

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6216

(202) 225-6906
judiciary.house.gov

May 9, 2024

Ms. Sheri Saulsberry
Warden
FPC Pensacola
Federal Prison Camp
P.O. Box 3933
Pensacola, FL 32516

Dear Ms. Saulsberry:

On March 5, 2024, pursuant to the House’s ongoing impeachment inquiry and our legislative oversight authorities,¹ the Committee on the Judiciary (“Judiciary Committee”), along with the Committee on Oversight and Accountability (“Oversight Committee”), wrote to two Department of Justice (DOJ) components requesting a narrow and specific set of materials relating to claims of the DOJ’s unfair treatment of Hunter Biden’s business associate Jason Galanis.² As we explained, Mr. Galanis alleged that these DOJ components targeted him for “retribution” to suppress his testimony about the Biden family’s influence peddling scheme.³ From the documents and testimonial information available to the Committee, we believe that you possess information vital to our oversight and inquiry. We therefore write to request you appear for a voluntary transcribed interview before the Committee.

Since Mr. Galanis’s transcribed interview earlier this year, the Judiciary Committee has received additional information based on communications with Mr. Galanis’s legal counsel that strongly suggests DOJ had been retaliating against Mr. Galanis for his cooperation with the Committees’ inquiry. On February 4, 2023, Mr. Galanis applied to the Bureau of Prisons (BOP)

¹ See H. Res. 918, 118th Cong. (2023); Memorandum from Hon. James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Accountability, Hon. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, & Hon. Jason Smith, Chairman, H. Comm. on Ways & Means, to H. Comm. on Oversight & Accountability, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, & H. Comm. on Ways & Means. Re: Impeachment Inquiry (Sept. 27, 2023) (hereinafter Impeachment Inquiry Memorandum); February 12 Letter, *supra* note 1.

² Letter from Rep. James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Accountability, et al., to Negar Tekeei, Assistant U.S. Attorney, US. District Court of the Southern District of New York (Mar. 5, 2024); Letter from Rep. James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Accountability, et al., to Colette S. Peters, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons (Mar. 5, 2024).

³ *Id.*

Ms. Sheri Saulsberry

May 9, 2024

Page 2

for home confinement pursuant to the CARES Act.⁴ His application proceeded through the process as normal. In March 2023, the U.S. Probation Office serving the Southern District of California’s San Diego location approved Mr. Galanis’s post-confinement residence.⁵ The warden of the BOP facility—M.V. Joseph—where Mr. Galanis resided at the time, FPC Pensacola, later signed off on the application, and Mr. Galanis’s application went on to the Residential Reentry Management (RRM) center in Long Beach, California.⁶ On June 9, 2023, the Long Beach RRM approved Mr. Galanis’s request for home confinement and reached out to the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York (SDNY) regarding the application approval.⁷

On June 12, 2023, the Oversight Committee announced that it had subpoenaed Mr. Galanis’s business partner, Devon Archer, to testify about his relationship with Hunter Biden and the Biden family’s business activities.⁸ Around the same time as the Oversight Committee’s announcement, an SDNY Assistant U.S. Attorney, Negar Tekeei, responded to the Long Beach RRM with her “strongest objection,” and threatened to go “hard on this” to the BOP Director if Mr. Galanis’s application went any further.⁹ On June 22, 2023, a BOP official informed Mr. Galanis that his application had been denied on June 13—the day after the Oversight Committee’s announcement.¹⁰

On August 8, 2023, Mr. Galanis appealed the denial of his home confinement to you as the warden of FPC Pensacola. You subsequently denied his appeal on the erroneous grounds that the “amount of time” he requested on home confinement “was not appropriate.”¹¹ On September 22, 2023, Mr. Galanis appealed the warden’s denial to the Southeast Regional RRM and, after receiving no response, he appealed to the BOP Central Office.

On February 8, 2024, the Committees informed BOP that we intended to interview Mr. Galanis at the BOP facility where he presently resides, FPC Montgomery.¹² The next day, the BOP Central Office sent Mr. Galanis its denial of his appeal, which was dated over a month earlier, on January 4. In this denial, BOP changed its reasoning from an “inappropriate amount of time” for home confinement to the “CARES Act has expired.”¹³ This reason, however, is also not a proper basis for denial. Per BOP practice, and consistent with basic due process, anyone who applied for home confinement prior to the expiration of the CARES Act—and whose appeal

⁴ Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis at 13-14 (Feb. 23, 2024).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis at 13-14 (Feb. 23, 2024).

⁷ Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis at 14 (Feb. 23, 2024).

⁸ Letter from Rep. James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm on Oversight and Accountability to Matthew Schwartz, Boies Schiller Flexner (Jun. 12, 2023).

⁹ *See generally*, Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis (Feb. 23, 2024).

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *See generally*, Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis (Feb. 23, 2024).

¹² Mr. Galanis transferred to FPC Montgomery in August 2023; Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis at 15 (Feb. 23, 2024).

¹³ *See generally*, Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis (Feb. 23, 2024).

Ms. Sheri Saulsberry

May 9, 2024

Page 3

rights have not been exhausted—remained eligible to be considered under the Act.¹⁴ In fact, Mr. Galanis was originally approved for home confinement on June 9, 2023, after the May 31 expiration date of the CARES Act.¹⁵ Three days after Mr. Galanis sat for a transcribed interview with the Committees, BOP gave Mr. Galanis its final denial of his home confinement application under the CARES Act.

The evidence referenced above displays the Department’s alarming pattern of seeking retribution against a key witness who has attempted to provide Congress with information about President Biden’s complicity in his family’s crimes. As part of our constitutional oversight and impeachment inquiry¹⁶ responsibilities, we require testimony from both current and former Department employees about these matters. You served as the Warden of FPS Pensacola at the time when Jason Galanis’s CARES Act application process was under review.¹⁷ During your tenure, it has been alleged that Mr. Galanis was the victim of repeated acts of sexual harassment and assault, actions that went unaddressed in an act of retribution against Mr. Galanis for speaking out against the Biden family.¹⁸

Your testimony is directly relevant to both the impeachment inquiry and the Judiciary Committee’s legislative oversight of the Department. The Supreme Court has recognized that Congress has a “broad and indispensable” power to conduct oversight, which “encompasses inquiries into the administration of existing laws, studies of proposed laws, and surveys in our social, economic or political system for the purpose of enabling Congress to remedy them.”¹⁹ Pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee is authorized to conduct oversight of the Department as well as criminal justice matters in the United States to inform potential legislative reforms.²⁰

¹⁴ Press Release, Final Rule Issued for Home Confinement Under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act, U.S. Dept. of Justice (Apr. 4, 2023).

¹⁵ Transcribed Interview with Jason Galanis at 14 (Feb. 23, 2024).

¹⁶ See H.R. Res. 918, 118th Cong. (2023); Memorandum from Hon. James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Accountability, Hon. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, & Hon. Jason Smith, Chairman, H. Comm. on Ways & Means, to H. Comm. on Oversight & Accountability, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, & H. Comm. on Ways & Means. Re: Impeachment Inquiry (Sept. 27, 2023)

¹⁷ Transcribed Interview of Jason Galanis, at 13-14 (Feb. 23, 2024).

¹⁸ Transcribed Interview of Jason Galanis, at 119 (Feb. 23, 2024).

¹⁹ *Trump v. Mazars*, 140 S. Ct. 2019, 2031 (2020) (internal quotation marks omitted).

²⁰ Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, R. X (2023).

Ms. Sheri Saulsberry
May 9, 2024
Page 4

Additionally, Congress's authority to access information is broadest during an impeachment investigation,²¹ a fact which even Presidents and other Executive Branch officials have traditionally recognized.²² Indeed, conducting an impeachment inquiry based on anything less than all pertinent evidence would be an affront to the Constitution and irreparably damage public faith in the impeachment process.²³

Accordingly, we request that you appear for a transcribed interview with the Committee. To schedule your transcribed interview, please contact Committee staff at (202) 225- 6906 as soon as possible, but no later than 5:00 p.m. on May 23, 2024. If you are represented by private counsel, we ask that your private counsel respond promptly to the Committee on your behalf.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Jim Jordan
Chairman



Andy Biggs
Chairman
Subcommittee on Crime and Federal
Government Surveillance

cc: The Honorable Jerrold L. Nadler, Ranking Member
The Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Crime and
Federal Government Surveillance

²¹ TODD GARVEY, CONG. RSCH. SERV., LSB11083, IMPEACHMENT INVESTIGATIONS, PART II: ACCESS, at 1 (2023) (“[T]here is reason to believe that invocation of the impeachment power could improve the committees’ legal claims of access to certain types of evidence relevant to the allegations of misconduct against President Biden.”). *See also In re Application of Comm. on the Judiciary*, 414 F. Supp. 3d 129, 176 (D.D.C. 2019) (“[D]enying [the House Judiciary Committee] evidence relevant to an impeachment inquiry could pose constitutional problems.”), *aff’d*, 951 F.3d 589 (D.C. Cir. 2020), *vacated and remanded sub nom. on other grounds DOJ v. House Comm. on the Judiciary*, 142 S. Ct. 46 (2021); *In re Request for Access to Grand Jury Materials*, 833 F.2d 1438, 1445 (11th Cir. 1987) (concluding that “limit[ing] the investigatory power of the House in impeachment proceedings . . . would clearly violate separation of powers principles.”).

²² *See* GARVEY, *supra* note 6, at 2 (“As a historical matter, all three branches have suggested that the House possesses a robust right of access to information when it is investigating for impeachment purposes.”); Jonathan David Schaub, *The Executive’s Privilege*, 70 DUKE L.J. 1, 87 (2020) (“[P]residents and others have recognized throughout the history of the country that their ability to withhold information from Congress disappears in the context of impeachment.”).

²³ *See In re Application of Comm. on the Judiciary*, 414 F. Supp. 3d at 176 (“Impeachment based on anything less than all relevant evidence would compromise the public’s faith in the process.”); *In re Request for Access to Grand Jury Materials*, 833 F.2d at 1445 (“Public confidence in a procedure as political and public as impeachment is an important consideration justifying disclosure.”); *In re Report and Recommendation of June 5, 1972 Grand Jury*, 370 F. Supp. 1219, 1230 (D.D.C. 1974) (“It would be difficult to conceive of a more compelling need than that of this country for an unswervingly fair [impeachment] inquiry based on all the pertinent information.”).