VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

EXPEDITED PROCESSING AND TREATMENT REQUESTED

September 11, 2017

Hon. Robin C. Ashton
Chief
Office of Professional Responsibility
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW #3266
Washington, DC 20530

Hon. Michael E. Horowitz
Inspector General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, #4706
Washington, DC 20530

RE: COMPLAINT AGAINST SPECIAL COUNSEL ROBERT MUELLER AND STAFF AND REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED INVESTIGATION INTO GROSS PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT OF PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS

Dear Ms. Ashton and Mr. Horowitz:

The Office of Professional Responsibility and Inspector General must thoroughly investigate the torrent of leaks, and to the extent Department of Justice (“DoJ”) or Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") personnel are leaking investigative and/or grand jury evidence, presentations, witness testimony, or proceedings, discipline, terminate, and/or prosecute those responsible.

The undersigned General Counsel of Freedom Watch writes as a former prosecutor in the DoJ's Antitrust Division and the founder and former chairman of Judicial Watch, as well as the founder, chairman, and general counsel of Freedom Watch.
Mr. Klayman was also formerly a U.S. Senate candidate in the State of Florida in 2004. There is reason to believe that this Complaint is necessary because Mr. Robert Mueller has failed to carry out his oath of office and fulfill his duties as Special Counsel.

Just as I, Larry Klayman did when I served in the Department, Mr. Mueller took an oath to administer to and mete out justice within the bounds of the ethics and the law as a member of the DoJ. Having lived by these rules himself while a DoJ employee, the upholding of these rules holds a special significance to the undersigned.

Rarely in our memory has such a shocking river of leaks been so great in quantity, so flagrant and brazen, and so extensive and continuous. The purpose of the rules against leaks of information obtained during criminal investigations includes the fear of deterring cooperation of witnesses with investigators upon seeing that their "confidential" discussions with DoJ personnel are splashed upon the pages of The Washington Post or The New York Times and other anti-Trump “friendly media.” The damage done to DoJ for years to come involving all legal matters, not just this one, in convincing complaining witnesses and factual witnesses that they cannot trust DoJ personnel to adhere to the Department's own rules and safeguard their confidences is incalculable. And of course these leaks pollute the jury pool directly compromising the integrity of the legal process and depriving potential defendants of due process and unfairly smears those who may be found in the end to be blameless, yet smeared by the leaks.

Mr. Mueller was appointed a Special Counsel on or about May 17, 2017, by Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein precisely for the purpose of upholding the appearance of integrity in the public view. While prosecutors, investigators, and staff of DoJ are fully competent and capable of carrying out the duties delegated to Mr. Mueller,
assuring the American people that the process is above reproach and not subject to reasonable question was the reason for taking those tasks away from DoJ personnel actually experienced in carrying them out and transferring those duties instead to Mr. Mueller.

Unfortunately, Mr. Mueller and those he has hired have failed not only in presenting a public appearance above reproach but in adhering to the legal, regulatory, and ethical requirements of their appointment and employment with DoJ.

Special Counsel Mueller has convened not one, but two, grand juries which have been functioning for many months as the “legal heart” and base of operations of the Special Counsel's investigation.

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rule 6(e)(2) "The Grand Jury" requires that:

(2) ** * * *

(B) Unless these rules provide otherwise, the following persons must not disclose a matter occurring before the grand jury:

(i) a grand juror;
(ii) an interpreter;
(iii) a court reporter;
(iv) an operator of a recording device;
(v) a person who transcribes recorded testimony;
(vi) an attorney for the government; or
(vii) a person to whom disclosure is made under Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) or (iii).

(3) Exceptions.

(A) Disclosure of a grand-jury matter—other than the grand jury's deliberations or any grand juror's vote—may be made to:

(i) an attorney for the government for use in performing that attorney's duty;
(ii) any government personnel—including those of a state, state subdivision, Indian tribe, or foreign government—that an attorney for the government considers necessary to assist in performing that attorney's duty to enforce federal criminal law; or
(iii) a person authorized by 18 U.S.C. §3322.
(B) A person to whom information is disclosed under Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) may use that information only to assist an attorney for the government in performing that attorney's duty to enforce federal criminal law. An attorney for the government must promptly provide the court that impaneled the grand jury with the names of all persons to whom a disclosure has been made, and must certify that the attorney has advised those persons of their obligation of secrecy under this rule.

(C) An attorney for the government may disclose any grand-jury matter to another federal grand jury.

* * *

Furthermore, Rule 6(e)(7) provides that:

(7) Contempt. A knowing violation of Rule 6, or of any guidelines jointly issued by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence under Rule 6, may be punished as a contempt of court.

While it is often difficult by nature to know prior to an investigation who is responsible for leaks, a pattern of a persistent torrent of leaks, considering their nature, makes it clear that the majority of these leaks are coming from Special Counsel Robert Mueller and his staff, most of whom are suffering from serious conflicts of interest. The nature as well as the quantity of these leaks makes it clear that they are coming from the DoJ and/or FBI, and his legal staff, which are technically under the direction and control and authority of DoJ as well, egregiously under Special Counsel Mueller's direction.

Thus, Mr. Mueller as Special Counsel and his staff are subject to the requirements incumbent upon all DoJ personnel. DoJ regulations are extended to a Special Counsel under 28 C.F.R. § 600.7.

28 C.F.R. § 600.7 Conduct and accountability.

(a) A Special Counsel shall comply with the rules, regulations, procedures, practices and policies of the Department of Justice. He or she shall consult with appropriate offices within the Department for guidance with respect to established practices, policies and procedures of the Department, including ethics and security regulations and procedures. Should the Special Counsel conclude that the extraordinary circumstances
of any particular decision would render compliance with required review and approval procedures by the designated Departmental component inappropriate, he or she may consult directly with the Attorney General.

(b) The Special Counsel shall not be subject to the day-to-day supervision of any official of the Department. However, the Attorney General may request that the Special Counsel provide an explanation for any investigative or prosecutorial step, and may after review conclude that the action is so inappropriate or unwarranted under established Departmental practices that it should not be pursued. In conducting that review, the Attorney General will give great weight to the views of the Special Counsel. If the Attorney General concludes that a proposed action by a Special Counsel should not be pursued, the Attorney General shall notify Congress as specified in § 600.9(a)(3).

(c) The Special Counsel and staff shall be subject to disciplinary action for misconduct and breach of ethical duties under the same standards and to the same extent as are other employees of the Department of Justice. Inquiries into such matters shall be handled through the appropriate office of the Department upon the approval of the Attorney General.

(d) The Special Counsel may be disciplined or removed from office only by the personal action of the Attorney General. The Attorney General may remove a Special Counsel for misconduct, dereliction of duty, incapacity, conflict of interest, or for other good cause, including violation of Departmental policies. The Attorney General shall inform the Special Counsel in writing of the specific reason for his or her removal.

These requirements include:

28 U.S. Code § 530B - Ethical standards for attorneys for the Government

(a) An attorney for the Government shall be subject to State laws and rules, and local Federal court rules, governing attorneys in each State where such attorney engages in that attorney’s duties, to the same extent and in the same manner as other attorneys in that State.

(b) The Attorney General shall make and amend rules of the Department of Justice to assure compliance with this section.

(c) As used in this section, the term “attorney for the Government” includes any attorney described in section 77.2(a) of part 77 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations and also includes any independent counsel, or employee of such a counsel, appointed under chapter 40.
§ 3801.101 General

In accordance with § 2635.105 of this title, the regulations in this part apply to employees of the Department of Justice and supplement the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch in part 2635 of this title. In addition to the regulations contained in part 2635 of this title and in this part, employees are subject to the conduct regulations contained in part 735 of this title and 28 CFR part 45.

28 CFR § 45.12 Reporting to the Department of Justice Office of Professional Responsibility.

Department employees have a duty to, and shall, report to the Department of Justice Office of Professional Responsibility (DOJ-OPR), or to their supervisor, or their component's internal affairs office for referral to DOJ-OPR, any allegations of misconduct by a Department attorney that relate to the exercise of the attorney's authority to investigate, litigate or provide legal advice, as well as allegations of misconduct by law enforcement personnel when such allegations are related to allegations of attorney misconduct within the jurisdiction of DOJ-OPR.

No DoJ employee may participate in a criminal investigation or prosecution if he has a personal or political relationship with any person or organization substantially involved in the conduct that is the subject of the investigation or prosecution, or who would be directly affected by the outcome. 28 CFR 45.2

What Mueller's staff is focused on and even what they are thinking are being regularly reported in the news media. Note that the following news report governs not merely that questions have been asked but what topics dominate the Special Counsel's investigation and why.

Federal investigators working for Special Counsel Robert Mueller are keenly focused on President Donald Trump's role in crafting a response to a published article about a meeting between Russians and his son Donald Jr., three sources familiar with the matter told NBC News.
The sources told NBC News that prosecutors want to know what Trump knew about the meeting and whether he sought to conceal its purpose.


The activities and progress of Special Counsel Robert Mueller's staff of Democrat party donors have been reported in the news media on an almost daily basis.

One year after the FBI opened an investigation, the probe is now managed by special counsel Robert Mueller. Sources described an investigation that has widened to focus on possible financial crimes, some unconnected to the 2016 elections, alongside the ongoing scrutiny of possible illegal coordination with Russian spy agencies and alleged attempts by President Donald Trump and others to obstruct the FBI investigation. Even investigative leads that have nothing to do with Russia but involve Trump associates are being referred to the special counsel to encourage subjects of the investigation to cooperate, according to two law enforcement sources.

* * *

In recent weeks, investigators have also started looking into the June 2016 meeting in Trump Tower and how the White House responded to news of that meeting. The session included Trump Jr., Manafort, Trump's senior adviser and son-in-law Jared Kushner, and a Russian attorney.


It is also clear that the leaks are not coming from those being investigated:

In response to this CNN story, the President's attorney, Jay Sekulow, said, "President's outside counsel has not received any requests for documentation or information about this. Any inquiry from the special counsel that goes beyond the mandate specified in the appointment we would object to."
The daily activities of the Special Counsel's office are routinely disclosed to journalists. As a result, The New York Times learned through a leak what evidence the Special Counsel is obtaining and presenting to the grand jury.

The special counsel, Robert S. Mueller III, has obtained a letter drafted by President Trump and a top political aide that offered an unvarnished view of Mr. Trump’s thinking in the days before the president fired the F.B.I. director, James B. Comey.

The circumstances and reasons for the firing are believed to be a significant element of Mr. Mueller’s investigation, which includes whether Mr. Trump obstructed justice by firing Mr. Comey.


Similarly:

Trump ended up shelving that letter in favor of a far shorter one, but the draft has taken on new significance in the probe by special counsel Robert S. Mueller III, who is examining it as he determines whether Trump’s firing of Comey was part of an effort to obstruct justice, according to people with knowledge of the investigation.

Mueller will weigh the narrative with other events that led up to Comey’s firing, including Comey’s account of Trump’s efforts to intercede by requesting that the FBI director drop an investigation of former national security adviser Michael Flynn.

Rosalind S. Helderman, Carol D. Leonnig and Ashley Parker, "Mueller examining Trump’s draft letter firing FBI Director Comey," The Washington Post, Sept. 1, 2017

Furthermore, the leaks are not coming from the Trump team:
“I can’t comment on anything the special counsel might be interested in,” White House attorney Ty Cobb said. “But this White House is committed to being open and transparent with the special counsel’s investigation.”

Id.

The news media knows exactly what Special Counsel Mueller and his compromised staff is doing on a daily basis:

The letter Mueller is reviewing was drafted by Trump along with policy adviser Stephen Miller, and legal experts say it is possibly the most critical piece of evidence in Mueller's obstruction-of-justice case since Comey's testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee in June, because it can give prosecutors a direct window into Trump's thinking shortly before he fired Comey.


Special counsel Robert Mueller increasingly views President Donald Trump’s trip back from the G-20 summit in Europe this July as a critical moment in his investigation. And as part of an attempt to uncover just what happened on that fateful flight, his team is expected to question several White House officials. Among them will be the president’s close adviser Hope Hicks.

People familiar with the probe tell The Daily Beast that Hicks—the longtime Trump aide who is currently interim White House communications director—likely has information that will interest Mueller regarding Donald Trump Jr.’s initial claim that his meeting with the Kremlin-linked lawyer Natalia Veselnitskaya was just about adoption.

“No doubt in my mind she is going to be a witness,” a source familiar with the Mueller probe told The Daily Beast.

On Friday, The Washington Post reported that Hicks wasn’t alone on Mueller’s radar. Former White House chief
of staff Reince Priebus, former press secretary Sean Spicer, White House counsel Don McGahn, McGahn aide James Burnham, and Kushner aide and White House spokesman Josh Raffel are also expected to be questioned.


The investigative goals and activities of Mr. Mueller's office regularly appear in the news media:

Special counsel Robert Mueller is examining what role, if any, former national security adviser Mike Flynn may have played in a private effort to obtain Hillary Clinton’s emails from Russian hackers, according to people familiar with the matter.

The effort to seek out hackers who were believed to have stolen Mrs. Clinton’s emails, first reported by The Wall Street Journal, was led by a longtime Republican activist, Peter W. Smith.


Russian officials bragged in conversations during the presidential campaign that they had cultivated a strong relationship with former Trump adviser retired Gen. Michael Flynn and believed they could use him to influence Donald Trump and his team, sources told CNN.


Details of Mr. Mueller's investigation were leaked to the news media concerning the focus of the investigation:
Federal investigators working for Special Counsel Robert Mueller are keenly focused on President Donald Trump's role in crafting a response to a published article about a meeting between Russians and his son Donald Jr., three sources familiar with the matter told NBC News. The sources told NBC News that prosecutors want to know what Trump knew about the meeting and whether he sought to conceal its purpose.


The U.S. special counsel investigating possible ties between the Donald Trump campaign and Russia in last year’s election is examining a broad range of transactions involving Trump’s businesses as well as those of his associates, according to a person familiar with the probe.

FBI investigators and others are looking at Russian purchases of apartments in Trump buildings, Trump’s involvement in a controversial SoHo development in New York with Russian associates, the 2013 Miss Universe pageant in Moscow and Trump’s sale of a Florida mansion to a Russian oligarch in 2008, the person said.

The investigation also has absorbed a money-laundering probe begun by federal prosecutors in New York into Trump’s former campaign chairman Paul Manafort.


Mr. Mueller's investigative contacts and collaboration with the Internal Revenue Service were promptly leaked to the news media:

Special counsel Bob Mueller has teamed up with the IRS. According to sources familiar with his investigation into alleged Russian election interference, his probe has enlisted the help of agents from the IRS’ Criminal Investigations unit.

Details from the investigation are being regularly reported to the news media:

As the Robert Mueller investigation intensifies, new details are being leaked about the direction the probe is going. Buried in a story about the intensifying relationship between Mueller and Congress, CNN revealed some very interesting information. According to the report, Mueller’s team may have obtained evidence in the raid of Paul Manafort’s home that was not covered by the search warrant.

* * *

During that raid, Mueller’s investigators took documents considered to be covered by attorney-client privilege, sources told CNN. Lawyers from the WilmerHale law firm, representing Manafort at the time, warned Mueller’s office that their search warrant didn’t allow access to attorney materials. The documents in question have now been returned, the sources say.


Mr. Mueller’s core investigative and prosecution strategies have been leaked to the news media and publicly revealed:

U.S. investigators examining money laundering accusations against President Donald Trump’s former campaign manager Paul Manafort hope to push him to cooperate with their probe into possible collusion between Trump’s campaign and Russia, two sources with direct knowledge of the investigation said.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s team is examining Manafort’s financial and real estate records in New York as well as his involvement in Ukrainian politics, the officials said.

Between 2006 and 2013, Manafort bought three New York properties, including one in Trump Tower in Manhattan. He paid for them in full and later took out
mortgages against them. A former senior U.S. law enforcement official said that tactic is often used as a means to hide the origin of funds gained illegally. Reuters has no independent evidence that Manafort did this.

The sources also did not say whether Mueller has uncovered any evidence to charge Manafort with money laundering, but they said doing so is seen by investigators as critical in getting his full cooperation in their investigation.

“If Mueller’s team can threaten criminal charges against Manafort, they could use that as leverage to convince him to cooperate,” said one of the sources.


However, this is not coming from Manafort or his legal team, who deny the information being leaked and say it is false. The information is being leaked by Special Counsel Mueller's office:

Manafort’s spokesman, Jason Maloni, said, “Paul Manafort is not a cooperating witness. Once again there is no truth to the disinformation put forth by anonymous sources and leakers.”

*Id.*

Details about Mr. Mueller's sharing investigative information and procedures, as well as collaborating with the Attorney General's office of the State of New York -- also itself subject to confidentiality of criminal investigations as well -- were promptly leaked to the news media. It should be emphasized that Attorney General Schneiderman's office is restricted from sharing these details as much as Mr. Mueller's office is restricted.

Special counsel Robert Mueller’s team is working with New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman on its investigation into Paul Manafort and his financial transactions, according to several people familiar with the matter.
The cooperation is the latest indication that the federal probe into President Donald Trump’s former campaign chairman is intensifying. It also could potentially provide Mueller with additional leverage to get Manafort to cooperate in the larger investigation into Trump’s campaign, as Trump does not have pardon power over state crimes.

The two teams have shared evidence and talked frequently in recent weeks about a potential case, these people said. One of the people familiar with progress on the case said both Mueller’s and Schneiderman’s teams have collected evidence on financial crimes, including potential money laundering.


Details of Mr. Mueller's investigation including focusing on possible obstruction of justice by President Donald Trump and his campaign were promptly dumped into the public realm in the news media. It should be noted that government officials interviewed would not themselves be free to disclose information about their interviews:

The move by special counsel Robert S. Mueller III to investigate Trump’s conduct marks a major turning point in the nearly year-old FBI investigation, which until recently focused on Russian meddling during the presidential campaign and on whether there was any coordination between the Trump campaign and the Kremlin. Investigators have also been looking for any evidence of possible financial crimes among Trump associates, officials said.

Devlin Barrett, Adam Entous, Ellen Nakashima and Sari Horwitz, " Special counsel Mueller is investigating Trump for possible obstruction of justice," The Washington Post, June 14, 2017

The Washington Post has published an extraordinary continuing flow of details of the grand jury proceedings and investigative activities of Mr. Mueller's office. The Washington Post
... reported that Mueller was examining whether Trump has tried to obstruct justice and was seeking interviews with three administration officials: Dan Coats, the director of national intelligence; Michael Rogers, the head of the National Security Agency; and Richard Ledgett, the former NSA deputy director.

Mark Corallo, a spokesman for Trump's personal lawyer, responded Wednesday evening to the Post report by saying: "The FBI leak of information regarding the president is outrageous, inexcusable and illegal."


Leaks of confidential information from the criminal prosecution hit The Wall Street Journal on August 31, 2017, Peter Nicholas, Erica Orden and Paul Sonne, "Trump Attorneys Lay Out Arguments Against Obstruction-of-Justice Probe to Mueller" The Wall Street Journal. An extraordinary array of documents obtained from Mr. Mueller's office are summarized and discussed in this article, including identifying specific meetings with Mr. Mueller in the Special Counsel's office:

Lawyers for Donald Trump have met several times with special counsel Robert Mueller in recent months and submitted memos arguing that the president didn’t obstruct justice by firing former FBI chief James Comey and calling into question Mr. Comey’s reliability as a potential witness, people familiar with the matter said.

In the article, the reporters chronicle that the Trump administration and Trump's private lawyers would not comment on the memos or the story at all, indicating that they were not the source of the leaks. Mr. Mueller's office leaked the memos and information.

Special counsel Robert S. Mueller III has alerted the White House that his team will probably seek to interview six top current and former advisers to President Trump who were witnesses to several episodes relevant to the investigation of Russia’s meddling in the 2016 election, according to
people familiar with the request.

Mueller’s interest in the aides, including trusted adviser Hope Hicks, former press secretary Sean Spicer and former chief of staff Reince Priebus, reflects how the probe that has dogged Trump’s presidency is starting to penetrate a closer circle of aides around the president.


Furthermore, Mr. Mueller convened a second grand jury in the District of Columbia after already convening a grand jury in the Eastern District of Virginia at Alexandria, Virginia. Because jurors are drawn from voter rolls, and Donald Trump received only 4.1% of the vote in the District of Columbia for president on November 8, 2016, Mr. Mueller's efforts at juror shopping are not only unethical but fail to provide the public an assurance of the appearance of integrity in these proceedings. The grand jury in Virginia would have had all the authority necessary to consider evidence across the river in Washington, D.C. Furthermore, Donald Trump's campaign was headquartered in Manhattan in New York City, New York. Therefore, there is no valid reason for an investigation of the 2016 presidential campaign to be sited in Washington, D.C. The appearance is that the grand jury convened in Virginia was skeptical of Mr. Mueller's presentations and Mr. Mueller sought a different group of grand jurors.

Mr. Mueller was appointed because Attorney General Jeff Sessions needlessly recused himself from overseeing an investigation into a fanciful theory that we now know was invented by the Hillary Clinton presidential campaign in their deliberations within 24
hours of suffering an unexpected loss in the November 8, 2016 presidential campaign.\(^1\) Out of an abundance of caution, Sessions bent over backwards to avoid even the slightest appearance of bias or conflict of interest and recused himself.

Thus, Mr. Mueller was appointed as Special Counsel to uphold the highest standards of integrity and avoid even a hint of any impropriety in an investigation of a theory that there might have been some collusion between the presidential campaign of Donald Trump and the Russian Federation.

Because the theory has been discredited, the damage of continuing leaks to the reputation of innocent persons is especially harmful. The more the myth of collusion between Russia and the Trump presidential campaign unravels, the more the flow of leaks accelerates each day.

Meanwhile, Rule 1:7 of D.C.'s Rules of Professional Conduct -- Mr. Mueller's office and operations being in the District of Columbia and Ms. Rhee licensed by the District of Columbia Bar -- require:

A lawyer who has formerly represented a client in a matter shall not thereafter represent another person in the same or a substantially related matter in which that person’s

\(^1\) All nations spy on each other, such as the United States hacking Angela Merkel, German Chancellor. Of course Russia and China persistently try to hack government and private computer networks in the U.S.A. However, forensic investigation now reveals that Clinton campaign emails from the Democrat National Committee were copied at extraordinarily high speed (impossible over an internet connection) on to a thumb drive physically plugged into the DNC's computer system. "On the evening of July 5, 2016, 1,976 megabytes of data were downloaded from the DNC’s server. The operation took 87 seconds. This yields a transfer rate of 22.7 megabytes per second. These statistics are matters of record and essential to disproving the hack theory. No Internet service provider, such as a hacker would have had to use in mid-2016, was capable of downloading data at this speed." Patrick Lawrence, "A New Report Raises Big Questions About Last Year’s DNC Hack," The Nation, August 9, 2017; https://www.thenation.com/article/a-new-report-raises-big-questions-about-last-years-dnc-hack/
interests are materially adverse to the interests of the former client unless the former client gives informed consent.

28 CFR § 45.2 Disqualification arising from personal or political relationship.

(a) Unless authorized under paragraph (b) of this section, no employee shall participate in a criminal investigation or prosecution if he has a personal or political relationship with:

(1) Any person or organization substantially involved in the conduct that is the subject of the investigation or prosecution; or

(2) Any person or organization which he knows has a specific and substantial interest that would be directly affected by the outcome of the investigation or prosecution.

(b) An employee assigned to or otherwise participating in a criminal investigation or prosecution who believes that his participation may be prohibited by paragraph (a) of this section shall report the matter and all attendant facts and circumstances to his supervisor at the level of section chief or the equivalent or higher. If the supervisor determines that a personal or political relationship exists between the employee and a person or organization described in paragraph (a) of this section, he shall relieve the employee from participation unless he determines further, in writing, after full consideration of all the facts and circumstances, that:

(1) The relationship will not have the effect of rendering the employee's service less than fully impartial and professional; and

(2) The employee's participation would not create an appearance of a conflict of interest likely to affect the public perception of the integrity of the investigation or prosecution.

(c) For the purposes of this section:

(1) Political relationship means a close identification with an elected official, a candidate (whether or not successful) for elective, public office, a political party, or a campaign organization, arising from service as a principal adviser thereto or a principal official thereof; and

(2) Personal relationship means a close and substantial connection of the type normally viewed as likely to induce partiality. An employee is presumed to have a personal relationship with his father, mother, brother, sister, child and spouse. Whether relationships (including friendships)
of an employee to other persons or organizations are “personal” must be judged on an individual basis with due regard given to the subjective opinion of the employee. (d) This section pertains to agency management and is not intended to create rights enforceable by private individuals or organizations. [Order No. 993-83, 48 FR 2319, Jan. 19, 1983. Redesignated at 61 FR 59815, Nov. 25, 1996]

Special Counsel Mueller has been charged with investigating whether or not Russia interfered in the U.S. presidential election in the 2015-2016 election cycle, and if so to what extent and in what ways and whether in collusion with any U.S. campaigns or institutions.

But Mueller's office has a conflict of interest in exploring all of the alternatives and following the evidence where it leads. If the evidence shows that Russia intervened in the election in relation to Hillary Clinton's support for the sale of twenty percent (20%) of the uranium mining reserves of the United States to the Russian Federation as the leading member of the inter-governmental decision-making body the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), Mueller and his team would be ethically prohibited from honestly investigating and exploring the truth.

Special Counsel Mueller's investigation turns on the credibility and personal interests of Mueller's long-term colleague and close friend former FBI Director James Comey. Not only will the investigation impact Comey, but Mueller must judge his own friend's credibility as a witness.

A Republican congressman is calling on Special Counsel Robert Mueller to resign from his role leading the Russia investigation, citing the investigator's friendship with former FBI Director James B. Comey.
Rep. Trent Franks said Mr. Mueller’s relationship with Mr. Comey should make him ineligible to lead a probe of Russian interference in the presidential election and any possible coordination with the Trump campaign — the investigation includes whether the president fired the FBI director in an effort to undermine the investigation.

“Those who worked under them have attested he and Jim Comey possess a close friendship, and they have delivered on-the-record statements effusing praise of one another,” Mr. Franks, Arizona Republican, said in a statement issued Tuesday. “No one knows Mr. Mueller’s true intentions, but neither can anyone dispute that he now clearly appears to be a partisan arbiter of justice.”

Mr. Franks, a member of the House Judiciary Committee, cited federal law that prevents the special counsel from serving in the role if the person has a conflict of interest. In Mr. Mueller’s case, the lawmaker said that conflict is “a personal relationship with any person substantially involved in the conduct that is the subject of the investigation.”

Andrea Noble, "[Congressman] Trent Franks: Mueller must resign from Russia probe because of long friendship with Comey," The Washington Times, August 1, 2017

Just over a week after President Donald Trump fired James Comey as FBI director, the Department of Justice appointed Comey’s predecessor, former FBI Director Robert Mueller, as special counsel for the investigation into Russian attempts to influence the 2016 election.

The two former FBI chiefs have a unique relationship, stemming in large part from working side by side during a major confrontation with the Bush administration.

By sheer coincidence, this week marked 10 years since Comey gave his bombshell testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee about the showdown with President George W. Bush's White House. It began in 2004, when Comey refused to reauthorize an NSA spying program.

Comey was deputy attorney general at the time, and was serving as the acting head of the Justice Department while Attorney General John Ashcroft was in the hospital.

As recently as 2009, then Director of the FBI Robert Mueller personally carried samples of highly-enriched uranium to Moscow, as shown in official diplomatic cables that have been publicly released. While Mueller's involvement in transporting uranium samples to the Russian Federation may have been proper \(^2\) the task of the Special Counsel is to give public confidence and the appearance of enhanced integrity in the Russian collusion investigation. Compared with the professional permanent staff of the FBI and DoJ, Mueller cannot offer public confidence in the investigation having personally worked with Russia on such high level issues.

6. (S/Rel Russia) Action request: Embassy Moscow is requested to alert at the highest appropriate level the Russian Federation that FBI Director Mueller plans to deliver the HEU [Highly-Enriched Uranium] sample once he arrives to Moscow on September 21.


Mr. Mueller knowingly hired an attorney who had previously -- within the last year -- represented the Clinton Foundation of whom Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton are principals. Attorney Jeannie S. Rhee, D.C. Bar No. 464127 was ethically required to

\(^2\) "(S/NF) Background: Over two years ago Russia requested a ten-gram sample of highly enriched uranium (HEU) seized in early 2006 in Georgia during a nuclear smuggling sting operation involving one Russian national and several Georgian accomplices. The seized HEU was transferred to U.S. custody and is being held at a secure DOE facility. In response to the Russian request, the Georgian Government authorized the United States to share a sample of the material with the Russians for forensic analysis."
decline a position that places her in a conflict of interest as a staff attorney for Mr. Mueller. Having previously represented the Clinton Foundation as an attorney, including its Board of Directors and principals Hillary Clinton, Bill Clinton, Chelsea Clinton, and Former Counselor of the U.S. Department of State Cheryl Mills, Rhee cannot investigate, work on, or prosecute the topics related to the investigation of collusion by the Russian Federation with the presidential campaign of Donald Trump running against Hillary Clinton. Rhee's involvement contaminates the entire investigation by Mueller's office.

Furthermore, as her supervisor and a supervising attorney, Robert Mueller is committing ethical violations by directing an attorney to violate the ethical requirements of the Department of Justice and of the District of Columbia Bar. Mueller's hiring of Rhee -- and others -- is in itself an ethical violation of DoJ standards and professional rules. However, Mr. Mueller's refusal to correct this unethical conduct speaks volumes and loudly proclaims the true nature of Mueller's intentions and undertakings.

Now, Jeannie Rhee is investigating Donald Trump's alleged Russian collusion with Russia during the 2016 presidential campaign as one of Mueller's top lawyers. With Mueller's experience, he knows that the lawyers he is hiring will be legally prevented from following the evidence wherever it leads. One must infer that Mueller intends a hatchet job on President Trump in retaliation for James Comey's firing from head of the FBI.

Legally Rhee can only investigate Trump, even if the evidence might show that Hillary Clinton -- through Rhee's former (recent) client the Clinton Foundation -- actually colluded with Russia instead or that leaked emails from Hillary Clinton's campaign were leaked by DNC employee Seth Rich. Rhee is not ethically or legally allowed to look into alternative theories or any of the outrageous leaks from the deep state defending Hillary Clinton's loss, the disclosure of Clinton campaign emails to Wikileaks, etc.


All told, more than half of Mueller's massive team of lawyers are donors to the Democrat party investigating the presidential campaign of a Republican Donald Trump. Alexi McCammond, "Meet Bob Mueller's team tackling the Russia probe," Axios, June 18, 2017, accessible at:https://www.axios.com/meet-bob-muellers-dream-team-tackling-
This behavior is the most egregious example of ethically-questionable behavior that I can recall in the DoJ's history, at least since the tongue-lashing from Judge Emmet G. Sullivan of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on April 7, 2009, in the bungled prosecution of former Senator Ted Stevens, not to mention other egregious violations of ethics in other cases of late. Anna Stolley Persky, "A Cautionary Tale: The Ted Stevens Prosecution," republished *Washington Lawyer* (publication of the District of Columbia Bar), October 2009

Simply put, after a swift and thorough bona fide investigation – one that is not whitewashed by the establishment if not so called “Deep State” within the DoJ -- Special Counsel Mueller must be removed as Special Counsel, as well as his conflicted staff, and this matter referred back to DoJ for the appointment of a new and ethical Special Counsel who will uphold his or her oath of office, rather than playing sleazy partisan politics with secret grand jury proceedings and this serious and important matter in general. In addition, other appropriate remedies much be considered and then implemented and imposed, such as prosecution of those directly and indirectly responsible for the grand jury leaks, including but not limited to Special Counsel Mueller and his equally conflicted staff.

An investigation into this extraordinary flow of leaks from criminal prosecutors, almost unprecedented in the history of the U.S. government is of paramount importance. The public already cynical and distrusting of the government, with a society appearing to be on the verge of civil unrest or even civil war, needs to know that their government can be trusted to follow its own rules and live by integrity and ethics in carrying out these
important duties. No matter what the outcome Special Counsel Mueller's investigation, no one will trust anything Mr. Mueller's office says or does under these unethical and illegal circumstances.

The Office of Professional Responsibility and Inspector General must thoroughly investigate these leaks and patent conflicts of interest and political bias, and discipline, terminate, and/or prosecute those responsible.

Mr. Klayman, personally and as the General Counsel and Chairman of Freedom Watch, will fully cooperate with the requested investigation and respectfully requests a meeting expeditiously with both the OPR and the IG to further this Complaint and the ensuing investigation.

Sincerely,

Larry Klayman, Esq.

Freedom Watch, Inc.
Chairman and General Counsel
2020 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W., Suite 345
Washington, D.C. 20006
leklayman@gmail.com

Cc:
Hon. Jeff Sessions
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC, 20530

Hon. Rod Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC, 20530

Hon. Don McGahn
White House Counsel
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC, 20500