

**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**

**OFFERED BY MR. COMER**

**Beginning on page 1, strike “The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, having considered this Report” and all that follows through the end of the report, and insert the following:**

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 William J. Clinton, former President of the United States, for contempt of Congress pursuant to this Report is as follows:

*Resolved*, That William J. Clinton, former President of the United States, 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 William J. Clinton, former President of the United States, 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 President William J. 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

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BACKGROUND ON THE INVESTIGATION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>A. The Committee Seeks Information from Witnesses and Entities as Part of Its Investigation.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>B. After Months of Correspondence and Rescheduling, President Clinton Defies the Subpoena.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>C. President Clinton's Purported Reasons for Non-Compliance with the Subpoena Are Without Merit.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>i. The subpoena seeks testimony related to a valid legislative purpose.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>ii. President Clinton was subpoenaed to advance the Oversight Committee's investigation, not to harass or embarrass him.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>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 President Clinton of his obligation to appear for a deposition.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>iv. The separation of powers does not render the subpoena unenforceable.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>D. Precedent Supports the Committee's Position to Proceed with Holding President Clinton in Contempt. ....</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ROLL CALL VOTES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>EARMARK IDENTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>_____ VIEWS .....</b>	<b>22</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

William J. Clinton, former President of the United States (President 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, President Clinton refused to appear for his scheduled deposition on January 13, 2026. President Clinton's unwillingness to comply with the subpoena, even after the Oversight Committee agreed to postpone his deposition date, at his request, for nearly a month, has substantially interfered with the Oversight Committee's investigation.

President Clinton maintained a close personal relationship with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell for several years, and the testimony sought by the subpoena is relevant to the Oversight Committee's investigation. In particular, President Clinton possesses firsthand information regarding 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. His testimony may inform the Oversight Committee's consideration of legislative reforms designed to combat the operation of sex-trafficking rings, efforts to shield them from scrutiny, and ethics reforms for current and former elected officials.

President Clinton has invoked no valid reason for refusing to appear for a deposition, and the Oversight Committee's efforts to persuade him to testify have reached a dead end. Accordingly, the Chairman of the Oversight Committee recommends that the House of Representatives find President William J. Clinton in contempt for his failure to comply with the subpoena issued to him 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."<sup>1</sup> 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."<sup>2</sup> "The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is

---

<sup>1</sup> *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 174 (1927).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 175.

broad.”<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

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 Rulemaking Clause of the U.S. Constitution.<sup>5</sup> 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.”<sup>6</sup> 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.”<sup>7</sup>

House Rule XI clause 2(k)(6) states that “the chair shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.”<sup>8</sup> 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.”<sup>9</sup> It also includes 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.”<sup>10</sup> House Rules further provide that the “power to authorize and issue subpoenas” may be delegated to the Committee chairman.<sup>11</sup> The subpoenas discussed in this report were issued pursuant to these authorities by Chairman James Comer.

The deposition subpoena issued to President 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. President Clinton’s refusal to comply with the Oversight Committee’s deposition subpoena is therefore hindering the Oversight Committee’s investigation.

## **BACKGROUND ON THE INVESTIGATION**

---

<sup>3</sup> *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 1887 (1957).

<sup>4</sup> 2 U.S.C. §§ 192, 194.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

On July 6, 2019, federal authorities arrested Jeffrey 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.<sup>12</sup> According to the indictment, Mr. Epstein sexually exploited and abused dozens of minor girls at his homes in Manhattan, Palm Beach, and other locations.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

On August 10, 2019, while in federal custody at the Metropolitan Correctional Center in New York, New York, Mr. Epstein died.<sup>16</sup> The Chief Medical Examiner of New York City ruled his death a suicide.<sup>17</sup> Subsequently, on June 28, 2022, Ms. Maxwell was sentenced to 20 years in prison for conspiring with Mr. Epstein to sexually abuse minors.<sup>18</sup>

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."<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup>

#### ***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

---

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

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

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 2-3.

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

<sup>16</sup> 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).

<sup>17</sup> 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>.

<sup>18</sup> 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).

<sup>19</sup> 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).

<sup>20</sup> 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).

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.<sup>21</sup>

President Clinton’s subpoena required him to appear for a deposition on October 14, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.<sup>22</sup> The cover letter accompanying the subpoena explained that President Clinton had enjoyed a close relationship with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell and detailed the Oversight Committee’s rationale for issuing the subpoena to him.<sup>23</sup> It noted, for example, that President Clinton “flew on Jeffrey Epstein’s private plane four separate times in 2002 and 2003.”<sup>24</sup> During one of these trips, President Clinton was pictured receiving a massage from one of Mr. Epstein’s victims.<sup>25</sup> The cover letter explained that “it has also been claimed that [President Clinton] pressured *Vanity Fair* not to publish sex-trafficking allegations against [his] ‘good friend’ Mr. Epstein.”<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, it noted that there “are conflicting reports about whether [President Clinton] ever visited Mr. Epstein’s island.”<sup>27</sup> The cover letter set forth that President Clinton was “also allegedly close to Ms. Ghislaine Maxwell, an Epstein co-conspirator, and attended an intimate dinner with her in 2014, three years after public reports about her involvement in Mr. Epstein’s abuse of minors.”<sup>28</sup> In sum, the cover letter explained how, “given [President Clinton’s] past relationships with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell, the Committee believes that [President Clinton has] information regarding their activities that is relevant to the Committee’s investigation.”<sup>29</sup>

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*

---

<sup>21</sup> 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 General, 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).

<sup>22</sup> Subpoena to William J. Clinton, Former President of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

<sup>24</sup> 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).

<sup>25</sup> Aaron Feis, *New photos show Bill Clinton getting massage from Epstein accuser*, THE N.Y. POST (Aug. 20, 2020).

<sup>26</sup> Emily Crane, *et al.*, *Bill Clinton allegedly stormed into Vanity Fair newsroom, ‘threatened’ outlet to not run sex-trafficking stories against ‘good friend’ Jeffrey Epstein: new docs*, THE N.Y. POST (Jan. 4, 2024).

<sup>27</sup> Aaron Feis, *Ex-Bill Clinton aide Doug Band dishes on family ties to Epstein, Ghislaine Maxwell*, THE N.Y. POST (Dec. 2, 2020).

<sup>28</sup> Dan Adler, *From Jeffrey Epstein’s Home to a Bill Clinton Dinner, More Details About Ghislaine Maxwell Emerge*, VANITY FAIR (Sept. 24, 2020).

<sup>29</sup> Subpoena Cover Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to William J. Clinton, Former President of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

(20-cr-330) and documents and communications relating or referring to the death of Mr. Epstein.<sup>30</sup>

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.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup>

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.<sup>34</sup> In response, the Estate has, to date, produced thousands of documents pertaining to the investigation.<sup>35</sup> The documents included mentions of President Clinton in flight logs from Mr. Epstein's private plane, a birthday book gifted to Mr. Epstein by Ms. Maxwell, and appearances by President Clinton in photographs with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell.<sup>36</sup>

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 Oversight Committee.<sup>37</sup> He testified about his involvement in the Department's investigation of and non-prosecution agreement with Mr. Epstein when he was U.S. Attorney.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Subpoena to Pamela J. Bondi, Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025).

<sup>31</sup> 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).

<sup>32</sup> Deposition of William P. Barr, Former U.S. Att'y Gen. (Aug. 18, 2025).

<sup>33</sup> 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).

<sup>34</sup> Subpoena to the Estate of Jeffrey Epstein (Aug. 25, 2025).

<sup>35</sup> 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).

<sup>36</sup> Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Oversight Committee Releases Additional Epstein Estate Documents (Nov. 12, 2025).

<sup>37</sup> Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Chairman Comer Statement on Transcribed Interview with Alexander Acosta (Sept. 19, 2025).

<sup>38</sup> Transcribed Interview of R. Alexander Acosta, former U.S. Att'y for the S. Dist. of Fla. (Sept. 19, 2025).

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,<sup>39</sup> 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, President Clinton Defies the Subpoena.***

President Clinton, through his attorney, accepted service of the subpoena on August 13, 2025,<sup>40</sup> and his attorney stated that “[t]he subpoena[] will be responded to in an appropriate manner.”<sup>41</sup> On September 30, 2025, counsel for the Oversight Committee conveyed to President Clinton’s attorney, David E. Kendall, an attorney for the Clintons who negotiated on both their behalf throughout this process, that the Oversight Committee expected President Clinton to appear for his scheduled deposition.<sup>42</sup>

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 President Clinton to submit a written declaration instead of sitting for his deposition, while acknowledging that “[t]he Committee is entitled to what little information the Clintons have about Epstein and Maxwell.”<sup>43</sup>

The Oversight Committee declined this request. On October 22, 2025, the Oversight Committee replied to Mr. Kendall and conveyed its skepticism that President Clinton only had “little information” about Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell.<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup> The Oversight Committee emphasized that “it is the Committee—not President Clinton ... —that will determine the value of the information [he has].”<sup>46</sup> In sum, the Oversight Committee confirmed that President Clinton must comply with its subpoena requiring him to appear for a deposition.<sup>47</sup> Subsequently, the Oversight Committee rescheduled President Clinton’s deposition for December 17, 2025.

---

<sup>39</sup> *Oversight of Fraud and Misuse of Federal Funds in Minnesota: Part I*, 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).

<sup>40</sup> Email from David E. Kendall to Committee counsel (Aug. 13, 2025, at 11:44AM).

<sup>41</sup> *Id.*

<sup>42</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025).

<sup>43</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Oct. 6, 2025).

<sup>44</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025).

<sup>45</sup> *Id.*

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*

<sup>47</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025).



On November 3, 2025, Mr. Kendall sent a reply letter claiming that President Clinton does not “have anything to offer for the stated purposes of the Committee’s investigation.”<sup>48</sup> On November 21, 2025, the Oversight Committee replied to Mr. Kendall that President Clinton must provide in-person testimony to the Oversight Committee.<sup>49</sup> On December 10, 2025, Mr. Kendall replied to the Oversight Committee’s November 21 letter, again arguing that President Clinton has “no relevant information justifying a deposition.”<sup>50</sup>

Following numerous letters, phone calls, and email correspondence, on December 12, 2025, President Clinton indicated he was unable to testify on December 17, 2025, due to his attendance at a friend’s funeral.<sup>51</sup> Mr. Kendall instead raised the prospect of President Clinton testifying on December 24, 2025.<sup>52</sup> Oversight Committee counsel stated that the Oversight Committee was unable to depose President Clinton on Christmas Eve but would accommodate any date during the weeks of January 5-9 or January 12-16, 2026.<sup>53</sup> Mr. Kendall stated he was unable to commit to his client appearing during those weeks.<sup>54</sup>

On December 15, 2025, the Oversight Committee sent another letter to address each of the claims in Mr. Kendall’s December 10, 2025, letter.<sup>55</sup> The letter accommodated President Clinton’s request to postpone the deposition scheduled for December 17, 2025, in light of his friend’s memorial service.<sup>56</sup>

The Oversight Committee rescheduled President Clinton’s deposition for January 13, 2026.<sup>57</sup> The Oversight Committee further gave notice to Mr. Kendall that, should President Clinton fail to comply with subpoena on the new date, the Oversight Committee would move immediately to initiate contempt of Congress proceedings.<sup>58</sup>

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 President Clinton.<sup>59</sup> Mr. Kendall attached to the letter another letter setting forth what President Clinton could state in a sworn written

---

<sup>48</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

<sup>49</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Nov. 21, 2025).

<sup>50</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Dec. 10, 2025).

<sup>51</sup> Email from Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 12, 2025, at 5:05PM).

<sup>52</sup> *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).

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*

<sup>55</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 15, 2025).

<sup>56</sup> *Id.*

<sup>57</sup> *Id.*

<sup>58</sup> *Id.*

<sup>59</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 3, 2026).

declaration.<sup>60</sup> This letter was from Mr. Kendall himself, not President 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 President Clinton as well since he had “no relationship whatsoever to the law enforcement efforts” involved in the Epstein investigation.<sup>61</sup>

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.<sup>62</sup> 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.<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup> Finally, the Oversight Committee clarified that if President Clinton failed to appear for his respective deposition, it would “leave the Committee no choice but to initiate contempt of Congress proceedings.”<sup>65</sup>

On January 12, 2026, Mr. Kendall and new counsel from Jenner & Block transmitted one final, last-minute letter raising arguments as to why President Clinton should not be required to sit for a deposition before the Oversight Committee.<sup>66</sup> They asserted—yet again—that President Clinton has “no information pertinent to the ... investigation.”<sup>67</sup> The letter was sent to the Oversight Committee at 11:02 p.m. EST the night before President Clinton was scheduled to appear to testify at his deposition.<sup>68</sup>

On the morning of January 13, 2026, President Clinton failed to comply with a congressional subpoena by not appearing to testify at his deposition.<sup>69</sup> That same day, 13 minutes after he was required to appear for his deposition, President Clinton emailed a written declaration to the Oversight Committee, outlining what he deemed to be all relevant information sought by the Committee.<sup>70</sup> However, the Oversight Committee had expressly stated on numerous

---

<sup>60</sup> *Id.*

<sup>61</sup> *Id.*

<sup>62</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

<sup>63</sup> *Id.*

<sup>64</sup> *Id.*

<sup>65</sup> *Id.*

<sup>66</sup> 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).

<sup>67</sup> *Id.*

<sup>68</sup> *Id.*

<sup>69</sup> Press Release, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, Chairman Comer: House Oversight Committee to Initiate Contempt of Congress Proceedings Against Former President Clinton for Defying Bipartisan Subpoena (Jan. 13, 2026).

<sup>70</sup> 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).

occasions prior to January 13, 2026, that a written statement in lieu of live testimony would not be sufficient and that President Clinton was required to appear for his deposition.<sup>71</sup> Furthermore, President Clinton declared in his statement, among other things, that he did, in fact have a relationship with Mr. Epstein prior to 2009 and that he did fly on Mr. Epstein's private plane on multiple occasions with other individuals.<sup>72</sup>

In his statement, among other things President Clinton also declared that “as a private citizen after leaving office in January 2001, I did not direct, oversee or participate in the handling of the investigations or prosecutions of the Epstein or Maxwell cases.”<sup>73</sup> However, according to court documents, a victim of Mr. Epstein alleged that, prior to 2011, “B. Clinton walked into [Vanity Fair] and threatened them not to write sex-trafficking [*sic*] articles about his good friend [Jeffrey Epstein].”<sup>74</sup> In the early and mid-2000s—as the recently former President of the United States—President Clinton may have had the strongest influence of all of Mr. Epstein's associates.<sup>75</sup> The Oversight Committee has previously raised this claim in its August 5, 2025 subpoena cover letter and in its October 22, 2025, letter to the Clintons' counsel, yet neither counsel nor President Clinton ever denied it.<sup>76</sup>

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.<sup>77</sup> 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.”<sup>78</sup> 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.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> 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 James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

<sup>72</sup> 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).

<sup>73</sup> *Id.*

<sup>74</sup> *Giuffre v. Maxwell*, Case No. 15-cv-07433-RWS, at GIUFFRE004886, GIUFFRE004887 (S.D.N.Y. 2024) (resp. to non-party Sharon Churcher's mot. to quash subpoena).

<sup>75</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025).

<sup>76</sup> *Id.*; Subpoena Cover Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to William J. Clinton, Former President of the U.S. (Aug. 5, 2025).

<sup>77</sup> Email from Jon Skladany, to Mark Marin, Staff Dir., H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 16, 2026, at 10:21PM).

<sup>78</sup> *Id.*

<sup>79</sup> *Id.*

The Oversight Committee stated that the parameters of this offer would not “allow the Committee to appropriately further its investigation.”<sup>80</sup> 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.”<sup>81</sup> The absence of an official transcript is particularly unacceptable given President Clinton’s documented history of parsing language to evade questions and responding falsely under oath<sup>82</sup> which resulted in his impeachment<sup>83</sup> and suspension from the practice of law.<sup>84</sup> The Committee did agree to “discuss an accommodation on the location” of both President and Secretary Clinton’s deposition.”<sup>85</sup>

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 ask questions.<sup>86</sup> 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.”<sup>87</sup> As of the drafting of this report, the Committee has not received further offers for President 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 President Clinton’s scheduling concerns, President Clinton still chose to defy his subpoena and failed to appear to testify before Congress. As the events described above make clear, the Oversight Committee’s efforts to persuade President Clinton to comply with its duly issued deposition subpoena have reached a dead end.

### ***C. President Clinton’s Purported Reasons for Non-Compliance with the Subpoena Are Without Merit.***

Through his counsel, President Clinton has offered several bases for his defiance of the Committee’s subpoena, particularly in his letter to the Oversight Committee, dated January 12, 2026.<sup>88</sup> President Clinton contends the Oversight Committee’s subpoena is “invalid and legally unenforceable” because: (i) the Oversight Committee shows “no connection to a valid legislative

---

<sup>80</sup> Email from Mark Marin, Staff Dir., H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to Jon Skladany (Jan. 17, 2026, at 12:11PM).

<sup>81</sup> *Id.*

<sup>82</sup> H.Res. 611, 105th Cong. (1998) (enacted).

<sup>83</sup> *Id.*

<sup>84</sup> Notice of Suspension of Attorney’s Privilege to Practice Law, Ark. S. Ct. Comm. On Prof’l Conduct, (Feb. 2, 2001).

<sup>85</sup> Email from Mark Marin, Staff Dir., H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to Jon Skladany (Jan. 17, 2026, at 12:11PM).

<sup>86</sup> Email from Ashley Callen, to Mark Marin, Staff Dir., H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 19, 2026, at 1:31PM).

<sup>87</sup> Email from Daniel Ashworth, Gen. Counsel, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to Ashley Callen (Jan. 19, 2026, at 7:11PM).

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

purpose,”<sup>89</sup> (ii) the subpoena is “an effort to publicly harass and embarrass President...Clinton,”<sup>90</sup> (iii) the subpoena is an impermissible exercise of law enforcement authority committed to coordinate branches of government,”<sup>91</sup> and (iv) the subpoena “run[s] afoul of the separation of powers doctrine.”<sup>92</sup> 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, President Clinton has attempted to argue his way out of the subpoena by claiming it was invalid because it served no legislative purpose and that his testimony was not intended to inform Congress in an area where legislation may be had.<sup>93</sup> 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,<sup>94</sup> 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.”<sup>95</sup> 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.

In addition, House Rule X further grants the Oversight Committee *broad oversight jurisdiction*, including authority to “conduct investigations of any matter” at “any time.”<sup>96</sup> That includes broad jurisdiction over federal “[g]overnment management” and reform, including the “[o]verall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities.”<sup>97</sup>

Here, the Oversight Committee’s investigative and legislative purposes for issuing a subpoena to President Clinton have been made exhaustingly clear to his 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,

---

<sup>89</sup> *Id.*

<sup>90</sup> *Id.*

<sup>91</sup> *Id.*

<sup>92</sup> *Id.*

<sup>93</sup> 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)).

<sup>94</sup> See generally *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 174; *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 178.

<sup>95</sup> *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 174.

<sup>96</sup> 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).

<sup>97</sup> Rule X, cl. 1(n), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

and (iii) reforming the use of non-prosecution agreements and/or plea agreements in sex-crime investigations.

While President Clinton has also claimed that his testimony would have no “pertinence to the stated purpose of the Committee’s investigation,”<sup>98</sup> that argument is unavailing. There is substantial evidence that President Clinton had a well-established relationship with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell for many years during the time when they were operating a sex-trafficking ring.<sup>99</sup> Furthermore, it is likely no accident that Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell maintained close relationships with powerful and influential people such as President Clinton while they were operating a sex-trafficking ring. Those relationships were probably intended to shield their activities from scrutiny.

President Clinton can therefore 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 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 examination 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, President Clinton’s contention that he should be excused from testifying because of a lack of personal knowledge and instead allowed to submit a written certification lacks merit.<sup>100</sup> Unlike the other witnesses subpoenaed by the Oversight Committee, President Clinton could offer testimony in his personal capacity about his time spent with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell and his observations based on his close personal relationships with them. 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.<sup>101</sup> During one of these trips, President Clinton was pictured receiving a massage from an individual who was later found to be one of Mr. Epstein’s victims.<sup>102</sup> To further demonstrate a personal connection, in 2010, Ms. Maxwell was invited to and attended the wedding of President Clinton’s daughter Chelsea Clinton.<sup>103</sup> 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.”<sup>104</sup> Additionally, in a 2007 letter to the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of Florida, Mr. Epstein’s lawyers

---

<sup>98</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

<sup>99</sup> 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).

<sup>100</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Oct. 6, 2025).

<sup>101</sup> 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).

<sup>102</sup> Aaron Feis, *New photos show Bill Clinton getting massage from Epstein accuser*, THE N.Y. POST (last updated Aug. 20, 2020).

<sup>103</sup> 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).

<sup>104</sup> Michael Gold, *Bill Clinton and Jeffrey Epstein: How Are They Connected*, THE N.Y. TIMES (July 9, 2019).

claimed that Mr. Epstein helped start the Clinton Foundation.<sup>105</sup> 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 personal relationships with Mr. Epstein.

It is noteworthy that counsel for President 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 President Clinton’s deposition was set to commence.<sup>106</sup> The Oversight Committee negotiated with President 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 former Secretary Clinton to appear for depositions on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day, respectively, in accordance with the Oversight Committee’s duly issued subpoenas.<sup>107</sup> And he previously acknowledged that the Oversight Committee “is entitled to what little information the Clintons have about Epstein and Maxwell.”<sup>108</sup>

If President Clinton was serious about this claim, his counsel could have argued the validity of the subpoena at any point during the months of negotiations. Instead, counsel waited until mere hours before President Clinton’s deposition to make this assertion. The subpoena was duly issued by the Chairman; therefore, the subpoena remains valid and legally enforceable.<sup>109</sup>

To reiterate, President Clinton’s interactions with and 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 President Clinton’s counsel that the Oversight Committee lacks a legitimate legislative purpose to pursue testimony from the former President is not persuasive.

ii. *President Clinton was subpoenaed to advance the Oversight Committee’s investigation, not to harass or embarrass him.*

---

<sup>105</sup> 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).

<sup>106</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

<sup>107</sup> 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).

<sup>108</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Oct. 6, 2025).

<sup>109</sup> Subpoena to William J. Clinton, Former President 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).

While President Clinton’s counsel argues that the subpoena is invalid because it is intended to “harass and embarrass” President Clinton,<sup>110</sup> 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 President Clinton. Moreover, this argument does not fit the facts here: if the Oversight Committee’s purpose was to harass and embarrass President Clinton, that purpose would seem to be best accomplished by subpoenaing him 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, President Clinton’s counsel alleges that he and Secretary 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.<sup>111</sup> 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.<sup>112</sup> Federal courts have consistently held that witnesses may not “impose [their] own conditions upon the manner of [congressional] inquiry.”<sup>113</sup> That is because “a witness does not have the legal right to dictate the conditions under which he will or will not testify”<sup>114</sup> or “to prescribe the conditions under which he may be interrogated by Congress.”<sup>115</sup>

Here, President 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.

President Clinton was subpoenaed because of his personal relationships with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell. And as the public record, evidence compiled by the Oversight Committee, and President Clinton’s counsel’s own letters to the Oversight Committee make clear, President Clinton is unable to certify that he had no personal relationship with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell or no information about them. The Committee’s decision to demand in-person

---

<sup>110</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

<sup>111</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

<sup>112</sup> See, e.g., Todd Garvey, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., LSB11093, COMMITTEE DISCRETION IN OBTAINING WITNESS TESTIMONY (Dec. 22, 2023).

<sup>113</sup> *Eisler v. United States*, 170 F.2d 273, 280 (D.C. Cir. 1948).

<sup>114</sup> *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”).

<sup>115</sup> *United States v. Hintz*, 193 F.Supp. 325, 335 (N.D. Ill. 1961).



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 him.

Mr. Kendall's argument that "President Clinton's interactions from two decades ago . . . plainly bear no relevance to this Committee's present inquiry"<sup>116</sup> is untrue; among other things, such interactions took place at the time Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell were engaged in sex trafficking and presumably engaged in efforts to shield their activities from investigation and public scrutiny.

Moreover, a survey of the Oversight Committee's investigative activities belies any suggestion that its subpoena is designed to embarrass President Clinton. The Committee's broad efforts to conduct a fair investigation are highlighted by the nine other individuals the Oversight Committee subpoenaed the same day as President Clinton,<sup>117</sup> of which only Attorney General Barr, a Republican, sat for a deposition;<sup>118</sup> a wide-ranging subpoena to the Department of Justice for documents, again the same day as President Clinton's subpoena;<sup>119</sup> a voluntary transcribed interview with former U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Florida Alex Acosta, again a Republican;<sup>120</sup> a subpoena for a deposition of Ms. Maxwell, whose attorney has stated she intends to assert her Fifth Amendment right;<sup>121</sup> a subpoena for Mr. Epstein's estate that has led to the Committee receiving thousands of pages of documents;<sup>122</sup> and most recently, three more motions to subpoena Les Wexner, Darren Indyke, and Richard Kahn,<sup>123</sup> all of whom had personal or business relationships with Mr. Epstein, which were voice voted by the full Committee.

Neither has the Oversight Committee subpoenaed President Clinton to expose his private affairs for the sake of exposure. While his counsel argues that the Supreme Court has "long invalidated such freewheeling hunts that 'inquir[e] into the private affairs of the citizen,'"<sup>124</sup> that is not the purpose of this subpoena. As an initial matter, the Committee has already explained

---

<sup>116</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025) (citing Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Oct. 6, 2025)).

<sup>117</sup> 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).

<sup>118</sup> Deposition of William P. Barr, Former U.S. Att'y Gen. (Aug. 18, 2025).

<sup>119</sup> Subpoena to Pamela J. Bondi, U.S. Att'y Gen., Dep't of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025).

<sup>120</sup> Transcribed Interview of R. Alexander Acosta, former U.S. Att'y for the S. Dist. of Fla. (Sept. 19, 2025).

<sup>121</sup> Subpoena to Ghislaine Maxwell (July 23, 2025); Hailey Fuchs, *Ghislaine Maxwell will plead Fifth in House Epstein probe, Comer says*, POLITICO (Nov. 21, 2025).

<sup>122</sup> Subpoena to the Estate of Jeffrey Epstein (Aug. 25, 2025).

<sup>123</sup> *Oversight of Fraud and Misuse of Federal Funds in Minnesota: Part I*, 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).

<sup>124</sup> 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)).

how President Clinton’s testimony is relevant to its oversight investigation. Moreover, the Oversight Committee has shown that there is ample evidence—flight logs, photos with unidentified females, handwritten notes, White House logs, among other things—connecting President Clinton to Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell at the time that they were operating a sex-trafficking ring.<sup>125</sup> 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 President Clinton of his obligation to appear for a deposition.*

Contrary to the claims of President Clinton’s counsel,<sup>126</sup> the subpoena to President 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 Oversight 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 President Clinton, violated the law. Photos released of President Clinton relating to the “Epstein Files” were in the custody and control of the Department of Justice,<sup>127</sup> which plainly show at least some nexus to the investigations of Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell—one of the stated purposes of this Committee’s investigation. Issuing a subpoena to President Clinton was not a “freewheeling hunt” of a private citizen, nor was it a law enforcement operation.<sup>128</sup> Instead, the subpoena was a natural next step to gathering information about Mr. Epstein’s and Ms. Maxwell’s activities as part of a larger effort to develop legislative reforms to combat sex trafficking.

President 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.”<sup>129</sup> 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.<sup>130</sup> And to the extent that witnesses, including President Clinton, are

---

<sup>125</sup> 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).

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

<sup>127</sup> DOJ Disclosures, Dep’t. of Just., available at <https://www.justice.gov/epstein/doj-disclosures>.

<sup>128</sup> 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)).

<sup>129</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 3, 2026).

<sup>130</sup> 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

concerned that answers to the 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, we note that any decision by President Clinton to invoke the Fifth Amendment during a deposition would appear to be at odds with the representations made by his counsel to the Oversight Committee regarding the nature of his 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,”<sup>131</sup> does not provide a justification for President Clinton refusing 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 President Clinton has failed to appear for his deposition, the issue of potential separation-of-powers concerns is moot.

President Clinton’s counsel contends that President Clinton should not have to testify because “no president or former president has been compelled to testify by congressional subpoena because of ‘the significant separation-of-powers issues raised by congressional subpoenas for the President’s information.’”<sup>132</sup> It is unclear precisely what separation-of-powers issues could exist regarding President Clinton’s potential testimony here, which would encompass events that occurred in his personal life as a private citizen, without him first appearing to testify. President Clinton “ha[s] been [a] private citizen[] for the last 24 ... years ...”<sup>133</sup> He maintained a relationship with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell in his personal capacity as a private citizen. Therefore, counsel’s attempt to raise separation-of-powers concerns and issues under *Mazars* fails because the testimony sought by the Oversight Committee from President Clinton is primarily concerned with his time as a private citizen, and any potential issues of executive privilege or other legal privileges could have been raised on a question-by-question basis during a deposition. There are plainly many questions that the Oversight Committee could ask President Clinton that could not conceivably raise any separation-of-powers concerns. And to the extent that President Clinton believes that certain Committee questions do raise such concerns, the House of Representatives’ deposition rules allow for privilege-based objections, such as executive privilege, to be raised on a question-by-question basis as President Clinton testifies.<sup>134</sup>

***D. Precedent Supports the Committee’s Position to Proceed with Holding President Clinton in Contempt.***

---

potentially be harmful to a witness in some distinct proceeding . . . or when crime or wrongdoing is exposed.” *Hutcheson*, 369 U.S. at 618.

<sup>131</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

<sup>132</sup> *Id.* (quoting *Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP*, 591 U.S. 848, 866 (2020)).

<sup>133</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

<sup>134</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Dec. 15, 2025).

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.’”<sup>135</sup> 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.”<sup>136</sup> 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.<sup>137</sup> Like the “ordinary federal criminal statute,” 2 U.S.C. § 192 “requires a criminal intent—in this instance, a deliberate, intentional refusal to answer.”<sup>138</sup>

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.<sup>139</sup> 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.<sup>140</sup> 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.<sup>141</sup> 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.<sup>142</sup>

President Clinton has not properly asserted any claims of privilege, nor has he asserted any basis for immunity from answering questions. In correspondence with his attorney prior to the scheduled date of the deposition, the Oversight Committee addressed and rejected President Clinton’s justifications for not complying with the terms of the subpoena.<sup>143</sup> The Oversight

<sup>135</sup> *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 504 (1975) (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 175).

<sup>136</sup> *Id.* at 504-05.

<sup>137</sup> 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).

<sup>138</sup> *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 165 (1955).

<sup>139</sup> Todd Garvey, CONG. RSCH. SERV., LSB10974, CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS, 3 (2023).

<sup>140</sup> 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).

<sup>141</sup> Rebecca Beitsch, *Republicans vote to hold Garland in contempt of Congress*, THE HILL (June 12, 2024).

<sup>142</sup> 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 GOV’T REFORM, RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY (Jan. 2024).

<sup>143</sup> 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

Committee specifically notified President Clinton, via his attorney, that his failure to appear for the deposition as required by the subpoena would lead to the Oversight Committee initiating contempt of Congress proceedings.<sup>144</sup> President 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 President Clinton to comply with its deposition subpoena. However, President Clinton has made clear that he will not appear for his deposition and he has not offered any valid legal justification for refusing to do so. President Clinton's actions have impeded an Oversight Committee investigation and its ability to perform its Constitutional oversight duties. President 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, and ordered the Report and the Resolution contained herein to be favorably reported, as amended, to the House by a recorded vote of \_\_ ayes to \_\_ noes.

## **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:

[...]

## **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.

---

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

<sup>144</sup> 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).

## **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 President William J. 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.

## **\_\_\_\_\_ VIEWS**

**[INSERT MINORITY, SUPPLEMENTAL, OR ADDITIONAL VIEWS]**