

**Questions for the Record from Speaker Mike Johnson for Attorney General Merrick
Garland
Hearing on Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice
September 20, 2023**

DOJ Authority to Stop Unauthorized Sports Wagering Activity Clarifications

- 1. Attorney General Garland, Louisiana is among the states that in recent years has authorized legal, regulated channels to place wagers on sporting events. Despite the legalization of this activity, a significant amount of unregulated offshore, online platforms continue to target Louisianans in obvious violation of both state and multiple federal laws. Our state’s chief Gaming Regulator – Ronnie Johns – raised this issue with the Department in April along with gaming regulators from 6 other states. While I appreciated the Department’s response acknowledging this is a problem it takes seriously, it’s clear that more focus is required on the most popular platforms that are laundering billions of dollars a year and putting millions of Americans at risk – in Louisiana and other states across the country. Does the Department have the necessary legal authorities under current law to bring action to shut down these operations? If not, please describe the additional tools the department requires to make meaningful progress in addressing this problem.**

Response: The Criminal Division advises as follows: It continues to be the policy of the Department to prosecute internet gambling companies that operate in violation of federal law. This includes enforcing laws that protect our financial systems, such as bank fraud and money laundering. Further, the Department continues to prioritize investigating and prosecuting the most egregious conduct, including conduct tied to organized crime, or conduct in which gambling activity is part of a larger criminal scheme.

The FBI is the investigative arm of the Department tasked with vetting allegations of violations of federal gaming laws. According to the FBI, when an allegation is investigated, and evidence of a violation is found, the FBI will forward the results of the investigation to the appropriate federal prosecuting authority to pursue charges, likely a U.S. Attorney’s Office in the jurisdiction where the crime has occurred. The Department takes seriously the issue of illegal gambling, including illegal online gambling, and continues to successfully investigate and prosecute illegal internet gambling. The Department works hard to establish and maintain strong partnerships with both public and private entities to combat illegal gaming. The Department understands the adverse impact illegal gaming can have on individuals and communities and will continue to use all available tools to detect, investigate, and prosecute such illegal activity. The Office of Legislative Affairs is available to discuss this issue further with your office and work with your staff to schedule a briefing.

Questions for the Record from Ms. Harriet Hageman for Attorney General Merrick Garland

**Hearing on Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice
September 20, 2023**

1. There is one specific issue that has arisen with respect to the pricing of aluminum. I have a very large Pepsi bottler in my state. They have informed me that suppliers and can makers of aluminum are charging their company and other customers an implied aluminum tariff on metal that should never be subject to any tariff. These fraudulent charges have added billions of dollars in cost to end users and in turn have increased the price of soda and beer cans, food containers, cars, planes, boats, campers, and other goods that utilize aluminum. Aluminum that is produced from recycled metal or is sourced domestically, or from exempted countries like Canada, should not be subject to any tariff. Moreover, the bulk of the duty collected is never paid to the government resulting in a windfall to the aluminum producers, can makers, and traders. We have a private party that has used the Federal Government as an unwitting accomplice/accessory to defraud another party. This may very well constitute a deceptive trade practice.

a. Will you pledge to investigate this issue and report back to my staff your findings?

Response: The Civil Division advises as follows: The Department actively enforces a variety of laws and regulations that combat deceptive trade practices. Longstanding Department policy and practice prevents the Department from commenting on pending or potential cases or investigations beyond what is in the public record. The Department has forwarded the information you provided to the appropriate component or investigative agency for review. You should not interpret this as confirmation of an investigation of the matters described above.

**Questions for the Record from Ms. Mary Gay Scanlon for Attorney General Merrick
Garland
Hearing on Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice
September 20, 2023**

1. Thank you for your efforts to increase enforcement against corporate crime and to establish the Corporate Crime Case Database on the DOJ website. Well-reported corporate crime data is necessary to inform prosecutors, courts, Congress, and the public about the nature and prevalence of these kinds of violations. While the Corporate Crime Case Database is a step in the right direction, more information is needed for the data to be useful. Regarding the Corporate Crime Case Database:

- a. Do you plan to add cases before April 2023 to the database?**
- b. Do you plan to add entries on settlements, deferred prosecution agreements, and non-prosecution agreements?**
- c. Are you assessing the feasibility of including civil and administrative case data for corporate-related offenses from other federal agencies?**
- d. What additional authorities or resources would improve the usefulness of the database or improve the collection of case data?**

Response to (a)–(d): The Criminal Division advises as follows:

Corporate crime weakens our economic institutions by undermining public trust in the fairness of those institutions. Failing to aggressively prosecute such crimes weakens our democratic institutions by undermining public trust in the rule of law. The Department will continue to hold companies and individuals who commit and profit from corporate malfeasance accountable for their criminal conduct.

To that end, as you are aware, earlier this year, the Department established the Corporate Crime Case Database (Database), which includes a public repository of information for corporate crime cases.

Since the establishment of the Database, the Department’s focus has been to provide information regarding significant, relevant cases that have been resolved since the beginning of 2023. The cases resolved this year and listed in the Database resulted from multi-year investigations and prosecutions. In addition, as the Database is being populated, the Department is including cases resolved in prior years. *See, e.g., United States v. Mid-Columbia Research, Zain Research LLC* (resolved Oct. 2, 2020); *United States v. The Terminix International Company Limited* (resolved Jan. 19, 2019).

The Database already includes cases involving deferred prosecution agreements and non-prosecution agreements. *See, e.g., United States v. British America Tobacco P.L.C., et al.* (deferred prosecution agreement); *In re Albemarle Corp.* (non-prosecution agreement). Because the Database relates to criminal cases, settlement information from civil cases is not included.

The Department is continuing to consider ways to better collect and report data related to corporate crime cases across the Department, which is currently done by the Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). In addition, BJS advises that it is continuing to actively look for ways to better collect and report on information that other federal agencies possess regarding relevant enforcement actions.

We appreciate your invitation to seek additional authorities or resources for the Database. As described in the Department's FY 2024 budget request, the Department requests \$39.7 billion, which will, among other things, support the Department's commitment to enhancing the use of data and evidence to drive better decision-making and achieve greater impact.

2. While I am encouraged by DOJ's efforts to improve corporate crime enforcement and compliance by businesses, I am concerned with the well-documented decline in enforcement actions against corporate crime. Similarly, I am concerned with DOJ's continued reliance on settlements, non-prosecution agreements, and deferred prosecution agreements.

a. What additional authorities would aid in obtaining convictions against, or deterring offenses by, corporations and the individuals they employ?

b. Would an authority to impose targeted monetary penalties (civil or criminal) on company leadership responsible for the actions of a firm help deter corporate offenses?

Response to (a)–(b): The Criminal Division and the Executive Office for United States Attorneys advise as follows:

The Department continues to devote substantial resources to fight against corporate crime, and our first priority in corporate cases is to prosecute the individuals who commit and profit from corporate malfeasance. In 2023, the Department charged more than 4,800 individual white-collar defendants nationwide and secured \$5 billion in criminal penalties from corporations. In just the last few months of 2023, the Justice Department successfully prosecuted the CEOs of two of the world's largest cryptocurrency exchanges. These convictions followed several other significant convictions of corporate executives for fraud and money laundering. *See, e.g., United States v. Shah, et al.* (three former executives of Outcome Health who orchestrated a \$1 billion fraud scheme were convicted in April 2023 following an 11-week trial); *United States v. Ng Chong Hwa* (a former Managing Director of Goldman Sachs was convicted of a multi-billion dollar foreign bribery and money laundering scheme following a nine-week trial and sentenced in March 2023); *United States v. Smith, et al.* (JP Morgan traders were convicted of manipulating the global gold market that resulted in over \$10 million in losses to market participants and sentenced in August 2023).

The Department will continue to use every tool at its disposal to investigate and prosecute corporate crime and hold accountable the individual executives who are responsible for it. The Office of Legislative Affairs is available to discuss this issue further and work with your office on proposals to strengthen these tools.

**Questions for the Record from Mr. Lance Gooden for Attorney General Merrick Garland
Hearing on Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice
September 20, 2023**

Settlement Slush Funds:

1. The Justice Department published a policy memo to allow redirection of settlements to third parties such as NGOs and social justice organizations. While this policy was scrapped by Attorney General Jeff Sessions in 2017, the current administration revived it. Please elaborate on the general implementation of this policy by answering the following questions.

- a. Since its revival, has the Justice Department implemented this donation policy in all cases? Please specify the cases in which this has been implemented.**
- b. Has the Justice Department ever reduced or offered to reduce a penalty or fine in any case in exchange for the charged entity paying a donation to a third party or NGO of your choosing?
 - i. Has the Justice Department ever made settlement offers mandating a donation to third-party organizations?**
 - ii. Has the Justice Department ever made a settlement offer contingent on mandatory donations to a third-party organization?****
- c. What is the exact amount that the Justice Department has settled in cases since 2021? How much of this has been redirected as donations or grants to third parties and NGOs?**
- d. How many third parties that have received donations due to settlements have been involved in accommodating, processing, or assisting immigrants?**
- e. Have any settlement amounts gone to NGOs or entities dealing with immigrants or accommodating and assisting immigrants?**

Response to (a)–(e): On May 5, 2022, the Attorney General issued a memorandum that addressed concerns regarding settlement agreements that direct or provide payments to non-governmental third parties. That memorandum set forth guidelines and limitations that govern the Justice Department’s approach to entering into such settlement agreements. The memorandum is available at:

https://www.justice.gov/d9/pages/attachments/2022/05/05/02_ag_guidlines_and_limitations_memorandum_0.pdf.

f. Since the revival of this policy, has there been any communication, dialogue, exchange, or negotiation between the Justice Department and any third-party entities for any settlements made, offered, or negotiated since January 2021? Please provide copies of all such communications, dialogues, exchanges, or negotiations.

Response: While longstanding Department policy and practice prevents the Department from commenting on the course of settlement negotiations in particular matters beyond what is in the public record, any such case resolutions would be subject to the restrictions set forth in the May 5, 2022 memorandum. The memorandum is available at:

https://www.justice.gov/d9/pages/attachments/2022/05/05/02_ag_guidelines_and_limitations_memo.pdf.

g. How many of these cases settled by the Justice Department has the settlement amount reached the Treasury and/or the victims of the settled case? Please provide a dollar value along with a percentage value in relation to the total amount settled.

Response: The Department's litigating components advise that the Department places great weight on the deterrent role of fines and penalties and the need to ensure appropriate compensation of victims and others harmed by violations of law and seeks to provide for full deterrence and proper compensation of victims in every case. On May 5, 2022, the Attorney General issued a memorandum that addressed concerns regarding settlement agreements that direct or provide payments to non-governmental third parties. That memorandum set forth guidelines and limitations that govern the Justice Department's approach to entering into such settlement agreements. The memorandum is available at:

https://www.justice.gov/d9/pages/attachments/2022/05/05/02_ag_guidelines_and_limitations_memo.pdf.

2. The Justice Department has been reported to have made settlement agreements on several cases related to the Jeffrey Epstein case. Please provide details regarding the settling party, the settlement amount, and the rationale behind settling the case, along with answers to the following questions:

- a. **How many cases related to the Epstein Case/Scandal has the Justice Department settled?**
- b. **Is the Justice Department implementing this settlement and donation policy in all cases? How many cases has this occurred in?**
- c. **What was the rationale for reaching settlements in these cases and the settlement amount? How did the Justice Department arrive at these figures and deem it was fair? Please provide details of all settlement offers or negotiations made.**
- d. **Please provide the details of where these settlement amounts have been or are planned to be deposited and the list of all recipients of these settlements.**
- e. **If any donations, contributions, or payments have been made to third parties as part of the settlement agreement or arising from negotiations since 2021, please provide the rationale for this decision and the justification for selecting said third parties as ideal recipients of these contributions, payments, or donations.**
- f. **If there have been any other donations or contributions made or planned to be made by the settling party as part of or related to the offense they are settling, please provide all details, including the recipient, the amount, and the date of such contributions (if already made).**

- g. Have any funds from the settlement or any donations, contributions or payments from these settled cases been made to non-governmental organizations?**
 - i. If so, please provide details including but not limited to the recipient entity's name, the amount, and the purpose of the donation.**
 - ii. Are any of these recipient entities involved in accommodating or assisting immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers or working with organizations involved in accommodating immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers?**
 - iii. Are any of these recipient entities involved in promoting, supporting, propagating, or providing assistance for sexual choice, sexual preference, multi-gender identities, gender re-assignment, or gender transitioning in minors or non-adults?**

Specific Settlements

JP Morgan:

- 3. The Justice Department recently reached a settlement with JP Morgan for \$75 million for their involvement in the Epstein Case. Please provide answers to the following questions:**
 - a. What was the rationale for reaching a settlement with JP Morgan instead of pursuing a proper prosecution?**
 - b. What was the rationale behind the settlement amount? How did the Justice Department arrive at a figure of \$75 million and deem it was a fair settlement amount? Please provide details of all settlement offers or negotiations made.**
 - c. There have been reports of a large chunk of the settlement being donated to third parties. Please provide the details of where the settlement amount has been or is planned to be deposited and the list of all recipients of the settlement amount.**
 - d. If any donations, contributions, or payments have been made to third parties as part of the settlement agreement or arising from negotiations related to this case, please provide the rationale for this decision and the rationale behind selecting said third parties as ideal recipients of these contributions, payments, or donations.**
 - e. If there have been any other donations or contributions made or planned to be made by the settling party as part of or related to their settlement, please provide all details, including the recipient, the amount, and the date of these contributions.**
 - f. Have any funds from the settlement or any donations, contributions, or payments arising from this case been made to any non-governmental organizations?**
 - i. If so, please provide details including but not limited to the recipient entity's name, the amount, and the purpose of the donation.**
 - ii. Are any of these recipient entities involved in accommodating or assisting immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers or working with organizations involved in accommodating immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers?**
 - iii. Are any of these recipient entities involved in promoting, supporting, propagating, or providing assistance for sexual choice, sexual preference, multi-gender identities, gender re-assignment, or gender transitioning in minors or non-adults?**

CHASE:

4. The Justice Department recently reached a settlement with Chase for \$300 million for their involvement in the Epstein Case. Please provide answers to the following questions:

- a. What was the rationale for reaching a settlement with Chase instead of pursuing a proper prosecution?**
- b. What was the rationale behind the settlement amount? How did the Justice Department arrive at a figure of \$300 million and deem it was a fair settlement amount? Please provide details of all settlement offers or negotiations made.**
- c. There have been reports of a large chunk of the settlement being donated to third parties. Please provide the details of where the settlement amount has been or is planned to be deposited and the list of all recipients of the settlement amount.**
- d. If any donations, contributions, or payments have been made to third parties as part of the settlement agreement or arising from negotiations related to this case, please provide the rationale for this decision and the rationale behind selecting said third parties as ideal recipients of these contributions, payments, or donations.**
- e. If there have been any other donations or contributions made or planned to be made by the settling party as part of or related to their settlement, please provide all details, including the recipient, the amount, and the date of these contributions.**
- f. Have any funds from the settlement or any donations, contributions, or payments from this case been made to any non-governmental organizations?**
 - i. If so, please provide details including but not limited to the recipient entity's name, the amount, and the purpose of the donation.**
 - ii. Are any of these recipient entities involved in accommodating or assisting immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers or working with organizations that are involved in accommodating immigrants, refugees, or asylum seekers?**
 - iii. Are any of these recipient entities involved in promoting, supporting, propagating, or providing assistance for sexual choice, sexual preference, multi-gender identities, gender re-assignment, or gender transitioning in minors or non-adults?**

Response to 2–4: Settlements in all civil cases handled by the Department are based on many factors. See Justice Manual, 4-3.200, <https://www.justice.gov/jm/jm-4-3000-compromising-and-closing>.

In reference to the two settlements with JPMorgan Chase, the Department was not involved with either case. One matter was brought by victims of Jeffrey Epstein against a private party, JPMorgan Chase, in the Southern District of New York. *Doe I. v. JPMorgan Chase*, No. 1:22-cv-10019 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 24, 2022). The other was brought by the Attorney General of the U.S. Virgin Islands against a private party, JPMorgan Chase, also in the Southern District of New York. *United States Virgin Islands v. JPMorgan Chase*, No. 1:22-cv-10904-UA (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 27, 2022).

CCP Questions:

Given the sharp rise in Chinese infiltration of our academia and intellectual property, many of our companies have come under threat here and abroad. This issue has also been

highlighted by FBI Director Wray before the Judiciary Committee in July. To better understand the position and status of the Justice Department in dealing with this issue, please answer the following questions:

- 1. What specific steps has the Department of Justice taken to address this issue?**
- 2. Have you received adequate support from the administration in terms of the availability of resources and funding?**
- 3. If so, how much of the funds available to the Justice Department have been used to combat the rising threat of Chinese infiltration in these critical areas?**

Response to 1–3: The National Security Division advises as follows:

As the Assistant Attorney General for National Security has noted, the government of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) threatens our security through its concerted use of espionage, theft of trade secrets, malicious cyber activity, transnational repression, and other tactics to advance its interests – all to the detriment of the United States and other democratic nations and their citizens. The government of the PRC is becoming more aggressive and more capable in their malign activity than ever before.

The Department continues to devote substantial resources to counter the threat of Chinese Communist Party (CCP)-directed efforts to obtain U.S. research, technology, and industrial secrets using targeted, unlawful actions to infiltrate high-value sectors in academic and business institutions. The Department, through the National Security Division, the Criminal Division’s Computer Crime and Intellectual Property Section, and U.S. Attorneys’ Offices around the country, has aggressively investigated and prosecuted cases involving these threats. These cases have ranged from economic espionage, thefts of trade secrets, exfiltration of sensitive scientific, financial, and personal data from U.S. individuals, academic institutions, and businesses, and similar cyberthreats, to piracy of U.S. copyrighted works, and counterfeiting of U.S. products into the United States.

The Department takes very seriously the national security threat to the United States posed by theft of intellectual property. In February 2023, the Department announced the creation of the Department’s “Disruptive Technology Strike Force” (Strike Force), a partnership between the Department of Justice and the Department of Commerce designed to enforce U.S. laws protecting U.S. advanced technologies from illegal acquisition and use by nation-state adversaries.¹ The Strike Force is already having an impact on defending intellectual property rights, including from foreign actors from the PRC. For example, on May 16, 2023, Department officials from multiple components and five different U.S. Attorneys’ Offices announced

¹ U.S. JUSTICE DEP’T, Justice and Commerce Departments Announce Creation of Disruptive Technology Strike Force (Feb. 16, 2023), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-and-commerce-departments-announce-creation-disruptive-technology-strike-force>.

criminal charges in five cases and four arrests in connection with the new Strike Force.² Three of the cases have a nexus to Chinese companies and citizens.

Additionally, in November 2022, Xu Yanjun, a Deputy Division Director within the PRC's Ministry of State Security, was sentenced to 20 years in prison following his conviction for conspiring to commit economic espionage and related charges following a years-long effort to steal aviation trade secrets on behalf of the PRC³ government through both insiders and cyber-enabled means. In January 2023, Xiaoqing Zheng, an engineer working for General Electric (GE) Power & Water in New York, was sentenced to 24 months in prison following his conviction for conspiring to steal trade secrets from GE related to GE gas and steam turbines and transmitting stolen files to a Chinese company.⁴ Similarly, Haoyang Yu was sentenced to 6 months in prison followed by three years of supervised release in which he cannot work in the microchip industry and ordered to pay a fine of \$55,000 and restitution following his conviction for theft of trade secrets. Yu stole present and future microchip designs and schematics and used the information to start his own microchip business.⁵

The Department and the Strike Force will continue to take aggressive actions to counter the PRC government's campaign of illegally exporting sensitive technology and to mitigate this threat to the American people. To be clear, these concerns are with the PRC government's policies and practices—not against the Chinese people or those of Chinese descent. The Department can and must defend U.S. economic interests and national security and protect Americans' civil rights and civil liberties at the same time.

Moreover, according to the National Security Division, over the years, the Department has disrupted the PRC government's cyber-enabled targeting of our critical infrastructure sectors, including the PRC government's theft of intellectual property and other sensitive business information from the Defense Industrial Base, Critical Manufacturing, Information Technology, Transportation, and Healthcare Sectors. The Department is also focused on disrupting the PRC government's efforts to hold our critical infrastructure sectors at risk of a destructive or disruptive attack during a future geopolitical crisis. For example, in January 2024, the Department announced a court-authorized technical operation that disrupted a botnet that PRC state-sponsored hackers, known to the private sector as "Volt Typhoon," had used to obfuscate their hacking of critical infrastructure organizations in the United States and elsewhere. That operation was preceded and accompanied by the Department's release, alongside our U.S. government and private sector partners, of valuable network defense guidance to enhance the

² U.S. JUSTICE DEP'T, *Justice Department Announces Five Cases as Part of Recently Launched Disruptive Technology Strike Force* (May 16, 2023), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-announces-five-cases-part-recently-launched-disruptive-technology-strike>.

³ U.S. JUSTICE DEP'T, *Chinese Government Intelligence Officer Sentenced to 20 Years in Prison for Espionage Crimes, Attempting to Steal Trade Secrets from Cincinnati Company* (Nov. 16, 2022), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/chinese-government-intelligence-officer-sentenced-20-years-prison-espionage-crimes-attempting>.

⁴ U.S. JUSTICE DEP'T, *Former GE Power Engineer Convicted of Conspiracy to Commit Economic Espionage Following Four-Week Trial* (Apr. 1, 2022), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-ndny/pr/former-ge-power-engineer-convicted-conspiracy-commit-economic-espionage-following-four>.

⁵ U.S. JUSTICE DEP'T, *Former Engineer Sentenced for Possessing Stolen Semiconductor Trade Secret* (June 1, 2023), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-ma/pr/former-engineer-sentenced-possessing-stolen-semiconductor-trade-secret>.

private sector's defenses against this threat. Through the Department's investigations, prosecutions, technical operations, and sharing of threat intelligence, the Department is instituting an "all tools" approach to enhancing this country's cybersecurity and disrupting the PRC's malicious activities.

The Department continues to devote substantial resources to counter the threats of the PRC.

The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2024 requests a total of \$39.7 billion in discretionary resources, an increase of \$2.3 billion, or 6 percent, over the Fiscal Year 2023 enacted level, and \$9.7 billion in mandatory funding for the Department of Justice. Included in this request is almost \$7.7 billion for national security programs, including \$32.7 million in program increases to expand the Department's ability to counter terrorism and keep pace with rising national security threats, while protecting civil rights and civil liberties, and \$179.7 million in program enhancements to support the Department's efforts to respond to cybersecurity and cyber threats.

SpaceX Questions:

Earlier this year, it was reported that the Department of Justice was pursuing legal action against Elon Musk and his companies, particularly SpaceX, for not hiring foreign nationals. These companies handle critical government contracts with access to sensitive information, including national security and defense. Please answer the following questions to clarify your stance on the issue:

- 1. Is the Justice Department of the view that foreign nationals should be allowed to access sensitive defense information or that granting access to government data to foreigners is mandatory for all entities within the United States?**
- 2. Please provide the rationale and appropriate legal authority behind pursuing legal action in this case.**
- 3. How many foreign nationals have been employed by the Department of Justice that have access to sensitive information, including but not limited to national security, defense, and critical infrastructure and communications?**

Response to 1–3: The Civil Rights Division advises as follows:

As described in the complaint in *United States v. Space Exploration Technologies Corp* (Aug. 23, 2023), the Civil Rights Division's Immigrant and Employee Rights (IER) Section opened an independent investigation of SpaceX on May 29, 2020, to determine if the company was engaging in any pattern or practice of discrimination in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) based on having a reason to believe that discrimination could be occurring. The complaint alleges that although SpaceX stated that they could only hire U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents because of export control laws and regulations like the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), under ITAR and the Export Administration Regulations, U.S. persons working for U.S. companies can access export-controlled items without authorization from the U.S. government. And under these laws, a "U.S. person" includes

individuals granted refugee or asylum status by the U.S. government. The complaint further alleges that SpaceX discriminated against individuals who were, or whom it perceived to be, individuals granted asylum and refugee status because of citizenship or immigration status during the hiring process, and that SpaceX's actions constitute a pattern or practice of discrimination prohibited under 8 U.S.C. 1324b(a)(1)(B). Specifically, the complaint alleges that, from at least September 2018 to at least May 2022, SpaceX discriminated against individuals granted asylum and refugee status throughout its hiring process, including during recruiting, screening, and selection, in violation of the INA.