The Clinton Foundation Meeting Timeline

October 17, 2017

2015

In July or August of 2015, WFO SSA [redacted] had a brief discussion with [redacted], U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia (USAO-DC) regarding the Clinton Foundation (CF) allegations that were the focus of the book "Clinton Cash." [redacted] was advised [redacted] was in the process of attempting to predicate an investigation based on the allegations. [redacted] in turn expressed interest in the matter and requested they meet to review supporting information sometime in the future. [redacted] never met with [redacted] to discuss further.

During Fall 2015, [redacted] may have had one or two brief discussions with the [redacted] /Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) [redacted] USAO-DC and [redacted] of the Public Integrity (PIN) Section at DOJ. These conversations did not focus significantly on the CF matter and any mention was likely ancillary to other discussions, with the intention of informing them [redacted] was continuing to study the matter to possibly predicate an investigation.

2016

1/21 A meeting was hosted by then [redacted]. The following personnel participated in the meeting: CID - [redacted], former [redacted], former [redacted], and [redacted]; CD - [redacted], SC Jonathan Moffa, and SC [redacted]; OGC - NSLB Attorney [redacted] and ILU Attorney [redacted]; WFO - [redacted]. Former SAC [redacted], former [redacted], and [redacted]; NYO - former ADIC [redacted], and [redacted]; LR - former SAC David Resch, and [redacted]. The meeting was held to discuss the opening of the Clinton Foundation (CF) investigation. [redacted] authorized all three field offices to open investigations but to not take any investigative steps until the matter was discussed with DOJ. CF investigative team access to e-mails [redacted] was discussed and requested. CD advised the search/access parameters for their investigation were limited in scope and specific to [redacted]. Therefore, CD advised they would not be able to share [redacted] with the CF investigative team.

1/22 NYO initiated a Preliminary Investigation.

1/27 LR initiated Full Field Investigation.

1/29 WFO initiated a Preliminary Investigation. Prior to the opening, unknown exact date, former WFO SAC [redacted] briefed this matter to [redacted], USAO-DC. [redacted] was aware NYO and LR were also looking into the matter and provided a non-committal response, implying he would wait until the FBI had made a decision on which office would be taking the lead on this investigation. WFO SSA [redacted] also contacted AUSA [redacted], USAO-DC and DOJ's PIN [redacted]. The USAO-DC expressed interest in the case, but was not prepared to offer a prosecutorial opinion. DOJ-PIN would not offer a prosecutorial opinion until the case was presented to DOJ leadership (no specific names provided) by FBIHQ.

2/1 EAD [redacted] and CID personnel [redacted] met with DOJ Criminal Division [redacted] and PIN [redacted] regarding the CF investigation. DOJ indicated they would not be supportive of a FBI investigation. No further information was available.

Shortly after the 2/1 CID meeting with DOJ (unknown exact date), LR personnel [redacted], possibly former [redacted] and [redacted], who did not know about the DOJ position mentioned above, briefed the Eastern District of Arkansas (EDAR) [redacted], [redacted],

The Clinton Foundation Meeting Timeline

2016

and [redacted] on the CF matter. [redacted] was told by LR personnel (either by [redacted] or [redacted]) he may not want to be a party to the briefing because of conflicts of interest. LR expressed these concerns due to the possibility that [redacted] was believed to be a supporter of the Democratic Party and possibly the Clintons. [redacted] advised he was fine and participated in the briefing. After the briefing, [redacted] stated he wished he could "unhear" the briefing, but agreed to move forward. EDAR USAO advised they were fully committed.

2/1 to 2/22 Between 2/1 and 2/22, [redacted] learned from former [redacted] and/or former CID [redacted] that DOJ was implying this case was just based on open source reporting and fishing through a book. [redacted] advised CID LR's case was opened based on [redacted] reporting and investigative work, in addition to open source reporting -- a source often used to open PC cases, as appropriate.

2/17 NYO former SAC [redacted], and [redacted] discussed NYO's investigative plan. Later in the same day, former NYO [redacted] and [redacted] met to discuss the plan.

2/17 A SVTC meeting was then held between [redacted], NYO [redacted], WFO [redacted], and Deputy Director (DD) McCabe, who led the meeting. Former CID [redacted] also participated in the SVTC. It is unknown if LR personnel participated in this meeting. DD McCabe was advised by NYO of a NYO CHS who possibly had information on the matter. DD McCabe directed that no overt investigative steps were to be taken on the CF investigation without his approval. He authorized the debriefing of open CHS(s) and analysis of information pertaining to the CF found in FBI databases. DD McCabe had been briefed on the CF matter previously, possibly by [redacted] or [redacted] but it is unknown to what extent.

2/22 CID hosted a SVTC with WFO, NYO, and LR, led by former [redacted]. CID advised all overt investigative steps related to the CF investigation would require DD approval with the exception of speaking to open CHSs. FBI Divisions were directed not to open or recruit any new CHSs, and no additional overt investigative steps were authorized.

3/1 LR [redacted], at the direction of former [redacted], sent an email to CID [redacted] requesting concurrence for LR to obtain supporting documents [redacted], if the POC would be willing to provide them voluntarily, thereby following DD McCabe's directives. LR never received permission to seek the documents.

Possibly March, unknown exact date, EDAR [redacted] informed LR [redacted] that Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Sally Yates, DOJ, ordered EDAR USAO to "shut it down." [redacted] notified former [redacted] and [redacted] and [redacted] did not have any follow-up conversations with the EDAR USAO regarding DAG Yates' order to "shut it down."

3/2 [redacted] of Eastern District of New York's (EDNYs) Public Integrity Unit advised NYO [redacted] that EDNY [redacted] spoke with the DAG's office and was told to move forward and meet with a Cooperating Witness (CW). The purpose of the meeting with the CW was for the CW to review transcripts of the recording between the CW and an individual associated with the CF. [redacted] and [redacted] discussed meeting with the CW to occur on or about March 10, 2016.

The Clinton Foundation Meeting Timeline

2016

7/19 DD McCabe was briefed on the CF investigation by CID. It is unknown if he was fully briefed on this previously as he requested a comprehensive briefing. CID provided a full detailed briefing concerning predication of the CF investigation involving open source, CHS, and [redacted] information.

8/1 CID hosted a SVTC with WFO, NYO, and LR. CID advised this investigation would be consolidated into one case file and worked by the NYO. NYO was determined to have the best opportunity to pursue this investigation proactively using an existing CHS and due to the fact the majority of the CF operations were based out of New York City. Additionally, having three field offices pursuing the same subject/target was inefficient and duplicative. WFO and LR were directed to close their investigations due to the consolidation. NYO was advised no overt investigative action was to take place unless authorized by the Deputy Director. Analysis of [redacted] obtained through a related LA investigation and the debriefing of existing CHSs were authorized. Analysis of Hillary Clinton [redacted] obtained through the State Department during the WFO investigation on [redacted] was also authorized.

8/10 [redacted] and EDNY [redacted] had a telephone conversation in which [redacted] requested a commitment from the EDNY for moving forward with at least [redacted]. [redacted] advised she would let [redacted] know upon review and discussion with her personnel.

8/16 NYO [redacted] contacted EDNY [redacted], to request [redacted]

8/23 EDNY [redacted] and [redacted] met to [redacted]. Later in the same day, [redacted] contacted [redacted] who advised that she will be meeting with U.S. Attorney (USA) Robert Capers to decide whether or not to move forward with the [redacted].

8/24 [redacted] met with [redacted], [redacted] of the EDNY's Criminal Division and was informed EDNY would not support the investigation. No further explanation was given.

8/24 [redacted] then contacted the Southern District of New York (SDNY) USAO, [redacted] as to whether or not they would support the investigation. No response was provided to [redacted] by SDNY at that time.

8/25 [redacted] had a conversation with SDNY PC [redacted] about the same matter. [redacted] advised more than likely the decision will be not to proceed. No further explanation was given.

8/25 [redacted] spoke with SDNY [redacted]. [redacted] advised he spoke with someone at the Office of the Deputy Attorney General (ODAG) who advised [redacted] that [redacted], Principal Deputy Attorney General, DOJ, had a conversation with FBIHQ (specifics not provided) and was under the impression the NYO was not looking for any legal process and simply reviewing documentation internally in the NYO's possession. SDNY advised they would not support the investigation and no further explanation was given.

The Clinton Foundation Meeting Timeline

2016

8/26 [redacted] requested a declination letter from EDNY [redacted]. [redacted] advised it is generally not done but would check with [redacted] to determine if she would do so.

9/1 Telcal between incoming [redacted] from DD regarding CF and EDNY with DD directing no overt action; review only, and requesting [redacted] relay the same to NYO SAC Harpster. DD had received call from ODAG asking why NYO was shopping the CF case around. [redacted] placed call to NYO [redacted] relaying DD's direction that there be no overt action; review only.

10/24 Telcal between [redacted] and [redacted] on several different matters to include brief discussion on WSJ article about [redacted].

10/25 SVTC ([redacted]) which included brief update on Weiner investigation; overt legal process and ability to get [redacted] for the Weiner [redacted]. Note: This small group discussion occurred after two separate larger group discussions during the same SVTC session. DD advised need to move forward and request action consistent with DOJ guidelines relative to election. In follow-up telcal between [redacted] and DD, DD is reminded that EDNY had previously stated not interested in pursuing CF matter, but then changed to no legal process ([redacted]) until after the election.

10/25 Telcals between [redacted] and [redacted] and separately [redacted]. Both advised of SVTC mtg with [redacted] and advised guidance given during that SVTC from DD was to seek legal process if that was deemed needed in accordance with DoJ guidelines. [redacted] advised that was contrary to previous guidance which was no overt legal process to be sought.

10/26 Telconf w/ [redacted], et al re: [redacted] leaks and [redacted]'s displeasure. [redacted] gives specific guidance on warning personnel about leaks.

10/26 In a follow-up call to the one above, the DD advises ADIC NYO and [redacted] that he wanted to be on the record recusing himself from the Clinton Foundation case. [redacted] NYO advised he would communicate information to [redacted]

10/30 Telcal from DD to [redacted] regarding WSJ article, concern over leaks and need to advise folks of media policy. Follow-up telcals w/ [redacted] on WSJ article and DD's direction.

11/1 DD sent an email recusing himself from the Clinton Foundation investigation.

11/1 [redacted] request to [redacted] to add CF investigative personnel to Weiner review team or to provide CF briefing to the Weiner review team. Anthony Weiner, former U.S. Congressman (New York), and [redacted] was the subject of [redacted]. A search warrant was obtained [redacted] and initial review revealed [redacted] Hillary Clinton. However, due to the limited scope of the search warrant, investigators were not able to fully review e-mails outside the scope of the underlying investigation. In May 2017, Weiner pled guilty to [redacted]

11/2 [redacted] is advised by [redacted] that the POC for coordinating/handling discussion of potential Clinton Foundation information that may be seen in plain view during Weiner [redacted] search is NYO [redacted].

The Clinton Foundation Meeting Timeline

2016

11/22 Mtg @ EDNY [redacted] concerning moving forward on CF investigation now that election is over consistent with previous understanding. [redacted] advised EDNY had some concerns regarding statute of limitations. [redacted] was more direct and advised he looked at the issue in three buckets: (1) he was personally concerned about the depiction of him in recent articles [note WSJ article on 11/2/2016 by [redacted] regarding tension between FBI and DOJ and specifically cites [redacted] (2) the case could have statute of limitations issues, and (3) [redacted] wanted to close this chapter and move forward. [redacted] advised he did not think DOJ/PIN would have an issue to pursue the case because there was no longer an election reason not to move forward and EDNY could pursue if in fact they decided to do so. EDNY requested additional time to contact DOJ/PIN. [redacted] and [redacted] shortly thereafter notified [redacted] and [redacted] respectively that EDNY would not proceed with the Clinton Foundation investigation. [redacted] advised [redacted] that he did not contact DOJ/PIN again on matter.

12/1 NYO [redacted] and [redacted] met with SDNY [redacted], Public Corruption [redacted], and AUSA [redacted] to discuss whether SDNY would open a case on the CF and assist NYO with subpoenas. SDNY requested time to speak with EDNY and DOJ/PIN.

12/9 SDNY [redacted] called [redacted] and advised he consulted with EDNY Criminal [redacted] and the ODAG. He advised the ODAG left it up to SDNY to make the decision. [redacted] advised he spoke to SDNY [redacted], Criminal [redacted], and the SDNY's Public Corruption Section on the matter and then stated SDNY was not in a position to disagree with EDNY and therefore SDNY declined to pursue the investigation into the Clinton Foundation.

12/20 A SVTC was held with LAFO, NYO, and FBIHQ. Participants included [redacted] NYO [redacted], LAFO [redacted], [redacted], NYO [redacted] and NYO [redacted]. The purpose of the SVTC was to discuss how to move forward on the investigation. FBIHQ advised there would be guidance from the Director's office soon after the New Year.

12/23 EDNY [redacted] advises [redacted] that he is not likely to authorize a declination letter because he was burned before on a different case. He agreed to meet after the New Year. [redacted] advised that a case wasn't presented for prosecution and that it is not a legitimate declination. Separately, [redacted] advised [redacted] of leaks admitted to by Supervisory Special Agent [redacted] who provided the WSJ information on an [redacted] investigation being conducted by [redacted] had also been previously assigned to the [redacted] investigation with EDNY, but [redacted] had stated he was not the source of leaks on [redacted]

2016

2017

1/11 [redacted] hosted a SVTC with [redacted], CID AD [redacted], DAD [redacted], SC [redacted]. The NYO, WFO, LAFO, and LR each briefed their respective holdings on case. NYO advised FBI NYO still did not have a USAO willing to work the case and provide subpoenas. LR briefed that their USA was willing to work the case.

The Clinton Foundation Meeting Timeline

2017

1/17 [redacted] sent an email to NYO, WFO, LR, CID advising that following a meeting with [redacted], a decision had been made to assign FBI [redacted] to conduct a 30 day in-depth review of the CF investigation.

4/10 [redacted] was briefed on the Clinton Foundation investigation. [redacted] CID, WFO, NYO, and LR participated in the briefing.

7/7 A meeting was hosted by [redacted] to discuss a way forward. [redacted], CID, WFO, NYO, LR, and OGC participated in the briefing.

7/24 LR [redacted] spoke with the Eastern District of Arkansas (EDAR) USAO, [redacted]. SSA [redacted] also separately spoke with EDAR [redacted], EDAR was supportive and agreed [redacted], but would require DOJ concurrence before moving forward.

8/2 [redacted] and [redacted] met with DOJ-Criminal Division's [redacted] and [redacted]

SC [redacted] and UC [redacted] from CID and [redacted] met separately with [redacted] PIN [redacted] and PIN [redacted] to discuss the CF investigation. During both meetings, DOJ personnel indicated USAOs have the autonomy and discretion to pursue any investigation deemed appropriate and EDAR does not require DOJ concurrence to move forward.

8/11 After discussions between LR [redacted] and SC [redacted] regarding CID's 8/2 meetings with DOJ, [redacted] called EDAR [redacted] to determine if they had heard from DOJ about DOJ's position on the matter -- that EDAR does not need concurrence from DOJ to proceed. [redacted] stated he had not heard from DOJ, but would call them to see if that was true. [redacted] added they continue to fully support LR FBI on this matter and re-iterated it was "the right thing to do," since the allegations were like any other PC case that would be worked, albeit this matter was more sensitive than others. However, because DOJ had told them to stand-down last year, [redacted] was going to wait until DOJ gave them concurrence to proceed. It is unknown if [redacted] had contacted DOJ.

8/23 SC [redacted], CID received a telephone call from [redacted] who requested follow-up information concerning the 19 CF bank accounts obtained by LAFO during a separate Campaign Finance Fraud investigation. He also requested a copy of the [redacted]