

House Calendar No. 58

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE HILLARY R. CLINTON IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JANUARY 27, 2026.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. COMER, from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, having considered this Report, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the Report be approved.

The form of the Resolution that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform would recommend to the House of Representatives citing Hillary R. Clinton, former Secretary of State, for contempt of Congress pursuant to this Report is as follows:

Resolved, That Hillary R. Clinton, former Secretary of State, shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with a congressional subpoena.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§ 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, detailing the refusal of Hillary R. Clinton, former Secretary of State, to appear for a deposition before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that former Secretary Hillary R. Clinton be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena.

CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	2
Authority and Purpose	3
Background on the Investigation	4
A. The Committee Seeks Information from Witnesses and Entities as Part of Its Investigation	5
B. After Months of Correspondence and Rescheduling, Secretary Clinton Defies the Subpoena	7
C. Secretary Clinton's Purported Reasons for Non-Compliance with the Subpoena Are Without Merit	11
i. The subpoena seeks testimony related to a valid legislative purpose	11
ii. Secretary Clinton was subpoenaed to advance the Oversight Committee's investigation, not to harass or embarrass her	15
iii. The subpoena is not an impermissible exercise of law enforcement authority committed to coordinate branches of government and the existence of a Department of Justice investigation into Mr. Epstein's and Ms. Maxwell's sex-trafficking ring does not relieve Secretary Clinton of her obligation to appear for a deposition	17
iv. The separation of powers does not render the subpoena unenforceable	18
D. Precedent Supports the Committee's Position to Proceed with Holding Secretary Clinton in Contempt	19
Conclusion	20
Committee Consideration	20
Roll Call Votes	20
Statement of Oversight Findings and Recommendations of the Committee	23
Statement of General Performance Goals and Objectives	23
Duplication of Federal Programs	23
Earmark Identification	23
New Budget Authority and Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	23
Minority Views	24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hillary R. Clinton, former Secretary of State (Secretary Clinton), willfully failed to comply with a deposition subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Oversight Committee) relating to its investigation of (i) the alleged mismanagement of the federal government's investigation into Mr. Jeffrey Epstein and Ms. Ghislaine Maxwell, (ii) the circumstances and subsequent investigations of Mr. Epstein's death, (iii) the operation of sex-trafficking rings and ways for the federal government to effectively combat them, (iv) ways in which Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell sought to curry favor and exercise influence to protect their illegal activities, and (v) potential violations of ethics rules related to elected officials.

After more than five months of negotiations, Secretary Clinton refused to appear for her scheduled deposition on January 14, 2026. Secretary Clinton's unwillingness to comply with the subpoena, even after the Oversight Committee agreed to postpone her deposition date, at her request, for nearly a month, has substantially interfered with the Oversight Committee's investigation.

The testimony sought by the subpoena is relevant to the Oversight Committee's investigation. Specifically, Secretary Clinton's testimony related to the activities of Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell and their efforts to establish relationships and curry favor with influential individuals while operating a sex-trafficking ring. In addition, given her service as Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton is in a position to provide firsthand information regarding efforts by the federal government to combat international sex trafficking. Her

testimony may inform the Oversight Committee's consideration of legislative reforms designed to combat the operation of sex-trafficking rings as well as efforts to shield them from scrutiny.

Secretary Clinton has invoked no valid reason for refusing to appear for a deposition, and the Oversight Committee's efforts to persuade her to testify have reached a dead end. Accordingly, the Chairman of the Oversight Committee recommends that the House of Representatives find Secretary Hillary R. Clinton in contempt for her failure to comply with the subpoena issued to her to provide testimony at a deposition.

AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE

Congress holds an essential responsibility, through powers expressly granted by the Constitution, to conduct legislative oversight. That authority, affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, has been recognized on numerous occasions. The Supreme Court held in *McGrain v. Daugherty* that "the power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function."¹ The Supreme Court has stated further that "[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."² "The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad."³ If a witness refuses to comply with a duly issued congressional subpoena, Congress is entitled to combat such refusal with a certified contempt citation, to be referred to the executive branch for the criminal prosecution of the contemnor.⁴

The Oversight Committee is a standing committee of the House of Representatives, duly established pursuant to the rules of the House of Representatives, which are adopted pursuant to the Rule-making Clause of the U.S. Constitution.⁵ House rule X grants to the Oversight Committee broad jurisdiction over federal "[g]overnment management" and reform, including the "[o]verall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities."⁶ House rule X further grants the Oversight Committee broad oversight jurisdiction, including authority to "conduct investigations of *any matter* without regard to clause 1, 2, 3, or this clause [of House rule X] conferring jurisdiction over the matter to another standing committee."⁷

House rule XI clause 2(k)(6) states that "the chair shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses."⁸ Additionally, House rule XI clause 2(m)(1)(B) specifically authorizes the Oversight Committee "to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it considers necessary."⁹ It also includes

¹ *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 174 (1927).

² *Id.* at 175.

³ *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957).

⁴ 2 U.S.C. §§ 192, 194.

⁵ U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 5.

⁶ Rule X, cl. 1(n), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

⁷ Rule X, cl. 4(c)(2), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025) (emphasis added).

⁸ Rule XI, cl. 2(k)(6), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

⁹ Rule XI, cl. 2(m)(1)(B), Rules of the U.S. Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

the authority for the Oversight Committee to create its own “rule[s] authorizing and regulating the taking of deposition by a member or counsel of the committee, including pursuant to subpoena under clause 2(m) of rule XI.”¹⁰ House Rules further provide that the “power to authorize and issue subpoenas” may be delegated to the Committee chairman.¹¹ The subpoenas discussed in this report were issued pursuant to these authorities by Chairman James Comer.

The deposition subpoena issued to Secretary Clinton is part of the Oversight Committee’s review into the possible mismanagement of the federal government’s investigation of Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell, the circumstances and subsequent investigations of Mr. Epstein’s death, the operation of sex-trafficking rings and ways for the federal government to effectively combat them, ways in which Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell sought to curry favor and exercise influence to protect their activities, and potential violations of ethics rules related to elected officials. As explained in detail below, the requested testimony would further the Oversight Committee’s investigation into these issues and the consideration of possible legislative reforms. Secretary Clinton’s refusal to comply with the Oversight Committee’s deposition subpoena is therefore hindering the Oversight Committee’s investigation.

BACKGROUND ON THE INVESTIGATION

On July 6, 2019, federal authorities arrested Mr. Epstein and, two days later, an indictment was unsealed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District for New York charging him with sex trafficking of minors and conspiracy to engage in sex trafficking of minors.¹² According to the indictment, Mr. Epstein sexually exploited and abused dozens of minor girls at his homes in Manhattan, Palm Beach, and other locations.¹³ Among other things, the indictment alleged that Mr. Epstein solicited girls as young as 14 years old to engage in sex acts with him in exchange for money.¹⁴ This was not the first time that Mr. Epstein had been investigated for committing sex crimes. In 2008, he pleaded guilty in Florida state court to two prostitution offenses, and, in exchange, he and his co-conspirators received immunity from federal prosecution through a non-prosecution agreement.¹⁵

On August 10, 2019, while in federal custody at the Metropolitan Correctional Center in New York, New York, Mr. Epstein died.¹⁶ The Chief Medical Examiner of New York City ruled his death a suicide.¹⁷ Subsequently, on June 28, 2022, Ms. Maxwell was sen-

¹⁰ *Id.*; Rule X, cl. 4(c)(3), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

¹¹ Rule XI, cl. 2(m)(3)(A)(1), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

¹² Press Release, U.S. Dep’t of Just., Jeffery Epstein Charged In Manhattan Federal Court With Sex Trafficking Of Minors (July 8, 2019).

¹³ See Indictment, *United States v. Epstein*, 19 Crim. 490 (S.D.N.Y. 2019), at ¶ 1.

¹⁴ *Id.* at ¶¶ 2–3.

¹⁵ See *In re Wild*, 994 F.3d 1244 (11th Cir. 2021) (en banc).

¹⁶ William K. Rashbaum, et al., *Jeffery Epstein Dead in Suicide at Jail, Spurring Inquiries*, THE N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 10, 2019); see also Press Release, U.S. Dep’t of Just., Statement from Attorney General William P. Barr on the death of Jeffery Epstein (Aug. 10, 2019).

¹⁷ Memorandum from U.S. Dep’t of Just. and Fed. Bureau of Investigation on Review of Investigative Holdings Relating to Jeffrey Epstein (July 7, 2025), available at <https://www.justice.gov/opa/media/1407001/dl?inline>.

tenced to 20 years in prison for conspiring with Mr. Epstein to sexually abuse minors.¹⁸

The facts and circumstances surrounding both Mr. Epstein's and Ms. Maxwell's cases have received immense public interest and scrutiny. On February 11, 2025, the Oversight Committee and its Task Force on the Declassification of Federal Secrets (Task Force) sent a letter to the Department of Justice (Department) requesting a briefing regarding documents in the Department's possession concerning "the investigation into and prosecution of Jeffrey Epstein."¹⁹ On May 8, 2025, the Task Force sent another letter to the Department requesting the public release of "the entirety of the Epstein files" and a briefing regarding the release of these files.²⁰

A. THE COMMITTEE SEEKS INFORMATION FROM WITNESSES AND ENTITIES AS PART OF ITS INVESTIGATION

On August 5, 2025, Chairman James Comer of the Oversight Committee, pursuant to the Subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement's voice vote on a motion to subpoena and the Oversight Committee's subpoena authority, issued subpoenas to ten individuals: former Attorneys General Alberto R. Gonzales, Eric H. Holder, Loretta E. Lynch, Jefferson B. Sessions III, William P. Barr and Merrick B. Garland; former FBI Directors Robert S. Mueller III and James B. Comey; former Secretary of State Hillary R. Clinton; and former President William J. Clinton to give testimony about any knowledge they might have of the activities of Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell and the federal government's investigation and prosecution of Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell.²¹

Secretary Clinton's subpoena required her to appear for a deposition on October 9, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.²² The cover letter accompanying the subpoena explained that Secretary Clinton's husband, President William J. Clinton, "flew on Jeffrey Epstein's private plane four separate times in 2002 and 2003 on trips for [Secretary Clinton's] family's foundation, the Clinton Foundation."²³ The cover letter also indicated that Secretary Clinton's husband "was allegedly close to Ms. Maxwell."²⁴ Furthermore, "Ms. Maxwell's nephew worked for [Secretary Clinton's] 2008 presidential campaign and was hired by the State Department shortly after [she]

¹⁸ Press Release, U.S. Dep't of Just., Ghislaine Maxwell Sentenced To 20 Years In Prison For Conspiring With Jeffrey Epstein To Sexually Abuse Minors (June 28, 2022).

¹⁹ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Anna Paulina Luna, Chairwoman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Task Force on the Declassification of Fed. Secrets, to Pamela Bondi, U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Feb. 11, 2025).

²⁰ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Anna Paulina Luna, Chairwoman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Task Force on the Declassification of Fed. Secrets, to Pamela Bondi, U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (May 8, 2025).

²¹ Subpoena to Alberto R. Gonzales, Former U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Eric H. Holder, Former U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Loretta E. Lynch, Former U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Jefferson B. Sessions III, U.S. Former Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to William P. Barr, Former U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Merrick B. Garland, Former U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Robert S. Mueller III, Dir., Fed. Bureau of Investigation (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to James B. Comey, Dir., Fed. Bureau of Investigation (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Hillary R. Clinton, Former Sec'y of State of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to William J. Clinton, Former President of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

²² Subpoena to Hillary R. Clinton, Former Sec'y of State of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

²³ Shane Galvin, *Bill Clinton denies visiting Jeffrey Epstein's private island in upcoming memoir 'Wish I had never met him'*, THE N.Y. POST (Nov. 15, 2024).

²⁴ Subpoena Cover Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to Hillary R. Clinton, Former Sec'y of State of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

became Secretary of State.”²⁵ Lastly, the cover letter explains how, “given [Secretary Clinton’s] past service as Secretary of State, the Committee believes [she] may have knowledge of efforts by the federal government to combat international sex-trafficking operations of the type run by Mr. Epstein.”²⁶ In sum, the cover letter explained how, “[g]iven [Secretary Clinton’s] family’s past relationships with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell, the Committee believes that [Secretary Clinton has] information regarding their activities that is relevant to the Committee’s investigation.”²⁷

That same day, the Oversight Committee issued a subpoena to the Department for records related to Mr. Epstein including, but not limited to, documents contained within the case files regarding *United States v. Jeffrey Epstein* (19-cr-490) and *United States v. Ghislaine Maxwell* (20-cr-330) and documents and communications relating or referring to the death of Mr. Epstein.²⁸

On August 18, 2025, the Oversight Committee conducted a deposition with former Attorney General William P. Barr in accordance with the subpoena transmitted to him on August 5, 2025.²⁹ Mr. Barr testified to any information he possessed related to the crimes perpetrated by Mr. Epstein and the federal government’s investigation into Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell.³⁰ Aside from Attorney General Barr, Secretary Clinton, and President Clinton, the other seven individuals subpoenaed by the Oversight Committee affirmed in writing, subject to 18 U.S.C. § 1001, that they lacked *any* information relevant to the investigation or otherwise had serious health issues that prevented their testimony.³¹

On August 25, 2025, the Oversight Committee issued a subpoena to the Estate of Jeffrey Epstein (Estate) requesting unredacted versions of cash ledgers, message logs, calendars, and flight logs.³² In response, the Estate has, to date, produced thousands of documents pertaining to the investigation.³³ Then, on September 19, 2025, R. Alexander Acosta, former U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Florida and former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, appeared voluntarily for a transcribed interview with the

²⁵ Rudy Takala, *Ghislaine Maxwell’s Nephew Worked on Mideast Policy in Hillary Clinton’s State Department*, MEDIATTE, (Aug. 21, 2020).

²⁶ Subpoena Cover Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to Hillary R. Clinton, Former Sec’y of State of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ Subpoena to Pamela J. Bondi, U.S. Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025).

²⁹ Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, Chairman Comer Announces New Actions in Oversight Committee’s Investigation of Federal Government’s Handling of Epstein and Maxwell (Sept. 16, 2025).

³⁰ Deposition of William P. Barr, Former U.S. Att’y Gen. (Aug. 18, 2025).

³¹ See Letter from Jefferson B. Sessions III, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Aug. 28, 2025); Letter from Merrick B. Garland, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Sept. 24, 2025); Letter from Robert K. Kelner on behalf of Eric H. Holder, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Sept. 26, 2025); Letter from Alberto R. Gonzales, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Aug. 22, 2025); Letter from James B. Comey, Former Dir. of Fed. Bureau of Investigation, to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Oct. 1, 2025); Letter from Theodore V. Wells Jr. on behalf of Loretta E. Lynch, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Oct. 17, 2025).

³² Subpoena to the Estate of Jeffrey Epstein (Aug. 25, 2025).

³³ Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, Oversight Committee Releases Records Provided by the Epstein Estate, Chairman Comer Provides Statement (Sept. 8, 2025); Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, Oversight Committee Releases Additional Epstein Estate Documents (Nov. 12, 2025).

Oversight Committee.³⁴ He testified about his involvement in the Department's investigation of and non-prosecution agreement with Mr. Epstein when he was U.S. Attorney.³⁵

Most recently, on January 7, 2026, the full committee authorized, by voice vote, three more motions to subpoena Les Wexner, Darren Indyke, and Richard Kahn,³⁶ all of whom had personal or business relationships with Mr. Epstein. As of the drafting of this report, the Oversight Committee is in the process of preparing these subpoenas.

**B. AFTER MONTHS OF CORRESPONDENCE AND RESCHEDULING,
SECRETARY CLINTON DEFIES THE SUBPOENA**

Secretary Clinton, through her attorney, accepted service of the subpoena on August 13, 2025,³⁷ and her attorney stated that “[t]he subpoena[] will be responded to in an appropriate manner.”³⁸ On September 30, 2025, counsel for the Oversight Committee conveyed to Secretary Clinton's attorney, David E. Kendall, that the Oversight Committee expected Secretary Clinton to appear for her scheduled deposition.³⁹

On October 6, 2025, just over two months after the Oversight Committee issued its subpoena, Mr. Kendall transmitted a letter to the Oversight Committee requesting that it allow Secretary Clinton to submit a written declaration instead of sitting for her deposition, while acknowledging that “[t]he Committee is entitled to what little information the Clintons have about Epstein and Maxwell.”⁴⁰

The Oversight Committee declined this request. On October 22, 2025, the Oversight Committee replied to Mr. Kendall and conveyed its skepticism that Secretary Clinton only had “little information” about Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell.⁴¹ Even if that happened to be the case, the Oversight Committee explained that such information should be provided in a deposition setting, where the Oversight Committee can best assess its breadth and value.⁴² The Oversight Committee emphasized that “it is the Committee—not . . . Secretary Clinton—that will determine the value of the information [she has].”⁴³ In sum, the Oversight Committee, confirmed that Secretary Clinton must comply with its subpoena requiring her to appear for a deposition.⁴⁴ Subsequently, the Oversight Committee rescheduled Secretary Clinton's deposition for December 18, 2025.

On November 3, 2025, Mr. Kendall sent a reply letter claiming that Secretary Clinton does not “have anything to offer for the stat-

³⁴ Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Chairman Comer Statement on Transcribed Interview with Alexander Acosta (Sept. 19, 2025).

³⁵ Transcribed Interview of R. Alexander Acosta, Former U.S. Atty for the S. Dist. of Fla. (Sept. 19, 2025).

³⁶ *Oversight of Fraud and Misuse of Federal Funds in Minnesota: Part 1*, 119th Cong. 2. (Jan. 7, 2026) (Voice Vote on Motion to Direct the Committee to Authorize and Issue Subpoenas for Leslie H. Wexner, Darren K. Indyke, and Richard D. Kahn to Appear for a Deposition).

³⁷ Email from David E. Kendall to Committee counsel (Aug. 13, 2025, at 11:44AM).

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025).

⁴⁰ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Oct. 6, 2025).

⁴¹ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025).

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ *Id.*

ed purposes of the Committee’s investigation.”⁴⁵ On November 21, 2025, the Oversight Committee replied to Mr. Kendall that Secretary Clinton must provide in-person testimony to the Oversight Committee.⁴⁶ On December 10, 2025, Mr. Kendall replied to the Oversight Committee’s November 21 letter, again arguing that Secretary Clinton has “no relevant information justifying a deposition.”⁴⁷

Following numerous letters, phone calls, and email correspondence, on December 12, 2025, Secretary Clinton indicated she was unable to testify on December 18, 2025, due to her attendance at a friend’s funeral.⁴⁸ Mr. Kendall instead raised the prospect of Secretary Clinton testifying on December 25, 2025.⁴⁹ Oversight Committee counsel stated that the Oversight Committee was unable to depose Secretary Clinton on Christmas Day but would accommodate any date during the weeks of January 5–9 or January 12–16, 2026.⁵⁰ Mr. Kendall stated he was unable to commit to his client appearing during those weeks.⁵¹

On December 15, 2025, the Oversight Committee sent another letter to address each of the claims in Mr. Kendall’s December 10, 2025, letter.⁵² The letter accommodated Secretary Clinton’s request to postpone the deposition scheduled for December 18, 2025, in light of her friend’s memorial service.⁵³

The Oversight Committee rescheduled Secretary Clinton’s deposition for January 14, 2026.⁵⁴ The Oversight Committee further gave notice to Mr. Kendall that, should Secretary Clinton fail to comply with the subpoena on the new date, the Oversight Committee would move immediately to initiate contempt of Congress proceedings.⁵⁵

On January 3, 2026, Mr. Kendall sent a letter in response to the Oversight Committee’s letter, arguing that a deposition would be “unfair” to Secretary Clinton.⁵⁶ Mr. Kendall attached to the letter another letter setting forth what Secretary Clinton could state in a sworn written declaration.⁵⁷ The letter was from Mr. Kendall himself, not Secretary Clinton. Mr. Kendall once again claimed that the Oversight Committee’s decision to allow other subpoenaed individuals to submit sworn statements instead of appearing to give live testimony should be extended to Secretary Clinton as well

⁴⁵ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

⁴⁶ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Nov. 21, 2025).

⁴⁷ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Dec. 10, 2025).

⁴⁸ Email from Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 12, 2025, at 5:05PM).

⁴⁹ *Id.*; Phone Calls from Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 12, 2025, at 2:35PM, 3:07PM, 4:41PM). Phone Call from David E. Kendall, to Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, (Dec. 12, 2025, at 2:34PM, 4:15PM).

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 15, 2025).

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ *Id.*

⁵⁶ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 3, 2026).

⁵⁷ *Id.*

since she had “no relationship whatsoever to the law enforcement efforts” involved in the Epstein investigation.⁵⁸

On January 8, 2026, the Oversight Committee replied to Mr. Kendall by letter for a fourth time to reiterate that it alone sets the terms for how investigations are conducted, including, but not limited to, which witnesses to interview, in what order to interview them, and whether or not to compel testimony in any time, place, and manner of its own choosing.⁵⁹ The letter pointed out that counsel, yet again, failed to include any legal arguments for why the Oversight Committee’s subpoena was invalid, instead relying on insufficient political and prudential arguments.⁶⁰ To address the concern about the Oversight Committee’s “intense and myopic focus” on the Clintons, the Oversight Committee noted in its letter that of the ten individuals subpoenaed to testify pursuant to this investigation—individuals continually brought up by counsel—only two had defied their subpoenas from the Oversight Committee: President Clinton and Secretary Clinton.⁶¹ Finally, the Oversight Committee clarified that if Secretary Clinton failed to appear for her respective deposition, it would “leave the Committee no choice but to initiate contempt of Congress proceedings.”⁶²

On January 12, 2026, Mr. Kendall and new counsel from Jenner & Block transmitted one final, last-minute letter raising arguments as to why Secretary Clinton should not be required to sit for a deposition before the Oversight Committee. They asserted—yet again—that Secretary Clinton has “no information pertinent to the . . . investigation.”⁶³ The letter was sent to the Oversight Committee at 11:02 p.m. EST approximately thirty-six hours before Secretary Clinton was scheduled to appear to testify at her deposition—and mere hours before President Clinton’s deposition.⁶⁴

On the morning of January 14, 2026, Secretary Clinton failed to comply with a congressional subpoena by not appearing to testify at this deposition.⁶⁵ The day prior, 13 minutes after President Clinton was required to appear for his deposition, Secretary Clinton, with President Clinton, emailed a written declaration to the Oversight Committee, outlining what she deemed to be all relevant information sought by the Committee.⁶⁶ However, the Oversight Committee had expressly stated on numerous occasions prior to January 13, 2026, that a written statement in lieu of live testimony would not be sufficient and that Secretary Clinton was required to appear for her deposition.⁶⁷

⁵⁸ *Id.*

⁵⁹ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

⁶² *Id.*

⁶³ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026, at 11:02PM).

⁶⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁵ Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, Chairman Comer: Chairman Comer: Bill and Hillary Clinton Are Not Above the Law (Jan. 14, 2026).

⁶⁶ Letter from Former President William J. Clinton & Former Sec’y of State Hillary R. Clinton to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 13, 2026).

⁶⁷ See Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025); Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Nov. 21, 2025); Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 15, 2025); and Letter from

Continued

In her statement, among other things, Secretary Clinton acknowledged that she had interacted with Ms. Maxwell. By way of explanation, she declared that Ms. Maxwell “began a personal relationship” with a “mutual friend” while Secretary Clinton knew her but failed to identify this “mutual friend.”⁶⁸ Secretary Clinton also asserted that during her time in public office, “I never had any responsibility for, or involvement with, the Department of Justice’s handling of the Epstein and Maxwell investigations or prosecutions. Furthermore, as a private citizen after leaving office in January 2013, I did not direct, oversee or participate in the handling of the investigations or prosecutions of the Epstein or Maxwell cases.”⁶⁹ Nowhere in the declaration, however, did Secretary Clinton address whether she had knowledge from her tenure as Secretary of State of federal government efforts to combat international sex-trafficking operations, a topic of interest specifically identified by the Committee in the cover letter accompanying her original subpoena.

On January 16, 2026, two days after the Oversight Committee noticed the markup of the contempt resolutions for the Clintons, counsel for the Clintons made an offer for the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Oversight Committee to travel to New York to conduct an interview with President Clinton.⁷⁰ The offer implicitly excluded the participation of other members of the Committee and staff attorneys, and precluded any verbatim transcript of the interview, instead the “Chairman and Ranking Member would each be accompanied by a staff member to take notes.”⁷¹ Furthermore, the offer seemingly excluded the Committee from conducting an interview with Secretary Clinton. In exchange for this incredibly limited offer, the Committee would halt its markup of the contempt resolutions and withdraw its subpoenas for both President and Secretary Clinton.⁷²

The Oversight Committee stated that the parameters of this offer, would not “allow the Committee to appropriately further its investigation.”⁷³ In particular, the Committee highlighted that “the lack of an official record, limitations on staff questioning, and the inability for the vast majority of Committee members to attend” were “far outside the normal and well-established operating procedures of the Committee when it conducts compulsory depositions.”⁷⁴ The Committee did agree to “discuss an accommodation on the location,” of both President and Secretary Clinton’s deposition.⁷⁵ Further, the implication in the Clinton’s counsel’s proposal that the Committee would not depose Secretary Clinton raises significant concerns to the Committee’s investigation. The Committee believes that Secretary Clinton’s on-the-record testimony is nec-

⁶⁸ James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

⁶⁹ Letter from Former President William J. Clinton & Former Sec’y of State Hillary R. Clinton to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 13, 2026).

⁷⁰ Letter from Former President William J. Clinton & Former Sec’y of State Hillary R. Clinton to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 13, 2026).

⁷¹ Email from Jon Skladany, to Mark Marin, Staff Dir., H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 16, 2026, at 10:21PM).

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ Email from Mark Marin, Staff Dir., H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to Jon Skladany (Jan. 17, 2026, at 12:11PM).

⁷⁴ *Id.*

⁷⁵ *Id.*

essary for the Committee's investigation given her knowledge from her time as Secretary of State of the federal government's work to counter international sex-trafficking rings, her personal knowledge of Ms. Maxwell, and her family's relationship with Mr. Epstein.

On January 19, 2026, the Clintons' counsel made a counteroffer for which the only notable change was to allow an additional staffer each for the majority and minority, who would be able to ask questions.⁷⁶ Further, this offer maintained the implication that the Committee would not depose Secretary Clinton. The Committee declined this counteroffer because it "fail[ed] to address the previously stated concerns regarding the necessity of an official record and the inability for the vast majority of Committee members to attend."⁷⁷ As of the drafting of this report, the Committee has not received further offers for Secretary Clinton to testify pursuant to the Committee's duly issued subpoenas.

In sum, after more than five months of negotiations with Mr. Kendall and other counsel representing the Clintons, during which the Oversight Committee accommodated Secretary Clinton's scheduling concerns, Secretary Clinton still chose to defy her subpoena and failed to appear to testify before Congress. As the events described above make clear, the Oversight Committee's efforts to persuade Secretary Clinton to comply with its duly issued deposition subpoena have reached a dead end.

C. SECRETARY CLINTON'S PURPORTED REASONS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE SUBPOENA ARE WITHOUT MERIT

Through counsel, Secretary Clinton has offered several bases for her defiance of the Oversight Committee's subpoena, particularly in her letter to the Oversight Committee, dated January 12, 2026.⁷⁸ Secretary Clinton contends the Oversight Committee's subpoena is "invalid and legally unenforceable" because: (i) the Oversight Committee shows "no connection to a valid legislative purpose,"⁷⁹ (ii) the subpoena is "an effort to publicly harass and embarrass . . . Secretary Clinton,"⁸⁰ (iii) the subpoena is an impermissible exercise of law enforcement authority committed to coordinate branches of government,⁸¹ and (iv) the subpoena "run[s] afoul of the separation of powers doctrine."⁸² These excuses, most of which were largely recycled from communications that took place throughout the months of negotiation outlined above, are unpersuasive and rejected by the Oversight Committee.

i. The subpoena seeks testimony related to a valid legislative purpose

Through counsel, Secretary Clinton has attempted to argue her way out of the subpoena by claiming it was invalid because it served no legislative purpose and that her testimony was not intended to inform Congress in an area where legislation may be

⁷⁶Email from Ashley Callen, to Mark Marin, Staff Dir., H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 19, 2026, at 1:31PM).

⁷⁷Email from Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to Ashley Callen (Jan. 19, 2026, at 7:11PM).

⁷⁸Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

⁷⁹*Id.*

⁸⁰*Id.*

⁸¹*Id.*

⁸²*Id.*

had.⁸³ Before addressing that specific argument, it is important to recognize the breadth of the Oversight Committee's oversight authority. The Supreme Court has recognized that Congress holds an essential responsibility to perform rigorous oversight,⁸⁴ stating that "[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."⁸⁵ So, for example, to develop legislative reforms designed to combat sex trafficking, it is entirely reasonable for Congress to closely examine the large sex-trafficking ring run by Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell and the methods that they used to avoid detection and accountability for so many years. It is also reasonable for Congress to examine efforts by the federal government to combat international sex trafficking.

In addition, House rule X further grants the Oversight Committee *broad oversight jurisdiction*, including authority to "conduct investigations of any matter" at "any time."⁸⁶ That includes broad jurisdiction over federal "[g]overnment management" and reform, including the "[o]verall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities."⁸⁷

Here, the Oversight Committee's investigative and legislative purposes for issuing a subpoena to Secretary Clinton have been made exhaustingly clear to her counsel: the Oversight Committee is investigating (i) the alleged mismanagement of the investigation into Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell, (ii) the circumstances and subsequent investigations of Mr. Epstein's death, (iii) the operation of sex-trafficking rings and ways for the federal government to effectively combat them, (iv) ways in which Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell sought to curry favor and exercise influence to protect their illegal activities, and (v) potential violations of ethics rules related to elected officials. The potential legislative reforms that may be impacted by the investigation include, but are not limited to, (i) improving federal efforts to combat sex trafficking, (ii) increasing certain ethical requirements on current and former elected officials, and (iii) reforming the use of non-prosecution agreements and/or plea agreements in sex-crime investigations.

While Secretary Clinton has also claimed that her testimony would have no "pertinence to the stated purpose of the Committee's investigation,"⁸⁸ that argument is unavailing for at least two reasons. First, given her service as Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton is in a position to provide firsthand information regarding efforts by the federal government to combat international sex trafficking. For example, what tools does the State Department have to foster international cooperation in addressing international sex trafficking and how does it utilize them? This is information that would be useful for Congress in considering legislative reforms to combat international sex-trafficking rings.

⁸³ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026) (quoting *Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 506 (1975)).

⁸⁴ See generally *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 174; *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 178.

⁸⁵ *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 174.

⁸⁶ Rule X, cl. 4(c)(2), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025); Rule X(A)(n)(4, 10), Rules of the H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, 119th Cong. (2025) (emphasis added).

⁸⁷ Rule X, cl. 1(n), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

⁸⁸ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

Second, there is substantial evidence that the Clinton family had relationships with both Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell for many years during the time when they were operating a sex-trafficking ring.⁸⁹ It is likely no accident that Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell maintained close relationships with powerful and influential people such as the Clinton family while they were operating a sex-trafficking ring. Those relationships were probably intended to shield their activities from scrutiny.

For example, while Secretary Clinton was running for the U.S. Senate in New York in 2000, Mr. Epstein contributed \$20,000 to her campaign.⁹⁰ She then served as the U.S. Senator from 2001 to 2009, the exact time period in which President Clinton claims in his own statement to the Oversight Committee to have had a relationship with Mr. Epstein of which his wife, Secretary Clinton, presumably would have been aware.⁹¹

Moreover, both Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell were involved with the Clinton Foundation, where Secretary Clinton served on the board of directors and was directly involved with many of the foundation's initiatives.⁹² For example, in 2006, the Clinton Foundation received a \$25,000 donation from the C.O.U.Q. Foundation, "a charity organization formerly run by Mr. Epstein."⁹³ Additionally, in a 2007 letter to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida, Mr. Epstein's lawyers claimed that Mr. Epstein helped start the Clinton Foundation.⁹⁴ And in 2013, Ms. Maxwell was honored by the Clinton Global Initiative at an event, supposedly for her work on ocean conservation.⁹⁵

Further, there is evidence that Secretary Clinton had a social relationship with Ms. Maxwell. For instance, in 2010, Ms. Maxwell was invited to and attended the wedding of Secretary Clinton's daughter Chelsea Clinton.⁹⁶ Secretary Clinton's own declaration even makes clear that she interacted with Ms. Maxwell, suggesting that they met through a mutual friend.⁹⁷

Secretary Clinton is, therefore, in a position to provide information to the Oversight Committee regarding the activities of Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell during the time when they were operating their sex-trafficking ring. And such testimony, for example, could inform the Oversight Committee's knowledge of that sex-trafficking ring or the ways in which Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell sought to use their relationships with influential people to discourage exam-

⁸⁹ Michael Gold, *Bill Clinton and Jeffrey Epstein: How Are They Connected*, THE N.Y. TIMES (July 9, 2019); Kelsey Vlamis, *Ghislaine Maxwell once said she couldn't take a deposition because her mom was sick, but then was photographed at Chelsea Clinton's wedding, lawyers say*, BUSINESS INSIDER (Oct. 22, 2020).

⁹⁰ Soo Rin Kim, *Jeffrey Epstein donated to several Democrats throughout 1990s and early 2000s*, ABC News (July 12, 2019).

⁹¹ Letter from Former President William J. Clinton & Former Sec'y of State Hillary R. Clinton to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 13, 2026).

⁹² Kenneth P. Vogel, *Hillary Clinton quits Clinton Foundation*, POLITICO (Apr. 12, 2015).

⁹³ Michael Gold, *Bill Clinton and Jeffrey Epstein: How Are They Connected*, THE N.Y. TIMES (July 9, 2019).

⁹⁴ Letter from Gerald B. Lefcourt, Law Office of Gerald B. Lefcourt P.C., to Jeffrey Sloman & Matthew Menchel, The U.S. Att'y's Off. S. Dist. of Fla. (July 6, 2007); Malia Zimmerman, *Billionaire sex offender Epstein once claimed he co-founded Clinton Foundation*, FOX NEWS (last updated July 6, 2016).

⁹⁵ Edward Helmore, *Maxwell honored at Clinton event years after sexual abuse allegations emerged*, THE GUARDIAN (Aug. 25, 2025).

⁹⁶ Kelsey Vlamis, *Ghislaine Maxwell once said she couldn't take a deposition because her mom was sick, but then was photographed at Chelsea Clinton's wedding, lawyers say*, BUSINESS INSIDER (Oct. 22, 2020).

⁹⁷ Letter from Former President William J. Clinton & Former Sec'y of State Hillary R. Clinton to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 13, 2026).

ination of their unlawful activities. That testimony, in turn, could inform Congress's consideration of legislative reforms designed to combat sex-trafficking rings and efforts to conceal sex trafficking.

Similarly, Secretary Clinton contends that she should be excused from testifying on the record because of a lack of personal knowledge and instead allowed to submit a written certification lacks merit.⁹⁸ First, Secretary Clinton has not certified that she has no knowledge of federal efforts to combat international sex trafficking, one of the topics specifically identified in the cover letter accompanying her subpoena. Second, unlike the other witnesses subpoenaed by the Oversight Committee, Secretary Clinton could offer testimony in her personal capacity about her time spent with Ms. Maxwell⁹⁹ and those in the orbit of her and Mr. Epstein, including her husband, and her observations. Further, based on her relationship with Ms. Maxwell, and her relationship with President Clinton, she could speak to Mr. Epstein's and Ms. Maxwell's relationship with powerful individuals writ large. President Clinton was a passenger on at least five trips consisting of a total of 26 flights on Mr. Epstein's private airplane, which was allegedly used for sex trafficking.¹⁰⁰ The Oversight Committee presumes Secretary Clinton's familiarity with these facts, and perhaps others that could be uncovered during her deposition. There is no evidence whatsoever that any of the witnesses who were permitted to submit written certifications to the Oversight Committee in lieu of testifying had relationships with Mr. Epstein or Ms. Maxwell.

It is noteworthy that counsel for Secretary Clinton raised this issue, that the duly authorized subpoena is invalid and legally unenforceable, for the first time in their letter to the Oversight Committee on January 12, 2026—the night before the deposition of her husband was set to commence and a day-and-a-half before her scheduled deposition.¹⁰¹ The Oversight Committee negotiated with Secretary Clinton's attorney for more than five months and, despite the numerous back-and-forth emails, calls, and letters during this time, January 12, 2026, was the first time that counsel made a legal claim for invalidity of the subpoenas. In fact, Mr. Kendall had pushed for President Clinton and Secretary Clinton to appear for depositions on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day, respectively, in accordance with the Oversight Committee's duly issued subpoenas.¹⁰² And he previously acknowledged that the Oversight Committee "is entitled to what little information the Clintons have about Epstein and Maxwell."¹⁰³

If Secretary Clinton was serious about this claim, her counsel could have argued the validity of the subpoena at any point during the months of negotiations. Instead, counsel waited until mere

⁹⁸ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Oct. 6, 2025).

⁹⁹ Edward Helmore, *Maxwell honored at Clinton event years after sexual abuse allegations emerged*, THE GUARDIAN (Aug. 25, 2025).

¹⁰⁰ Malia Zimmerman, *Flight logs show Bill Clinton flew on sex offender's jet much more than previously known*, FOX NEWS (last updated May 13, 2016).

¹⁰¹ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

¹⁰² Email from Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 12, 2025, at 5:05PM); Phone Calls from Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 12, 2025, at 2:35PM, 3:07PM, 4:15PM, 4:41PM).

¹⁰³ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Oct. 6, 2025).

hours before her husband's scheduled deposition to make this assertion. The subpoena was duly issued by the Chairman; therefore, the subpoena remains valid and legally enforceable.¹⁰⁴

To reiterate, Secretary Clinton's knowledge of the federal government's efforts to combat international sex trafficking may assist Congress in developing legislative reforms to combat such trafficking, and her potential knowledge about Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell may inform Congress's understanding of their sex-trafficking ring and efforts to curry favor and exercise influence to protect those activities, which, in turn, may assist Congress's exploration of potential legislative remedies to more effectively combat sex trafficking. Therefore, the argument posed by Secretary Clinton's counsel that the Oversight Committee lacks a legitimate legislative purpose to pursue this testimony is not persuasive.

ii. Secretary Clinton was subpoenaed to advance the Oversight Committee's investigation, not to harass or embarrass her

While Mr. Kendall argues that the subpoena is invalid because it is intended to "harass and embarrass" Secretary Clinton,¹⁰⁵ that claim falls far from the mark. As recounted above, the Oversight Committee has continuously and clearly stated the legislative purpose behind its investigation into Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell and its rationale for seeking testimony from Secretary Clinton. Moreover, this argument does not fit the facts here: if the Oversight Committee's purpose was to harass and embarrass Secretary Clinton, that purpose would seem to be best accomplished by subpoenaing her to testify at a public hearing, not a closed-door deposition, which is designed to elicit information from the witness in a private setting.

In support of the harassment claim, Secretary Clinton's counsel alleges that she and President Clinton are being treated differently from other witnesses. Specifically, counsel claims that the Oversight Committee "singl[ed] out the Clintons" by issuing subpoenas to multiple witnesses and not accepting written proffers from the Clintons.¹⁰⁶ It is critical to note that the Oversight Committee sets the terms of its oversight, including deciding which witnesses to interview, in what order to interview them, and whether or not to compel testimony in a time, place, and manner of its own choosing.¹⁰⁷ Federal courts have consistently held that witnesses may not "impose [their] own conditions upon the manner of [congressional] inquiry."¹⁰⁸ That is because "a witness does not have the legal right to dictate the conditions under which he will or will not

¹⁰⁴ Subpoena to Hillary R. Clinton, Former Sec'y of State of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025); Rule XI, cl. 2(k)(6), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025); Rule XI, cl. 2(m)(1)(B), Rules of the U.S. Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

¹⁰⁵ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

¹⁰⁶ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

¹⁰⁷ See, e.g., Todd Garvey, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., LSB11093, COMMITTEE DISCRETION IN OBTAINING WITNESS TESTIMONY (Dec. 22, 2023).

¹⁰⁸ *Eisler v. United States*, 170 F.2d 273, 280 (D.C. Cir. 1948).

testify”¹⁰⁹ or “to prescribe the conditions under which he may be interrogated by Congress.”¹¹⁰

Here, Secretary Clinton is not similarly situated to the other witnesses from whom the Oversight Committee has accepted written certifications. As mentioned above, none of these other witnesses (former Attorneys General and FBI Directors) had a personal relationship with Mr. Epstein or Ms. Maxwell. They were called to testify about knowledge they might have had of the federal government’s investigation and prosecution of Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell. And they were excused from their depositions because they could certify that they had *no* personal knowledge of those investigations and prosecutions to share with the Oversight Committee. As indicated above, there is substantial evidence that, during the time when Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell were operating a sex-trafficking ring, Secretary Clinton did have a personal relationship with Ms. Maxwell, and there were extensive ties between the Clinton family and Mr. Epstein.¹¹¹ In addition, Secretary Clinton has knowledge of federal government efforts to combat international sex trafficking from her years of service in the federal government, especially at the U.S. Department of State.¹¹² Given the combination of these two factors, the Oversight Committee’s decision to demand in-person deposition testimony is, therefore, entirely reasonable, and certainly does not rise to the level of demonstrating that the subpoena is designed to harass and embarrass her.

Moreover, a survey of the Oversight Committee’s investigative activities belies any suggestion that its subpoena is designed to embarrass Secretary Clinton. The Oversight Committee’s broad efforts to conduct a fair investigation are highlighted by the nine other individuals the Oversight Committee subpoenaed the same day as Secretary Clinton,¹¹³ of which only Attorney General Barr, a Republican, sat for a deposition;¹¹⁴ a wide-ranging subpoena to the Department of Justice for documents, again the same day as Secretary Clinton’s subpoena;¹¹⁵ a voluntary transcribed interview with former U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Florida Alex Acosta, again a Republican;¹¹⁶ a subpoena for a deposition of Ms. Maxwell, whose attorney has stated she intends to assert her Fifth

¹⁰⁹ *United States v. Costello*, 198 F.2d 200, 205 (2d Cir. 1952); *see also United States v. Brewster*, 154 F.Supp. 126, 134 (D.D.C. 1957) (finding a witness guilty of Contempt of Congress because “a witness has no right to set his own conditions for testifying”).

¹¹⁰ *United States v. Hintz*, 193 F.Supp. 325, 335 (N.D. Ill. 1961).

¹¹¹ Kelsey Vlamis, *Ghislaine Maxwell once said she couldn’t take a deposition because her mom was sick, but then was photographed at Chelsea Clinton’s wedding, lawyers say*, BUSINESS INSIDER (Oct. 22, 2020); Edward Helmore, *Maxwell honored at Clinton event years after sexual abuse allegations emerged*, THE GUARDIAN (Aug. 25, 2025).

¹¹² Fact Sheet, *Understanding Human Trafficking*, U.S. Dep’t of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (Jan. 20, 2025).

¹¹³ Subpoena to Alberto R. Gonzales, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Eric H. Holder, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Loretta E. Lynch, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Jefferson B. Sessions III, U.S. Former Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to William P. Barr, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Merrick B. Garland, Former U.S. Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Robert S. Mueller III, Dir., Fed. Bureau of Investigation (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to James B. Comey, Dir., Fed. Bureau of Investigation (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to Hillary R. Clinton, Former Sec’y of State of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025); Subpoena to William J. Clinton, Former President of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

¹¹⁴ Deposition of William P. Barr, Former U.S. Att’y Gen. (Aug. 18, 2025).

¹¹⁵ Subpoena to Pamela J. Bondi, Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025).

¹¹⁶ Transcribed Interview of R. Alexander Acosta, Former U.S. Att’y for the S. Dist. of Fla. (Sept. 19, 2025).

Amendment right;¹¹⁷ a subpoena for Mr. Epstein's estate that has led to the Oversight Committee receiving thousands of pages of documents;¹¹⁸ and most recently, three more motions to subpoena Les Wexner, Darren Indyke, and Richard Kahn,¹¹⁹ all of which had personal or business relationships with Mr. Epstein, whom were voice voted by the full Committee.

Neither has the Oversight Committee subpoenaed Secretary Clinton to expose her private affairs for the sake of exposure. While her counsel argues that the Supreme Court has "long invalidated such freewheeling hunts that 'inquir[e] into the private affairs of the citizen,'"¹²⁰ that is not the purpose of this subpoena. As an initial matter, the Committee has already explained in its letters to Secretary Clinton's counsel, how Secretary Clinton's testimony is relevant to its oversight investigation, including knowledge that she would have gained from her service as Secretary of State. Moreover, the Oversight Committee has shown that there is evidence connecting Secretary Clinton to Ms. Maxwell and her family to Mr. Epstein at the time that they were operating a sex-trafficking ring.¹²¹ This is no "freewheeling hunt," but a targeted subpoena.

iii. The subpoena is not an impermissible exercise of law enforcement authority committed to coordinate branches of government and the existence of a Department of Justice investigation into Mr. Epstein's and Ms. Maxwell's sex-trafficking ring does not relieve Secretary Clinton of her obligation to appear for a deposition

Contrary to the claims of Secretary Clinton's counsel,¹²² the subpoena to Secretary Clinton was issued as part of a legislative oversight investigation, not a law enforcement effort. The Oversight Committee is not, nor has it ever claimed to be, a criminal investigative body. As discussed above, the Committee is investigating to gather information to determine whether legislative reforms are necessary, including to more effectively combat sex trafficking. It is not seeking to assess whether any individuals, including Secretary Clinton, violated the law. Secretary Clinton's knowledge of federal government efforts to combat international sex trafficking is pertinent to the Oversight Committee's investigation. Additionally, the evidence discussed above indicates that Secretary Clinton had a relationship with Ms. Maxwell and her family had a close relationship with Mr. Epstein. Issuing a subpoena to Secretary Clinton was not a "freewheeling hunt" of a private citizen, nor was it a law enforcement operation.¹²³ Instead, the subpoena was a natural next

¹¹⁷ Subpoena to Ghislaine Maxwell (July 23, 2025); Hailey Fuchs, *Ghislaine Maxwell will plead Fifth in House Epstein probe, Comer says*, POLITICO (Nov. 21, 2025).

¹¹⁸ Subpoena to the Estate of Jeffrey Epstein (Aug. 25, 2025).

¹¹⁹ *Oversight of Fraud and Misuse of Federal Funds in Minnesota: Part 1*, 119th Cong. 2. (Jan. 7, 2026) (Voice Vote on Motion to Direct the Committee to Authorize and Issue Subpoenas for Leslie H. Wexner, Darren K. Indyke, and Richard D. Kahn to Appear for a Deposition).

¹²⁰ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026) (quoting *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 195 (1880)).

¹²¹ Michael Gold, *Bill Clinton and Jeffrey Epstein: How Are They Connected*, THE N.Y. TIMES (July 9, 2019); Dan Adler, *From Jeffrey Epstein's Home to a Bill Clinton Dinner, More Details About Ghislaine Maxwell Emerge*, VANITY FAIR (Sept. 24, 2020).

¹²² Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

¹²³ *Id.* (quoting *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 195 (1880)).

step to gathering information as part of a larger effort to craft legislation to combat sex trafficking.

Secretary Clinton's counsel has also invoked concerns about a Department of Justice investigation related to Epstein and Maxwell, stating that "[n]o responsible attorney would allow a client to testify in any Legislative Branch [sic] proceeding while this investigation . . . continues."¹²⁴ The Supreme Court has recognized that Congress's oversight authority is not restricted by ongoing civil and criminal investigations, including those initiated by the Department of Justice.¹²⁵ And to the extent that witnesses, including Secretary Clinton, are concerned that answers to the Oversight Committee's questions could incriminate themselves, they are permitted to assert their Fifth Amendment right on a question-by-question basis during their deposition. Here, however, the Committee notes that any decision by Secretary Clinton to invoke the Fifth Amendment during a deposition would appear to be at odds with the representations made by her counsel to the Oversight Committee regarding the nature of her relationships with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell.

iv. The separation of powers does not render the subpoena unenforceable

Counsel's final contention, that the subpoenas "potentially run afoul of the separation of powers doctrine,"¹²⁶ does not provide a justification for declining to attend the deposition. At most, raising separation-of-powers issues serves as a defense for whether to answer a specific question posed by the Oversight Committee, not whether to *appear* before the Oversight Committee. As Secretary Clinton has failed to appear for her deposition, the issue of potential separation-of-powers concerns is moot.

While the Clinton's attorney did not directly assert a separation-of-powers defense for Secretary Clinton, the Oversight Committee notes that President Clinton and Secretary Clinton "have been private citizens for the last 24 and 12 years, respectively."¹²⁷ Secretary Clinton interacted with Ms. Maxwell in her personal capacity as a private citizens, and her husband maintained a relationship with Mr. Epstein in his personal capacity as a private citizen.¹²⁸ Additionally, there is no valid separation-of-powers concern with Secretary Clinton appearing for a deposition to provide the Oversight Committee generally with her knowledge of federal government efforts to combat sex-trafficking operations. Therefore,

¹²⁴ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 3, 2026).

¹²⁵ In *Sinclair v. United States*, 279 U.S. 263 (1929), the Court noted that the pendency of litigation does not stop Congress's ability to investigate. In that case, the Court held that Congress's authority "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" civil or criminal suits. *Sinclair*, 279 U.S. at 295. Similarly, in *Hutcheson v. United States*, 369 U.S. 599 (1962), the Court explained that "a congressional committee . . . 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 . . . or when crime or wrongdoing is exposed." *Hutcheson*, 369 U.S. at 618.

¹²⁶ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

¹²⁷ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

¹²⁸ Michael Gold, *Bill Clinton and Jeffrey Epstein: How Are They Connected*, THE N.Y. TIMES (July 9, 2019); Kelsey Vlamis, *Ghislaine Maxwell once said she couldn't take a deposition because her mom was sick, but then was photographed at Chelsea Clinton's wedding, lawyers say*, BUSINESS INSIDER (Oct. 22, 2020).

counsel's attempt to raise separation-of-powers issues provides no defense here and, in any event, issues of applicable privileges should have been raised in a deposition setting on a question-by-question basis.

**D. PRECEDENT SUPPORTS THE COMMITTEE'S POSITION TO PROCEED
WITH HOLDING SECRETARY CLINTON IN CONTEMPT**

The Supreme Court has repeatedly noted that “the power to investigate is inherent in the power to make laws because ‘[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.’”¹²⁹ Further, “[w]here the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who do possess it. Experience has taught that mere requests for such information often are unavailing, and also that information which is volunteered is not always accurate or complete; so some means of compulsion are essential to obtain what is needed.”¹³⁰ Accordingly, 2 U.S.C. § 192 provides that a witness summoned before Congress must appear or be “deemed guilty of a misdemeanor” punishable by a fine of up to \$100,000 and imprisonment for up to one year.¹³¹ Like any “ordinary federal criminal statute,” 2 U.S.C. § 192 “requires a criminal intent—in this instance, a deliberate, intentional refusal to answer.”¹³²

Congress has held individuals in contempt for failing to comply with duly issued subpoenas. In the 116th and 117th Congress, the Democrat-controlled House “approved six criminal contempt of Congress citations” for such misconduct.¹³³ In fact, after congressional Democrats held White House officials Stephen Bannon and Peter Navarro in contempt of Congress, the Department of Justice successfully pursued criminal charges against them.¹³⁴ In the 118th Congress, under Republican control, the House voted to hold Attorney General Merrick Garland in contempt of Congress; however, the Biden Department of Justice—headed by Merrick Garland—declined to pursue criminal charges.¹³⁵ Additionally, during the 118th Congress, the Oversight Committee adopted a resolution recommending the House find Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress for his refusal to comply with a lawful subpoena, but this resolution was not voted on by the full House because Hunter Biden ultimately agreed to testify before the Oversight Committee.¹³⁶

¹²⁹ *Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 504 (1975) (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 175).

¹³⁰ *Eastland*, 421 U.S. at 504–05.

¹³¹ The prison term for this offense makes it a Class A misdemeanor. 18 U.S.C. § 3559(a)(6). By that classification, the penalty for contempt of Congress specified in 2 U.S.C. § 192 increased from \$1,000 to \$100,000. 18 U.S.C. § 3571(b)(5).

¹³² *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 165 (1955).

¹³³ Todd Garvey, CONG. RSCH. SERV., LSB10974, CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS, 3 (2023).

¹³⁴ Press Release, U.S. Dep't of Just., Former White House Advisor Convicted of Contempt of Congress (Sept. 7, 2023); Press Release, U.S. Dep't of Just., Stephen K. Bannon Found Guilty by Jury of Two Counts of Contempt of Congress (July 22, 2022).

¹³⁵ Rebecca Beitsch, *Republicans vote to hold Garland in contempt of Congress*, THE HILL (June 12, 2024).

¹³⁶ Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Oversight Committee Approves Resolution Recommending the House of Representatives Find Hunter Biden in Contempt of Congress (Jan. 10, 2024); H. COMM. ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVT REFORM, RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN IN CONTEMPT OF CON-

Continued

Secretary Clinton has not properly asserted any claims of privilege, nor has she asserted any basis for immunity from answering questions. In correspondence with her attorney prior to the scheduled date of the deposition, the Oversight Committee addressed and rejected Secretary Clinton's justifications for not complying with the terms of the subpoena.¹³⁷ The Oversight Committee specifically notified Secretary Clinton, via her attorney, that her failure to appear for the deposition as required by the subpoena would lead to the Oversight Committee initiating contempt of Congress proceedings.¹³⁸ Secretary Clinton's failure to appear for the deposition in the face of this clear advisement and warning by the Oversight Committee constitutes a willful failure to comply with the subpoena under 2 U.S.C. § 192.

CONCLUSION

The Oversight Committee has attempted for more than five months to convince Secretary Clinton to comply with its deposition subpoena. However, Secretary Clinton has made clear that she will not appear for her deposition and she has not offered any valid legal justification for refusing to do so. Secretary Clinton's actions have impeded an Oversight Committee investigation and its ability to perform its Constitutional oversight duties. Secretary Clinton's willful refusal to comply with the Oversight Committee's subpoena constitutes contempt of Congress and warrants referral to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia for prosecution as prescribed by law.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On January 21, 2026, the Committee met in open session, and with a quorum being present, to consider this Report, and adopted by voice vote an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Chairman James Comer that made certain technical edits as well as adding language describing negotiations between the Committee and Secretary Clinton and further language addressing Secretary Clinton's role as Secretary of State and the insight that position affords into international sex trafficking, and ordered the Report and the Resolution contained herein to be favorably reported, as amended, to the House by a recorded vote of 28 ayes to 15 noes, with 1 voting present.

ROLL CALL VOTES

In compliance with clause 3(b) of House rule XIII, the Committee states that the following recorded votes occurred during the Committee's consideration of the Report:

1. A motion by Chairman James Comer to report the Report for a Resolution Recommending That the House of Representatives

GRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY (Jan. 2024).

¹³⁷See Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025); Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Nov. 21, 2025); Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 15, 2025); Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

¹³⁸Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform to David E. Kendall (Dec. 15, 2025); Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

Find Hillary R. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform favorably to the House, as amended, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 28 ayes to 15 noes, with 1 voting present (Rollcall No. 4).

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

119TH CONGRESS

RATIO 25-21 (1 VACANCY)

ROLL CALL

Vote on: Favorably Reporting the Hillary R. Clinton Contempt Report

Date: 1/21/2026

VOTE #: 4

Republicans	Aye	No	Present	Democrats	Aye	No	Present
MR. COMER (KY) <i>(Chairman)</i>	X			MR. GARCIA (CA) <i>(Ranking Member)</i>		X	
MR. JORDAN (OH)	X			MS. NORTON (DC)		X	
MR. TURNER (OH)	X			MR. LYNCH (MA)		X	
MR. GOSAR (AZ)	X			MR. KRISHNAMOORTHI (IL)		X	
MS. FOXX (NC)	X			MR. KHANNA (CA)		X	
MR. GROTHMAN (WI)	X			MR. MFUME (MD)		X	
MR. CLOUD (TX)	X			MS. BROWN (OH)		X	
MR. PALMER (AL)	X			MS. STANSBURY (NM)	X		
MR. HIGGINS (LA)	X			MR. FROST (FL)		X	
MR. SESSIONS (TX)	X			MS. LEE of PENNSYLVANIA (PA)	X		
MR. BIGGS (AZ)	X			MR. CASAR (TX)			
MS. MACE (SC)	X			MS. CROCKETT (TX)			
MR. FALLON (TX)	X			MS. RANDALL (WA)		X	
MR. DONALDS (FL)	X			MR. SUBRAMANYAM (VA)		X	
MR. PERRY (PA)	X			MS. ANSARI (AZ)		X	
MR. TIMMONS (SC)	X			MR. BELL (MO)		X	
MR. BURCHETT (TN)	X			MS. SIMON (CA)		X	
MS. BOEBERT (CO)	X			MR. MIN (CA)			X
MRS. LUNA (FL)	X			MR. WALKINSHAW (VA)		X	
MR. LANGWORTHY (NY)	X			MS. PRESSLEY (MA)		X	
MR. BURLISON (MO)	X			MS. TLAIB (MI)	X		
MR. CRANE (AZ)	X						
MR. JACK (GA)	X						
MR. MCGUIRE (VA)	X						
MR. GILL (TX)	X						
VACANCY							

Roll Call Totals:

Ayes: 28

Nays: 15

Present: 1

Passed: X

Failed:

STATEMENT OF OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII and clause (2)(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's findings and recommendations are incorporated in the descriptive portions of this Report.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Committee states that pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this Report is to enforce the Committee's duly issued subpoena to obtain testimony and recommend holding former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in contempt of congress.

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(5) of House rule XIII, no provision of this Report establishes or reauthorizes a program of the federal government known to be duplicative of another federal program.

EARMARK IDENTIFICATION

This Report does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

The Committee finds the requirements of clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII and section 308(a) of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974*, and the requirements of clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII and section 402 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974*, to be inapplicable to this Report. Accordingly, the Committee did not request or receive a cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office and makes no findings as to the budgetary impacts of this Report or costs incurred to carry out the Report.

MINORITY VIEWS

Oversight Democrats strongly oppose the Majority's resolution recommending that the House of Representatives cite Hillary R. Clinton for contempt of Congress.

Oversight Democrats have been, and remain, steadfastly committed to pursuing the facts surrounding Jeffrey Epstein's and Ghislaine Maxwell's horrific crimes from any and all sources of relevant information. Oversight Democrats are committed to working to secure sworn testimony from Secretary Clinton.

This resolution, however, is above all an attempt to distract the American public from Oversight Republicans' wholesale failure to conduct a serious investigation or to secure justice for the survivors of Epstein's crimes. The Majority has selectively fixated on William "Bill" Clinton, former president of the United States, and Hillary Clinton, former secretary of state—in accordance with the expressed wishes of President Trump, who has characterized this Committee's investigation as a "Democratic hoax" and ordered the Attorney General Pamela J. Bondi to target his political enemies—while ignoring numerous other witnesses and sources of probative information. These potential witnesses and sources of probative information include President Donald Trump himself, who continues to use the power of the Presidency to forcefully resist and oppose transparency or accountability in the Epstein case.

Oversight Republicans have likewise failed to take any action in response to Attorney General Pam Bondi's flagrant disregard of the subpoena this Committee issued to the Department of Justice (DOJ) for the complete Epstein files. To date, DOJ has produced only a relative handful of materials pursuant to the subpoena, while admitting that it has more than five million pages of Epstein-related documents that it has not yet produced—even though more than five months have passed since this Committee issued a subpoena to DOJ for those materials, and despite numerous requests to DOJ from Oversight Democrats for clarification as to when DOJ expects to complete its production.¹ Moreover, rather than seeking testimony from known individuals who had long-standing ties to Epstein—including President Trump—the Majority, tellingly, has opted to focus on two prominent former Democratic officials—one of whom, Secretary Clinton, plainly lacks first-hand knowledge regarding Epstein's crimes.²

¹Department of Justice Is Reviewing Over 5.2 Million Jeffrey Epstein Files, PBS News (Dec. 31, 2025) (online at www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/department-of-justice-is-reviewing-over-5-2-million-jeffrey-epstein-files); Subpoena to The Hon. Pamela J. Bondi (Aug. 5, 2025) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025.08.05-Subpoena-and-Schedule-to-DOJ.pdf>).

²House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Republicans, *Press Release: Chairman Comer Subpoenas Bill and Hillary Clinton, Former U.S. Attorneys General and FBI Directors, and Records Related to Jeffrey Epstein*, (Aug. 5, 2025) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/release/chairman-comer-subpoenas-bill-and-hillary-clinton-former-u-s-attorneys-general-and-fbi-directors-and-records-related-to-jeffrey-epstein/>).

The Minority believes that this committee's resources would be far better spent, and the interests of Epstein's survivors and the American people in transparency and justice far better served, by a genuine, bipartisan effort to pursue the truth. Sadly, this proceeding, which is driven by a blatantly partisan effort to target the Clintons, falls far short of this goal.

I. CRIMINAL CONTEMPT IS WARRANTED AGAINST ATTORNEY GENERAL PAM BONDI, WHO HAS BRAZENLY DEFIED THIS COMMITTEE'S SUBPOENA AND FAILED TO PRODUCE THE EPSTEIN FILES

While relentlessly pursuing the Clintons, the Majority has failed to take any action to obtain the millions of pages of Epstein-related documents that this Committee directed Attorney General Bondi to produce pursuant to a duly issued subpoena five months ago. Though those materials would unquestionably shed significant light on Epstein's criminal enterprise and the individuals connected to it, the Majority has opted to ignore DOJ's non-compliance with its subpoena and, relatedly, its total failure to comply with the Epstein Files Transparency Act. Instead, the Majority has focused selectively and exclusively on two former Democratic officials—one of whom, according to Oversight Republicans' own characterization, lacks significant knowledge regarding Epstein.

On August 5, 2025, this Committee issued a subpoena to Attorney General Bondi in her official capacity, requiring her to produce seven categories of documents and communications relating to Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. The subpoena unambiguously required Attorney General Bondi to do so no later than August 19, 2025.³ DOJ made a single production of approximately 33,000 pages of documents to the Committee on August 22, 2025, all of which, were already public.⁴ DOJ has made no additional productions pursuant to the subpoena since that time.

Moreover, the agency has failed to provide specific information in response to repeated requests from Democratic Oversight staff as to DOJ's anticipated timetable for completing its production.⁵ Significantly, the agency's blanket refusal to provide meaningful detail to the Committee about its compliance with the subpoena stands in sharp contrast to the Clintons, whose counsel engaged in substantive correspondence with Committee staff, unilaterally offered information about the scope of their knowledge, and negotiated with the staff over their appearance before the Committee following the issuance of their subpoenas.⁶

³ Subpoena to The Hon. Pamela J. Bondi (Aug. 5, 2025) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025.08.05-Subpoena-and-Schedule-to-DOJ.pdf>).

⁴ *House Oversight Panel Releases Some Epstein Files as Pressure Mounts*, New York Times (Sept. 2, 2025) (online at www.nytimes.com/2025/09/02/us/politics/epstein-files-release-house-oversight.html).

⁵ Emails from Committee Staff to Department of Justice dated Aug. 22, 2025, Aug. 26, 2025, Sept. 10, 2025, and Oct. 8, 2025 (on file with Committee).

⁶ See *Clinton Say Comer Is "Lying With Impunity" About Epstein Inquiry, Release Written Declarations*, ABC News (Jan. 14, 2026) (online at <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/clintons-comer-lying-impunity-epstein-inquiry-release-written/story?id=129223202>); Report, *Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to the Committee Report for the Resolution Recommending That the House of Representatives Find Former President of the United States William J. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply With a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform at 8-12*; Report, *Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to the Committee Report for the Resolution Recommending That the House of Representatives*

Continued

In a clear sign that DOJ may have failed to even undertake preliminary steps necessary to comply with the Committee's subpoena, the limited release of files under the Epstein Files Transparency Act indicates that the Department failed to take adequate steps to even determine the number of Epstein-related documents in its possession. In December 2025—while searching for documents to publicize in compliance with the Epstein Files Transparency Act, not the Committee's subpoena—DOJ abruptly announced that it had discovered a new tranche of more than one million potentially relevant documents within the agency.⁷ In January 2026, however, DOJ provided yet another estimate to a federal district court, reporting that “there are more than 2 million documents potentially responsive to the [Epstein Files Transparency] Act that are in various phases of review.”⁸ In addition, DOJ reportedly has sought to recruit additional DOJ staff to review what it identified as *5.2 million* additional pages.⁹

The approximately 33,000 documents that DOJ has produced pursuant to the subpoena to date plainly constitute a minuscule fraction of the responsive documents that DOJ has acknowledged having in its possession. These facts raise the question of whether Attorney General Bondi ever intended to comply with the Committee's subpoena originally issued in August of 2025. Had DOJ been conducting a fulsome and comprehensive search for documents in response to the Committee's subpoena, these additional documents would have been discovered long before December.

The criminal contempt statute, 2 U.S.C. § 192, provides for criminal penalties against any person who “willfully makes default” on their obligation to “produce papers upon any matter under inquiry” by Congress pursuant to subpoena. Unlike the Clintons, Attorney General Bondi's conduct satisfies this standard. Not only has Attorney General Bondi come nowhere near to meeting her obligation to produce the materials covered by this Committee's subpoena, but she has also ignored the staff's repeated requests for information about DOJ's compliance, and has failed even to ensure that DOJ has in place sufficient processes to ascertain the scope of relevant documents, despite having those materials in its possession for years. These failures more plausibly reflect a conscious choice to ignore Congress's lawfully issued subpoena than mere inadvertence or negligence. Hence, Attorney General Bondi has plainly violated

Find Former United States Secretary of State Hillary R. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply With a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform at 8-12.

⁷DOJ Says It Could Take “A Few More Weeks” to Process Epstein Files After Receiving More Than 1 Million Additional Docs, NBC News (Dec. 24, 2025) (online at www.nbcnews.com/politics/justice-department/doj-weeks-process-epstein-files-1-million-additional-documents-fbi-rcna250847).

⁸Letter from Pamela Bondi, Attorney General, Todd Blanche, Deputy Attorney General, and Jay Clayton, Attorney, Southern District of New York, to The Hon. Paul A. Engelmayer, United States District Judge, at 2 (Jan. 5, 2026) (online at <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nysd.539612/gov.uscourts.nysd.539612.826.0.pdf>); see also DOJ Says Millions of Epstein Files Have Yet to be Released, Politico (Jan. 5, 2026) (online at www.politico.com/news/2026/01/05/doj-epstein-files-timing-delays-00712169).

⁹Justice Dept. Is Now Said to Be Reviewing 5.2 Million Pages of Epstein Files, New York Times (Dec. 30, 2025) (online at www.nytimes.com/2025/12/30/us/politics/espein-files-5-million-pages.html).

her obligations under the subpoena “willfully,” as the statute requires.¹⁰

Rather than pursue this overt instance of congressional contempt, the Majority has opted instead to ignore and deny it, to make the Clintons the focus of this Committee’s time and resources, and attempt to distract from their own and the Trump DOJ’s failure to investigate this matter competently and from President Donald Trump’s own obvious and extensive ties to Jeffrey Epstein, as set forth below.

II. THIS RESOLUTION IS A PATENT ATTEMPT TO DISTRACT FROM THE MAJORITY’S FAILURE TO CONDUCT A SERIOUS INVESTIGATION INTO EPSTEIN’S CRIMES

Oversight Republicans, acting at the direction of President Trump, have failed to conduct a serious and thorough investigation of Jeffrey Epstein’s crimes, opting instead to protect the White House and mislead the public. The Majority’s singling out of the Clintons through these contempt proceedings reflects its aim to place politics above justice for Epstein’s victims and truth for the American people.

Further demonstrating the Republicans’ partisan objectives are their failure to pursue several other areas of inquiry from sources that would very likely shed significant light on Epstein’s and Maxwell’s crimes and the government’s investigation and prosecution of both. As discussed above, the Majority has refused to make any serious efforts to enforce this Committee’s subpoena to DOJ or the Epstein Files Transparency Act and obtain the millions of pages of Epstein-related documents in DOJ’s possession. The Majority has likewise ignored President Trump’s years-long and evidently close relationship to Epstein and failed to pursue multiple witnesses with firsthand knowledge regarding Epstein and Maxwell.

1. THE MAJORITY’S FAILURE TO SEEK INFORMATION FROM PRESIDENT TRUMP

It is well established, through public reporting, materials produced to the Committee by Epstein’s estate, and President Trump’s own statements, that President Trump had close personal ties to Epstein for several years—including the period of time during which Epstein and Maxwell engaged in sex trafficking and sexual abuse.¹¹ Despite this extensive evidentiary record, the Majority has made no effort whatsoever to question or otherwise obtain information from President Trump regarding Epstein and Maxwell. Remarkably, while the Majority’s letters enclosing its subpoenas to the Clintons claimed that a deposition was necessary “[g]iven [President Clinton’s] past relationships with Mr. Epstein and Ms.

¹⁰See *Wheeldin v. United States*, 283 F.2d 535 (9th Cir. 1960) (noting that to satisfy the willfulness requirement under § 192, “evil intent is not necessary, and . . . a deliberate and conscious intent to disobey the subpoena is all that is needed”).

¹¹*Trump’s History with Jeffrey Epstein: Here’s The Full Timeline Ahead of Epstein Files Release*, Forbes (Dec. 18, 2025) (online at www.forbes.com/sites/saradorn/2025/12/18/trumps-history-with-jeffrey-epstein-heres-the-full-timeline-ahead-of-epstein-files-release/).

Maxwell,” the Majority disregards its own standard of factual relevance when it comes to Donald Trump.¹²

President Trump’s relationship with Jeffrey Epstein dates back at least to 1985, when Epstein was living in Palm Beach and Trump bought Mar-a-Lago.¹³ Epstein and Trump were in constant contact during this time, speaking on the phone and frequently visiting each other’s offices and properties.¹⁴ The two men were close friends for years, frequently attending parties together. In one instance, Epstein allegedly visited Trump’s casino in Atlantic City with a 19-year-old girl.¹⁵ In 1992, Trump hosted a party at Mar-a-Lago with Epstein, one other man, and dozens of “calendar girls,” at least two of whom Trump allegedly harassed or assaulted, according to a lawsuit filed by one of the women.¹⁶ As reflected in the flight logs produced by DOJ in December 2025, Trump flew on Epstein’s plane at least eight times, accompanying Epstein and Maxwell, a 20-year-old woman, and two women who the DOJ believed could be credible witnesses in their prosecution of Maxwell.¹⁷ In 1993, Epstein allegedly brought Stacey Williams to Trump Tower, where Trump is accused of assaulting her.¹⁸ Epstein also allegedly brought a 14-year-old victim and another victim to meet Trump, the latter of whom reported that Trump leered at her and Epstein said, “she’s not for you.”¹⁹

Significantly, Trump contributed a crude drawing of a woman’s naked body to Epstein’s “birthday book” in 2003, with a note that referred to having “certain things in common” and to “another wonderful secret.”²⁰ That book also included a photograph of Epstein with a giant check, referring to Epstein “sell[ing] a ‘fully depreciated’ young woman to Trump.²¹ Moreover, according to recent reporting, multiple young female masseuses were dispatched from Mar-a-Lago to Epstein’s home, even after some of those young women complained that Epstein was harassing them.²²

¹² Letter from Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to President William J. Clinton at 13 (Aug. 5, 2025) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025.08.05-Subpoena-Cover-Letters.pdf>); Letter from Chairman James Comer to Former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton at 25 (Aug 5, 2025) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025.08.05-Subpoena-Cover-Letters.pdf>).

¹³ *Trump’s History with Jeffrey Epstein: Here’s The Full Timeline Ahead of Epstein Files Release*, Forbes (Dec. 18, 2025) (online at www.forbes.com/sites/saradorn/2025/12/18/trumps-history-with-jeffrey-epstein-heres-the-full-timeline-ahead-of-epstein-files-release/).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *I’ve Told the Story About Donald Trump and Jeffrey Epstein for Years*, Slate (July 29, 2025) (online at slate.com/news-and-politics/2025/07/donald-trump-jeffrey-epstein-files-list-fbi-news.html).

¹⁶ *Inside the Long Friendship Between Trump and Epstein*, New York Times (July 19, 2025) (online at www.nytimes.com/2025/07/19/us/politics/inside-trump-epstein-friendship.html); *Jeffrey Epstein Was a ‘Terrific Guy,’ Donald Trump Once Said. Now He’s Not a Fan.,’* New York Times (July 9, 2019) (online at www.nytimes.com/2019/07/09/us/politics/trump-epstein.html).

¹⁷ *Trump Travelled on Epstein’s Plane More Than Previously Thought, Newly Released Prosecutor’s Email Says*, BBC (Dec. 23, 2025) (online at www.bbc.com/news/articles/c74xgp81pqgo).

¹⁸ *Former Model Accuses Donald Trump of Groping Her in 1993*, New York Times (Oct. 25, 2025) (online at www.nytimes.com/2024/10/25/business/donald-trump-stacey-williams-jeffrey-epstein.html).

¹⁹ *An Accuser’s Story Suggests How Trump Might Appear in the Epstein Files*, New York Times (July 20, 2025) (online at www.nytimes.com/2025/07/20/us/politics/epstein-employee-trump-investigation.html).

²⁰ *Epstein’s Full ‘Birthday Book’ Has Been Released. Here’s What’s Inside*, TIME (Sept. 9, 2025) (online at <https://time.com/7315609/epsteins-birthday-book-trump-clinton/>).

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Mar-a-Lago Was Key to Jeffrey Epstein’s Criminal Enterprise*, The Nation (Jan. 2, 2026) (online at www.thenation.com/article/politics/mar-a-lago-jeffrey-epstein-donald-trump/).

In a 2019 email to Maxwell released by the estate of Jeffrey Epstein, Epstein said that “of course Trump knew about the girls.”²³ In another email from 2011, Epstein said that Trump “spent hours at [Epstein’s] house” with a known Epstein survivor while she was being trafficked.²⁴ Photographs produced to the Committee by the Epstein estate and released by the DOJ have depicted Trump and Epstein partying together, as well as photographs of Trump and Epstein being displayed in the latter’s house, as survivors have attested to.²⁵

In addition to his relationship with Epstein, President Trump has taken extraordinary measures to withhold information about Jeffrey Epstein from the American public. For example, despite promising to release the Epstein files while on the campaign trail in 2024, President Trump instead chose to spread misinformation about the origin of the files, noting on July 15, 2025, that the files “were made up by Comey. They were made up by Obama. They were made up by Biden.”²⁶ Prior to the passage of the Epstein Files Transparency Act by the House of Representatives in November of 2025, President Trump pressured Republicans to vote against the bill, even summoning Rep. Lauren Boebert to the White House Situation Room to meet with Attorney General Pam Bondi and Kash Patel, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in an effort to influence her vote.²⁷ President Trump has gone as far as to bully a loyal member of his own party and of this Committee, former Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene, when her support for releasing the Epstein files and uncovering the truth clashed with his desire to protect his “friends,” whom he believed might be named publicly as abusers.²⁸

Given the length, depth, and timing of his relationship with Epstein, in addition to the conspicuous actions he has taken to prevent the release of the files, President Trump undoubtedly has significant and directly probative information to share with the Committee. It is, therefore, astonishing and unconscionable that the Majority has declined even to consider requesting information from President Trump. Oversight Republicans’ refusal to do so betrays their partisan intentions, lack of seriousness in conducting this in-

²³ *Trump’s History with Jeffrey Epstein: Here’s The Full Timeline Ahead of Epstein Files Release*, Forbes (Dec. 18, 2025) (online at www.forbes.com/sites/saradorn/2025/12/18/trumps-history-with-jeffrey-epstein-heres-the-full-timeline-ahead-of-epstein-files-release/).

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *New Photos from Epstein’s Personal Collection Show Trump, Clinton and Much More*, PBS News (Dec. 12, 2025) (online at www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/new-photos-from-epsteins-personal-collection-show-trump-clinton-and-much-more/); *Epstein Files: A Number of Documents, Including Trump Photo, Reportedly Removed from DOJ Release Site*, CNBC (Dec. 20, 2025) (online at www.cnbc.com/2025/12/20/trump-epstein-files-doj-photo.html?msocid=0287591ce49b66382b174ffde58267de); *Jeffrey Epstein Kept an ‘8x10 Framed Picture’ of Donald Trump on His Desk, Survivor Claims: Trump Was ‘His Biggest Brag,’* People (Sept. 3, 2025) (online at <https://people.com/epstein-kept-framed-picture-trump-on-desk-survivor-claims-11802686>).

²⁶ *What Trump has Said About Jeffrey Epstein Over the Years, Including on 2024 Campaign Trail*, ABC News (July 16, 2025) (online at <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-jeffrey-epstein-years-including-2024-campaign-trail/story?id=123778541>); *Trump: Epstein Files ‘Were Made Up By’ Obama, Biden, Former FBI Director Comey*, The Hill (July 15, 2025) (online at <https://thehill.com/video/trump-epstein-files-%e2%80%98were-made-up-by%e2%80%99-obama-biden-former-fbi-director-comey/10892955/>).

²⁷ *Trump Ramps Up Pressure on G.O.P. to Thwart Epstein Vote*, New York Times (Nov. 12, 2025) (online at www.nytimes.com/2025/11/12/us/politics/trump-epstein-vote-boebert.html).

²⁸ *I Was Just So Naïve: Inside Marjorie Taylor Greene’s Break with Trump*, New York Times (Dec. 29, 2025) (online at www.nytimes.com/2025/12/29/magazine/marjorie-taylor-greene-trump-maga-split.html).

vestigation, securing justice for survivors, and providing transparency to the American people.

2. THE MAJORITY'S FAILURE TO PURSUE OTHER RELEVANT WITNESSES

In addition to President Trump, the Majority has made no effort to seek information from other key individuals who were close to Epstein, or who traveled, socialized, and did business with him, and thus, have significant firsthand knowledge regarding Epstein and Maxwell. Indeed, it is only because of motions made by Democratic members to issue subpoenas to additional witnesses that key Epstein enablers Les Wexner, Richard Kahn, and Darren Indyke have been called to testify before this Committee.²⁹ And while Oversight Democrats sent a letter to former Prince Andrew Mountbatten Windsor requesting information regarding Epstein's criminal activities, Oversight Republicans have done nothing to pursue this critical line of inquiry.³⁰ Mr. Mountbatten Windsor was close friends with Epstein and Maxwell for many years, and paid a settlement to an Epstein survivor who accused the then-Prince of sexual assault.³¹

3. THE MAJORITY'S DELAYED ENFORCEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE'S SUBPOENA TO GHISLAINE MAXWELL

Ghislaine Maxwell—to date the only individual charged as a co-conspirator of Epstein—was convicted in 2021 of five counts of conspiracy to engage in sex trafficking in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, and is currently serving a 20-year sentence for her crimes.³² DOJ also charged Maxwell with two counts of perjury for lying about her and Epstein's crimes during a 2016 deposition in a civil lawsuit, but agreed to dismiss those counts following Maxwell's conviction on the sex trafficking charges in the interest of achieving closure for victims.³³

Maxwell was central to Epstein's trafficking scheme and possesses direct, firsthand knowledge about, among other issues, recruitment, exploitation, and treatment of victims; possible co-conspirators; and the high-profile connections that allowed Epstein to evade justice for decades. Indeed, Chairman Comer himself has acknowledged that Maxwell's testimony "is vital to the Committee's efforts regarding Mr. Jeffrey Epstein," and that "it is imperative that Congress conduct oversight of the federal government's en-

²⁹ House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Democrats, *Press Release: Ranking Member Robert Garcia Statement on Forcing Subpoenas of Epstein Co-Conspirator Les Wexner & Epstein Estate Executors Darren Indyke and Richard Kahn* (Jan. 7, 2026) (online at <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/news/press-releases/ranking-member-robert-garcia-statement-on-forcing-subpoenas-of-epstein-co-conspirator-les-wexner-and-epstein-estate-executors-darren-indyke-and-richard-kahn>).

³⁰ Letter from Ranking Member Robert Garcia et. al, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to former Prince Andrew Mountbatten Windsor (Nov. 6, 2025) (online at <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2025-11-06.garcia-subramanyam-et-al-to-andrew-windsor-re-ti-request.pdf>).

³¹ Prince Andrew Has Paid Settlement to Virginia Giuffre, According to Her Attorney, CNN (Mar. 8, 2022)(online at www.cnn.com/2022/03/08/us/prince-andrew-virginia-giuffre-settlement/).

³² Department of Justice, *Press Release: Ghislaine Maxwell Sentenced to 20 Years in Prison for Conspiring with Jeffrey Epstein to Sexually Abuse Minors* (June 28, 2022) (online at www.justice.gov/usao-sdny/pr/ghislaine-maxwell-sentenced-20-years-prison-conspiring-jeffrey-epstein-sexually-abuse).

³³ U.S. Offers to Dismiss Ghislaine Maxwell Perjury Case If Sex Abuse Conviction Stands, Reuters (Jan. 10, 2022) (online at www.reuters.com/world/us/us-offers-dismiss-ghislaine-maxwell-perjury-case-if-sex-abuse-conviction-stands-2022-01-11/).

forcement of sex trafficking laws generally and specifically its handling of the investigation and prosecution of [Maxwell] and Mr. Epstein.”³⁴

Given her pivotal role in arranging and facilitating Epstein’s years of sexual abuse, on July 22, 2025, the Committee’s Subcommittee on Government Operations voted to approve a motion to subpoena Ghislaine Maxwell for a deposition, after which Oversight Republicans issued the subpoena.³⁵ Maxwell’s lawyers asked the Committee to postpone her deposition until after the resolution of her appeal to the Supreme Court, and Oversight Republicans shortly thereafter granted that request.³⁶ In October 2025, the Supreme Court rejected Maxwell’s petition for a writ of *certiorari*, rejecting her appeal.³⁷

In November 2025, Maxwell’s counsel reportedly informed the Committee that she would invoke her Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination if the Committee enforced the subpoena issued to her and required her to appear at a deposition, as Congress is entitled to do.³⁸ Oversight Republicans made little effort to test this assertion, claiming that it would not be a “good investment” for staff and Members to travel to a deposition at which Maxwell would refuse to answer substantive questions.³⁹ This Committee, however, is entitled to inquire about the circumstances surrounding a witness’s assertion of the Fifth Amendment, and indeed, the Majority has repeatedly required witnesses to do so on the record during this Congress.⁴⁰

Moreover, the Majority’s professed concern about wasting congressional time and resources on fruitless testimony rings particularly hollow given their relentless pursuit of Secretary Clinton, who plainly lacks firsthand information about the crimes of Epstein and Maxwell, and whose on the record testimony would therefore do little to advance the relevant knowledge of the Committee.

On January 21, 2026—*during* the business meeting to consider the present resolution, and without giving notice to Oversight Democrats—Chairman Comer suddenly announced that the Committee would conduct a deposition with Maxwell on February 9,

³⁴ Letter from Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Ghislaine Maxwell (Aug. 1, 2025) (online at www.nationalreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025.08.01-Letter-to-Ghislaine-Maxwell.pdf); Letter from Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Ghislaine Maxwell (July 23, 2025) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/2025.07.23-Subpoena-Cover-Letter-to-Maxwell-FINAL.pdf>).

³⁵ Letter from Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Ghislaine Maxwell (July 23, 2025) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/2025.07.23-Subpoena-Cover-Letter-to-Maxwell-FINAL.pdf>).

³⁶ Letter from David Oscar Markus, Markus Moss PLLC, to Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (July 29, 2025) (on file with Committee); Letter from Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Ghislaine Maxwell (Aug. 1, 2025) (online at www.nationalreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025.08.01-Letter-to-Ghislaine-Maxwell.pdf).

³⁷ *Supreme Court Rejects Appeal from Ghislaine Maxwell, Imprisoned Former Girlfriend of Jeffrey Epstein*, Associated Press (Oct. 6, 2025) (online at <https://apnews.com/article/supreme-court-epstein-maxwell-appeal-a4ba832cd2a23a2c499cef23f1e30927>).

³⁸ *Ghislaine Maxwell Will Plead Fifth in House Epstein Probe*, Comer Says, Politico (Nov. 21, 2025) (online at www.politico.com/live-updates/2025/11/21/congress/ghislaine-maxwell-plead-fifth-house-oversight-00664640).

³⁹ See *id.*

⁴⁰ *Another Biden Aide Invokes the Fifth Amendment In Deposition Before House Panel*, ABC News (July 18, 2025) (online at <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/biden-aide-invokes-amendment-deposition-house-panel/story?id=123864994>).

2026.⁴¹ While this is a welcome development in the investigation, it appears that the Majority had secured a date for Maxwell's testimony *only after* announcements that Oversight Republicans would seek to hold the Clintons in contempt, possibly—but unsuccessfully—to preempt arguments that Oversight Republicans are selectively enforcing the Committee's subpoenas against the Clintons.⁴²

It is also notable that the Majority has chosen to disregard the shockingly preferential treatment that DOJ and the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) have accorded Maxwell following her highly unusual prison interview by Deputy Attorney General and Donald Trump's personal attorney, Todd Blanche in July 2025, suggesting a *quid pro quo* by the Trump Administration in exchange for her favorable testimony.⁴³ After Maxwell provided answers supporting President Trump's claims that he was not involved in Epstein's crimes, she was transferred to a "country-club"-like minimum security prison camp in Bryan, Texas, despite BOP policies stating that sex offenders such as Maxwell are ineligible for such facilities.⁴⁴ Multiple reports, including from whistleblowers, attest to Maxwell taking meetings not permitted for other inmates, having meals delivered to her dormitory room, and being allowed to exercise and shower later than other inmates.⁴⁵ Throughout this period, Maxwell was openly campaigning for a pardon from President Trump, a step which he has refused to rule out.⁴⁶

BOP and DOJ have refused to respond to repeated requests and letters from Oversight Democrats about this highly unusual and suspicious set of circumstances, and Oversight Republicans to date have declined to probe this apparent further attempt to suppress the facts surrounding Donald Trump's involvement with Epstein.⁴⁷

⁴¹ See Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Full Committee Business Meeting* (Jan. 21, 2026) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/markup/full-committee-business-meeting-83/>).

⁴² See Letter from David Oscar Markus, Counsel to Ghislaine Maxwell, to Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Jan. 20, 2026).

⁴³ *Ghislaine Maxwell, Who Wants a Pardon, Says She Never Saw Trump "In Any Inappropriate Setting,"* Politico (Aug. 22, 2025) (online at www.politico.com/news/2025/08/22/ghislaine-maxwell-jeffrey-epstein-donald-trump-interview-00520352).

⁴⁴ *Ghislaine Maxwell's Move to "Country Club" Prison Smacks of Special Treatment, Experts Say*, Washington Post (Aug. 5, 2025) (online at www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2025/08/05/trump-epstein-maxwell-sex-trafficking-prisons-corrections/).

⁴⁵ *Lockdowns and a Mysterious Meeting: A Quiet Texas Prison Adapts to Life With Ghislaine Maxwell*, Wall Street Journal (Oct. 11, 2025) (online at www.wsj.com/us-news/ghislaine-maxwell-prison-transfer-epstein-b5efd6ac?reflink=desktoppwebshare&permalinkwww); *Whistleblower Who Provided House Democrats with Ghislaine Maxwell Documents Speaks Out*, NBC News (Nov. 18, 2025) (online at www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/whistleblower-provided-house-democrats-ghislaine-maxwell-documents-spe-rn244418).

⁴⁶ *Supreme Court Rejects Epstein Associate Ghislaine Maxwell's Appeal of Her Criminal Conviction*, NBC News (Oct. 6, 2025) (online at www.nbcnews.com/politics/supreme-court/supreme-court-rejects-epstein-associate-ghislaine-maxwells-appeal-crim-rn243281).

⁴⁷ Letter from Ranking Member Robert Garcia, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Director William K. Marshall III, Bureau of Prisons (Aug. 1, 2025) (online at <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2025-08-01-rg-to-bop-director-marshall-re-maxwell.pdf>); Letter from Ranking Member Robert Garcia et. al, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Acting Attorney General Mr. William Blier, Department of Justice (Sept. 3, 2025) (online at <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2025-09-03.garcia-et-al-to-doj-oig-re-maxwell-transfer.pdf>); Email from BOP Office of Legislative Affairs, to Oversight Committee Minority Staff (Oct. 14, 2025) (on file with Committee); Letter from Ranking Member Robert Garcia, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Attorney General Pam Bondi, Department of Justice (Oct. 16, 2025) (online at <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2025-10-16.garcia-to-doj-re-maxwell.pdf>); Letter from Ranking Member Robert Garcia, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Warden Dr. Tanisha Hall, Federal Prison Camp Bryan (Oct. 30, 2025) (online at <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2025-10-30.garcia-to-fpc-bryan-warden-re-maxwell.pdf>).

III. THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IS FUNCTIONING AS A WEAPON FOR TARGETING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PERCEIVED ENEMIES

The Majority's single-minded pursuit of the Clintons takes place against the backdrop of President Trump's explicit aim of leveraging the federal government to target and punish those he perceives as political enemies. The scale and scope of his use of DOJ and other agencies for political retribution—targeting at least 470 individuals, according to one analysis—is unprecedented in American history. It also constitutes a shocking rejection of long-held democratic norms that, until now, had sought to ensure that law enforcement functioned to protect the American people, and not to advance the personal or partisan agenda of a president.⁴⁸

At President Trump's direction, DOJ has investigated and/or prosecuted, based on flimsy legal pretexts, former National Security Adviser John Bolton, New York Attorney General Letitia James, former FBI Director James Comey, Senator Adam Schiff, and, most recently, Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell, among others.⁴⁹ President Trump has likewise included former President Clinton in his target list for the express purpose of diverting attention from his own relevance to the Epstein investigation.

In May 2025, Attorney General Bondi reportedly informed President Trump that his name appeared in the DOJ's Epstein files "multiple times."⁵⁰ On June 5, 2025, in a public falling-out with President Trump, Elon Musk, the former senior advisor to the President, posted on X: "Time to drop the really big bomb. @realDonaldTrump is in the Epstein files. That is the real reason they have not been made public."⁵¹ Yet, casting aside the evidence of Epstein's relationship to President Trump and others, on July 7, 2025, Attorney General Bondi contradicted her previous statement that the Epstein client list was "on her desk" by releasing a concise memorandum announcing that there is no Epstein client list and that the DOJ no longer saw value in releasing any additional Epstein files.⁵²

Amidst the public outrage and bipartisan calls for transparency that followed DOJ's apparent cover-up, President Trump began demanding that the American people "not waste Time and Energy on

⁴⁸ *Trump's Campaign of Retribution: At Least 470 Targets and Counting*, Reuters (Nov. 26, 2025) (online at www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-trump-retribution-tracker/); *The Department of Justice's Broken Accountability System*, Brennan Center for Justice (Oct. 20, 2025) (online at www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/department-justices-broken-accountability-system); *Trump's Open Weaponization of the Government*, CNN (Sept. 22, 2025) (online at www.cnn.com/2025/09/22/politics/weaponization-trump-biden-analysis).

⁴⁹ *Here's a List of the Individuals, Including Jerome Powell, Targeted by the Trump Administration*, ABC News (Jan. 12, 2026) (online at <https://abcnews.go.com/US/list-individuals-including-lisa-cook-targeted-trump-administration/story?id=124968309>).

⁵⁰ *Justice Department Told Trump in May That His Name is Among Many in the Epstein Files*, Wall Street Journal (July 23, 2025) (online at www.wsj.com/politics/justice-department-told-trump-name-in-epstein-files-727a8038).

⁵¹ *Musk Says Trump Is 'In The Epstein Files' Which is Why They Haven't Been Made Public in Newest Slam*, Independent (June 5, 2025) (online at www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-epstein-files-pam-bondi-virginia-giuffre-death-b2740239.html).

⁵² *A Timeline of the Jeffrey Epstein Investigation, Now 20 Years Old*, AP (July 23, 2025) (online at <https://apnews.com/article/trump-epstein-investigation-records-timeline-545c371ee3dd3142355a26d27829c188>); Memorandum from the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (July 2025) (online at www.justice.gov/opa/media/1407001/dl?inline).

Jeffrey Epstein" and accused Democrats of perpetuating a hoax.⁵³ President Trump then directed Attorney General Bondi to target prominent Democrats, including President Clinton, writing in a November 14, 2025, Truth Social post:

Now that the Democrats are using the Epstein Hoax, involving Democrats, not Republicans, to try and deflect from their disastrous SHUTDOWN, and all of their other failures, I will be asking A.G. Pam Bondi, and the Department of Justice, together with our great patriots at the FBI, to investigate Jeffrey Epstein's involvement and relationship with Bill Clinton, Larry Summers, Reid Hoffman, J.P. Morgan, Chase [sic], any many other people and institutions, to determine what was going on with them, and him. This is another Russia, Russia, Russia Scam, with all arrows pointing to the Democrats. Records show that these men, and many others, spent large portions of their life with Epstein, and on his "Island." Stay tuned!!!⁵⁴

Attorney General promptly responded to President Trump's instruction within hours, posting on Truth Social:

Thank you Mr. President, SDNY U.S. Attorney Jay Clayton is one of the most capable and trusted prosecutors in the country, and I've asked him to take the lead. As with all matters, the Department of Justice will pursue this with urgency and integrity to deliver answers to the American people.⁵⁵

Viewed in this context, the Majority's singling out of the Clintons and complete disregard of President Trump's obvious relevance to this investigation serves only to advance President Trump's goal of deflecting attention from himself by targeting the Clintons, and thus, further confirms the purely partisan aim of these proceedings.

IV. CRIMINAL CONTEMPT IS NOT THE BEST AVAILABLE MEANS TO OBTAIN TESTIMONY FROM THE CLINTONS

The resolution seeking to hold Secretary Clinton in criminal contempt is clearly not the best available means to seek compliance with the subpoena or advance the Committee's investigation.

In general, criminal contempt of Congress aims to punish any person or entity who defies a congressional subpoena by referring the non-compliant witness to DOJ for criminal prosecution.⁵⁶ Ac-

⁵³ *Trump Tells Supporters Not To 'Waste Time' On Epstein Files. They're Not Happy*, NPR (July 14, 2025) (online at www.npr.org/2025/07/14/105467151/trump-epstein-files-doj-fbi-maga); *Trump Slams His Own Supporters as 'Weaklings' for Falling for What He Now Calls the Epstein 'Hoax'*, Fox 13 Salt Lake City (July 16, 2025) (online at www.fox13now.com/news/national-news/trump-slams-his-own-supporters-as-weaklings-for-falling-for-what-he-now-calls-the-epstein-hoax).

⁵⁴ Donald Trump (@realDonaldTrump), Truth Social (Nov. 14, 2025) (online at <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/115548785919046772>).

⁵⁵ Pamela Bondi (@AGPamBondi), Truth Social (Nov. 14, 2025) (online at <https://x.com/AGPamBondi/status/1989411168067440722>).

⁵⁶ *Comm. on the Judiciary v. Miers*, 558 F. Supp. 2d 53, 94 (D.D.C. 2008); Congressional Research Service, *Contempt Power and the Enforcement of Congressional Subpoenas: Law, History, Practice, and Procedure* (May 12, 2017) (online at www.congress.gov/crs/external_products/RL/PDF/RL34097/RL34097.23.pdf); Congressional Research Service, *Criminal Contempt of Congress: Frequently Asked Questions* (June 5, 2023) (online at www.crs.gov/Reports/LSB10974).

cordingly, the criminal contempt statute, 2 U.S.C. § 192, provides for criminal penalties against any person who “willfully makes default” on their obligation to “produce papers upon any matter under inquiry” by Congress pursuant to subpoena. Criminal contempt is generally not employed for the primary purpose of obtaining compliance.⁵⁷

As an alternative to criminal contempt, Congress may seek compliance with a duly issued subpoena through a civil suit in federal court. Unlike criminal contempt, civil enforcement aims to induce a violator *into complying* with a subpoena, rather than merely punishing the person through imprisonment or other criminal penalties for an alleged violation. Stated otherwise, a successful civil enforcement suit generally aims compliance with the congressional subpoena, so that Congress may eventually obtain the information it seeks.⁵⁸

In the present case, rather than consider this option, Oversight Republicans have insisted solely upon the punitive measure of holding the Clintons in criminal contempt. Oversight Republicans’ refusal to pursue the mechanism of civil contempt—designed to induce production of the requested information—demonstrates their lack of genuine interest in obtaining information from the Clintons, and exposes their partisan aim of politicizing the contempt process at the direction of Donald Trump.⁵⁹ Oversight Democrats proposed a motion to seek criminal contempt proceedings, which Oversight Republicans unanimously voted down.⁶⁰

Moreover, the Clintons, through their counsel, have engaged in communication with Oversight Republicans about providing information to the Committee and provided signed declarations to the Committee, under penalty of perjury, outlining the scope of their knowledge and relationship with Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell, an accommodation that Oversight Republicans have accepted from other individuals subpoenaed as part of the Epstein probe.⁶¹ The Clintons engaged in dialogue with Congress regarding the Committee’s demands during the very markup of this resolution.⁶² Oversight Democrats support further negotiations between the Clintons and the Committee in order to secure testimony.

⁵⁷ *Id.*

⁵⁸ See Committee on the Judiciary, *Testimony of Todd Garvey, Hearing on Civil Enforcement of Congressional Authorities* (June 8, 2021) (online at www.crs.gov/Reports/TE10064); Congressional Research Service, *Congressional Subpoenas: Enforcing Executive Branch Compliance* (Mar. 27, 2019) (online at www.crs.gov/Reports/R45653).

⁵⁹ *Trump Calls for release of Any Epstein Files Naming Democrats: “Embarrass Them,”* CBS News (Dec. 26, 2025) (online at www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-calls-for-release-epstein-files-naming-democrats/).

⁶⁰ See Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Full Committee Business Meeting* (Jan. 21, 2026) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/markup/full-committee-business-meeting-83/>).

⁶¹ See Letter from Ashley Callen, et al., counsel to William “Bill” and Hillary Clinton, to Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Jan. 12, 2026) (online at www.nytimes.com/interactive/2026/01/13/us/politics/clinton-legal-letter-comer.html); Letter from William “Bill” and Hillary Clinton to Chairman James Comer, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Jan. 13, 2026) (online at www.nytimes.com/interactive/2026/01/13/us/clinton-letter.html); see also Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Full Committee Business Meeting* (Jan. 21, 2026) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/markup/full-committee-business-meeting-83/>).

⁶² *Id.*

**V. SECRETARY CLINTON APPEARS TO LACK RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE
REGARDING THE COMMITTEE'S INVESTIGATION**

While the Majority insists that Secretary Clinton's testimony is essential to the Committee's investigation, Secretary Clinton's sworn declaration and, indeed, the Majority's own report on the present motion, make plain the lack of any factual nexus between the Secretary and the matters under investigation that would warrant her testimony. Therefore, there is no discernible purpose in forcing Secretary Clinton to testify, let alone in seeking to hold her in criminal contempt, beyond harassing a political opponent of President Trump.

Notably, the Majority fails to identify a single interaction between Secretary Clinton and Epstein or Maxwell. Instead, it resorts to a series of vague and generalized assertions about Secretary Clinton's alleged involvement in law enforcement policy, and her claimed proximity to other individuals or entities that were in contact with or received donations from Epstein.⁶³ In effect, the Majority seeks to shoehorn Secretary Clinton into the category of witnesses who have relevant knowledge by drawing vague links between her and other individuals who might.

Moreover, Secretary Clinton's declaration negates each of these claims. In her submission to the Committee on January 13, 2026, Secretary Clinton declared unequivocally and under penalty of perjury that she "had no personal knowledge" of Epstein's or Maxwell's crimes; "never had any responsibility for, or involvement with, the Department of Justice's handling of the Epstein and Maxwell investigations or prosecutions;" does not recall ever meeting Epstein; never flew on Epstein's plane or visited his island; has no recollection of the specifics surrounding her interactions with Maxwell; and has no connection to Maxwell beyond having a friend in common.⁶⁴

As noted, there remain multiple witnesses who, unlike Secretary Clinton, unquestionably have extensive and specific firsthand knowledge about the matters that the Committee is investigating. The majority's failure to seek testimony from those individuals, while relentlessly pursuing Secretary Clinton, makes their partisan motivations all the more apparent.

VI. CONCLUSION

From the inception of this Committee's investigation, Oversight Democrats have been, and remain, firmly committed to pursuing the facts surrounding Epstein's and Maxwell's horrific crimes, and accordingly, obtaining information from all individuals with relevant information. By brushing aside Attorney General Bondi's utter disregard for this Committee's investigative authority, ignoring President Trump's extensive ties to Epstein and other pertinent witnesses, and legitimizing President Trump's retribution campaign and weaponization of federal law enforcement, this pro-

⁶³ Report to Amend in the Nature of a Substitute to the Committee Report for the Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives Find Former United States Secretary of State Hillary R. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform at 13–14 (online at <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/GO/GO00/20260121/118877/BILLS-119-HResXX-C001108-Amndt-2.pdf>).

⁶⁴ Declaration of Hillary Rodham Clinton (Jan. 13, 2026) (on file with the Committee).

ceeding runs squarely counter to that goal. Epstein's and Maxwell's victims, along with the American people, deserve far better.

ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member.

