conduct by the President. In general, courts properly refrain from questioning legislative motive when assessing the legitimacy of congressional investigations, *accord* Maj. Op. 22, but this does not excuse us from the judicial duty to assure Congress is acting “in pursuance of its constitutional power.” *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 132, 79 S. Ct. 1081, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1115 (1959); *see also Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508-09 (upholding subpoenas “about a subject on which legislation may be had”); *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200 (“[M]otives alone would not vitiate an investigation . . . if that assembly’s legislative purpose is being served.”). An inquiry into motive involves looking behind the stated reasons for a Committee’s actions. In the Committee’s investigation, however, the “suspicions of criminality” are quite clearly articulated in the subpoena, the Cummings Memorandum, and other documents: the Committee seeks evidence of alleged unlawful actions by the President. *See Shelton*, 404 F.2d at 1297 (noting that sources for determining “[t]he object of the particular inquiry” include “the resolution of the Congress authorizing the inquiry,” “the opening statement of the Chairman,” and “statements of the members of the committee” (citing *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 209)); *see also Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 117 (“[T]he nature of the proceedings themselves, might sometimes make the topic (under inquiry) clear.” (quoting *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 209)).

First, and most overtly, the subpoena seeks to uncover “whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office.” Cummings Memorandum at 4. This inquiry relates in part to unofficial wrongdoing—i.e., events that occurred before

Appendix A

President Trump’s tenure in office—but also to actions during his tenure in office. The investigation specifically targets the President. It is not about administration of the laws generally or the President’s incidental involvement in or knowledge of any alleged unlawful activity within the executive branch. Instead the topics of investigation exclusively focus on the President’s possible engagement in “illegal conduct.”

Second, the subpoena seeks to help the Committee understand “whether [the President] has undisclosed conflicts of interest that may impair his ability to make impartial policy decisions.” *Id.*; *see also* Appellee Br. 32 (“These documents may illuminate whether and to what extent [President] Trump misrepresented his liabilities on federal disclosure forms and has undisclosed conflicts of interest.”). Again, this inquiry seeks to uncover alleged wrongdoing—undisclosed conflicts of interest may violate the statutory reporting requirements applicable to the President. *See* Appellee Br. 33 (“[E]xposing conflicts of interest is one of the core objectives of the Ethics in Government Act.” (quoting *Trump v. Comm. on Oversight & Reform*, 380 F. Supp. 3d 76, 95 (D.D.C. 2019))).

Third, the subpoena seeks to investigate “whether [the President] is complying with the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution.” Cummings Memorandum at 4; *see also* Appellee Br. 34-35 (discussing “[t]he Oversight Committee’s related investigations into [President] Trump’s potential violations of the Emoluments Clauses”). On the Committee’s own terms, it is investigating whether the President is in violation of the constitutional bar on public officials “accept[ing] . . . any present, Emolument,

Appendix A

Office, or Title.” U.S. CONST. art. I, § 9, cl. 8 (Foreign Emoluments Clause); *see also* U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 7 (Domestic Emoluments Clause). Quite simply the Committee seeks information about whether the President is violating the Constitution.

Fourth, the Committee seeks to inquire about “whether [the President] has accurately reported his finances to the Office of Government Ethics and other federal entities.” Cummings Memorandum at 4; *see also* Appellee Br. 31 (“[The Committee’s] investigations include . . . whether [President] Trump . . . submitted inaccurate financial disclosure forms to the Ethics Office.”). Again, the Committee seeks to uncover whether the President has violated the law in his official capacity—namely, the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 5 U.S.C. app. 4 § 101 *et seq.*, which imposes financial disclosure requirements on the President. The Committee’s jurisdiction includes the authority to conduct oversight of the Office of Government Ethics and how it implements various ethics requirements for federal officials. *See* Letter from Appellee Regarding Oral Argument Matter at 3-4 (July 16, 2019) (asserting that the Oversight Committee has jurisdiction over the Ethics in Government Act under House Rule X, cl. 1(n)(1)). Yet this particular inquiry is not about the administration of the Office of Government Ethics or of the laws it administers, but rather about reconstructing suspected violations of ethics laws by the Chief Executive. The Committee seeks information about past transactions related to the President’s financial reporting—which, if found inaccurate or incomplete, may carry civil and criminal penalties. *See* 5 U.S.C. app. 4 § 104(a).

Appendix A

The four inquiries stated in the Cummings Memorandum are more than political flourish—they unambiguously set out the nature of this investigation. These inquiries are repeated throughout statements and letters of the Chairman on behalf of the Committee. *See, e.g.*, Letter from Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Reform, to Pat Cipollone, Counsel to the President (Jan. 8, 2019) (request for “documents related to President Trump’s reporting of debts and payments to his personal attorney, Michael Cohen”); Letter from Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Reform, to Emory A. Rounds III, Director of Office of Gov’t Ethics (Jan. 22, 2019) (request for “documents relating to President Donald Trump’s reporting of debts and payments to his personal attorney, Michael Cohen, to silence women alleging extramarital affairs”); Letter from Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Reform, to Pat Cipollone, Counsel to the President (Feb. 15, 2019) (demanding answers to “significant questions about why some of the President’s closest advisors made [] false claims [about alleged payments] and the extent to which they too were acting at the direction of, or in coordination with, the President”); Letter from Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Reform, to Victor Wahba, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Mazars USA, LLP (Mar. 20, 2019) (request for documents citing accusation by Cohen that “President Trump changed the estimated value of his assets and liabilities on financial statements . . . including inflating or deflating the value of assets depending on the purpose for which he intended to use the statements”). The Cummings

Appendix A

Memorandum also relies on the February 27, 2019, hearing testimony of Michael Cohen, Cummings Memorandum at 1-2, during which the Chairman and Oversight Committee members repeatedly invoked allegations of criminality by the President. *See* Appellant Br. 7-8 (collecting statements from Cohen hearing). In this subpoena, the Committee has made clear that it seeks to investigate illegal conduct of the President. Indeed, the majority acknowledges that the Committee has an “interest in determining whether and how illegal conduct has occurred.” Maj. Op. 30.

The subpoena itself focuses on information that closely tracks the Committee’s stated object of investigating illegal conduct. It seeks, “with respect to Donald J. Trump” and his organizations, “[a]ll memoranda, notes, and communications” and “[a]ll underlying, supporting, or source documents and records” relating to multiple categories of financial statements going back to 2011, as well as “all engagement agreements or contracts” “without regard to time.” In addition, the subpoena specifically demands “all communications” between President Trump and his accountants and “all communications related to” any “potential concerns” that President Trump’s records “were incomplete, inaccurate, or otherwise unsatisfactory.”

The subpoena thus seeks to recreate, in exhaustive detail, the exact processes, discussions, and agreements that went into preparing the President’s financial records over a multi-year period in order to determine whether there is anything misleading or problematic in those records. Such requests are akin to a criminal grand jury

Appendix A

subpoena, designed to “inquire into all information that might possibly bear on [the] investigation until it has identified an offense or has satisfied itself that none has occurred.” *United States v. R. Enters., Inc.*, 498 U.S. 292, 297, 111 S. Ct. 722, 112 L. Ed. 2d 795 (1991). By contrast, “legislative judgments normally depend more on the predicted consequences of proposed legislative actions . . . than on precise reconstruction of past events.” *Senate Select*, 498 F.2d at 732.

Moreover, the Committee’s litigating position in this case continues to emphasize the importance of the four inquiries, each of which target the President’s alleged wrongdoing and potential violations of statutes and the Constitution: “The Oversight Committee is investigating whether [President] Trump inaccurately represented liabilities on his statutorily mandated financial disclosures, impermissibly benefited from a lease with a government agency, and violated the Constitution.” Appellee Br. 44; *see also id.* at 8-17, 21, 22-23, 31-35, 42, 44-45. Thus, we need not peer behind the curtain to find the Committee’s suspicions of wrongdoing—the Committee has explicitly and consistently avowed the purpose of investigating alleged illegal activities of the President.

The Committee also offers a legislative purpose. The Cummings Memorandum concludes with the statement that “[t]he Committee’s interest in these matters informs [the Committee’s] review of multiple laws and legislative proposals under [its] jurisdiction.” Cummings Memorandum at 4; *see also* Letter from Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and

Appendix A

Reform, to Pat Cipollone, Counsel to the President (Feb. 15, 2019) (“Congress has investigated how existing laws are being implemented and whether changes to the laws are necessary.”). Thus, even though the legislative purpose appears in a single sentence, the Committee states a double purpose—to investigate “criminal conduct by [President] Trump” and also to pursue remedial legislation relating to government ethics. Appellee Br. 44.

Given the broad power to investigate in aid of legislation, remedial legislative purposes will often be sufficient to uphold an investigation and accompanying subpoena. *See Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 160-61 (investigative power co-extensive with legislative power). The majority finds the Committee’s assertion of a legislative purpose sufficient because “[s]uch an ‘express avowal of the [Committee’s] object’ offers strong evidence of the Committee’s legislative purpose.” Maj. Op. 26 (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178). “The Committee’s interest in alleged misconduct, therefore, is in direct furtherance of its legislative purpose.” *Id.* at 31. In other words, the majority acknowledges that the Committee seeks to investigate illegal conduct of the President, but then states it is “even more important” that the Committee is seeking to “review multiple laws and legislative proposals under [its] jurisdiction.” *Id.* at 26 (quoting Cummings Memorandum at 4). Because the Constitution provides only one way for Congress to investigate illegal conduct by the President, the mere statement of a legislative purpose is not “more important” when a committee also plainly states its intent to investigate such conduct. The legislative power cannot support this subpoena.

Appendix A

The majority ignores the essential constitutional distinction between the different investigative powers of Congress and turns longstanding practice on its head by concluding dismissively that “we can easily reject the suggestion that this rationale [of investigating whether the ‘President may have engaged in illegal conduct’] spoils the Committee’s otherwise valid legislative inquiry.” *Id.* at 29. The valid legislative inquiry is not entirely spoiled—the Committee’s inquiry into legislative proposals may continue in any number of legitimate directions. Yet the Committee’s specific investigation targeting the President, if it is to continue, may be pursued only through impeachment. Since the Republic’s beginning, the President, Congress, and the courts have recognized that when Congress seeks to investigate individual suspicions of criminality against the President (or other impeachable officials), it cannot rely on its legislative powers. The legislative power being more general and expansive, it cannot trump, so to speak, the more specific impeachment power, which is necessary for an investigation of the illegal conduct of the President.

B.

This is the first time a court has recognized that a congressional investigation pertains to “whether and how illegal conduct has occurred,” Maj. Op. 30, but then upholds that investigation under the legislative power. The majority attempts to rely on our precedents to justify this subpoena by focusing on whether it is an impermissible exercise of “law enforcement” power. *Id.* at 21-22 (responding to appellants). The majority relies

Appendix A

on cases that deal with private citizens and problems of administration—but a subpoena against the President that investigates allegations of illegal conduct cannot be shoehorned into this framework. A review of the cases demonstrates the novelty of the majority’s holding.

The majority maintains that “an interest in past illegality can be wholly consistent with an intent to enact remedial legislation.” *Id.* at 29. To the extent the precedents support this general principle, however, it has been applied only in the context of *private individuals*. It is well established that Congress cannot exercise the executive or judicial powers, which are vested in the other departments of the government. “[T]he power to investigate must not be confused with any of the powers of law enforcement; those powers are assigned under our Constitution to the Executive and the Judiciary.” *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161. The Court made this general observation with respect to private individuals, not impeachable public officials. As far as private individuals are concerned, Congress emphatically has no law enforcement powers—no power to indict, to try, or to convict—and cannot enact a bill of attainder that would single out a person for punishment through legislation. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 9, cl. 3; art. I, § 10, cl. 1; *see also Brown*, 381 U.S. at 445-46 (“[T]he Legislative Branch is not so well suited as politically independent judges and juries to the task of ruling upon the blameworthiness of, and levying appropriate punishment upon, specific persons. . . . By banning bills of attainder, the Framers of the Constitution sought to guard against such dangers by limiting legislatures to the task of rule-making.”).

Appendix A

The cases cited by the majority demonstrate that during an investigation of private activity, the *incidental* revelation of criminal activity is tolerated when Congress has a legitimate legislative purpose,¹⁵ precisely because Congress cannot take any action against a private person for lawbreaking. In *Hutcheson v. United States*, the Supreme Court permitted a Senate committee to investigate the unlawful activity of a union president despite the fact that, if any wrongdoing was uncovered, the evidence might have “warranted a separate *state* prosecution.” 369 U.S. 599, 617, 82 S. Ct. 1005, 8 L. Ed. 2d 137 (1962) (emphasis added). The union president was, of course, not amenable to prosecution by Congress. Similarly, in *Sinclair v. United States*, the Court allowed a committee to question an oil executive, including on matters pertaining to pending criminal proceedings involving that executive. 279 U.S. 263, 290-91, 294-95, 49 S. Ct. 268, 73 L. Ed. 692 (1929). The proceedings determining the oil executive’s liability or innocence, however, were being conducted by an entirely separate branch: the Article III judiciary.

15. Even when a valid legislative purpose exists, the Court has been vigilant in guarding the constitutional rights of private citizens. *See Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 198-99 (courts cannot “abdicate the responsibility placed by the Constitution upon the judiciary to insure that the Congress does not unjustifiably encroach upon an individual’s right to privacy nor abridge his liberty of speech, press, religion or assembly”); *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161; *United States v. Rumely*, 345 U.S. 41, 44, 73 S. Ct. 543, 97 L. Ed. 770 (1953) (“[W]e would have to be that ‘blind’ Court . . . not to know that there is wide concern, both in and out of Congress, over some aspects of the exercise of the congressional power of investigation.” (quoting *Child Labor Tax Case*, 259 U.S. 20, 37, 42 S. Ct. 449, 66 L. Ed. 817, 1922-2 C.B. 337, T.D. 3346 (1922))).

Appendix A

The Court has upheld some congressional investigations that incidentally uncover unlawful action by private citizens in part because private individuals cannot be punished by Congress, but may be prosecuted by the executive branch and then face trial before an independent judiciary. *Cf. Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 182 (the Constitution requires that prosecutions of private individuals proceed by “a trial in which the rights of the party shall be decided by a tribunal appointed by law, which tribunal is to be governed by rules of law previously established”). The majority does not explain why precedents about union presidents and oil executives would apply to the President when the Constitution provides a wholly separate mechanism for Congress to impeach, to try, and, if convicted, to remove the President from office.

Importantly, the majority does not cite a single case in which the Court has upheld a congressional committee’s investigation into the past illegality of an impeachable official for a legislative purpose. In sharp contrast to private individuals, Congress possesses not only legislative but also judicial powers over officials amenable to impeachment. This is a notable and important exception to the separation of powers—vesting non-legislative powers in the House and Senate for the limited purpose of checking the actions of certain high officials. When a legislative investigation turns toward the wrongdoing of the President or any impeachable official, it has never been treated as merely incidental to a legislative purpose. Such investigations require the House to exercise the solemn powers of the “NATIONAL INQUEST,” *The Federalist* No. 65, at 338, with all of the procedural protections and accountability that accompany the decision to target a high official.

Appendix A

Indeed, in the one case dealing with a subpoena to the President for legislative purposes, our court did not ask whether the Senate Select Committee had a valid legislative purpose in investigating the events surrounding the Watergate break-in. *See Senate Select*, 498 F.2d at 732 (“[T]he need for the tapes premised solely on [Congress’s] asserted power to investigate and inform cannot justify enforcement of the [Select] Committee’s subpoena.”). We concluded instead that a legislative purpose could not justify demanding the President’s materials “in the peculiar circumstances of this case, including the subsequent and on-going investigation of the House Judiciary Committee.” *Id.* at 733. As our court explained:

[T]he House Committee on the Judiciary has begun an inquiry into presidential impeachment
.....

The sufficiency of the [Select] Committee’s showing of need has come to depend, therefore, entirely on whether the subpoenaed materials are critical to the performance of its legislative functions. There is a clear difference between Congress’s legislative tasks and the responsibility of a grand jury, or any institution engaged in like functions. While fact-finding by a legislative committee is undeniably a part of its task, legislative judgments normally depend more on the predicted consequences of proposed legislative actions and their political acceptability, than on precise reconstruction of past events.

Appendix A

Id. at 732. Thus, we carefully distinguished legislative tasks from grand jury or similar functions. When the House had already authorized and was pursuing impeachment proceedings, we found that the Senate Select Committee’s legislative need was “too attenuated and too tangential to its functions to permit a judicial judgment that the President is required to comply with the Committee’s subpoena.” *Id.* at 733.

Similarly here, the questions of illegal conduct and interest in reconstructing specific financial transactions of the President are “too attenuated and too tangential” to the Oversight Committee’s legislative purposes. *Id.* The parallels between our case and *Senate Select* continue to unfold, as some type of “impeachment inquiry” against the President has been invoked in the House. *See, e.g.*, Letter from Rep. Adam B. Schiff, Chairman, H. Perm. Select Comm. on Intelligence et al., to Rudolph Giuliani (Sept. 30, 2019) (transmitting subpoena for the President’s papers “[p]ursuant to the House of Representatives’ impeachment inquiry”).

Other cases involving congressional investigations of public officials confirm the distinction between impeachment and legislative purposes and demonstrate the caution with which the Court has ensured Congress is not pursuing impeachable offenses in a legislative inquiry. For example, in *McGrain*, the Supreme Court upheld an investigation of the Department of Justice only after determining that there was no targeted inquiry into unlawful action or allegations of impeachable offenses. The Senate resolution sought information about “the administration of the Department of Justice—whether its

Appendix A

functions were being properly discharged or were being neglected or misdirected, and particularly whether the Attorney General and his assistants were performing or neglecting their duties.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177. While the resolution mentioned Attorney General Daugherty, the Court emphasized that the Senate was not “attempting or intending to try the Attorney General at its bar or before its committee for any crime or wrongdoing.” *Id.* at 179-80. It was essential to the Court’s decision that the investigation did not target the unlawful behavior of the Attorney General. *See id.* at 178-80.

The majority draws a different “lesson” from *McGrain*: “that an investigation may properly focus on one individual if that individual’s conduct offers a valid point of departure for remedial legislation.” Maj. Op. 31. The majority places emphasis on the Court’s statement, “[n]or do we think it a valid objection to the investigation that it might possibly disclose crime or wrongdoing on [the Attorney General’s] part.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 179-80. Yet the Court also stressed that Congress was not targeting the unlawful behavior of an impeachable official and that “[i]t is not as if an inadmissible or unlawful object were affirmatively and definitely avowed.” *Id.* at 180. In *McGrain*, the Court determined that the inquiry at issue was a legislative one, and specifically did not target “crime or wrongdoing.”¹⁶ *Id.*

16. The Supreme Court in *McGrain* did not question the legal principle articulated by the district court that to investigate the illegal conduct of the Attorney General would be an exercise of the judicial power. *But see* Maj. Op. 48 (contending the Supreme Court rejected the district court’s reasoning in *McGrain*). Instead, the Supreme Court simply disagreed with the district court’s

Appendix A

Thus, the majority cannot rely on *McGrain* for its novel holding that Congress can investigate illegal conduct of an impeachable official pursuant to the legislative power.

Similarly, in *Kilbourn*, the Court invalidated a subpoena against the Secretary of the Navy because it lacked a legitimate legislative purpose, while noting that “the whole aspect of the case would have been changed” if the investigation related to impeachment. 103 U.S. at 193. No purpose of impeachment could be found, however, from the preamble characterizing the Secretary of the Navy’s conduct as “improvident.” *Id.* The Court concluded that “the absence of any words implying suspicion of criminality repel the idea of such [impeachment] purpose, for the secretary could only be impeached for ‘high crimes and misdemeanors.’” *Id.* In *McGrain* and *Kilbourn*, the Court allows Congress some leeway in its legislative investigations so long as it is not seeking to use the legislative power to circumvent the impeachment process.

By contrast, the gravamen of the Oversight Committee’s investigation in this case is the President’s wrongdoing. The Committee has “affirmatively and definitely avowed,” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 180, its suspicions of criminality against the President. As we recognized in *Senate Select*, such inquiries are outside the

characterization of the proceedings, which were not about the wrongdoing of the Attorney General but the administration of the Department of Justice as a whole. “[W]hen the proceedings are rightly interpreted, [] the object of the investigation . . . was to obtain information for legislative purposes.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177.

Appendix A

legislative power in part because they pertain to subjects proper to an impeachment proceeding in the House, which like a grand jury must assess whether “certain named individuals did or did not commit specific crimes.” 498 F.2d at 732. The majority’s conclusion is inconsistent with our precedents, which confirm that investigations of the illegal conduct of an impeachable official cannot be pursued through the legislative power.

This subpoena goes beyond the legislative power precisely because it seeks to reconstruct whether the President broke the law. The Constitution creates a wholly separate impeachment power for such inquiries. The majority implicitly collapses these distinct powers when it concludes that the Committee’s “interest in determining whether and how illegal conduct has occurred . . . is in direct furtherance of its legislative purpose.” Maj. Op. 31. Yet the legislative and impeachment powers are not interchangeable. Congress, the President, and the courts have consistently maintained a careful line between these distinct powers. Thus, I would find that this subpoena exceeds the legislative power of Congress because it seeks to uncover wrongdoing by the President.

IV.

By collapsing the distinction between Congress’s legislative and impeachment powers, the majority’s decision has serious consequences for the separation of powers. The decision today expands the legislative

Appendix A

power beyond constitutional boundaries, calling into question our precedents for reviewing the scope of congressional investigations; interpreting the legislative power of Congress to subsume the impeachment power; and permitting serious encroachments on the executive branch. For the majority, the fact that Congress seeks the President's papers is just a "twist" on the history of congressional investigations. Maj. Op. 65. In our government of three separate and co-equal departments, the targeting of the President in a congressional subpoena seeking evidence of illegal conduct is no mere "twist," but the whole plot.

A.

At bottom, the majority and I disagree about the meaning of the legislative power and whether Congress can use this power to conduct investigations of illegal conduct by the President. Yet the framework employed by the majority both decides too little and too much. To begin with, even though the majority determines that the House has the power to issue this subpoena, our precedents require making a separate inquiry regarding the scope of the Committee's delegated authority.¹⁷ The

17. Because I conclude that Congress lacks the authority to issue this subpoena pursuant to the legislative power, it follows that the House could not delegate such authority to the Oversight Committee. *See, e.g., Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 42-43 (in assessing validity of congressional investigation, court must determine "whether Congress had the power to confer upon the committee the authority which it claimed"); *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 196 (committee has "no lawful authority" to investigate if authorizing

Appendix A

majority begins by recognizing as much: “it matters not whether the Constitution would give Congress authority to issue a subpoena if Congress has given the issuing committee no such authority.” Maj. Op. 18. The majority, however, collapses this two-part inquiry by concluding that “[b]ecause Congress already possesses—in fact, has previously exercised, *see supra* at 16-17—the authority to subpoena Presidents and their information, nothing in the House Rules could in any way ‘alter the balance between’ the two political branches of government.” *Id.* at 59-60 (quoting *Armstrong v. Bush*, 924 F.2d 282, 289, 288 U.S. App. D.C. 38 (D.C. Cir. 1991)). The only evidence presented to support the conclusion that Congress possesses this authority is a citation to the majority’s analysis—which, as discussed above, fails to provide a single historical example of a successful subpoena to investigate a president for legislative purposes. Instead, the majority stitches together a few examples of subpoenas that issued to other officials, investigations of agency administration, presidents voluntarily sharing information with Congress, and one case from our court invalidating the only similar subpoena, which was issued to President Nixon during the Watergate investigations. *Id.* at 16-17; *see also Senate Select*, 498 F.2d at 733. On this flimsy foundation, the majority concludes that it cannot scrutinize the House Rules “absent a substantial constitutional question pertaining to the *House’s* legislative power.” Maj. Op. 63.

resolution is “in excess of the power conferred on [the House] by the Constitution”).

Appendix A

This conclusion is unsupported by the Supreme Court’s decisions in this area, which have required courts not only to consider the scope of legislative power possessed by the House or Senate as a whole, but to inquire specifically whether that power has been delegated to a particular Committee. *See United States v. Rumely*, 345 U.S. 41, 42-43, 73 S. Ct. 543, 97 L. Ed. 770 (1953) (“This issue—whether the committee was authorized to exact the information which the witness withheld—must first be settled before we may consider whether Congress had the power to confer upon the committee the authority which it claimed.”); *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 201 (“An essential premise . . . is that the House or Senate shall have instructed the committee members on what they are to do with the power delegated to them.”). This delegation of authority has separate importance because, as the Court has admonished, Congress should not separate power from responsibility. *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 215.

The scope of delegation particularly matters when Congress seeks to investigate a co-equal branch of government. Requiring a clear statement creates an important form of accountability by giving notice to the executive branch. Accordingly, “[w]henver constitutional limits upon the investigative power of Congress have to be drawn by this Court, it ought only to be done after Congress has demonstrated its full awareness of what is at stake by unequivocally authorizing an inquiry of dubious limits.” *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 46. We have applied this rule with special force in oversight investigations: “[T]he courts have adopted the policy of construing such resolutions of authority narrowly, in order to obviate the

Appendix A

necessity of passing on serious constitutional questions.” *Tobin v. United States*, 306 F.2d 270, 274-75, 113 U.S. App. D.C. 110 (D.C. Cir. 1962).

Moreover, “[o]ut of respect for the separation of powers and the unique constitutional position of the President,” the Court requires “an express statement by Congress” before subjecting the President to legislative restrictions and oversight. *Franklin v. Massachusetts*, 505 U.S. 788, 800-01, 112 S. Ct. 2767, 120 L. Ed. 2d 636 (1992); *see also Armstrong*, 924 F.2d at 289. These longstanding interpretive principles recognize that congressional encroachments upon the President raise serious constitutional questions, and courts should not reach out to decide such questions unless Congress squarely raises the issue.¹⁸ One might say Congress does

18. The ordinary analysis of congressional authorization is somewhat complicated in this case because, after oral argument, the House enacted a resolution ratifying “all current and future investigations, as well as all subpoenas previously issued or to be issued . . . to [*inter alia*] the President in his personal or official capacity.” H.R. Res. 507, 116th Cong. (July 24, 2019). The majority, however, does not rely on this Resolution to provide a clear statement, but merely to “confirm” the plain meaning of the House Rules, because all the parties agree that the Resolution does not expand the Committee’s jurisdiction. Importantly, the majority properly expresses skepticism and leaves open the question of whether such a resolution can indeed provide a post hoc expansion of a committee’s subpoena authority. Maj. Op. 63-64. I similarly decline to speculate about the validity of a resolution that reaches both forwards and backwards in time to authorize investigations of the President. *See Dombrowski v. Burbank*, 358 F.2d 821, 825, 123 U.S. App. D.C. 190 (D.C. Cir. 1966) (“Whether this apparently

Appendix A

not hide presidents in mouseholes. *Cf. Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc.*, 531 U.S. 457, 468, 121 S. Ct. 903, 149 L. Ed. 2d 1 (2001).

Thus, even on the majority's assertion that the House possesses the legislative power to issue this subpoena, the Committee might not. The House Rules may upset the balance of power by failing to provide notice to the President.¹⁹ While courts should properly refrain from micromanaging the House Rules, our precedents require reviewing whether Congress has taken responsibility for pushing up against constitutional limitations. *See Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 205-06. In the novel circumstances

approving action by the full Subcommittee would serve as a *nunc pro tunc* ratification and consequent validation of the subpoena for all purposes, we need not decide.”), *rev'd in part on other grounds sub nom. Dombrowski v. Eastland*, 387 U.S. 82, 87 S. Ct. 1425, 18 L. Ed. 2d 577 (1967).

19. Even without applying the clear statement rule, the majority's “natural reading” of the House Rules to include this subpoena is hardly natural, given that for over 200 years the House has declined to investigate the wrongdoing of the President without clearly designating a special committee or resolution for that purpose. That historical backdrop casts significant doubt on the majority's interpretation that a rule making no reference to the President should be read to encompass the President. *See Tobin*, 306 F.2d at 275 (“[I]f Congress had intended the Judiciary Committee to conduct such a novel investigation it would have spelled out this intention in words more explicit than the general terms found in the authorizing resolutions under consideration.”); *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 117-18 (noting that a vague House rule may acquire content through its “long history” and the “course of congressional actions”).

Appendix A

of this case, the majority has eviscerated this longstanding principle and essentially collapsed the broader question of constitutional power and the question of a committee's delegated authority.

Another difficulty with the majority's approach is that it focuses on the legislative power in isolation, and therefore proceeds to determine the contours of what legislation could be had in an area rife with constitutional concerns. *See, e.g.*, Letter From Laurence H. Silberman, Acting Att'y Gen., to Rep. Howard W. Cannon, Chairman, H. Comm. on Rules and Administration 4-5 (Sept. 20, 1974) (construing conflicts of interest legislation governing the "executive branch" to apply to the President raises "serious questions of constitutionality" as such legislation could "disable him from performing some of the functions required by the Constitution or [] establish a qualification for his serving as President (to wit, elimination of financial conflicts) beyond those contained in the Constitution"). Responding in part to arguments from the appellants, the majority marches through a very detailed and, in my view, unnecessary analysis of what specific forms of legislation might be possible in this area. Maj. Op. 36-45.

The majority concludes that amendments to "the Ethics in Government Act . . . to require Presidents and presidential candidates to file reports more frequently, to include information covering a longer period of time, or to provide new kinds of information such as past financial dealings with foreign businesses or current liabilities of closely held companies" would pass constitutional muster. *Id.* at 38-39. The majority also affirms that some category

Appendix A

of theoretical laws requiring presidents to disclose evidence of potential conflicts of interest and other financial matters constitute a “less burdensome species of laws” than similarly hypothetical laws requiring presidents to divest assets or recuse from conflicted matters. *Id.* at 38. Based on this analysis of the relative constitutionality of as-yet-unenacted laws, the majority informs us that we can comfortably conclude such financial disclosure laws of the future would not “prevent[] the [President] from accomplishing [his] constitutionally assigned functions.” *Id.* at 39-40 (alterations in original) (quoting *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. 425, 443, 97 S. Ct. 2777, 53 L. Ed. 2d 867 (1977)). More troubling still, the majority declares that a statute “facilitating the disclosure of” any payment of “foreign emoluments” to the President would “surely . . . lie[] within constitutional limits,” *id.* at 40, notwithstanding the fact that the scope of the Foreign Emoluments Clause is an unresolved question that is currently pending before this court. *See Blumenthal v. Trump*, No. 19-5237, filed Sept. 4, 2019 (D.C. Cir.). The majority passes on the constitutionality of a range of different legislative possibilities without a single enacted statute before us.

In the absence of any statute that has run the Article I, section 7, gauntlet, such determinations are advisory at best. The Article III judicial power extends to deciding cases, not applying “statutory litmus test[s],” *Maj. Op.* 37. From the Founding Era to the present, our courts have refrained from opining on the constitutionality of legal issues outside of a live case or controversy. *See Chamber of Commerce v. EPA*, 642 F.3d 192, 208, 395 U.S. App.

Appendix A

D.C. 193 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (“To seek judicial review of . . . a contemplated-but-not-yet-enacted [statute] is to ask the court for an advisory opinion in connection with an event that may never come to pass.”); Letter from Chief Justice John Jay and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court to President George Washington (Aug. 8, 1793) (declining the President’s request to issue an advisory opinion). I would avoid passing on such questions and simply recognize that an investigation into the illegal conduct of the President is outside the legislative power altogether because it belongs to the House’s power of impeachment for high crimes and misdemeanors.

B.

By allowing the Oversight Committee to use the legislative power to circumvent the impeachment power, the majority substantially disrupts the careful balance between Congress and the other departments. The text and structure of the Constitution, along with unbroken historical practice, make plain the importance of maintaining a line between these distinct investigative powers—one ancillary to the legislative power, and the other an exercise of the House’s judicial power of impeachment. The concerns underlying the distinction are fundamental and no mere anachronism.

To begin with, permitting this subpoena allows Congress to use its substantial legislative power to gather information that may be used for impeachment without the protections inherent in an impeachment investigation or proceeding. Impeachable officials are protected from

Appendix A

ill-considered exercises of this power through careful constitutional design. The Constitution divides the impeachment and removal powers between the House and Senate, U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 5; art. I, § 3, cl. 6; limits the scope of impeachable offenses, U.S. CONST. art. II, § 4; and provides for limited punishments upon conviction by the Senate, U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3, cl. 7. Senate trials of impeachment are an exercise of judicial power and have always been understood to include constitutional and common law protections similar to what might be available in the judicial context. *Marshall*, 243 U.S. at 546-48; *Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 191; Jefferson's Manual §§ 592, 619 ("The trial . . . differs not in essentials from criminal prosecutions before inferior courts."); 3 Hinds § 2486 ("[S]uch rules must be observed as are essential to justice." (quoting Op. Att'y Gen. of May 9, 1796)); 2 Story § 796 ("[T]he same rules of evidence, the same legal notions of crimes and punishments prevail.").

Allowing the use of legislative power to reach illegal conduct undermines the protections afforded to officials being investigated for impeachable offenses. These protections are essential given the obvious harms to the reputation and honor of officials targeted through the very public process of impeachment. *See* The Federalist No. 65, at 338 ("The delicacy and magnitude of a trust which so deeply concerns the political reputation and existence of every man engaged in the administration of public affairs, speak for themselves.").

Moreover, expanding the legislative power to include investigations of illegal conduct eviscerates Congress's

Appendix A

accountability for impeachment. Such accountability is an essential protection for the People, who elect the President as well as Members of Congress, and thus have an undeniable stake in any congressional targeting of the Chief Executive and his chosen officers. The majority allows Congress to evade public accountability by permitting investigations of the President for illegal conduct outside the “grave and weighty” impeachment process. *See* Maj. Op. 47. With impeachment, the Constitution unites power with responsibility. Impeachment and removal are Congress’s “sword of Damocles,” but the House and Senate must pay a political price for using these powers. William H. Rehnquist, *Grand Inquests* 270 (1992); *see also* Gerhardt, *The Federal Impeachment Process* 57 (“[T]he framers deliberately made the impeachment process cumbersome in order to make impeachment difficult to achieve.”); O’Sullivan, *Impeachment and the Independent Counsel Statute*, 86 *GEO. L.J.* at 2229-30 (“The Framers intentionally designed the impeachment device to make its successful invocation difficult in order to ensure that civil officers would not be unduly dependent upon the legislative branch.”).

The House and Senate have consistently maintained the importance of this responsibility and explicitly invoked the impeachment power when pursuing official wrongdoing. *See, e.g.*, 3 Hinds § 2400 (opening Johnson impeachment inquiry); H.R. Res. 803, 93d Cong. (opening Nixon impeachment inquiry); H.R. Res. 581, 105th Cong. (opening Clinton impeachment inquiry). Presidents since George Washington have declined demands to produce documents for legislative purposes, while acknowledging

Appendix A

that the same request pursuant to the impeachment power might be treated differently. *See supra* Part II; *see also Position of the Executive Department Regarding Investigative Reports*, 40 Op. Att’y Gen. 45, 51 (1941) (Attorney General Robert Jackson declining to provide information to Congress about pending FBI investigations, but noting that “pertinent information would be supplied in impeachment proceedings”).²⁰

Overlooking the special procedures and accountability attendant to an impeachment proceeding, the district court conflated the legislative and judicial powers of the House. With no support in the text, structure, or history of the Constitution, the district court cited the impeachment power to bootstrap a more expansive legislative power to investigate individual wrongdoing: “It is simply not fathomable that a Constitution that grants Congress the power to remove a President for reasons including criminal behavior would deny Congress the power to investigate him for unlawful conduct—past or present—even without formally opening an impeachment inquiry.” *Trump*, 380 F. Supp. 3d at 95.

20. As the Committee has not relied on the impeachment power for this subpoena, I do not consider whether or how this court would assess such a demand for documents under the impeachment power. I simply note that Congress, the Executive, and the courts have maintained that requests under the legislative and impeachment powers may be treated differently. *See, e.g., Kilbourn*, 103 U.S. at 193 (were the investigation related to impeachment, “the whole aspect of the case would have been changed”).

Appendix A

The district court suggests that the greater power of impeachment and removal must include the lesser legislative power to investigate illegal actions by the President. Yet the Constitution is not designed this way. The greater power does not include the lesser in a Constitution that explicitly vests Congress with limited and enumerated legislative powers and then provides for a wholly separate impeachment power with different objects, processes, and limits. It is not only fathomable, but essential, that the impeachment and legislative powers remain distinct. The power of impeachment does not somehow expand the power to investigate for legislative purposes.

The majority similarly recognizes no separation between the House's judicial and legislative powers. But once the boundary between the legislative and judicial powers is breached, it is hard to discern any limit to the reach of the legislative power of investigation. Perhaps the functionalist approach to reading the Constitution has obscured the essential core of the constitutional powers vested in each of the three branches. The legislative power focuses on prospective, general rules for governing society. One thing it has never been is the power to reconstruct and punish individual actions, whether of private individuals or public officials. Private and public individuals are protected by the Bill of Attainder Clauses, U.S. CONST. art. I, § 9, cl. 3; art. I, § 10, cl. 1, and Congress may pursue the high crimes and misdemeanors of impeachable officials exclusively through the impeachment power, U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 5; art. I, § 3, cl. 6.

Appendix A

Thus, it should be startling when the majority asserts it is a “quintessentially legislative judgment that some concerns about potential misconduct are better addressed through . . . legislation than impeachment.” Maj. Op. 49. The majority argues in effect that Congress must be able to choose to target the wrongdoing of the President through its legislative powers, instead of impeachment. If this does not quite sanction a bill of attainder, it comes awfully close. The majority’s assertions that Congress can simply choose between legislation and impeachment when the President’s wrongdoing is at issue are unsupported by any constitutional provision and provide no rebuttal to the remarkably consistent historical understanding, which demonstrates that both the executive branch and Congress, despite their conflicting interests, have steadfastly maintained the necessity of pursuing wrongdoing of public officials through impeachment.

The majority attempts to bolster its argument by referencing a functional separation of powers and citing to interpretations of Madison’s statement in Federalist 47 that the separation of powers “do[es] not mean that these departments ought to have no *partial agency* in, or no *control* over, the acts of each other.” *Id.* at 43 (citing *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 702-03, 117 S. Ct. 1636, 137 L. Ed. 2d 945 (1997), and *Nixon v. Adm’r of Gen. Servs.*, 433 U.S. at 442-43). Yet Madison’s words are being taken out of context. In Federalist 47, Madison makes this statement when interpreting Montesquieu’s theory of separation of powers. *See* The Federalist No. 47, at 251 (James Madison). Madison’s primary point is that “[n]o political truth is certainly of greater intrinsic value, or is

Appendix A

stamped with the authority of more enlightened patrons of liberty,” than the maxim that “the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments, ought to be separate and distinct.” *Id.* at 249. The general rule of the Constitution is separation of powers—but the Constitution includes certain specific exceptions to the general rule, such as requiring the advice and consent of the Senate in the appointment of executive officers, or placing the judicial power of impeachment in the House and Senate. These exceptions reinforce the system of checks and balances and “provide some practical security for each, against the invasion of the others.” The Federalist No. 48, at 256-58 (James Madison). Madison explains at length the deliberate structure of the Constitution, which permits overlap or sharing of powers for limited purposes without collapsing any one branch into dependence on another.

The exceptions to the separation of powers, however, have never been mistaken as a rule of flexible blending of powers for the sake of convenience or expediency. To the contrary, the Court has read the exceptions narrowly and interpreted them to reinforce the constitutional limits that separate the three powers of the federal government. *See Myers*, 272 U.S. at 116 (“[T]he reasonable construction of the Constitution must be that the branches should be kept separate in all cases in which they were not expressly blended, and the Constitution should be expounded to blend them no more than it affirmatively requires.”). The majority alleges that this dissent “would reorder the very structure of the Constitution,” *Maj. Op.* 49, but provides no analysis of the Constitution to support its assertion. Similarly, the majority offers no evidence from the original

Appendix A

meaning, historical practice, or our judicial precedents for its contrived claim that Congress can simply choose to use either the legislative or impeachment powers when investigating the President for violations of the law.

Instead, the majority chooses to march out a parade of horrors about what might happen if Congress were unable to investigate illegal conduct under its legislative power. *Id.* at 46-47, 48-49. Contrary to the majority's ahistorical alarm, maintaining the separation of the legislative and impeachment powers will in no way prevent the House from continuing to pursue remedial legislation. I do not question the longstanding recognition that Congress possesses the ability to investigate as necessary and proper to effectuate the legislative power. Such investigations can provide important and salutary oversight of administration of the laws and study the basis for new legislation. Yet targeting officials for impeachable offenses must proceed, and always has proceeded, through the impeachment power.

Thus, there is no "Hobson's Choice" here between impeachment or nothing, *id.* at 49, because whether the House moves forward with impeachment or not, Congress retains all of the legislative powers it has under the Constitution to introduce and enact legislation. The fact that Congress cannot reconstruct "whether and how" the President violated the law as part of the legislative power does not "strip[] Congress of its power to legislate." *Id.* Indeed, frustration with lack of access to documents might prompt Congress to attempt legislation that requires such disclosure in the future, and similar legislation has

Appendix A

already been proposed. *See, e.g.*, H.R. 1, 116th Cong., §§ 8012, 8013 (2019) (increasing stringency of presidential corporate financial disclosure requirements). To treat an inquisitorial power as essential to legislation is to misunderstand the legislative power in the context of our constitutional system of separated powers. The Committee cannot use a legislative purpose to circumvent the House’s power to serve as the grand inquest of the nation when investigating the illegal conduct of the President.

C.

Allowing the legislative power to reach investigation of impeachable offenses provides Congress with a new bludgeon against the Executive, making it all too easy for Congress to encroach on the executive branch by targeting the President and his subordinates through legislative inquiries. *See Nixon v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 731, 743, 102 S. Ct. 2690, 73 L. Ed. 2d 349 (1982) (a “special solicitude [is] due to claims alleging a threatened breach of essential Presidential prerogatives under the separation of powers”). The majority incorrectly asserts “no party argues that compliance with the subpoena would impair the President’s execution of the Article II power.” Maj. Op. 46; *see also id.* at 64-65. To the contrary, both the Trump plaintiffs and the Department of Justice argue that this subpoena may “distract a President from his public duties, to the detriment of not only the President and his office but also the Nation that the Presidency was designed to serve.” Appellants Reply Br. 3 (quoting *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. at 753); *see also* DOJ Br. 6 (“[C]ongressional committees may issue successive subpoenas in waves,

Appendix A

making far-reaching demands that harry the President and distract his attention.” (citing *Rumely*, 345 U.S. at 46)). The majority repeatedly states that the precedents allow Congress to choose between the legislative and impeachment powers, but only where “no intrusion on the President’s execution of his official duties is alleged.” Maj. Op. 46; *see also id.* at 45. Yet contrary to the majority’s assertions, both the Department of Justice and the President have alleged that the subpoena encroaches on the executive power, which substantially undermines the majority’s premise.

By allowing any claim of a remedial legislative purpose to justify an investigation into the “illegal conduct” of the President, the majority effectively expands the already expansive legislative power. *Cf. Brewster v. United States*, 255 F.2d 899, 901, 103 U.S. App. D.C. 147 (D.C. Cir. 1958) (rejecting an interpretation that “for all practical purposes, would give the Committee on Government Operations jurisdiction to investigate virtually every activity engaged in by every person in the land”). Pursuant to its legislative powers, Congress already has substantial leeway to investigate how executive officers are administering their duties. Yet allowing Congress to use the legislative power to investigate individual officials for unlawful conduct takes “oversight” to a whole new level. The Constitution provides in effect that Congress cannot reach such allegations by “side-blows,” Cong. Globe, 29th Cong., 1st Sess. 641 (1846) (statement of Rep. Adams), but must instead proceed through impeachment. *Cf. Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 713, 108 S. Ct. 2597, 101 L. Ed. 2d 569 (1988) (Scalia, J., dissenting) (“How much

Appendix A

easier it is for Congress, instead of accepting the political damage attendant to the commencement of impeachment proceedings against the President on trivial grounds . . . simply to trigger a debilitating criminal investigation of the Chief Executive.”).

Unhindered by the constitutional mechanisms of accountability, Congress can expand its incursions against the Executive. As Madison cautioned, Congress’s “constitutional powers being at once more extensive, and less susceptible of precise limits, it can, with the greater facility, mask under complicated and indirect measures, the encroachments which it makes on the co-ordinate departments.” *The Federalist* No. 48, at 257; *see also Zivotofsky*, 135 S. Ct. at 2096 (“It was an improper act for Congress to ‘aggrandize its power at the expense of another branch.’” (quoting *Freytag v. Commissioner*, 501 U.S. 868, 878, 111 S. Ct. 2631, 115 L. Ed. 2d 764 (1991))).

The majority takes a narrow view of potential harms to the executive branch—suggesting that such harms result largely from the inconvenience of the President having to produce documents or make copies himself. *Maj. Op.* 34-35, 65. Yet using the legislative power to target and uncover illegal conduct by executive officials provides Congress with an additional form of control over executive officials who otherwise must be within the direction and control of the President. *See* U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cls. 1, 8; art. II, § 3; *Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.*, 561 U.S. 477, 493, 130 S. Ct. 3138, 177 L. Ed. 2d 706 (2010) (invalidating restrictions on the removal power that would “impair[]” the President’s

Appendix A

“ability to execute the laws [] by holding his subordinates accountable for their conduct”); *Myers*, 272 U.S. at 163-64 (“[A]rticle 2 grants to the President the executive power of the government, i. e., the general administrative control of those executing the laws.”). The President cannot “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” U.S. CONST. art. II, § 3, if his subordinates are exposed to inquisitorial jeopardy through the ordinary legislative power.

Under the majority’s decision, Congress may choose to launch investigations of illegal conduct under the legislative power—a choice that under the current rules may be implemented by a single committee chairman without the accountability and deliberation that precede impeachment. And while this case deals only with a single subpoena, the recognition of a wholly unprecedented power to investigate shifts the balance between the branches and may unleash additional subpoenas against the President or his subordinates, which “may, like a flicking left jab, confound the Executive Branch in dealing with Congress.” *In re Sealed Case*, 838 F.2d 476, 508, 267 U.S. App. D.C. 178 (D.C. Cir. 1988) (Silberman, J.), *rev’d sub nom. Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 108 S. Ct. 2597, 101 L. Ed. 2d 569 (1988).

While congressional oversight investigations may probe a wide range of matters and often are no picnic for executive officials, such investigations may proceed ancillary to the legislative power. Allegations and reconstructions of illegal conduct, however, are an entirely different matter. If a congressional committee can invoke a legislative purpose to subpoena information targeting

Appendix A

unlawful actions by the President, imagine the peril for other officers who lack the ability to fend off such requests and cannot depend on the visibility and public mandate that follow the President. *Cf. Morrison*, 487 U.S. at 713 (Scalia, J., dissenting) (“[A]s for the President’s high-level assistants, who typically have no political base of support, it is [] utterly unrealistic to think that they will not be intimidated by this prospect [of an independent counsel], and that their advice to him and their advocacy of his interests before a hostile Congress will not be affected It deeply wounds the President, by substantially reducing the President’s ability to protect himself and his staff.”). The prospect of a Congress that can use the legislative power, rather than impeachment, to reach illegal conduct of executive officers could very well “weaken the Presidency by reducing the zeal of his staff.” *Id.*

Allowing Congress to investigate impeachable officials for suspicions of criminality pursuant to the legislative power has serious consequences for the separation of powers because it allows Congress to escape the responsibility and accountability inherent in impeachment proceedings. Congressional aggrandizement in this case comes at the expense of the Executive, which no longer can rely on procedural protections when Congress, or a single committee chairman, determines to investigate unlawful activity of the President. The House’s overreaching also comes at the expense of the People, who established a Constitution with specific processes for electing both

Appendix A

Members of Congress and the President and which provides only one way for Congress to punish and remove the President.

V.

The familiar tale recounted by the majority describes a general arc of expanding legislative powers and the accompanying recognition of Congress's power to investigate ancillary to those powers. Yet the more specific story here pertains to the fundamental separation between the legislative and judicial powers of Congress. When the House chooses to investigate the President for alleged violations of the laws and the Constitution, it must proceed through impeachment, an exceptional and solemn exercise of judicial power established as a separate check on public officials. This constitutional principle was articulated by George Washington in 1796 and by the House in 1998: "The Constitution contains a single procedure for Congress to address the fitness for office of the President of the United States—impeachment by the House, and subsequent trial by the Senate." H.R. Rep. No. 105-830, at 137 (report of the House Judiciary Committee recommending articles of impeachment).

The Constitution and our historical practice draw a consistent line between the legislative and judicial powers of Congress. The majority crosses this boundary for the first time by upholding this subpoena investigating the illegal conduct of the President under the legislative power. I respectfully dissent.

**APPENDIX B — MEMORANDUM OPINION OF
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DATED MAY 20, 2019**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Case No. 19-cv-01136 (APM)

DONALD J. TRUMP, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM OF
THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

May 20, 2019, Decided
May 20, 2019, Filed

MEMORANDUM OPINION

I. INTRODUCTION

*I do, therefore, . . . solemnly protest
against these proceedings of the House
of Representatives, because they are in
violation of the rights of the coordinate
executive branch of the Government, and
subversive of its constitutional independence;*

Appendix B

because they are calculated to foster a band of interested parasites and informers, ever ready, for their own advantage, to swear before ex parte committees to pretended private conversations between the President and themselves, incapable, from their nature, of being disproved; thus furnishing material for harassing him, degrading him in the eyes of the country . . .

- President James Buchanan¹

These words, written by President James Buchanan in March 1860, protested a resolution adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives to form a committee—known as the Covode Committee—to investigate whether the President or any other officer of the Executive Branch had sought to influence the actions of Congress by improper means. *See* Buchanan at 218-21. Buchanan “cheerfully admitted” that the House of Representatives had the authority to make inquiries “incident to their legislative duties,” as “necessary to enable them to discover and to provide the appropriate legislative remedies for any abuses which may be ascertained.” *Id.* at 221. But he objected to the Covode Committee’s investigation of his conduct. He maintained that the House of Representatives possessed no general powers to investigate him, except when sitting as an impeaching body. *Id.* Buchanan feared that, if the House were to exercise such authority, it “would

1. JAMES BUCHANAN, *THE WORKS OF JAMES BUCHANAN VOLUME XII* 225-26 (John Bassett Moore ed., J.B. Lippincott Company) (1911) [hereinafter Buchanan].

Appendix B

establish a precedent dangerous and embarrassing to all my successors, to whatever political party they might be attached.” *Id.* at 226.

Some 160 years later, President Donald J. Trump has taken up the fight of his predecessor. On April 15, 2019, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives issued a subpoena for records to Mazars USA LLP, a firm that has provided accounting services to President Trump. The subpoena called for Mazars to produce financial records and other documents relating to President Trump personally as well as various associated businesses and entities dating back to 2011—years before he declared his candidacy for office. The decision to issue the subpoena came about after the President’s former lawyer and confidant, Michael Cohen, testified before the House Oversight Committee that the President routinely would alter the estimated value of his assets and liabilities on financial statements, depending on the purpose for which a statement was needed. For instance, Cohen said that the President provided inflated financial statements to a bank to obtain a loan to purchase a National Football League franchise. But when it came time to calculate his real estate taxes, the President would deflate the value of certain assets. To support his accusations, Cohen produced financial statements from 2011, 2012, and 2013, at least two of which were prepared by Mazars.

Echoing the protests of President Buchanan, President Trump and his associated entities are before this court, claiming that the Oversight Committee’s subpoena to Mazars exceeds the Committee’s constitutional power to

Appendix B

conduct investigations. The President argues that there is no legislative purpose for the subpoena. The Oversight Committee's true motive, the President insists, is to collect personal information about him solely for political advantage. He asks the court to declare the Mazars subpoena invalid and unenforceable.

Courts have grappled for more than a century with the question of the scope of Congress's investigative power. The binding principle that emerges from these judicial decisions is that courts must presume Congress is acting in furtherance of its constitutional responsibility to legislate and must defer to congressional judgments about what Congress needs to carry out that purpose. To be sure, there are limits on Congress's investigative authority. But those limits do not substantially constrain Congress. So long as Congress investigates on a subject matter on which "legislation could be had," Congress acts as contemplated by Article I of the Constitution.

Applying those principles here compels the conclusion that President Trump cannot block the subpoena to Mazars. According to the Oversight Committee, it believes that the requested records will aid its consideration of strengthening ethics and disclosure laws, as well as amending the penalties for violating such laws. The Committee also says that the records will assist in monitoring the President's compliance with the Foreign Emoluments Clauses. These are facially valid legislative purposes, and it is not for the court to question whether the Committee's actions are truly motivated by political considerations. Accordingly, the court will enter judgment in favor of the Oversight Committee.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The 116th Congress and the House Oversight Committee

On January 3, 2019, the 116th Congress began with the Democratic Party controlling a majority of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. One of the House's first actions was to adopt the "Rules of the House of Representatives," which govern proceedings during the two-year term. This vote took place on January 9, 2019.² Rule X of the adopted House Rules, titled "Organization of Committees," establishes various standing committees and their respective jurisdictions.³ Among the standing committees with the broadest purview is the Committee on Oversight and Reform ("Oversight Committee"). Its subject areas of primary jurisdiction range from the lofty—"[o]verall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations"—to the mundane—" [f]ederal paperwork reduction." House Rules at 8. If there is a common thread running through the subjects within the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction, it is the oversight of the operations and administration of the Executive Branch.

2. Final Vote Results for Roll Call 19, Adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundredth Sixteenth Congress, <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2019/roll019.xml> (last visited May 20, 2019).

3. Rules of the House of Representatives, 116th Congress at 6 (Jan. 11, 2019), <https://rules.house.gov/sites/democrats/rules.house.gov/files/116-1/116-House-Rules-Clerk.pdf> (last visited May 20, 2019) [hereinafter House Rules].

Appendix B

Each of the House’s standing committees possess “[g]eneral oversight responsibilities.” *Id.* at 9. Those responsibilities are meant to assist the House in (1) “its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of” “the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of Federal laws” and (2) “conditions and circumstances that may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation,” and (3) “its formulation, consideration, and enactment of changes in Federal laws, and of such additional legislation as may be necessary or appropriate.” *Id.* Some of the House’s standing committees have “[s]pecial oversight functions.” *Id.* at 10. The Oversight Committee is one of them. Its “special oversight function” is described as involving the “review and study on a continuing basis the operation of Government activities at all levels, including the Executive Office of the President.” *Id.* The Executive Office of the President consists of a small group of federal agencies that most immediately aid the President on matters of policy, politics, administration, and management. The President’s closest advisors typically are situated in the Executive Office.⁴

Rule X also vests the Oversight Committee with special authority to conduct investigations. According to the Rule, “the Committee on Oversight and Reform may *at any time* conduct investigations of *any matter* without regard to [other rules] conferring jurisdiction over the

4. *See generally* Congressional Research Service, “The Executive Office of the President: An Historical Overview,” Nov. 26, 2008, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/98-606.pdf> (last visited May 20, 2019).

Appendix B

matter to another standing committee.” House Rules at 11 (emphasis added). In other words, the Oversight Committee is empowered to investigate as to any subject matter, even in those areas that are expressly assigned to other committees. No other committee possesses such sweeping investigative authority.

The Oversight Committee’s broad investigative power is not new. In each of the four preceding Congresses—all controlled by the Republican Party, including during the final six years of the Obama Administration—the House Oversight Committee enjoyed the same power “at any time [to] conduct investigations of any matter.”⁵

B. The Oversight Committee’s Investigation

From the start of the 116th Congress, the Oversight Committee, now led by a Democrat, moved aggressively to use its investigative powers. It did not adopt a resolution or issue a public statement defining the scope of what it intended to investigate. Instead, it sent a series of letters to the White House and elsewhere seeking various records

5. Rules of the House of Representatives, 115th Congress at 505 (2017), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/HMAN-115/pdf/HMAN-115.pdf>, (last visited May 20, 2019); Rules of the House of Representatives, 114th Congress at 497 (2015), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/HMAN-114/pdf/HMAN-114.pdf> (last visited May 20, 2019); Rules of the House of Representatives, 113th Congress at 496 (2013), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/HMAN-113/pdf/HMAN-113-house.rules.pdf> (last visited May 20, 2019); Rules of the House of Representatives, 112th Congress at 492 (2011), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/HMAN-112/pdf/HMAN-112.pdf> (last visited May 20, 2019).

Appendix B

regarding the President’s personal finances, as well as records concerning his businesses and related entities. For instance, days before the new Congress started, the incoming Chairman of the Oversight Committee, Representative Elijah Cummings, wrote the President’s personal lawyer, Sheri Dillon, and the Executive Vice President and Chief Compliance Counsel of the Trump Organization, George Sorial, asking them to produce previously requested “documents regarding the Trump Organization’s process for identifying payments from foreign governments and foreign-government controlled entities . . .”⁶ In a different letter, the Chairman asked the General Services Administration (“GSA”), the agency that manages federally owned and leased buildings, to produce records concerning the federal government’s lease with the Trump Organization for the Old Post Office Building, which houses the Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C.⁷ Chairman Cummings indicated that he sought these records for multiple reasons, including the concern that the lease might violate the Constitution’s Emoluments Clauses. Cummings’ April 12th GSA Letter

6. Letter from the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Member, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to Sheri A. Dillon, Counsel to Donald Trump, and George A. Sorial, Exec. Vice President and Chief Compliance Counsel, Trump Org. (Dec. 19, 2018), <https://tinyurl.com/Dec19CummingsDillonLetter> (last visited May 20, 2019).

7. Letter from the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, et al., to Emily Murphy, Administrator, Gen. Servs. Admin. (Apr. 12, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/Apr12CummingsHorneLetter> (last visited May 20, 2019) [hereinafter Cummings’ April 12th GSA Letter].

Appendix B

at 1.⁸ These are but two examples of the types of records requests made by the Oversight Committee at the start of the 116th Congress.

The investigative demand that sparked this lawsuit was issued on January 8, 2019. On that day, Chairman Cummings wrote to Pat Cipollone, the White House Counsel, asking the President to produce “documents related to President Trump’s reporting of debts and payments to his personal attorney, Michael Cohen, to silence women alleging extramarital affairs with the President before the election.”⁹ The prior year, in May

8. This request for documents was not new. During the early months of the Trump Administration, Representative Cummings, who was then the Ranking Member on the Oversight Committee, along with other Democratic members, asked GSA to produce records regarding the Old Post Office lease. *See Cummings v. Murphy*, 321 F. Supp. 3d 92, 97-99 (D.D.C. 2018). When GSA did not cooperate, the Members brought a lawsuit to force it to disclose the records. *See generally id.* This judge handled that very matter and ruled that the Democratic members lacked standing to bring the case. *See id.* at 101-17. That decision is pending before the D.C. Circuit.

9. Letter from the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to Pat Cipollone, White House Counsel (Jan. 8, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/Jan8CummingsCipolloneLetter> (last visited May 20, 2019) [hereinafter Cummings’ January 8th Letter]. Then-Ranking Member Cummings made a request for similar records in September 2018, which went unanswered. *See* Letter from the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Member, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to Donald F. McGahn II, White House Counsel, and George A. Sorial, Exec. Vice President and Chief Compliance Counsel, Trump Org. (September 12, 2018), <https://oversighthouse.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/2018-09-12.EEC%20>

Appendix B

2018, the Office of Government Ethics had concluded that the President should have disclosed a payment made by Cohen as a liability on the President’s public financial disclosure report.¹⁰ Chairman Cummings noted in the January 8th letter that the Oversight Committee “has jurisdiction over a wide range of matters, including the Ethics in Government Act of 1978,” a law that requires “all federal officials, including the President, to publicly disclose financial liabilities that could impact their decision-making.” Cummings’ January 8th Letter at 1. On February 1, 2019, the White House Counsel responded to Chairman Cummings that the President was prepared to consider making some documents available for review.¹¹

Chairman Cummings wrote the White House Counsel again on February 15, 2019. *See* Cummings’ February 15th Letter. He opened by stating that, by his January 8th letter, “the Committee launched an investigation into the failure of President Donald Trump to report hundreds of thousands of dollars in payments and liabilities to

to%20McGahn-WH%20Serial-TrumpOrg%20re%20Financial%20Disclosures%20Cohen%20Payments.pdf (last visited May 20, 2019).

10. Letter from David J. Apol, Acting Dir., Office of Gov’t Ethics, to Rod J. Rosenstein, Deputy Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Justice (May 16, 2018), [https://oge.gov/web/OGE.nsf/0/D323FD5ABB1FD2358525828F005F4888/\\$FILE/OGE%20Letter%20to%20DOJ%20\(posting\).pdf](https://oge.gov/web/OGE.nsf/0/D323FD5ABB1FD2358525828F005F4888/$FILE/OGE%20Letter%20to%20DOJ%20(posting).pdf) (last visited May 20, 2019).

11. Letter from the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to Pat Cipollone, White House Counsel at 1 (Feb. 15, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/Feb15CummingsCipolloneLetter> [hereinafter Cummings’ February 15th Letter].

Appendix B

his former attorney, Michael Cohen, to silence women alleging extramarital affairs during the 2016 presidential campaign.” *Id.* at 1. Chairman Cummings explained that “[t]he Committee’s interest in obtaining these documents is even more critical in light of new documents obtained by the Committee from the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) that describe false information provided by lawyers representing President Trump . . . “ *Id.* The letter went on to detail a timeline of recent events starting with statements made by the President’s lawyers to the Office of Government Ethics and to the public about a supposed purpose of the Cohen payments unrelated to the election; followed by the President’s disclosure of the Cohen payments on his 2017 Financial Disclosure form as a liability of less than \$250,000; and then revelations by federal prosecutors that the Cohen payments in fact exceeded the \$250,000 reported by the President. *Id.* at 2-6. In the end, Chairman Cummings cited Congress’s “plenary authority to legislate and conduct oversight regarding compliance with ethics laws and regulations” as the source of its authority to make the records demand, as well as its “broad authority to legislate and conduct oversight on issues involving campaign finance.” *Id.* at 7.

C. Subpoena to Mazars USA LLP

On February 27, 2019, Michael Cohen appeared for a public hearing before the House Oversight Committee.¹²

12. *Hearing with Michael Cohen, Former Attorney to President Donald Trump: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Oversight & Reform*, 116th Cong. (2019), <https://tinyurl.com/CohenHearing> (last visited May 20, 2019) [hereinafter Cohen Testimony].

Appendix B

By this time, Cohen had pleaded guilty to a host of federal felony charges, including tax evasion, campaign finance violations, and making false statements to Congress.¹³ During his testimony, Cohen alleged that financial statements prepared by the President’s accountants falsely represented the President’s assets and liabilities. *See* Cohen Testimony at 13, 19. Specifically, Cohen stated that, in his experience, “Mr. Trump inflated his total assets when it served his purposes . . . and deflated his assets to reduce his real estate taxes.” *Id.* Cohen supplied the Oversight Committee with portions of the President’s Statements of Financial Condition from 2011, 2012, and 2013, some of which were signed by Mazars.¹⁴

Following Cohen’s testimony, Chairman Cummings wrote to Mazars on March 20, 2019. The letter first summarized aspects of Cohen’s testimony accusing the President of manipulating financial statements to suit his purposes; it then identified a half-dozen questions about assets and liabilities reflected in the President’s Statements of Financial Condition that Cohen had provided to the Oversight Committee. *See* Cummings’

13. *See* Mark Mazzetti, et al., *Cohen Pleads Guilty and Details Trump’s Involvement in Moscow Tower Project*, N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 29, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/29/nyregion/michael-cohen-trump-russia-mueller.html> (last visited May 20, 2019).

14. *See* Letter from the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to Victor Wahba, Chairman and Chief Exec. Officer, Mazars USA LLP (Mar. 20, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/Mar20CummingsLetter> (last visited May 20, 2019) [hereinafter Cummings’ March 20th Letter]; *see also* Cohen Testimony at 13.

Appendix B

March 20th Letter at 1-3. Chairman Cummings stated that these financial statements “raise questions about the President’s representations of his financial affairs on these forms and on other disclosures, particularly relating to the President’s debts.” *Id.* at 1. The letter concluded by asking Mazars to produce four categories of documents with respect to not just the President, but also several affiliated organizations and entities, including the Trump Organization Inc., the Donald J. Trump Revocable Trust, the Trump Foundation, and the Trump Old Post Office LLC. *See id.* at 4. The records requested included statements of financial condition, audited financial statements, documents relied upon to prepare any financial statements, engagement agreements, and communications between Mazars and the President or employees of the Trump Organization. *See id.* The relevant time period identified for the requested records was “January 1, 2009, to the present.” *Id.* In his initial letter to Mazars, Chairman Cummings did not articulate any legislative purpose for the records requested.

A week later, on March 27, 2019, Mazars responded that it “cannot voluntarily turn over documents sought in the Request.”¹⁵ Mazars cited various federal and state regulations and professional codes of conduct that prevented it from doing so. *See* Mazars March 27th Letter at 1.

15. Letter from Jerry D. Bernstein, BlankRome LLP, Outside Counsel to Mazars USA LLP, to the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform (Mar. 27, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/Mar27MazarsLetter> (last visited May 20, 2019) [hereinafter Mazars March 27th Letter].

Appendix B

On April 12, 2019, Chairman Cummings distributed a memorandum to Members of the Oversight Committee (“Memorandum”), advising them of his intent to issue a subpoena to Mazars.¹⁶ Under a section titled “Need for Subpoena,” Chairman Cummings cited to Cohen’s testimony that the President had “altered the estimated value of his assets and liabilities on financial statements,” as well as to the records Cohen had provided to support these claims. Cummings’ April 12th Mem. at 1-2. He also referenced “[r]ecent news reports” raising “additional concerns regarding the President’s financial statements and representations.” *Id.* at 1. In the “Conclusion” section of the Memorandum, Chairman Cummings listed the purposes for seeking the Mazars-held records:

The Committee has full authority to investigate whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office, to determine whether he has undisclosed conflicts of interest that may impair his ability to make impartial policy decisions, to assess whether he is complying with the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution, and to review whether he has accurately reported his finances to the Office of Government Ethics and other federal entities. The Committee’s interest in these matters informs its review of multiple

16. Memorandum from Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to Members of the Committee on Oversight and Reform (April 12, 2019), <https://www.politico.com/f/?id=0000016a-131f-da8e-adfa-3b5f319d0001> (last visited May 20, 2019) [hereinafter Cummings’ April 12th Mem.].

Appendix B

laws and legislative proposals under our jurisdiction, and to suggest otherwise is both inaccurate and contrary to the core mission of the Committee to serve as an independent check on the Executive Branch.

Id. at 4. Chairman Cummings allowed 48 hours for Members to offer their views on issuing the subpoena. *See id.* The Committee’s new Ranking Member, Congressman Jim Jordan, responded, declaring the action “an unprecedented abuse of the Committee’s subpoena authority to target and expose the private financial information of the President of the United States.”¹⁷

Notwithstanding the Ranking Member’s objection, on April 15, 2019, the Oversight Committee issued the subpoena to Mazars that is the subject of this lawsuit. The subpoena sought the same four categories of records identified in the March 20th letter relating to the President and his affiliated organizations and entities. *See* Subpoena, ECF No. 9-2, Ex. A, at 3 [hereinafter Subpoena]; *see also* Cummings’ March 20th Letter at 4. The subpoena, however, differed in one respect—it narrowed the relevant time period by two years to “calendar years 2011 through 2018.”¹⁸ Subpoena at 3.

17. Letter from the Honorable Jim Jordan, Ranking Member, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform at 1 (April 15, 2019), <https://republicans-oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/2019-04-15-JDJ-to-EEC-re-Mazars-Subpoena.pdf> (last visited May 20, 2019).

18. At oral argument, Plaintiffs stated that paragraph 2 of the subpoena applies “without regard to time.” Hr’g Tr. at 69. That

*Appendix B***D. Procedural History****1. Plaintiffs Seek Injunctive Relief**

On April 22, 2019, President Trump, along with his affiliated organizations and entities (collectively “Plaintiffs”),¹⁹ filed this lawsuit. *See* Compl., ECF No. 1 [hereinafter Compl.]. They originally named as defendants Chairman Cummings; Peter Kenny, the Chief Investigative Counsel of the Oversight Committee; and Mazars. Plaintiffs asked the court, among other things, to declare that the Oversight Committee’s subpoena to Mazars “is invalid and unenforceable” and to issue a “permanent injunction quashing Chairman Cummings’ subpoena.” Compl. at 13. With their Complaint, Plaintiffs filed an Application for a Temporary Restraining Order and Motion for Preliminary Injunction. *See* Pls.’ App. for a TRO, ECF No. 9; Pls.’ Mot. for Prelim. Inj., ECF No. 11; Stmt. of P&A in Support of Pls.’ App. for a TRO and Mot. for Prelim. Inj., ECF Nos. 9-1, 11-1 [hereinafter Pls.’ Stmt.]. The Application asked the court to enter an order “prohibiting Defendants from enforcing or complying with Chairman Cummings’ subpoena so that the Court can decide Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction.” Pls.’ Stmt. at 14.

paragraph, however, is for all engagement agreements or contracts related to items “described in Item Number 1,” which is time-limited from 2011 to 2018. *See* Subpoena at 3.

19. The complete list of affiliated organizations and entities includes: The Trump Organization, Inc.; Trump Organization LLC; The Trump Corporation; DJT Holdings LLC; The Donald J. Trump Revocable Trust; and the Trump Old Post Office LLC.

Appendix B

Following discussions with the Oversight Committee, Plaintiffs consented to the Committee's intervention as a defendant in this matter and agreed to dismiss Chairman Cummings and Kenny as defendants. *See* Consent Mot. of the Oversight Committee to Intervene, ECF No. 12; Joint Stip., ECF No. 15. The parties settled on a briefing schedule on Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction, which the court entered. Minute Order, Apr. 23, 2019. The Oversight Committee also agreed to postpone the date for Mazars to produce records until seven days after the court ruled on Plaintiffs' motion. *See id.* That agreement made it unnecessary for the court to enter a temporary restraining order.

2. Consolidation under Rule 65(a)(2)

Under the entered schedule, the parties were to appear before the court for oral argument on May 14, 2019. Five days before the hearing and one day after the parties had completed briefing, the court entered an order announcing its intention to consolidate the hearing on the preliminary injunction with the "trial on the merits," as is permitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(a)(2). *See* Order, ECF No. 25 [hereinafter Order]. The court explained the reason for consolidation as follows:

The sole question before the court—Is the House Oversight Committee's issuance of a subpoena to Mazars USA LLP for financial records of President Donald J. Trump and various associated entities a valid exercise of legislative power?—is fully briefed, and the

Appendix B

court can discern no benefit from an additional round of legal arguments. Nor is there an obvious need to delay ruling on the merits to allow for development of the factual record.

Id. The court made the decision to consolidate conscious of the need to expedite these types of cases. In *Eastland v. U.S. Servicemen's Fund*, the Supreme Court stated that motions to enjoin a congressional subpoena "be given the most expeditious treatment by district courts because one branch of Government is being asked to halt the functions of a coordinate branch." 421 U.S. 491, 511 n.17, 95 S. Ct. 1813, 44 L. Ed. 2d 324 (1975); *see also Exxon Corp. v. Federal Trade Com.*, 589 F.2d 582, 589, 191 U.S. App. D.C. 59 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (describing *Eastland* as emphasizing "the necessity for courts to refrain from interfering with or delaying the investigatory functions of Congress"). The court also was cognizant of the fact that the Constitution's Speech or Debate Clause forecloses Plaintiffs from compelling discovery from the Oversight Committee, its Members, or staff. *See Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 503 (stating that "a private civil action, whether for an injunction or damages, creates a distraction and forces Members to divert their time, energy, and attention from their legislative tasks to defend the litigation"); *see also Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606, 616-22, 92 S. Ct. 2614, 33 L. Ed. 2d 583 (1972). Relatedly, the D.C. Circuit has recognized that evidence relevant to determining whether Congress has acted in its legislative capacity is likely to come largely, if not exclusively, from public sources. *See Shelton v. United States*, 404 F.2d 1292, 1297, 131 U.S. App. D.C. 315 (D.C. Cir. 1968) (observing that

Appendix B

relevant sources of evidence include “the resolution of the Congress authorizing the inquiry,” “the opening statement of the Chairman at the hearings,” and “statements of the members of the committee . . . or of the Staff Director”) (citations omitted). The court ordered the parties to submit any additional evidence to the court or lodge an objection to consolidation by May 13, 2019. Order at 2.

Plaintiffs protested the court’s consolidation order, but the Oversight Committee did not. *See* Pls.’ Objections to Rule 65(a)(2) Consolidation, ECF No. 29 [hereinafter Pls.’ Objections]; *see also* Oversight Committee’s Resp. to the Court’s May 9, 2019 Order, ECF No. 31. Plaintiffs asserted that, in briefing only a motion for preliminary injunction, they were constrained in their arguments on the merits. *See* Pls.’ Objections at 4 (“Nor have the parties had the opportunity to fully brief the important constitutional questions that this case presents.”). They also maintained that they needed more time to obtain additional evidence, specifically (1) a memorandum of understanding negotiated between Chairman Cummings and a Chair of a different House Committee, which they believed the Ranking Member of the Oversight Committee would voluntarily disclose to them, and (2) communications between Mazars and the Oversight Committee. *Id.* at 6-7. Plaintiffs did not assert that they could obtain discovery from the Oversight Committee. *See generally id.*

At the May 14th hearing, the court heard further argument from Plaintiffs on consolidation, and overruled their objection. The court found that no additional briefing would aid in its decision-making, as the parties

Appendix B

had comprehensively presented the issues and cited all applicable precedent. *See* Hr’g Tr. at 34. Indeed, Plaintiffs could identify no new argument that they would make if given the chance to do so. *Id.* at 34-36. To allow for Plaintiffs’ asserted need to gather additional evidence, the court left the record open until May 18, 2019. *Id.* at 75. Plaintiffs already had submitted some additional evidence after the consolidation order, which consisted of news reports of public statements of various Members of Congress. *See* Supp. Decl. of William S. Consovoy, ECF No. 30 [hereinafter First Supp. Decl.]. Plaintiffs added two more letters from the Ranking Member before the record closed. *See* Second Supp. Decl. of William S. Consovoy, ECF No. 34.²⁰

E. Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment

The legal issues presented do not require the court to resolve any fact contests because the material facts are not in dispute.²¹ Accordingly, having ordered consolidation

20. Plaintiffs did not offer any evidence from Mazars; nor did they submit the memorandum of understanding that they claimed in their Opposition was critical evidence. The Oversight Committee, however, did submit that memorandum of understanding to the court *in camera*. The court has considered the contents of the agreement in rendering its judgment.

21. Although the Oversight Committee’s “motive” for issuing the subpoena to Mazars is a disputed fact, as discussed further below, it is not a “material” fact that would prevent deciding the case on cross-motions for summary judgment. *See Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 200, 77 S. Ct. 1173, 1 L. Ed. 2d 1273, 76 Ohio Law Abs. 225 (1957). In addition, the Committee admitted “there

Appendix B

under Rule 65(a)(2), the court treats the parties' briefing as cross-motions for summary judgment. *See Mar. for Life v. Burwell*, 128 F. Supp. 3d 116, 124 (D.D.C. 2015) (reviewing case consolidated under Rule 65(a)(2) as cross-motions for summary judgment); *Indep. Bankers Ass'n of Am. v. Conover*, 603 F. Supp. 948, 953 (D.D.C. 1985) (same).

III. LEGAL PRINCIPLES**A. Congress's Broad Investigative Authority**

Article I of the Constitution grants Congress all "legislative Powers." U.S. Const. art. I, § 1. Although Article I does not say so expressly, the power to secure "needed information . . . has long been treated as an attribute of the power to legislate." *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 161, 47 S. Ct. 319, 71 L. Ed. 580 (1927). As the Supreme Court observed in *McGrain*, the power to investigate is deeply rooted in the nation's history: "It was so regarded in the British Parliament and in the colonial Legislatures before the American Revolution, and a like view has prevailed and been carried into effect in both houses of Congress and in most of the state Legislatures." *Id.* "There can be no doubt as to the power of Congress, by itself or through its committees, to investigate matters and conditions relating to contemplated legislation." *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 160, 75 S. Ct. 668, 99 L. Ed. 964 (1955).

is no legitimate dispute about the facts here. We're not saying that Congressman Cummings didn't say the things that he's quoted as saying . . ." Hr'g Tr. at 61-62.

Appendix B

Related to Congress's legislative function is its "informing function." The Supreme Court has understood that function to permit "Congress to inquire into and publicize corruption, maladministration or inefficiency in agencies of the Government." *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 200 n.33, 77 S. Ct. 1173, 1 L. Ed. 2d 1273, 76 Ohio Law Abs. 225 (1957). "From the earliest times in its history, the Congress has assiduously performed an 'informing function' of this nature." *Id.* (citing James M. Landis, *Constitutional Limitations on the Congressional Power of Investigation*, 40 HARV. L. REV. 153, 168-194 (1926)). The informing function finds its roots in the scholarship of President Woodrow Wilson, which the Court first cited in *United States v. Rumely*:

It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice, and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.

Appendix B

345 U.S. 41, 43, 73 S. Ct. 543, 97 L. Ed. 770 (1953) (quoting WOODROW WILSON, CONGRESSIONAL GOVERNMENT: A STUDY IN AMERICAN POLITICS, 303). Thus, though not wholly distinct from its legislative function, the informing function is a critical responsibility uniquely granted to Congress under Article I. *See* Landis, 40 HARV. L. REV. at 205 n.227 (describing the informing function as “implied and inherent” within the legislative function).

In furtherance of these duties, Congress’s power to investigate is “broad.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187. “It encompasses inquiries concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes. It includes surveys of defects in our social, economic or political system for the purpose of enabling the Congress to remedy them.” *Id.* In short, “[t]he scope of the power of inquiry . . . is as penetrating and far-reaching as the potential power to enact and appropriate under the Constitution.” *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 111, 79 S. Ct. 1081, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1115 (1959).

But Congress’s investigatory power is not unbounded. The Constitution’s very structure puts limits on it. For instance, the power to investigate may not “extend to an area in which Congress is forbidden to legislate.” *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161. Nor may Congress “trench upon Executive or judicial prerogatives.” *McSurely v. McClellan*, 521 F.2d 1024, 1038, 172 U.S. App. D.C. 364 (D.C. Cir. 1975). A prime example of such overreach is exercising the “powers of law enforcement; those powers are assigned under our Constitution to the Executive and the Judiciary.” *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161. The Supreme Court has recognized other

Appendix B

limits. Congress cannot “inquire into private affairs unrelated to a valid legislative purpose.” *Id.* Nor is there a “congressional power to expose for the sake of exposure.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200. “The public is, of course, entitled to be informed concerning the workings of its government. That cannot be inflated into a general power to expose where the predominant result can only be an invasion of the private rights of individuals.” *Id.*²²

B. Determining Whether Congress Has Acted Legislatively

When a court is asked to decide whether Congress has used its investigative power improperly, its analysis must be highly deferential to the legislative branch. A number of guideposts mark the way forward.

To start, the court must proceed from the assumption “that the action of the legislative body was with a legitimate object, if it is capable of being so construed, and [the court] ha[s] no right to assume that the contrary was intended.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178 (citation omitted). It also “must presume that the committees of Congress will exercise their powers responsibly and with due regard for the rights of affected parties.” *Exxon Corp.*, 589 F.2d at 589. So, when it appears that Congress is investigating on a subject-matter in aid of legislating, “the presumption

22. Other limitations on Congress’s investigative powers can be found in the Bill of Rights. *See Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161. Plaintiffs have not asserted that disclosure of the records sought from Mazars would implicate any “specific individual guarantees of the Bill of Rights.” *Id.*; *see generally* Pls.’ Stmt.

Appendix B

should be indulged that this was the real object.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178.

An important corollary to this presumption of regularity is that courts may not “test[] the motives of committee members” to negate an otherwise facially valid legislative purpose. *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200; *see also Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 508 (“Our cases make clear that in determining the legitimacy of a congressional act we do not look to the motives alleged to have prompted it.”) (citation omitted). “So long as Congress acts in pursuance of its constitutional power, the Judiciary lacks authority to intervene on the basis of the motives which spurred the exercise of that power.” *Barenblatt*, 360 U.S. at 132 (citation omitted). Thus, it is not the court’s role to decipher whether Congress’s true purpose in pursuing an investigation is to aid legislation or something more sinister such as exacting political retribution. *See McSurely*, 521 F.2d at 1038. If there is some discernable legislative purpose, courts shall not impede Congress’s investigative actions. *See Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200 (“Their motives alone would not vitiate an investigation which had been instituted by a House of Congress if that assembly’s legislative purpose is being served.”).

Although Congress’s motives are off limits, courts can consider what Congress has said publicly to decide whether it has exceeded its authority. *See Shelton*, 404 F.2d at 1297. Relevant evidence includes the resolution authorizing the investigation, statements by Committee members, and questions posed during hearings. *See id.* At the same time, the mere absence of public statements identifying the

Appendix B

investigation's purpose or subject matter is not, by itself, conclusive proof of an *invalid* purpose. *See McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 176-78. Congress is not required to announce its intentions in advance. *See id.* at 178. Similarly, it does not matter if the investigation does not produce legislation. *See Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 509. "The very nature of the investigative function—like any research—is that it takes the searchers up some 'blind alleys' and into nonproductive enterprises. To be a valid legislative inquiry there need be no predictable end result." *Id.*; *see also Townsend v. United States*, 95 F.2d 352, 355 (D.C. Cir. 1938) (Congress's "power to conduct a hearing for legislative purposes is not to be measured by recommendations for legislation or their absence."). The critical inquiry then is not legislative certainty, but legislative potential: If the subject matter of the investigation is "one on which legislation *could be had*," Congress acts within its legislative function. *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177 (emphasis added); *see also Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 504 n.15 ("The subject of any inquiry always must be one 'on which legislation could be had.'") (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177).

Once a court finds that an investigation is one upon which legislation could be had, it must not entangle itself in judgments about the investigation's scope or the evidence sought. Only an investigative demand that is "plainly incompetent or irrelevant to any lawful purpose of the [committee] in the discharge of its duties" will fail to pass muster. *McPhaul v. United States*, 364 U.S. 372, 381, 81 S. Ct. 138, 5 L. Ed. 2d 136 (1960) (citation omitted) (cleaned up). Importantly, in making this assessment, it is not the judicial officer's job to conduct a "line-by-line

Appendix B

review of the Committee's requests." *Bean LLC v. John Doe Bank*, 291 F. Supp. 3d. 34, 44 (D.D.C. 2018). "There is no requirement that every piece of information gathered in such an investigation be justified before the judiciary." *McSurely*, 521 F.2d at 1041.

And, finally, courts must take care not to be swayed by the political conflicts of the day. Its role is not to act as a political referee. As the Supreme Court cautioned in *Tenney v. Brandhove*:

In times of political passion, dishonest or vindictive motives are readily attributed to legislative conduct and as readily believed. Courts are not the place for such controversies. Self-discipline and the voters must be the ultimate reliance for discouraging or correcting such abuses. The courts should not go beyond the narrow confines of determining that a committee's inquiry may fairly be deemed within its province.

341 U.S. 367, 378, 71 S. Ct. 783, 95 L. Ed. 1019 (1951).

IV. ANALYSIS

With these principles in mind, the court proceeds to consider whether the Oversight Committee's subpoena to Mazars is "facially legislative in character," *McSurely*, 521 F.2d at 1038, or whether it exceeds Congress's power to investigate. To answer that question, the court first considers the legislative reasons offered by the Oversight

Appendix B

Committee to justify the subpoena. It then addresses Plaintiffs' contentions why those reasons are invalid.

A. Legislative Purpose for Issuing the Subpoena to Mazars

Had the Oversight Committee adopted a resolution that spells out the intended legislative purpose and scope of its investigation, the court would have begun its inquiry there. Indeed, the Supreme Court has considered congressional resolutions as a primary source from which to glean whether information “was sought . . . in aid of the legislative function.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 176; *see also Shelton*, 404 F.2d at 1297 (observing that relevant sources of evidence to “ascertain whether [an inquiry] is within the broad investigative authority of Congress” include “the resolution . . . authorizing the inquiry”). However, the Committee never adopted one. While a clearly drafted resolution would have made this court’s task easier or might have preempted the challenge now brought altogether, it is not a constitutional prerequisite to start an investigation. *Cf. McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 178.

Without a resolution as a point of reference, the logical starting point for identifying the purpose of the Mazars subpoena is the memorandum to Members of the Oversight Committee written by Chairman Cummings on April 12, 2019. Chairman Cummings penned that Memorandum in anticipation of issuing the subpoena. It is therefore the best evidence of the Committee’s purpose. The Memorandum lists four areas of investigation: (1) “whether the President may have engaged in illegal

Appendix B

conduct before and during his tenure in office,” (2) “whether he has undisclosed conflicts of interest that may impair his ability to make impartial policy decisions,” (3) “whether he is complying with the Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution,” and (4) “whether he has accurately reported his finances to the Office of Government Ethics and other federal entities.” Cummings’ April 12th Mem. at 4. Each of these is a subject “on which legislation could be had.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 177.

Taking the reasons in reverse order, the accuracy of the President’s financial reporting relates directly to the law that requires it: The Ethics in Government Act of 1978. *See* 5 U.S.C. App. 4 § 101 *et seq.* In his letter to the White House Counsel dated February 15, 2019, Chairman Cummings alluded to how documents relating to the accuracy of the President’s disclosures fell within the legislative purview of Congress: “Since the earliest days of our republic, Congress has investigated how existing laws are being implemented and whether changes to the laws are necessary. For decades, this has included laws relating to financial disclosures required of the President.” Cummings’ February 15th Letter at 9. As to the specific demand made on February 15th, which related to the payments by Michael Cohen and the President’s failure to publicly report them as a liability, Chairman Cummings explained that “[t]hese documents will help the Committee determine why the President failed to report these payments and *whether reforms are necessary to address deficiencies with current laws, rules, and regulations.*” *Id.* (emphasis added). This legislative rationale applies equally to the financial records requested by the Mazars subpoena.

Appendix B

Congress reasonably might consider those documents in connection with deciding whether to legislate on federal ethics laws and regulations. For example, the discovery of additional disclosure violations by the President could influence whether Congress strengthens public reporting requirements or enhances penalties for non-compliance. Thus, there can be little doubt that Congress's interest in the accuracy of the President's financial disclosures falls within the legislative sphere.

Investigating whether the President is abiding by the Foreign Emoluments Clause is likewise a subject on which legislation, or similar congressional action, could be had. The Foreign Emoluments Clause prohibits the President from “accept[ing]” any “Emolument” from “any King, Prince, or foreign State” without the “Consent of the Congress.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 8. The Constitution thus expressly vests in Congress the unique authority to approve the President's acceptance of “Emoluments,” however one defines that term. *See generally Blumenthal v. Trump*, No. 17-1154 (EGS), 373 F. Supp. 3d 191, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 72431, 2019 WL 1923398 (D.D.C. Apr. 30, 2019). Even under the President's favored interpretation, the Clause, at a minimum, “was intended to combat corruption and foreign influence . . .” 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 72431, [WL] at *8. Surely, incident to Congress's authority to consent to the President's receipt of Emoluments is the power to investigate the President's compliance with the Clause. Without such power, Congress's constitutional function to approve or disapprove Emoluments would be severely and unduly constrained. The Founders could not have intended that

Appendix B

result. A congressional investigation to carry out an expressly delegated Article I function, in addition to any legislation that might be had relating to that function, is plainly valid.²³

So, too, is an investigation to determine whether the President has any conflicts of interest. As already discussed, it lies within Congress's province to legislate regarding the ethics of government officials. Indeed, exposing conflicts of interest is one of the core objectives of the Ethics in Government Act. As the D.C. Circuit has observed, "the Act shows Congress'[s] general belief that public disclosure of conflicts of interest is desirable despite its cost in loss of personal privacy." *Washington Post Co. v. U.S. Dep't of Health & Human Servs.*, 690 F.2d 252, 265, 223 U.S. App. D.C. 139 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Obtaining records to shed light on whether the President has undisclosed conflicts of interests is therefore entirely consistent with potential legislation in an area where Congress already has acted and made policy judgments.

23. To be clear, even if Congress's authority to approve the President's receipt of Emoluments is technically not a "legislative" act, the court doubts that the Supreme Court would read its precedent to foreclose Congress from investigating an Emoluments Clause violation based on a semantic distinction. The fact is, no court has ever been asked to address the extent of Congress's power to police the Emoluments Clause. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that there is no case holding that Congress may exercise its power to investigate in relation to that Clause. But just as Congress's authority to legislate is expressly rooted in Article I, so too is its power to consent to presidential receipt of Emoluments. If Congress's power to investigate is incidental to its legislative function, it likewise must be incidental to carry out its Foreign Emoluments Clause function.

Appendix B

Finally, a congressional investigation into “illegal conduct before and during [the President’s] tenure in office,” Cummings’ April 12th Mem. at 4, fits comfortably within the broad scope of Congress’s investigative powers. At a minimum, such an investigation is justified based on Congress’s “informing function,” that is, its power “to inquire into and publicize corruption,” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200 n.33.²⁴ It is simply not fathomable that a Constitution that grants Congress the power to remove a President for reasons including criminal behavior would deny Congress the power to investigate him for unlawful conduct—past or present—even without formally opening an impeachment inquiry. On this score, history provides a useful guide. *Cf. Tobin v. United States*, 306 F.2d 270, 275-76, 113 U.S. App. D.C. 110 (D.C. Cir. 1962) (relying on historical practice to determine the scope of a congressional investigation). Twice in the last 50

24. Plaintiffs suggested at oral argument that Congress’s informing function was limited to rooting out corruption only in “agencies” of the Government, and the President is not an “agency” of the government. *See* Hr’g Tr. at 9, 75. Although footnote 33 in *Watkins* refers to the informing function in connection with “agencies of the Government,” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200 n.33, the original conception of that function as embraced by the Court in *Rumely* was not so limited, *see Rumely*, 345 U.S. 41, 73 S. Ct. 543, 97 L. Ed. 770. *Rumely* spoke more generally of shining a light on “every affair of government” and “the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the government,” without qualification. *Id.* at 43. *Watkins*’ reference to administrative agencies is therefore better understood as a case-specific statement—the investigation there involved the Attorney General—rather than a limiting principle. Plaintiffs’ artificial line-drawing is antithetical to the checks and balances inherent in the Constitution’s design.

Appendix B

years Congress has investigated a sitting President for alleged law violations, *before* initiating impeachment proceedings. It did so in 1973 by establishing the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, better known as the Watergate Committee, and then did so again in 1995 by establishing the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters. *See* S. Res. 60 (93rd Cong., 1st Session) (Feb. 7, 1973) [hereinafter Watergate Res.]; *see also* S. Res. 120 (104th Cong., 1st Session) (May 17, 1995). The former investigation included within its scope potential corruption by President Nixon while in office, while the latter concerned alleged illegal misconduct by President Clinton before his time in office. Congress plainly views itself as having sweeping authority to investigate illegal conduct of a President, before and after taking office. This court is not prepared to roll back the tide of history.²⁵

Before moving on to Plaintiffs' arguments, the court notes that the Oversight Committee has identified several pieces of actual legislation that, it asserts, are related to its overall investigation of the President. *See* Oversight Committee's Opp'n to Pls.' Mot. for Prelim. Injunction, ECF No. 20, at 5-6. The House has passed H.R. 1, which requires, among other things, the President and Vice

25. Even if an investigation into a sitting President's past or present illegal conduct lies beyond the Oversight Committee's reach, its investigation here still would be legitimate because the Committee identified three other justifications with a valid legislative purpose. *See McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 176-77 (rejecting lower court's opinion striking down a congressional investigation because the investigation "contemplat[ed] the taking of action other than legislative").

Appendix B

President to file new financial disclosure forms within 30 days of taking office, and to divest all financial interests that would pose a conflict of interest by “either converting those interests to cash or investments that satisfy ethics rules or placing those interests in a qualified blind trust or disclosing information about business interests.” *Id.* at 6 (citing H.R. 1, 116th Cong., Title VIII (2019)). Other bills cited by the Oversight Committee include H.R. 745, which would strengthen the Office of Government Ethics, and H.R. 706, which would prohibit the President and Vice President from conducting business directly with the Federal Government. *See id.* (citing H.R. 745, 116th Cong. (2019); H.R. 706, 116th Cong. (2019)). There is no mention of any of these bills in any written request from the Oversight Committee, let alone the April 12th Memorandum justifying the Mazars subpoena. That absence is not fatal, however. Again, the question for the court is whether the congressional investigation pertains to a subject matter on which legislation could be had, so Congress need not proactively identify any specific legislation to justify its activities. Here, the bills identified by the Oversight Committee demonstrate Congress’s intent to legislate, at the very least, in the areas of ethics and accountability for Executive Branch officials, including the President. These are subjects, therefore, on which legislation could be had.

B. Plaintiffs’ Contentions

The court now turns to Plaintiffs’ contentions. Each of Plaintiffs’ arguments for why the Mazars subpoena exceeds Congress’s Article I investigative

Appendix B

power fall into one of three general categories. First, by characterizing the Oversight Committee's investigation as one delving "into the accuracy of a private citizen's past financial statements," Plaintiffs contend that the Oversight Committee is engaged in "a quintessential law enforcement task reserved to the executive and judicial branches." Pls.' Stmt. at 11. Plaintiffs similarly contend that an investigation into the accuracy of the President's financial disclosures, his adherence to the Emoluments Clauses, and his present or past compliance with the law is "law enforcement" activity that encroaches on the prerogatives of the coordinate branches. Hrg. Tr. at 7, 13-18, 25. Second, Plaintiffs charge that the Oversight Committee's investigation "has nothing to do with government oversight," but is instead intended to expose for the mere sake of exposure "the conduct of a private citizen years before he was even a candidate for public office . . ." Pls.' Stmt. at 11. Finally, Plaintiffs maintain that the Oversight Committee has exceeded its authority, insofar as it is doing nothing more than "conduct[ing] roving oversight of the President," and the records sought from Mazars are not "pertinent" to any legitimate legislative purpose. Pls.' Reply in Support of Pls.' Mot. for Prelim. Injunction, ECF No. 24 [hereinafter Pls.' Reply], at 11-12. The court addresses each of these arguments in turn.

1. Usurpation of Executive and Judicial Functions

Plaintiffs first assert that each of the four justifications for the Mazars subpoena identified by Chairman Cummings

Appendix B

in the April 12th Memorandum falls outside the bounds of legislative power, because each seeks to determine whether the President broke the law, a function reserved exclusively to the Executive and Judicial branches. *See id.* at 13-14. That argument, however, rests on a false premise. Just because a congressional investigation has the potential to reveal law violations does not mean such investigation exceeds the legislative function. The Supreme Court's understanding of a "legislative" purpose is not so constrained.

To be certain, the Supreme Court has said that the "power to investigate must not be confused with any of the powers of law enforcement; those powers are assigned under our Constitution to the Executive and the Judiciary." *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161; *see also Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187 ("Nor is the Congress a law enforcement or trial agency."). But that limitation is not so absolute as to foreclose Congress from investigating any law violation by a private citizen, let alone a sitting President, so long as Congress is operating with a legislative purpose. As the Court explained in *Sinclair v. United States*:

It may be conceded that Congress is without authority to compel disclosures for the purpose of aiding the prosecution of pending suits; but the authority of that body, directly or through its committees, to require pertinent disclosures in aid of its own constitutional power is not abridged because the information sought to be elicited may also be of use in such suits.

Appendix B

279 U.S. 263, 295, 49 S. Ct. 268, 73 L. Ed. 692 (1929). Thus, the Court has made clear that the mere prospect that a congressional inquiry will expose law violations does not transform a permissible legislative investigation into a forbidden executive or judicial function. *See McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 179-80 (“Nor do we think it a valid objection to the investigation that it might possibly disclose crime or wrongdoing on [the Attorney’s General’s] part.”); *see also Townsend*, 95 F.2d at 355 (describing *McGrain* as holding that “the presumption should be indulged that the object of the inquiry was to aid the Senate in legislating . . . even though the investigation might possibly disclose crime or wrongdoing on the part of the then Attorney General, whose name was expressly referred to in the resolution”).

Moreover, appellate courts have demanded exacting proof before declaring that Congress has impermissibly intruded into exclusive executive or judicial territories. According to the Supreme Court, “[t]o find that a committee’s investigation has exceeded the bounds of legislative power it must be *obvious* that there was a usurpation of functions exclusively vested in the Judiciary or the Executive.” *Tenney*, 341 U.S. at 378 (emphasis added). Similarly, the D.C. Circuit has said that Congress avoids trenching upon executive or judicial prerogatives “so long as [the investigative activity] remains facially legislative in character.” *McSurely*, 521 F.2d at 1038. Therefore, a congressional investigation that seeks to uncover wrongdoing does not, without more, exceed the scope of Congress’s authority.

Appendix B

In this case, there is nothing “obvious” about the Oversight Committee’s activities to support the conclusion that the subpoena to Mazars is a usurpation of an exclusively executive or judicial function. Nothing “give[s] warrant for thinking the [Oversight Committee is] attempting or intending to try [the President] at its bar or before its committee for any crime or wrongdoing.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 179. Nor is there evidence before the court that the Oversight Committee initiated its investigative activities at the behest of federal or state law enforcement officials, or is coordinating its actions with such officials. If anything, the evidence is to the contrary. The Executive Branch is clearly not coordinating with Congress, as it continues to resist calls to disclose records relating to the President’s actions in areas arguably well within Congress’s investigative powers.²⁶ The Committee’s stated purposes, therefore, do not usurp judicial or executive functions.

To support their position, Plaintiffs point out that (1) the Mazars subpoena arose out of the testimony of Michael Cohen—“an admitted perjurer,” Pls.’ Stmt. at 4; (2) the records sought relate primarily to the President’s personal and financial interests years before he became

26. See, e.g., Carol D. Leonnig, et al., *No ‘Do-Over’ on Mueller Probe, White House Lawyer Tells House Panel, Saying Demands for Records, Staff Testimony Will be Refused*, WASH. POST, May 15, 2019, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/no-do-over-on-mueller-probe-white-house-lawyer-tells-house-panel-saying-demands-for-records-staff-testimony-will-be-refused/2019/05/15/1ad19728-7715-11e9-b3f5-5673edf2d127_story_html?utm_term=.b67bc595c86a (last visited May 20, 2019).

Appendix B

a candidate, *id.* at 11; and (3) Chairman Cummings admitted that the Mazars subpoena was intended to “investigate whether the President may have engaged in illegal conduct before and during his tenure in office,” Cummings’ April 12th Mem. at 4. In addition, Plaintiffs cite to statements made by Chairman Cummings before he issued the Mazars subpoena. For instance, in his March 20th letter to Mazars, Chairman Cummings focused solely on Michael Cohen’s allegations that President Trump misrepresented his assets and liabilities and made no mention of a legislative purpose for obtaining the records. *See* Cummings’ March 20th Letter; *see also* First Supp. Decl. at 5-9. Additionally, Plaintiffs offer a November 2018 *Vox* article that quotes Chairman Cummings as saying, “[w]e’ve got to address this issue of exposing President Trump and what he has done, and we’ve got to face the truth . . . The [P]resident is a guy who calls truth lies and lies truth. But at some point, he’s also creating policy, and that’s affecting people’s day-to-day life.” First Supp. Decl. at 42. Plaintiffs also provide a *Politico* article in which Chairman Cummings is quoted as saying, “[o]ver the last two years President Trump set the tone from the top in his administration that behaving ethically and complying with the law is optional . . . We’re better than that.” *Id.* at 54. None of these facts, individually or taken together, make for an “obvious” “usurpation of functions exclusively vested in the Judiciary or the Executive.” *Tenney*, 341 U.S. at 378.

History has shown that congressionally-exposed criminal conduct by the President or a high-ranking Executive Branch official can lead to legislation. The

Appendix B

Senate Watergate Committee provides an apt example. That Committee's express mandate was to investigate "the extent, if any, to which illegal, improper, or unethical activities were engaged in by any persons, acting either individually or in combination with others, in the presidential election of 1972, or in any related campaign or canvass conducted by or [o]n behalf of any person seeking nomination or election as the candidate . . . for the office of President . . ." Watergate Res. at 1-2. As a consequence of the Committee's work, Congress passed numerous pieces of legislation—among them, the Ethics in Government Act, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the War Powers Resolution, and the Independent Counsel Statute—with objectives to "open up the operation of the presidency to greater public oversight, subject[] the presidency to legal checks by other branches or institutions of government and, more generally, impose[] rule of law principles to more and more types of presidential decision making." Michael A. Fitts, *The Legalization of the Presidency: A Twenty-Five Year Watergate Retrospective*, 43 ST. LOUIS UNIV. LAW J. 725, 726 (1999). The Teapot Dome Scandal provides another illustration. That congressional investigation concerned the award of a no-bid contract to lease federal oil reserves in Wyoming. Congress's investigation revealed that the Secretary of Interior had accepted bribes from the oil companies that were awarded the leases. This discovery motivated Congress to enact several good-government reforms, including the Revenue Act of 1924 and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. See James Sample, *The Last Rites of Public Campaign Financing?*, 92 NEB. L. REV. 349, 363 (2013).

Appendix B

See also Lawrence A. Zelenak & Marjorie E. Kornhauser, *Shaping Public Opinion and the Law: How a “Common Man” Campaign Ended a Rich Man’s Law*, 73 LAW & CONTEMP. PROBS. 123, 126 (2010). This court is in no position to say that an equally ambitious legislative agenda might not arise out of the current era of congressional investigations of the presidency.

2. Investigation of Private Affairs

Plaintiffs next accuse the Oversight Committee of issuing the subpoena to Mazars simply to investigate the private affairs of a citizen. *See* Pls.’ Stmt. at 9, 11. This argument fares no better than Plaintiffs’ first.

More than a century ago, in *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, the Supreme Court stated that Congress does not possess “the general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of the citizen.” 103 U.S. 168, 190, 26 L. Ed. 377 (1880). In the ensuing decades, the Supreme Court repeatedly has affirmed that constraint on Congress’s investigative powers. *See, e.g., McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 173-74; *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161; *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 504 n.15. But *Kilbourn* is the high-water mark for that limiting principle. In the nearly 140 years since *Kilbourn*, neither the Supreme Court nor any circuit court has found a congressional investigation unconstitutional because it invades the “private affairs of the citizen.” Indeed, years later, in the context of warning courts to be wary of declaring a congressional inquiry unconstitutional, the Supreme Court acknowledged *Kilbourn*’s shortcomings:

Appendix B

Experience admonishes us to tread warily in this domain. The loose language of *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 26 L. Ed. 377, the weighty criticism to which it has been subjected, *see, e.g.*, Fairman, Mr. Justice Miller and the Supreme Court, 332-334; Landis, *Constitutional Limitations on the Congressional Power of Investigation*, 40 Harv. L. Rev. 153, the inroads that have been made upon that case by later cases, *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 170-171, 47 S. Ct. 319, 71 L. Ed. 580, and *Sinclair v. United States*, 279 U.S. 263, 49 S. Ct. 268, 73 L. Ed. 692, strongly counsel abstention from adjudication unless no choice is left.

Rumely, 345 U.S. at 46 (alternations added). Accordingly, although the notion from *Kilbourn* that Congress does not have the general power to investigate into personal affairs remains alive today, the case is largely impotent as a guiding constitutional principle. *See* Landis, 40 HARV. L. REV. at 220 (“But no standard for judgment can be developed from *Kilbourn v. Thompson*. Its result contradicts an unbroken Congressional practice continuing even after the decision, with the increasing realization that committees of inquiry are necessary in order to make government effectively responsible to the electorate.”).

How then to measure whether Congress has ventured into impermissible territory of investigating the personal affairs of a private citizen? The Supreme Court has

Appendix B

provided some guidance. In *Quinn*, the Court said that Congress cannot use its investigative power “to inquire into private affairs *unrelated* to a valid legislative purpose.” 349 U.S. at 161 (emphasis added). Similarly, in *Watkins*, the Court stated that: “The public is, of course, entitled to be informed concerning the workings of its government. That cannot be inflated into a general power to expose where *the predominant result can only be* an invasion of the private rights of individuals.” 354 U.S. at 200 (emphasis added). Thus, the question the court must ask is whether the Oversight Committee’s investigation into the President’s personal affairs is fully divorced from any legislative purpose.

Indulging in the presumption that when Congress acts it does so for a proper reason, the court cannot say that the records sought from Mazars are “unrelated to a valid legislative purpose” or that the “predominant result can only be an invasion of” the President’s private affairs. As discussed above, legislation could stem from the Oversight Committee’s investigation of the President’s personal and corporate finances and the possible conflicts of interest under which he is operating. Thus, the potential presence of some intent to “ridicule, harass, or punish” the President cannot overcome this facially valid legislative purpose. *McSurely*, 521 F.2d at 1038.

In their Complaint and in their supplemental evidentiary submissions, Plaintiffs reference various statements from Democratic Members of Congress and congressional aides to the effect that Democrats are intending to use their subpoena power to exact political

Appendix B

retribution. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 27-30; *see also* First Supp. Decl. at 35-79. For instance, one Congressman is quoted as saying, “We’re going to have to build an air traffic control tower to keep track of all the subpoenas flying from here to the White House.” Compl. ¶ 29. Another unnamed Democratic official said that House Democrats were preparing a “subpoena cannon” to fire at the President. *Id.* Plaintiffs urge that these and similar statements reveal that the Democrats’ true motive is to embarrass and harass the President, which cannot be cured by the Committee’s “retroactive rationalizations” in the April 12th Memorandum. Hr’g Tr. at 8.

Even if the court were to take these statements at face value—at best, a dubious evidentiary proposition given that these individuals do not control the actions of the Oversight Committee—they make no material difference. The case law makes clear that “motives alone would not vitiate an investigation which had been instituted by a House of Congress if that assembly’s legislative purpose is being served.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 200. In *Watkins*, the petitioner “marshalled an impressive array of evidence that some Congressmen have believed that” their duty “was to bring down upon himself and others the violence of public reaction because of their past beliefs, expressions and associations.” *Id.* at 199. This evidence did not, however, carry the day with the Supreme Court because Congress also had a legitimate legislative purpose for its investigation. *Id.* at 200. Likewise, in *McGrain*, the Court rejected a lower court’s decision echoing the arguments Plaintiffs advance here: “The extreme personal cast of the original resolutions; the spirit of hostility towards the

Appendix B

then Attorney General which they breathe; that it was not avowed that legislative action was had in view until after the action of the Senate had been challenged; and that the avowal then was coupled with an avowal that other action was had in view—are calculated to create the impression that the idea of legislative action being in contemplation was an afterthought.” *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 176. The Court held that the lower court was “wrong,” because “the subject [of the investigation] was one on which legislation could be had.” *Id.* at 177. In short, as long as there is a facially valid legislative purpose for the investigation, Congress acts within its constitutional authority. That is the case here.²⁷

3. Pertinency of the Records Request

Plaintiffs’ third and final challenge rests on the “pertinency” of the records requested from Mazars. *See* Pls.’ Reply at 12-14. This argument takes multiple forms, none of which are persuasive.

27. For this same reason, the forceful dissenting statements of the Ranking Member of the Oversight Committee, Congressman Jim Jordan, do not change the court’s calculus. The Ranking Member views the Committee’s investigation as without legislative purpose, and its sole design to harass and embarrass the President. *See* Second Decl. of William S. Consovoy, ECF No. 34; Ex. B, Letter from the Honorable Jim Jordan, Ranking Member, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform, to the Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Chairman, House Comm. on Oversight & Reform (May 15, 2019). But, again, so long as lawmaking could follow from the Committee’s investigation, any attendant political purpose does not make the inquiry unconstitutional.

Appendix B

To begin, according to Plaintiffs, for the Mazars subpoena to be valid the records sought must be “‘reasonably relevant’ to [the subpoena’s] legitimate legislative purpose,” and the records demanded fail that test. *Id.* at 13 (citing *McPhaul*, 364 U.S. at 381-82). This argument suffers from two problems. The first is that Plaintiffs conflate the concept of “pertinency” with the notion of “relevancy” as used in civil proceedings. “Pertinency” does not require the court to ask, as it would in a civil discovery dispute, whether the documents requested are likely to yield useful evidence. Instead, pertinency “is a jurisdictional concept . . . drawn from the nature of a congressional committee’s source of authority.” *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 206. The concept appears most often in the context of a *criminal* conviction for contempt of Congress, in which a person has refused to comply with a subpoena or answer questions posed at a hearing. Pertinency, in this setting, is an element of criminal contempt. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 192 (making it a misdemeanor for a person summoned as a witness before Congress either to not appear or, if “having appeared, [to] refuse[] to answer any question *pertinent* to the question under inquiry . . .”) (emphasis added). The pertinency inquiry therefore asks whether the question posed to a witness is one that fell within the scope of the Committee’s investigative authority, which typically is defined by the resolution authorizing the investigation. *See Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 207-10; *Sinclair*, 279 U.S. at 292 (stating that, under the contempt statute, “a witness rightfully may refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded or where the questions asked are not pertinent to the matter under inquiry”). This is not a contempt case and therefore

Appendix B

the pertinency inquiry, properly understood, has no role here.

But even if the court were to treat pertinency as akin to a relevance determination, that test is satisfied here. The standard adopted by the Supreme Court is a forgiving one. The subpoenaed records need only be “not plainly incompetent or irrelevant to any lawful purpose [of the Committee] in the discharge of its duties.” *McPhaul*, 364 U.S. at 381 (cleaned up). Here, the Oversight Committee has shown that it is not engaged in a pure fishing expedition for the President’s financial records. It is undisputed that the President did not initially identify as liabilities on his public disclosure forms the payments that Michael Cohen made to alleged mistresses during the presidential campaign.²⁸ Furthermore, Michael Cohen has pleaded guilty to campaign finance violations arising from those payments.²⁹ These events, when combined with Cohen’s testimony and the financial statements he supplied, make it reasonable for the Oversight Committee to believe that the records sought from Mazars might reveal other financial transgressions or improprieties. As already discussed, it is not unreasonable to think that the Mazars records might assist Congress in determining whether ethics statutes or regulations need updating to strengthen Executive Branch accountability, promote transparency, and protect against

28. Letter from David J. Apol, *supra* n.10.

29. See Mark Mazzetti, et al., *Cohen Pleads Guilty and Details Trump’s Involvement in Moscow Tower Project*, N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 29, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/29/nyregion/michael-cohen-trump-russia-mueller.html> (last visited May 20, 2019).

Appendix B

Executive Branch officials operating under conflicts of interest. Additionally, the Mazars records could provide the Oversight Committee with clues about the President's foreign interests or sources of foreign income, if any, which would assist in determining Congress's obligations under the Foreign Emoluments Clause. This concern is not a new one. In other letters seeking records, one sent to the Trump Organization and the other to the GSA, Chairman Cummings expressly stated that the records sought would be useful in assessing the President's compliance with the Foreign Emoluments Clause. *See* n. 7 & 8, *supra*. The records from Mazars likewise could advance this legislative purpose. Pertinency, to the extent it may apply, is thus satisfied.

Two more arguments remain. First, Plaintiffs insist that the Oversight Committee cannot be seeking pertinent material because the legislative actions contemplated "extend to an area in which Congress is forbidden to legislate," *Quinn*, 349 U.S. at 161. *See* Pls.' Reply at 15-16. For example, Plaintiffs argue that H.R. 1 is unconstitutional insofar as it adds qualifications for the presidency beyond those contained in Article II of the Constitution. *See id.* at 16. More broadly, Plaintiffs maintain that *any* regulation of the "President's finances or conflicts of interest" would be unconstitutional for the same reason. *Id.*

Plaintiffs' contention flies in the face of decades of legislation covering the President. For example, the Ethics in Government Act requires the President to report the source, type, and amount of certain income and

Appendix B

assets to the Office of Government Ethics. *See* 5 U.S.C. App. 4 §§ 101(a), (f); *id.* §§ 102(a), (b); *id.* § 103(b). The Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act of 2012 provides that no “executive branch employee,” including the President, may use “nonpublic information derived from such person’s position” “as a means for making a private profit,” and further states that “executive branch employees,” including the President, “owe[] a duty arising from a relationship of trust and confidence to the United States Government and the citizens of the United States with respect to material, nonpublic information derived from [their] position.” Pub. Law No. 112-105 § 9. And, the Presidential Records Act “directs the President to ‘take all such steps as may be necessary to assure that the activities, deliberations, decisions, and policies that reflect the performance of his constitutional, statutory, or other official or ceremonial duties are adequately documented and that such records are maintained as Presidential records.’” *Armstrong v. Bush*, 924 F.2d 282, 285, 288 U.S. App. D.C. 38 (D.C. Cir. 1991) (citing 44 U.S.C. § 2203). Plaintiffs’ argument, if accepted, would wipe out some, and perhaps all, of these statutes.

But there is an even more fundamental problem with Plaintiffs’ position. It is not the court’s role in this context to evaluate the constitutionality of proposed or contemplated legislation. Doing so would go beyond its limited powers. The Supreme Court said as much in *Rumely*: “Whenever constitutional limits upon the investigative power of Congress have to be drawn by this Court, it ought only to be done after Congress has demonstrated its full awareness of what is at stake by

Appendix B

unequivocally authorizing an inquiry of dubious limits. Experience admonishes us to tread warily in this domain.” 345 U.S. at 46. Consequently, courts must avoid declaring an investigation by Congress unconstitutional, unless “no choice is left.” *See id.* In this case, not only is there no need to confront difficult constitutional questions, it would be improper to do so. Federal courts do not “render advisory opinions. For adjudication of constitutional issues ‘concrete legal issues, presented in actual cases, not abstractions’ are requisite.” *United Pub. Workers of Am. (C.I.O.), et al., v. Mitchell, et al.*, 330 U.S. 75, 89, 67 S. Ct. 556, 91 L. Ed. 754 (1947) (citations omitted). The court here faces only abstract constitutional questions about prospective legislation that is not yet law. The court cannot declare a congressional investigation unconstitutional in such ill-defined circumstances.³⁰

Finally, Plaintiffs suggest that the court has the authority to “narrow overbroad [congressional] subpoenas,” and should consider doing so here. Pls.’ Reply at 13. But the federal courts enjoy no such power.

30. The D.C. Circuit’s decision in *Tobin* does not compel a different result. 306 F.2d 270, 113 U.S. App. D.C. 110 (D.C. Cir. 1962). If anything, *Tobin* advises courts to sidestep important constitutional issues unless squarely presented and unavoidable. In *Tobin*, the setting was review of a contempt conviction, which the Circuit found “is not the most practical method of inducing courts to answer broad questions broadly.” 306 F.2d at 274. This case is even less amenable to resolving an important constitutional issue than *Tobin*. There is no conviction or piece of legislation before the court to evaluate. Assessing the constitutionality of a not-yet-enacted statute would be the equivalent of answering a hypothetical question on a law school exam. This court cannot engage in such an exercise.

Appendix B

“A legislative inquiry may be as broad, as searching, and as exhaustive as is necessary to make effective the constitutional powers of Congress.” *Townsend*, 95 F.2d at 361 (citation omitted). “There is no requirement that every piece of information gathered in such an investigation be justified before the judiciary.” *McSurely*, 521 F.2d at 1041. The court therefore cannot “engage in a line-by-line review” of the Mazars subpoena and narrow its demands. *Bean LLC*, 291 F. Supp. 3d at 44; *see also Senate Select Committee on Ethics v. Packwood*, 845 F. Supp. 17, 20 (D.D.C. 1994) (“This [c]ourt . . . has no authority to restrict the scope of the Ethics Committee’s investigation.”).

V. REQUEST FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL

At the May 14th oral argument, Plaintiffs asked the court to stay the return date of the subpoena beyond the seven days already agreed upon by the parties, pending final appellate review by the D.C. Circuit. *See* Hr’g Tr. at 77-78. The court declines to do so.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(c) authorizes a district court to issue an injunction pending appeal. Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(c). To obtain a stay pending appeal, the moving party “must establish [1] that he is likely to succeed on the merits, [2] that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, [3] that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and [4] that an injunction is in the public interest.” *See Winter v. NRDC, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20, 129 S. Ct. 365, 172 L. Ed. 2d 249 (2008); *accord Cuomo v. United States Nuclear Regulatory Com.*, 772 F.2d 972, 974, 249 U.S. App. D.C. 54 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (per curiam)

Appendix B

(citing *Wash. Metro. Area Transit Comm'n v. Holiday Tours, Inc.*, 559 F.2d 841, 843, 182 U.S. App. D.C. 220 (D.C. Cir. 1977)). The court balances these factors on a “sliding scale,” such that “a strong showing on one factor could make up for a weaker showing on another.” *Sherley v. Sebelius*, 644 F.3d 388, 392, 396 U.S. App. D.C. 1 (D.C. Cir. 2011); see also *Cigar Ass'n of Am. v. United States FDA*, 317 F. Supp. 3d 555, 560 (D.D.C. 2018).

As to the first factor, Plaintiffs have not shown that their challenge to the Mazars subpoena presents “serious legal questions going to the merits, so serious, substantial, difficult as to make them a fair ground of litigation and thus for more deliberative investigation.” *Population Inst. v. McPherson*, 797 F.2d 1062, 1078, 254 U.S. App. D.C. 395 (D.C. Cir. 1986) (quoting *Holiday Tours*, 559 F.2d at 844). None of the three grounds upon which Plaintiffs challenge the subpoena rests on “potentially persuasive authority.” *John Doe Co. v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 849 F.3d 1129, 1131, 428 U.S. App. D.C. 55 (D.C. Cir. 2017). Indeed, Plaintiffs have cited no case since *Kilbourn* from 1880 in which the Supreme Court or the D.C. Circuit has interfered with a congressional subpoena—because it either intrudes on the law enforcement prerogatives of the Executive or Judicial branches, seeks personal information unrelated to a legislative purpose, or demands records that lack “pertinency.” This case does not merit becoming the first in nearly 140 years.³¹

31. This case is unlike *Eastland* in which the D.C. Circuit by a 2-1 margin granted a stay to enforce subpoenas issued by Congress. See *United States Servicemen's Fund v. Eastland*, 488 F.2d 1252, 1256-57, 159 U.S. App. D.C. 352 (D.C. Cir. 1974), rev'd on other

Appendix B

As for irreparable harm, this court has recognized that “the disclosure of confidential information is, by its very nature, irreparable ‘because such information, once disclosed, loses its confidential nature.’” *Robert Half Int’l Inc. v. Billingham*, 315 F. Supp. 3d 419, 433 (D.D.C. 2018) (citations omitted). That concern is somewhat mitigated here, however, because of the recipient of the records. Unlike *Robert Half Int’l*, where the challenged disclosure was to a market competitor, the disclosure here is made to Congress, and the D.C. Circuit has held that “courts must presume that the committees of Congress will exercise their powers responsibly and with due regard for the rights of affected parties.” *Exxon*, 589 F.2d at 589 (citation omitted). That said, the court is not naïve to reality—a reality confirmed by the fact that the Oversight Committee has said that the decision whether to make the records public lies within its discretion. *See* Hr’g Tr. at 59. Thus, there is a chance that some records obtained from Mazars will become public soon after they are produced. The second factor of irreparable harm therefore favors a stay.

The final two factors—the balance of equities and the public interest—merge when, as here, “the Government is the opposing party.” *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 435, 129 S. Ct. 1749, 173 L. Ed. 2d 550 (2009). These factors tip the balance in favor of denying a stay. In *Exxon*, the plaintiff had challenged Congress’s right to obtain records from

grounds, *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 491. The court granted the stay because the case presented “serious constitutional questions . . .” *Id.* at 1256. No such “serious constitutional questions” are presented here.

Appendix B

the Federal Trade Commission that contained its trade secrets. 589 F.2d at 586-87. The district court denied the plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. In affirming that decision on appeal, the D.C. Circuit held that the public interest favored Congress having access to the records. The court stated that the plaintiff's burden to obtain injunctive relief was "considerably heightened by the clear public interest in maximizing the effectiveness of the investigatory powers of Congress . . . It would, then, require an extremely strong showing by the appellants to succeed in obtaining an injunction in light of the compelling public interest *in denying such relief.*" *Id.* at 594 (emphasis added). The court concluded: "To grant the injunction appellants request, this court would be required to interfere with the operation of Congress, and also to depart from traditional doctrine concerning the availability of equitable relief." *Id.* The same would be true in this case.³²

The court is well aware that this case involves records concerning the private and business affairs of the President of the United States. But on the question of whether to grant a stay pending appeal, the President is subject to the same legal standard as any other litigant that does not prevail. Plaintiffs have not raised a "serious

32. The court acknowledges that this case differs from *Exxon* in one respect. Unlike *Exxon*, this case does involve records whose public disclosure might give rise to "private injury." 589 F.2d at 594. It is unclear, however, what proportion of the records at issue in this case are truly "personal," as opposed to corporate records. The fact of some uncertain amount of private injury does not change the court's calculus.

Appendix B

legal question[] going to the merits.” *Population Inst.*, 797 F.2d at 1078. And, the balance of equities and the public interest weigh heavily in favor of denying relief. The risk of irreparable harm does not outweigh these other factors. The court, therefore, will not stay the return date of the subpoena beyond the seven days agreed upon by the parties.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the court will enter judgment in favor of the House Oversight Committee and against Plaintiffs. The court denies Plaintiffs’ request for a stay pending appeal. A separate final order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Dated: May 20, 2019

/s/ Amit P. Mehta
Amit P. Mehta
United States District Court Judge

213a

**APPENDIX C — ORDER OF THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT,
DATED NOVEMBER 13, 2019**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-5142

DONALD J. TRUMP, *et al.*,

Appellants,

v.

MAZARS USA, LLP AND COMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND REFORM OF THE U.S. HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Appellees.

Filed on: November 13, 2019

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia
(No. 1:19-cv-01136)

On Petition for Rehearing *En banc*

Appendix C

Before: GARLAND, *Chief Judge*; HENDERSON,* ROGERS,
TATEL, GRIFFITH, SRINIVASAN, MILLETT, PILLARD,
WILKINS, KATSAS,* and RAO,* *Circuit Judges*.

ORDER

Appellants' petition for rehearing *en banc* and the response thereto were circulated to the full court, and a vote was requested. Thereafter, a majority of the judges eligible to participate did not vote in favor of the petition. Upon consideration of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the petition be denied.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/_____

Michael C. McGrail

Deputy Clerk

* Circuit Judges Henderson, Katsas, and Rao would grant the petition.

A statement by Circuit Judge Katsas, with whom Circuit Judge Henderson joins, dissenting from the denial of rehearing *en banc*, is attached.

A statement by Circuit Judge Rao, with whom Circuit Judge Henderson joins, dissenting from the denial of rehearing *en banc*, is attached.

Appendix C

KATSAS, *Circuit Judge*, with whom Circuit Judge HENDERSON joins, dissenting from the denial of rehearing *en banc*:

If the competing opinions here demonstrate anything, it is that this case presents exceptionally important questions regarding the separation of powers among Congress, the Executive Branch, and the Judiciary. For the second time in American history, an Article III court has undertaken to enforce a congressional subpoena for the records of a sitting President. The first time that was attempted, we took the case *en banc*, refused to enforce the subpoena, and stressed that the availability of impeachment foreclosed any conclusion that the records at issue were “demonstrably critical to the responsible fulfillment” of Congress’s legislative prerogatives, even when Congress was investigating significant allegations of presidential misconduct. *Senate Select Comm. on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon*, 498 F.2d 725, 731-33, 162 U.S. App. D.C. 183 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (*en banc*).

This case differs from *Senate Select Committee* in two respects, but neither diminishes its comparative importance. First, the subpoena at issue is directed not to the President directly, but to an accounting firm holding his personal financial records. Yet as Judge Rao has explained, that difference in form does not matter, because the subpoena in substance targets his records. *Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP*, No. 19-5142, slip op. at 9-11 (Rao, J., dissenting). Second, *Senate Select Committee* involved official communications over which the President had asserted executive privilege, whereas this case involves

Appendix C

personal records and no privilege assertion. But that difference cuts in both directions. On the one hand, this case does not implicate the President’s need to secure candid advice from close governmental advisors—the interest supporting a presidential communications privilege covering various official-capacity records. *See, e.g., In re Sealed Case*, 121 F.3d 729, 742-44, 326 U.S. App. D.C. 276 (D.C. Cir. 1997). On the other hand, the unavailability of that privilege creates an open season on the President’s personal records. Under the panel’s analysis, whenever Congress conceivably could pass legislation regarding the President, it also may compel the President to disclose personal records that might inform the legislation. And precisely because such demands would target his personal records, the President would have no privilege-based ground for making the records even “presumptively” unavailable. *See id.* at 744.

This threat to presidential autonomy and independence is far greater than that presented by compulsory process issued by prosecutors in criminal cases, as in *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 94 S. Ct. 3090, 41 L. Ed. 2d 1039 (1974), or even by private plaintiffs in civil cases, as in *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 117 S. Ct. 1636, 137 L. Ed. 2d 945 (1997). In those circumstances, governing rules provide for trimming any requests to avoid “embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Crim. P. 17(c)(2). Moreover, the rules are applied by judges instructed that avoiding “potential burdens on the President ... should inform the conduct of the entire proceeding.” *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. at 707. By contrast, under the panel’s

Appendix C

uncompromising extension of *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 47 S. Ct. 319, 71 L. Ed. 580 (1927), and its progeny to the President, the courts are powerless to take comparable considerations into account. *See Mazars USA, LLP*, slip op. at 23. Thus, the scope of required disclosure is determined not by neutral judges applying some form of rule-based interest balancing, but by the whim of Congress—the President’s constitutional rival for political power—or even, as in this case, by one committee of one House of Congress. With regard to the threat to the Presidency, “this wolf comes as a wolf.” *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 699, 108 S. Ct. 2597, 101 L. Ed. 2d 569 (1988) (Scalia, J., dissenting).

Appendix C

RAO, *Circuit Judge*, with whom Circuit Judge HENDERSON joins, dissenting from the denial of rehearing *en banc*:

I would grant rehearing *en banc* for the reasons expressed in my dissent to the panel opinion. *See Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP*, 940 F.3d 710, 748-84 (D.C. Cir. 2019) (Rao, J., dissenting). The House Committee on Oversight and Reform issued a subpoena to President Trump's accounting firm, Mazars USA, LLP, seeking evidence of alleged illegal conduct by the President. The Committee has relied throughout this litigation on Congress's legislative power as the authority for its subpoena. As I explained, the Committee exceeded its constitutional authority when it issued a legislative subpoena investigating whether the President broke the law. *See id.* at 767-75. Investigations of impeachable offenses simply are not, and never have been, within the legislative power because impeachment is a separate judicial power vested in Congress. The panel's analysis of these issues misapprehends the gravamen of the Committee's subpoena and glosses over the difficult questions it raises for the separation of powers.

While Congress's power to investigate as necessary and proper to the legislative power is broad, this subpoena is unprecedented. The Constitution and our historical practice draw a sharp line between the legislative and judicial powers of Congress. By upholding this subpoena, the panel opinion has shifted the balance of power between Congress and the President and allowed a congressional committee to circumvent the careful process of impeachment. The exceptionally important

Appendix C

constitutional questions raised by this case justify further review by our court. *See generally Senate Select Comm. on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon*, 498 F.2d 725, 162 U.S. App. D.C. 183 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (*en banc*) (considering *en banc* the only case concerning the propriety of a subpoena directed to a sitting President pursuant to the legislative power and concluding that the Senate committee responsible for investigating the Watergate break-in lacked authority to subpoena President Nixon).

Separately, I note that the Committee is wrong to suggest that these questions are no longer of “practical consequence” because the House has subsequently authorized an impeachment inquiry. *See* Committee Br. 13 (citing H.R. Res. 660, 116th Cong. (Oct. 31, 2019)). From the outset of its investigation, the Committee has relied consistently and exclusively on the legislative power to justify this subpoena. *See* Memorandum from Chairman Elijah E. Cummings to Members of the Committee on Oversight and Reform 4 (Apr. 12, 2019) (“The Committee’s interest in these matters informs its review of multiple laws and legislative proposals under our jurisdiction.”). Throughout this litigation, the Committee has maintained that it is “not here relying on impeachment power,” Oral Arg. at 1:34:19-22, and both the panel opinion and dissent agree that the Committee has never invoked the impeachment power as the basis for this subpoena. *See Mazars*, 940 F.3d at 726-27; *id.* at 767-71 (Rao, J., dissenting).

Appendix C

The Committee’s suggestion that the current impeachment inquiry somehow alters this case depends on whether House Resolution 660 ratifies this subpoena. This Circuit has not determined whether a defective subpoena can be revived by after-the-fact approval. See *Dombrowski v. Burbank*, 358 F.2d 821, 825, 123 U.S. App. D.C. 190 (D.C. Cir. 1966) (“Whether this apparently approving action by the full Subcommittee would serve as a nunc pro tunc ratification and consequent validation of the subpoena for all purposes, we need not decide.”), *rev’d in part on other grounds sub nom. Dombrowski v. Eastland*, 387 U.S. 82, 87 S. Ct. 1425, 18 L. Ed. 2d 577 (1967). But we need not confront that question here, because even assuming the subpoena could be issued under the impeachment power, the Committee has not reissued the subpoena pursuant to that power and House Resolution 660 does not purport to sweep previously issued subpoenas into the ambit of the impeachment inquiry. Resolution 660 is explicitly forward looking: it authorizes the Oversight Committee, *inter alia*, to “continue [its] ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives” impeachment inquiry. H.R. Res. 660 § 1. In telling contrast, during the pendency of this litigation, the House enacted Resolution 507, which specifically claimed to ratify all “current and future investigations, as well as all subpoenas previously issued” relating to the President, pursuant to its “legislative authority under Article I of the Constitution.” H.R. Res. 507, 116th Cong. (July 24, 2019). House Resolution 660 does not even purport to ratify previously issued subpoenas, so the authority for the subpoena in this case continues to depend exclusively on the legislative power.

Appendix C

Thus, the central question presented here remains whether the Committee can issue this subpoena investigating the alleged wrongdoing of the President pursuant to the legislative power. This question is one of exceptional importance, both for this case as well as for the recurring disputes between Congress and the Executive Branch.

I respectfully dissent from the denial of rehearing *en banc*.

APPENDIX D — CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. art. I, § 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

Appendix D

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all

Appendix D

Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 8

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 1

The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows.

U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 7

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within

Appendix D

that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

U.S. Const. art. II, § 2

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

*Appendix D***U.S. Const. art. II, § 3**

He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

**APPENDIX E — SUBPOENA OF THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DATED
APRIL 15, 2019**

SUBPOENA

**BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

To Mazars USA LLP

You are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives of the United States at the place, date, and time specified below.

to produce the things identified on the attached schedule touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee or subcommittee; and you are not to depart without leave of said committee or subcommittee.

Place of production: <u>2157 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington DC 20515</u> Date: <u>April 29, 2019</u> Time: <u>12:00 (noon)</u>
--

to testify at a deposition touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee or subcommittee; and you are not to depart without leave of said committee or subcommittee.

Appendix E

Place of testimony: _____ Date: _____ Time: _____
--

to testify at a hearing touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee or subcommittee; and you are not to depart without leave of said committee or subcommittee.

Place of testimony: _____ Date: _____ Time: _____
--

To any authorized staff member or the U.S. Marshals Service to serve and make return.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, D.C. this 15th day of April, 2019.

/s/
Chairman or Authorized Member

229a

Appendix E

PROOF OF SERVICE

Subpoena for Mazars USA LLP

Address c/o Jerry Bernstein, Esq., BlankRome LLP

405 Lexington Ave., New York, NY 10174

before the Committee on Oversight and Reform

U.S. House of Representatives
116th Congress

Served by (print name) Peter Kenny

Title Chief Investigative Counsel, Committee on Oversight and Reform

Manner of service Email to Jerry Bernstein, BlankRome LLP, Counsel to Mazars USA LLP

Date April 15, 2019

Signature of Server /s/ _____

Address 2157 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

Appendix E

SCHEDULE A

With respect to Donald J. Trump, Donald J. Trump Revocable Trust, the Trump Organization Inc., the Trump Organization LLC, the Trump Corporation, DJT Holdings LLC, the Trump Old Post Office LLC, the Trump Foundation, and any parent, subsidiary, affiliate, joint venture, predecessor, or successor of the foregoing:

1. All statements of financial condition, annual statements, periodic financial reports, and independent auditors' reports prepared, compiled, reviewed, or audited by Mazars USA LLP or its predecessor, WeiserMazars LLP;
2. Without regard to time, all engagement agreements or contracts related to the preparation, compilation, review, or auditing of the documents described in Item Number 1;
3. All underlying, supporting, or source documents and records used in the preparation, compilation, review, or auditing of documents described in Item Number 1, or any summaries of such documents and records relied upon, or any requests for such documents and records; and
4. All memoranda, notes, and communications related to the preparation, compilation, review, or auditing of the documents described in Item Number 1, including, but not limited to:

231a

Appendix E

- a. all communications between Donald Bender and Donald J. Trump or any employee or representative of the Trump Organization; and
- b. all communications related to potential concerns that records, documents, explanations, or other information, including significant judgments, provided by Donald J. Trump or other individuals from the Trump Organization, were incomplete, inaccurate, or otherwise unsatisfactory.

Unless otherwise noted, the time period covered by this subpoena includes calendar years 2011 through 2018.

Appendix E

Schedule Instructions

1. In complying with this subpoena, you are required to produce all responsive documents that are in your possession, custody, or control, whether held by you or your past or present agents, employees, and representatives acting on your behalf. Produce all documents that you have a legal right to obtain, that you have a right to copy, or to which you have access, as well as documents that you have placed in the temporary possession, custody, or control of any third party.
2. Subpoenaed documents, and all documents reasonably related to the subpoenaed documents, should not be destroyed, altered, removed, transferred, or otherwise made inaccessible to the Committee.
3. In the event that any entity, organization, or individual denoted in this subpoena is or has been known by any name other than that herein denoted, the subpoena shall be read also to include that alternative identification.
4. The Committee's preference is to receive documents in electronic form (i.e., CD, memory stick, thumb drive, or secure file transfer) in lieu of paper productions.
5. Documents produced in electronic format should be organized, identified, and indexed electronically.

Appendix E

6. Electronic document productions should be prepared according to the following standards:
 - a. The production should consist of single page Tagged Image File (“TIF”), files accompanied by a Concordance-format load file, an Opticon reference file, and a file defining the fields and character lengths of the load file.
 - b. Document numbers in the load file should match document Bates numbers and TIF file names.
 - c. If the production is completed through a series of multiple partial productions, field names and file order in all load files should match.
 - d. All electronic documents produced to the Committee should include the following fields of metadata specific to each document, and no modifications should be made to the original metadata:

BEGDOC, ENDDOC, TEXT, BEGATTACH, ENDATTACH, PAGECOUNT, CUSTODIAN, RECORDTYPE, DATE, TIME, SENTDATE, SENTTIME, BEGINDATE, BEGINTIME, ENDDATE, ENDTIME, AUTHOR, FROM, CC, TO, BCC, SUBJECT, TITLE, FILENAME, FILEEXT, FILESIZE, DATECREATED, TIMECREATED, DATELASTMOD, TIMELASTMOD, INTMSGID, INTMSGHEADER, NATIVELINK, INTFILPATH, EXCEPTION, BEGATTACH.

Appendix E

7. Documents produced to the Committee should include an index describing the contents of the production. To the extent more than one CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, zip file, box, or folder is produced, each should contain an index describing its contents.
8. Documents produced in response to this subpoena shall be produced together with copies of file labels, dividers, or identifying markers with which they were associated when the subpoena was served.
9. When you produce documents, you should identify the paragraph(s) in the subpoena schedule to which the documents respond.
10. The fact that any other person or entity also possesses non-identical or identical copies of the same documents shall not be a basis to withhold any information.
11. The pendency of or potential for litigation shall not be a basis to withhold any information.
12. In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(d), the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and any statutory exemptions to FOIA shall not be a basis for withholding any information.
13. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b)(9), the Privacy Act shall not be a basis for withholding information.
14. If compliance with the subpoena cannot be made in full by the specified return date, compliance shall be made

Appendix E

to the extent possible by that date. An explanation of why full compliance is not possible shall be provided along with any partial production.

15. In the event that a document is withheld on the basis of privilege, provide a privilege log containing the following information concerning any such document: (a) every privilege asserted; (b) the type of document; (c) the general subject matter; (d) the date, author, addressee, and any other recipient(s); (e) the relationship of the author and addressee to each other; and (f) the basis for the privilege(s) asserted. If a claimed privilege applies to only a portion of any document, that portion only should be withheld and the remainder of the document should be produced. As used herein, "claim of privilege" includes, but is not limited to, any claim that a document either may or must be withheld from production pursuant to any statute, rule, or regulation.
16. In complying with the subpoena, be apprised that (unless otherwise determined by the Committee) the Committee does not recognize: any purported non-disclosure privileges associated with the common law including, but not limited to, the deliberative-process privilege, the attorney-client privilege, and attorney work product protections; any purported privileges or protections from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act or the Privacy Act; or any purported contractual privileges, such as non-disclosure agreements.

Appendix E

17. Any assertion by a subpoena recipient of any such non-constitutional legal bases for withholding documents or other materials, for refusing to answer any deposition question, or for refusing to provide hearing testimony, shall be of no legal force and effect and shall not provide a justification for such withholding or refusal, unless and only to the extent that the Committee (or the chair of the Committee, if authorized) has consented to recognize the assertion as valid.
18. If any document responsive to this subpoena was, but no longer is, in your possession, custody, or control, identify the document (by date, author, subject, and recipients), and explain the circumstances under which the document ceased to be in your possession, custody, or control.
19. If a date or other descriptive detail set forth in this subpoena referring to a document is inaccurate, but the actual date or other descriptive detail is known to you or is otherwise apparent from the context of the subpoena, produce all documents that would be responsive as if the date or other descriptive detail were correct.
20. This subpoena is continuing in nature and applies to any newly-discovered information. Any record, document, compilation of data, or information not produced because it has not been located or discovered by the return date shall be produced immediately upon subsequent location or discovery.

Appendix E

21. All documents shall be Bates-stamped sequentially and produced sequentially.
22. Two sets of each production shall be delivered, one set to the Majority Staff and one set to the Minority Staff. When documents are produced to the Committee, production sets shall be delivered to the Majority Staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority Staff in Room 2105 of the Rayburn House Office Building.
23. Upon completion of the production, submit a written certification, signed by you or your counsel, stating that: (1) a diligent search has been completed of all documents in your possession, custody, or control that reasonably could contain responsive documents; and (2) all documents located during the search that are responsive have been produced to the Committee.

Definitions

1. The term “document” means any written, recorded, or graphic matter of any nature whatsoever, regardless of how recorded, and whether original or copy, including, but not limited to, the following: memoranda, reports, expense reports, books, manuals, instructions, financial reports, data, working papers, records, notes, letters, notices, confirmations, telegrams, receipts, appraisals, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, prospectuses, communications, electronic mail (email), contracts, cables, notations of any type of conversation,

Appendix E

telephone call, meeting or other inter-office or intra-office communication, bulletins, printed matter, computer printouts, teletypes, invoices, transcripts, diaries, analyses, returns, summaries, minutes, bills, accounts, estimates, projections, comparisons, messages, correspondence, press releases, circulars, financial statements, reviews, opinions, offers, studies and investigations, questionnaires and surveys, and work sheets (and all drafts, preliminary versions, alterations, modifications, revisions, changes, and amendments of any of the foregoing, as well as any attachments or appendices thereto), and graphic or oral records or representations of any kind (including without limitation, photographs, charts, graphs, microfiche, microfilm, videotape, recordings and motion pictures), and electronic, mechanical, and electric records or representations of any kind (including, without limitation, tapes, cassettes, disks, and recordings) and other written, printed, typed, or other graphic or recorded matter of any kind or nature, however produced or reproduced, and whether preserved in writing, film, tape, disk, videotape, or otherwise. A document bearing any notation not a part of the original text is to be considered a separate document. A draft or non-identical copy is a separate document within the meaning of this term.

2. The term “communication” means each manner or means of disclosure or exchange of information, regardless of means utilized, whether oral, electronic, by document or otherwise, and whether in a meeting, by telephone, facsimile, mail, releases, electronic

Appendix E

message including email (desktop or mobile device), text message, instant message, MMS or SMS message, message application, or otherwise.

3. The terms “and” and “or” shall be construed broadly and either conjunctively or disjunctively to bring within the scope of this subpoena any information that might otherwise be construed to be outside its scope. The singular includes plural number, and vice versa. The masculine includes the feminine and neutral genders.
4. The term “including” shall be construed broadly to mean “including, but not limited to.”
5. The term “Company” means the named legal entity as well as any units, firms, partnerships, associations, corporations, limited liability companies, trusts, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, departments, branches, joint ventures, proprietorships, syndicates, or other legal, business or government entities over which the named legal entity exercises control or in which the named entity has any ownership whatsoever.
6. The term “identify,” when used in a question about individuals, means to provide the following information: (a) the individual’s complete name and title; (b) the individual’s business or personal address and phone number; and (c) any and all known aliases.
7. The term “related to” or “referring or relating to,” with respect to any given subject, means anything

Appendix E

that constitutes, contains, embodies, reflects, identifies, states, refers to, deals with, or is pertinent to that subject in any manner whatsoever.

8. The term “employee” means any past or present agent, borrowed employee, casual employee, consultant, contractor, de facto employee, detailee, fellow, independent contractor, intern, joint adventurer, loaned employee, officer, part-time employee, permanent employee, provisional employee, special government employee, subcontractor, or any other type of service provider.
9. The term “individual” means all natural persons and all persons or entities acting on their behalf.

APPENDIX F — H. RES. 507

H. RES. 507

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

July 24, 2019.

Whereas Congress' power to conduct oversight and investigations is firmly rooted in its legislative authority under Article I of the Constitution, which commits to the House of Representatives alone the authority to establish its rules governing the procedures and methods for the conduct of oversight and investigations, as well as to determine the powers that it delegates to its various committees;

Whereas those powers delegated to the committees include the power to conduct oversight into and to investigate, pursuant to the legitimate legislative purposes of the respective committees, matters involving, referring, or related, directly or indirectly, to the persons, entities, and organizations specified in this resolution;

Whereas committees of the House, pursuant to the authority delegated by clause 2(m) of rule XI and clause 11(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, have undertaken investigations and issued related subpoenas seeking personal, financial, banking, and tax information related to the President, his immediate family, and his business entities and organizations, among others;

Appendix F

Whereas the validity of some of these investigations and subpoenas has been incorrectly challenged in Federal court on the grounds that the investigations and subpoenas were not authorized by the full House and lacked a “clear statement” of intent to include the President, which the President’s personal attorneys have argued in Federal court is necessary before the committees may seek information related to the President; and

Whereas while these arguments are plainly incorrect as a matter of law, it is nevertheless in the interest of the institution of the House of Representatives to avoid any doubt on this matter and to unequivocally reject these challenges presented in ongoing or future litigation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives ratifies and affirms all current and future investigations, as well as all subpoenas previously issued or to be issued in the future, by any standing or permanent select committee of the House, pursuant to its jurisdiction as established by the Constitution of the United States and rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, concerning or issued directly or indirectly to—

- (1) the President in his personal or official capacity;
- (2) his immediate family, business entities, or organizations;

243a

Appendix F

- (3) the Office of the President;
- (4) the Executive Office of the President;
- (5) the White House;
- (6) any entity within the White House;
- (7) any individual currently or formerly employed by or associated with the White House;
- (8) any Federal or State governmental entity or current or former employee or officer thereof seeking information involving, referring, or related to any individual or entity described in paragraphs (1) through (7); or
- (9) any third party seeking information involving, referring, or related to any individual or entity described in paragraphs (1) through (7).

Attest:

Clerk.

APPENDIX G — H. RES. 660

H. RES. 660

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

October 31, 2019.

Resolved, That the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committees on Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, and Ways and Means, are directed to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America.

**SEC. 2. OPEN AND TRANSPARENT
INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON
INTELLIGENCE.**

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (referred to in this resolution as the “Permanent Select Committee”) is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

- (1) The chair of the Permanent Select Committee shall designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

Appendix G

- (2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or a Permanent Select Committee employee if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2) (A) of rule XI.
- (3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first

Appendix G

section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to

Appendix G

the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

- (C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.
- (5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Permanent Select Committee in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.
- (6) The Permanent Select Committee is directed to issue a report setting forth its findings and any recommendations and appending any information and materials the Permanent Select Committee may deem appropriate with respect to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution. The chair shall transmit such report and appendices, along with any supplemental, minority, additional, or

Appendix G

dissenting views filed pursuant to clause 2(l) of rule XI, to the Committee on the Judiciary and make such report publicly available in electronic form, with appropriate redactions to protect classified and other sensitive information. The report required by this paragraph shall be prepared in consultation with the chairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

**SEC. 3. TRANSMISSION
OF ADDITIONAL MATERIALS.**

The chair of the Permanent Select Committee or the chair of any other committee having custody of records or other materials relating to the inquiry referenced in the first section of this resolution is authorized, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transfer such records or materials to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**SEC. 4. IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY PROCEDURES
IN THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.**

- (a) The House authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct proceedings relating to the impeachment inquiry referenced in the first section of this resolution pursuant to the procedures submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on Rules, including such

Appendix G

procedures as to allow for the participation of the President and his counsel.

(b) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to promulgate additional procedures as it deems necessary for the fair and efficient conduct of committee hearings held pursuant to this resolution, provided that the additional procedures are not inconsistent with the procedures referenced in subsection (a), the Rules of the Committee, and the Rules of the House.

(c)(1) The ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(A) by subpoena or otherwise—

(i) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(ii) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(B) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

Appendix G

- (2) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to paragraph (1), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.
- (3) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.
- (d) The Committee on the Judiciary shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

Attest:

Clerk.

251a

**APPENDIX H — EXCERPTS OF THE RULES OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

RULES

of the

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

PREPARED BY

Karen L. Haas
Clerk of the House of Representatives
JANUARY 11, 2019

252a

Appendix H

Rule X

3(i) The Committee on Oversight and Reform shall review and study on a continuing basis the operation of Government activities at all levels, including the Executive Office of the President.

4(c)(2) In addition to its duties under subparagraph (1), the Committee on Oversight and Reform may at any time conduct investigations of any matter without regard to clause 1, 2, 3, or this clause conferring jurisdiction over the matter to another standing committee.
