
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 __, 2026. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE.....	3
BACKGROUND ON THE INVESTIGATION	5
<i>A. The Committee Seeks Information from Witnesses and Entities as Part of Its Investigation</i>	6
<i>B. After Months of Correspondence and Rescheduling, Secretary Clinton Defies the Subpoena.....</i>	8
<i>C. Secretary Clinton's Purported Reasons for Non-Compliance with the Subpoena Are Without Merit.</i>	11
<i>i. The subpoenas seek testimony related to a valid legislative purpose.....</i>	11
<i>ii. Secretary Clinton was subpoenaed to advance the Oversight Committee's investigation, not to harass or embarrass her.</i>	15
<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 and Ms. Maxwell's sex-trafficking ring does not relieve Secretary Clinton of her obligation to appear for a deposition.....</i>	17
<i>iv. The separation of powers does not render the subpoena unenforceable.</i>	18
CONCLUSION	20
COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
COMMITTEE VOTES	Error! Bookmark not defined.
COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND TAX EXPENDITURES.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	Error! Bookmark not defined.
ADVISORY ON EARMARKS.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

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, in particular 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. 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 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

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

² *Id.*

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

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 Rulemaking 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 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 provides 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.

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).

¹⁰ Rule XI, cl. 2(m)(1)(B), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025); 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).

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

The facts and circumstances surrounding both Mr. Epstein 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

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>.

¹⁸ Press Release, U.S. Dep’t of Just., Ghislaine Maxwell Sentenced To 20 Years In Prison For Conspiring With Jeffery 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).

A. The Committee Seeks Information from Witnesses and Entities as Part of Its Investigation.

On August 5, 2025, the Chairman of the Oversight Committee, pursuant to the Subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement's voice vote on a motion to subpoena, 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] 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*

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).

²⁵ Rudy Takala, Ghislaine Maxwell's Nephew Worked on Mideast Policy in Hillary Clinton's State Department, MEDiATE, (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.*

(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 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 which 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.

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).

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. Att'y for the S. Dist. of Fla. (Sept. 19, 2025).

³⁶ *Curbing Federal Fraud: Examining Innovative Tools to Detect and Prevent Fraud in Federal Programs Hearing Before H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform*, 119th Cong. 2 (Jan. 13, 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).

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 David E. Kendall, an attorney for the Clintons who negotiated on both their behalf throughout this process, 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 But 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 stated 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

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

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.*

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).

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 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 And it accommodated Secretary Clinton’s request to postpone the deposition scheduled for December 18, 2025, in light of her friend’s memorial service.

The Oversight Committee rescheduled Secretary Clinton’s deposition for January 14, 2026.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴

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.⁵⁵ Mr. Kendall attached to the letter another letter setting forth what Secretary Clinton could state in a sworn written declaration.⁵⁶ 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 since she had “no relationship whatsoever to the law enforcement efforts” involved in the Epstein investigation.⁵⁷

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

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ *Id.*

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.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ 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.”⁶¹

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.”⁶² 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.⁶³

On the morning of January 14, 2026, Secretary Clinton failed to comply with a congressional subpoena by not appearing to testify at this deposition.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶

⁵⁸ Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2026).

⁵⁹ *Id.*

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ *Id.*

⁶² Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026 at 11:02 p.m.).

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ 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).

⁶⁵ 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).

⁶⁶ 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).

In her statement, among other things, Secretary Clinton acknowledges that she had interacted with Ms. Maxwell. By way of explanation, she declares that Ms. Maxwell “began a personal relationship” with a “mutual friend” while Secretary Clinton knew her but fails to identify this “mutual friend.”⁶⁷ Secretary Clinton also asserts 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.”⁶⁸ Nowhere in the declaration, however, does 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.

In sum, after more than five months of negotiations with Mr. Kendall, 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 Subpoenas Are Without Merit.

Through her counsel, Secretary Clinton has offered several bases for her defiance of the Oversight Committee’s subpoenas, particularly in her final letter to the Oversight Committee, dated January 12, 2026.⁶⁹ Secretary Clinton contends the Oversight Committee’s subpoenas are “invalid and legally unenforceable” because: (i) the Oversight Committee shows “no connection to a valid legislative purpose,”⁷⁰ (ii) the subpoenas are “an effort to publicly harass and embarrass...Secretary Clinton,”⁷¹ (iii) the subpoenas are an impermissible exercise of law enforcement authority committed to coordinate branches of government,”⁷² and (iv) “the subpoenas run afoul of the separation of powers doctrine.”⁷³ 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 subpoenas seek 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

⁶⁷ 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).

⁶⁸ *Id.*

⁶⁹ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ *Id.*

intended to inform Congress in an area where legislation may be had.⁷⁴ 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 oversight⁷⁵ 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.”⁷⁶ 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*.⁷⁷ That includes broad jurisdiction over federal “[g]overnment management” and reform, including the “[o]verall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities.”⁷⁸

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 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,”⁷⁹ 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.

⁷⁴ 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)).

⁷⁵ See generally *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 174; *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 178.

⁷⁶ *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 174.

⁷⁷ 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).

⁷⁸ Rule X, cl. 1(n), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).

⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁰ 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.⁸¹ 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.⁸²

Moreover, both Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell were involved with the Clinton Foundation, where Secretary Clinton has served on the board of directors for more than a decade. 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.”⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ Moreover, in 2013, Ms. Maxwell was honored by the Clinton Global Initiative at an event, supposedly for her work on ocean conservation.⁸⁵

Additionally, 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.⁸⁶ And her own declaration even makes clear that she interacted with Ms. Maxwell, suggesting that they met through a mutual friend.⁸⁷

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 Committee’s knowledge of that sex-trafficking ring or the ways in which Mr. Epstein and Ms.

⁸⁰ 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).

⁸¹ Soo Rin Kim, *Jeffrey Epstein donated to several Democrats throughout 1990s and early 2000s*, ABC NEWS (July 12, 2019).

⁸² 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).

⁸³ Michael Gold, *Bill Clinton and Jeffrey Epstein: How Are They Connected*, THE N.Y. TIMES (July 9, 2019).

⁸⁴ 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).

⁸⁵ Edward Helmore, *Maxwell honored at Clinton event years after sexual abuse allegations emerged*, THE GUARDIAN (Aug. 25, 2025).

⁸⁶ 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).

⁸⁷ 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).

Maxwell sought to use their relationships with influential people to discourage examination of their unlawful activities. And 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's 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.⁸⁸ 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. Maxwell⁸⁹ and those in the orbit of her and Mr. Epstein, including her husband, and her observations. Further, based on her relationships with Maxwell, and her relationship with President Clinton, she could speak to Mr. Epstein 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.⁹⁰ 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 personal relationships with Mr. Epstein.

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.⁹¹ 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.⁹²

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

⁸⁸ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Oct. 6, 2025).

⁸⁹ Edward Helmore, *Maxwell honored at Clinton event years after sexual abuse allegations emerged*, THE GUARDIAN (Aug. 25, 2025).

⁹⁰ 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).

⁹¹ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

⁹² 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).

until mere hours before the first scheduled deposition to make this assertion. The subpoena was duly issued by the Chairman; therefore, the subpoena remains valid and legally enforceable.⁹³

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 Secretary Clinton’s counsel argues that the subpoena is invalid because it is intended to “harass and embarrass” Secretary Clinton,⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶ Federal courts have consistently held that witnesses may not “impose [their] own conditions upon the manner of [congressional] inquiry.”⁹⁷ That is because “a witness does not have the legal right to dictate the conditions under which he will or

⁹³ 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).

⁹⁴ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

⁹⁵ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

⁹⁶ See, e.g., Todd Garvey, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., LSB11093, COMMITTEE DISCRETION IN OBTAINING WITNESS TESTIMONY (Dec. 22, 2023).

⁹⁷ *Eisler v. United States*, 170 F.2d 273, 280 (D.C. Cir. 1948).

will not testify”⁹⁸ or “to prescribe the conditions under which he may be interrogated by Congress.”⁹⁹

Here, Secretary Clinton is not similarly situated to the other witnesses from whom the 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 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.¹⁰⁰ In addition, Secretary Clinton has knowledge of federal government efforts to combat international sex trafficking. 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 Committee subpoenaed the same day as Secretary Clinton,¹⁰¹ of which only Attorney General Barr, a Republican, sat for a deposition;¹⁰² a wide-ranging subpoena to the Department of Justice for documents, again the same day as Secretary Clinton’s subpoena;¹⁰³ a voluntary transcribed interview with former U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Florida Alex Acosta, again a Republican;¹⁰⁴ a subpoena for a deposition of Ms. Maxwell, whose attorney has stated she intends to assert her Fifth Amendment right;¹⁰⁵ a subpoena for Mr. Epstein’s estate which has led to the Oversight Committee receiving thousands of pages of documents,¹⁰⁶ and

⁹⁸ *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”).

⁹⁹ *United States v. Hintz*, 193 F.Supp. 325, 335 (N.D. Ill. 1961).

¹⁰⁰ 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).

¹⁰¹ 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).

¹⁰² Deposition of William P. Barr, Former U.S. Att’y Gen. (Aug. 18, 2025).

¹⁰³ Subpoena to Pamela J. Bondi, Att’y Gen., Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 5, 2025).

¹⁰⁴ Transcribed Interview of R. Alexander Acosta, Former U.S. Att’y for the S. Dist. of Fla. (Sept. 19, 2025).

¹⁰⁵ Subpoena to Ghislaine Maxwell (July 23, 2025); Hailey Fuchs, *Ghislaine Maxwell will plead Fifth in House Epstein probe, Comer says*, POLITICO (Nov. 21, 2025).

¹⁰⁶ Subpoena to the Estate of Jeffrey Epstein (Aug. 25, 2025).

most recently, three more motions to subpoena Les Wexner, Darren Indyke, and Richard Kahn,¹⁰⁷ all of which had personal or business relationships with Mr. Epstein, which were 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,’”¹⁰⁸ 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.¹⁰⁹ 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 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,¹¹⁰ 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 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.¹¹¹ Instead, the subpoena was a natural next step to gathering information as part of a larger effort to craft legislation to combat sex trafficking.

¹⁰⁷ *Curbing Federal Fraud: Examining Innovative Tools to Detect and Prevent Fraud in Federal Programs Hearing Before H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform*, 119th Cong. 2 (Jan. 13, 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).

¹⁰⁸ 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)).

¹⁰⁹ 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).

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

¹¹¹ *Id.* (quoting *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 195 (1880)).

Secretary Clinton’s counsel has also invoked concerns about a Department of Justice investigation, stating that “[n]o responsible attorney would allow a client to testify in any Legislative Branch [sic] proceeding while this investigation … continues.”¹¹² 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.¹¹³ 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 invoking 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,”¹¹⁴ does not provide a justification for declining to attend the deposition. At most, raising separations-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.”¹¹⁵ 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.¹¹⁶ 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, counsel’s attempt to raise

¹¹² Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 3, 2026).

¹¹³ 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.

¹¹⁴ Letter from David E. Kendall & Ashley Callen to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Jan. 12, 2026).

¹¹⁵ Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

¹¹⁶ 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).

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.’”¹¹⁷ 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.”¹¹⁸ 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.¹¹⁹ Like the “ordinary federal criminal statute,” 2 U.S.C. § 192 “requires a criminal intent—in this instance, a deliberate, intentional refusal to answer.”¹²⁰

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.¹²¹ 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.¹²² 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.¹²³ 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 ultimately not voted on by the full House because Hunter Biden ultimately agreed to testify before the Oversight Committee.¹²⁴

¹¹⁷ *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 504 (1975) (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 175).

¹¹⁸ *Id.* at 504–05.

¹¹⁹ 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).

¹²⁰ *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 165 (1955).

¹²¹ Todd Garvey, CONG. RSCH. SERV., LSB10974, CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS, 3 (2023).

¹²² 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).

¹²³ Rebecca Beitsch, *Republicans vote to hold Garland in contempt of Congress*, THE HILL (June 12, 2024).

¹²⁴ 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).

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.¹²⁵ 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.¹²⁶ 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, 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:

[...]

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

¹²⁵ 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); Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, to David E. Kendall (Jan. 8, 2025).

¹²⁶ 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 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 related to determining whether sufficient grounds exist to hold 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 clauses 9 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.