UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

———————————————————————————————

JOSEPH KIRCHNER,

Plaintiff,

v. **Civil Action No. 25-cv-_____**

MIKE JOHNSON, et al.,

Defendants.

———————————————————————————————

APPENDIX IV

SYSTEMATIC VIOLATION OF FEDERAL TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS

Exhaustive FOIA Exemption Analysis Proving Unauthorized Criminal Associate Protection

I. LEGAL STANDARD

1. **5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)** requires agencies "shall make records promptly available to any person" unless records fall within the **nine exhaustive exemptions** under **5 U.S.C. § 552(b)**.

2. Government officials cannot create additional exemptions through political coordination, executive preference, or criminal associate protection.

3. The statutory framework is **exhaustive and exclusive** - agencies possess no authority to withhold records outside these specific provisions.

4. **Congressional Intent**: FOIA enacted with "general philosophy of full agency disclosure" (*S. Rep. No. 813, 89th Congress* (1965)) finding prior law "had become more of a withholding than a disclosure mechanism."

5. The **nine exemptions** provide the exclusive grounds for withholding authentic government documents.

II. FOUNDATIONAL JURISDICTIONAL BARS DESTROYING ALL DEFENSES

A. Temporal/Jurisdictional Impossibility

6. **FOIA exemptions apply exclusively to official government actions, not private citizen conduct predating official service.**

7. Trump's Epstein associations were private citizen conduct (1990s-2000s) occurring **outside the temporality of the Trump Administration.**

8. **Legal Impossibility**: Cannot retroactively apply FOIA protection to unofficial acts that occurred before government service.

9. The **temporal bar** is absolute - private conduct consequences cannot be treated as government action requiring FOIA protection.

10. **Circular Reasoning Prohibition**: Cannot use FOIA to conceal evidence of private conduct because revealing that conduct might complicate prosecuting that conduct.

B. Official vs. Unofficial Acts Doctrine

11. Supreme Court jurisprudence (*Trump v. Vance*) distinguishes **official presidential acts** from **private conduct.**

12. FOIA exemptions protect **official government actions** exclusively.

13. Private citizen relationships with criminal enterprises fall outside FOIA's protective scope regardless of subsequent official positions.

III. SYSTEMATIC EXEMPTION-BY-EXEMPTION ANALYSIS

A. EXEMPTION (1): NATIONAL SECURITY

14. **Statutory Text**: "specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy."

15. **Legal Analysis**: National security exemptions cannot depend upon individual criminal conspiracy protection.

16. The only conspiracy potentially congruent with national security interests would be conspiracy by an entire nation, which is logically impossible under principles of national sovereignty.

17. FOIA does not exempt individual criminal conspiracies from disclosure regardless of participants' social status or political connections.

18. **Johnson/Trump Violation**: Attempting to invoke national security rationales for protecting individual criminal associates.

19. Individual criminal accountability cannot constitute national security threat requiring FOIA exemption.

20. **Temporal Bar**: Trump's private Epstein associations (1990s-2000s) occurred outside official government service and cannot receive national security protection retrospectively.

21. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

B. EXEMPTION (2): INTERNAL PERSONNEL RULES

22. **Statutory Text**: "related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency."

23. **Legal Analysis**: Criminal associate accountability information does not constitute internal agency personnel matters.

24. Private citizen conduct predating government service cannot be classified as agency personnel rules.

25. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

C. EXEMPTION (3): OTHER STATUTES

26. **Statutory Text**: "specifically exempted from disclosure by statute...provided that such statute (A) requires that the matters be withheld from the public in such a manner as to leave no discretion on the issue, or (B) establishes particular criteria for withholding."

27. **Legal Analysis**: Defendants' systematic conflation of **Fed. R. Evid. 901** (authentication) with **Fed. R. Evid. 607** (credibility determination) violates separation of powers and cannot satisfy statutory exemption requirements.

28. **Constitutional Authority Distinction**: a. **Fed. R. Evid. 901**: Executive branch can authenticate documents through chain of custody b. **Fed. R. Evid. 607**: Only

constitutional fact-finder can determine credibility (Congress for oversight per **2 U.S.C. §§ 192, 194**)

29. **Johnson/Trump Violation**: Accepting executive "credibility assessment" authority creates unauthorized statutory interpretation subordinating congressional fact-finding to executive filtering.

30. No statute grants executive authority to filter congressional oversight through credibility determinations.

31. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

D. EXEMPTION (4): TRADE SECRETS

32. **Statutory Text**: "trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential."

33. **Legal Analysis**: Criminal associate accountability information does not constitute trade secrets or commercial information.

34. Private criminal associations cannot claim commercial protection.

35. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

E. EXEMPTION (5): DELIBERATIVE PROCESS

36. **Statutory Text**: "inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation."

37. **Legal Analysis**: This exemption covers deliberative communications regarding document processing, not final determinations about criminal associate accountability.

38. **DOJ July 7, 2025 memo** (Exhibit B-5) proves all deliberative processes concluded with **final determinations** ready for disclosure after processing: a. Over **300 gigabytes** of data reviewed b. **10,000+** videos/images examined c. **40+** computers processed d. All victim protection work **completed**

39. **Johnson/Trump Violation**: Using deliberative process rationale to prevent disclosure of **completed determinations** violates exemption scope by converting final agency action into protected deliberative process.

40. **THE SMOKING GUN**: Johnson prevented disclosure **after** all deliberative work was completed, proving criminal protection motivation rather than legitimate process protection.

41. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

F. EXEMPTION (6): PERSONAL PRIVACY

42. **Statutory Text**: "personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

43. **Legal Analysis**: Criminal associate accountability information does not constitute protected personal privacy.

44. Federal law provides **no privacy protection** for criminal network participants regardless of wealth, social status, or claimed innocence.

45. **Statutory Framework**: a. **18 U.S.C. § 3771** (Crime Victims' Rights Act) b. **22 U.S.C. § 7101** (Trafficking Victims Protection Act)

46. Both statutes **exclude criminal associates** from victim protection, establishing that only actual trafficked individuals receive privacy protection through standard redaction protocols.

47. **Johnson/Trump Violation**: Systematic expansion of victim classifications to include criminal associates violates federal statutory boundaries designed to protect actual trafficking victims while ensuring perpetrator network accountability.

48. **Public Interest Test**: Public interest in criminal network accountability **far outweighs** any claimed privacy interest of criminal associates. *Department of Justice v. Reporters Committee*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989).

49. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

G. EXEMPTION (7): LAW ENFORCEMENT RECORDS

50. **Statutory Text**: "records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, but only to the extent that production...could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings, would deprive a person of a right to a fair trial, could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, could reasonably be expected to disclose the identity of a confidential source, would disclose techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations, or could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual."

51. **Legal Analysis**: All subcategory concerns **(7)(A) through (7)(F)** are comprehensively addressed through standard redaction protocols proposed in **Massie-Khanna H.R. 581 resolution** and completed DOJ processing.

52. **Subcategory Analysis**: a. **(7)(A) - Interfere with enforcement proceedings**: DOJ memo proves all processing **completed** with no active enforcement proceedings regarding disclosure, and congressional oversight **enhances** rather than interferes with enforcement b. **(7)(B) - Fair trial deprivation**: **TEMPORAL BAR** prevents retroactive FOIA trial protection for pre-government private conduct, criminal associates are not defendants requiring trial protection, and public awareness of criminal associations **strengthens** judicial process integrity c. **(7)(C) - Personal privacy invasion**: Criminal associates have **no privacy protection** from accountability under federal law, only victims receive privacy protection through standard redaction protocols, and "unwarranted" standard cannot protect criminal network participants d. **(7)(D) - Confidential source disclosure**: Criminal associates are **not confidential sources**, criminal network participants cannot claim source protection, and cooperation with law enforcement doesn't create permanent immunity from accountability e. **(7)(E) - Law enforcement techniques**: Standard redaction protocols protect techniques while enabling accountability, criminal associate identification doesn't reveal investigative methods, and **Massie-Khanna H.R. 581 resolution** addresses technique protection f. **(7)(F) - Physical safety endangerment**: No credible evidence of physical danger to criminal associates from accountability, reputational accountability is **not physical endangerment**, and standard threat assessment procedures show no credible physical risk

53. **THE SMOKING GUN - COMPLETED DOJ PROCESSING**: The **DOJ July 7, 2025 memo** documented in Exhibit B-5 **destroys** Exemption 7 defense by proving all legitimate concerns were resolved through comprehensive processing including victim protection, technique protection, and safety assessments.

54. **Johnson's Fraud Exposed**: Prevented disclosure **after** all Exemption 7 concerns were resolved, proving criminal protection motivation rather than legitimate law enforcement concerns.

55. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

H. EXEMPTION (8): FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

56. **Statutory Text**: "contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of an agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions."

57. **Legal Analysis**: Criminal associate accountability concerns conduct unrelated to official financial institution regulatory actions.

58. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

I. EXEMPTION (9): GEOLOGICAL INFORMATION

59. **Statutory Text**: "geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells."

60. **Legal Analysis**: Obviously inapplicable to criminal associate accountability information.

61. **EXEMPTION DOES NOT APPLY.**

IV. UNAUTHORIZED EXEMPTIONS CREATED BY DEFENDANTS

62. Having established that **ZERO** of the nine exhaustive exemptions apply, Defendants created unauthorized exemptions appearing nowhere in federal law: a. **"Executive**

Credibility Assessment Exemption" - Executive branch filtering congressional oversight through credibility determinations b. **"Criminal Associate Reputation Protection Exemption"** - Protecting wealthy criminal associates from accountability c. **"Political Coordination Protection Exemption"** - Cross-branch coordination to prevent disclosure d. **"Victim Classification Expansion Exemption"** - Reclassifying criminal associates as protected victims

63. These invented exemptions violate the **exhaustive statutory framework** Congress established through the nine specific exemptions in **5 U.S.C. § 552(b)**.

64. **Systematic creation of unauthorized exemptions constitutes federal fraud through governmental authority abuse.**

V. CONGRESSIONAL EXCLUSION VIOLATION

65. **5 U.S.C. § 552(d)**: "This section is **not authority to withhold information from Congress**."

66. **Systematic Violation**: Executive branch uses FOIA-style exemption rationales to prevent congressional oversight despite **statutory prohibition.**

67. Johnson's coordination enables systematic violation of the Congressional exclusion provision by accepting executive filtering of congressional oversight materials.

68. **Constitutional Impossibility**: Congress cannot constitutionally defer its independent fact-finding authority to executive credibility determinations without violating Article I, Section 1 requirements for legislative independence.

VI. LOGICAL IMPOSSIBILITY OF LEGITIMATE DEFENSE

69. **Temporal Bar**: FOIA cannot protect pre-government private conduct.

70. **Jurisdictional Bar**: Private criminal associations fall outside FOIA's protective scope.

71. **Exhaustive Framework**: All nine statutory exemptions fail to apply.

72. **Congressional Exclusion**: FOIA cannot withhold information from Congress.

73. **Unauthorized Creation**: Defendants invented exemptions existing nowhere in federal law.

74. This constitutes concrete statutory injury with clear judicial remedies and attorney's fees provisions under **5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(E)**.

75. **The systematic violation proves criminal conspiracy using governmental authority for criminal associate protection through systematic circumvention of mandatory federal transparency requirements.**

VII. CONCLUSION

76. Defendants have systematically violated mandatory federal disclosure requirements by creating unauthorized exemptions serving criminal associate protection rather than applying the exhaustive statutory framework Congress established.

77. **Legal Impossibility Summary**: The combination of temporal bars, jurisdictional limitations, exhaustive exemption failure, congressional exclusion violations, and unauthorized exemption creation creates **mathematical impossibility** of legitimate defense under federal transparency law.

78. **Criminal Enterprise Evidence**: Systematic circumvention of mandatory disclosure requirements proves coordinated criminal conspiracy using governmental authority for criminal associate protection rather than statutory compliance.

79. This systematic violation requires immediate judicial intervention, complete disclosure compliance, and criminal referral for federal fraud through systematic circumvention of congressionally mandated transparency requirements.