

July 29, 2025

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Chairman
Senate Judiciary Committee
135 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Grassley:

I respectfully submit this letter in response to the ongoing partisan attacks on my nomination based on strategically-timed claims from three whistleblowers. While I respect whistleblowers and the process that is typically employed to evaluate their allegations in order to improve government functions, that is not what is happening here. At the July 17, 2025 markup proceeding relating to my nomination, Chairman Grassley pointed out that the “unfair rhetoric and treatment” directed at me had “crossed the line” and had **“all the hallmarks of a political hitjob timed for maximum media splash with minimum substance.”**¹

Since that criticism, Senate Democrats have only escalated the attacks. Most recently, these Senators have promoted claims from a third whistleblower based on a late-disclosed purported recording of an internal DOJ video meeting on February 14, 2025, which they say calls into question my testimony at the confirmation hearing. While I have no intention of disparaging the whistleblower process or witnesses that participate in it, I reject these claims. Questions regarding the February 14 meeting are not new. At least some Democrat Senators appeared to have access to the recording in connection with my confirmation hearing in late June, but they withheld the recording until now. I still have not had access to it. However, I testified truthfully and accurately at the hearing and in response to Questions for the Record (QFRs). I am undeterred by this smear campaign, and these tactics should not delay the Senate’s consideration of my nomination.

I. Whistleblower #1

The first whistleblower is Erez Reuveni. Mr. Reuveni is represented by the Government Accountability Project (GAP). GAP funds the “Justice Connection,”² which is a group of former DOJ attorneys that has worked with GAP in a coordinated attack on my nomination. GAP has also worked with Democracy Defenders Action,³ which is led by Norm Eisen—another participant in the attacks against me and in prolonged lawfare against President Trump.⁴

¹ <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/press/rep/releases/grassley-opens-executive-business-meeting-speaks-on-bove-nomination>.

² <https://www.thejusticeconnection.org/who-we-are> (“Justice Connection is honored to have [GAP] as its fiscal sponsor.”).

³ See, e.g., *Widakuswara, et al., v. Lake, et al.*, No. 25 Civ. 1015 (D.D.C.); *Zaid v. EOP, et al.*, No. 25 Civ. 1365 (D.D.C).

⁴ E.g., <https://x.com/normeisen/status/1945855258841813021?s=42>.

I addressed Mr. Reuveni's claims at my confirmation hearing and in response to QFRs from the Committee. My testimony is corroborated by a written statement from Mr. Reuveni's immediate supervisor, submitted under penalty of perjury long before my nomination, in which the supervisor explained that **I instructed DOJ attorneys to "avoid" a court order and "do whatever we could properly do"** to accomplish that goal during the March 14, 2025 meeting.⁵ In an effort to bolster Mr. Reuveni's allegations in the face of that evidence, he leaked documents to the media. At the markup proceeding, Chairman Grassley made clear that Democrats had **"grossly mischaracterize[d]" the documents at issue** and that "almost none" of the materials reference me at all.⁶ Chairman Grassley also explained that **four additional corroborating witnesses** from the March 14, 2025 meeting had confirmed that I did not direct anyone to ignore a court order, and that each of the four witnesses "left the meeting with the understanding that the Justice Department would aggressively litigate, but would follow court orders."⁷

II. Whistleblower #2

Last Friday, July 25, 2025, counsel representing a second whistleblower issued a press release claiming that their client had provided information to DOJ's Office of the Inspector General that allegedly "corroborates" the "thrust" of Mr. Reuveni's allegations.⁸ I do not know what counsel considers to be the "thrust" of Mr. Reuveni's allegations, and I have not seen this second whistleblower's submission. The carefully worded release used my name but offered no direct claim against me by the whistleblower. Later on Friday night, MSNBC correspondent Lisa Rubin acknowledged that the **second whistleblower "had no direct interaction with Emil Bove and did not participate in the litigation surrounding the Alien Enemies Act and/or Kilmar Abrego Garcia."**⁹ Notwithstanding those concessions, on Sunday night, CNN reporter Annie Grayer presented the strained assertion that the second whistleblower claimed that I had "suggested" that DOJ attorneys "could ignore court orders during a contentious legal battle in an immigration case."¹⁰ CNN ignored MSNBC's reporting, and CNN **"has not independently reviewed the documents submitted by this whistleblower."**¹¹ Thus, the second whistleblower's allegations add no force to those by Mr. Reuveni, which are refuted by, among other things, a sworn statement

⁵ <https://thefederalist.com/2025/07/11/new-docs-shatter-leftist-claims-emil-bove-ordered-former-doj-official-to-defy-court-orders>.

⁶ <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/press/rep/releases/grassley-opens-executive-business-meeting-speaks-on-bove-nomination>; *see also* https://www.grassley.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/majority_response_to_summary_of_reuveni_documents.pdf.

⁷ <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/press/rep/releases/grassley-opens-executive-business-meeting-speaks-on-bove-nomination>.

⁸ <https://whistlebloweraid.org/whistleblower-aid-client-and-former-doj-attorney-corroborates-the-thrust-of-the-allegations-against-emil-bove>.

⁹ <https://x.com/lawofruby/status/1948909508253581768?s=10>.

¹⁰ <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/07/27/politics/justice-department-official-second-whistleblower>.

¹¹ *Id.*

and information from four witnesses. **As Chairman Grassley observed at the markup: “[T]here’s no scandal here.** Government lawyers aggressively litigating and interpreting court orders isn’t misconduct—it’s what lawyers do.”¹²

III. Whistleblower #3

In the most recent part of the attack on my nomination, the *Washington Post* alleged late yesterday afternoon that there is a third whistleblower with “new” evidence that I “misled” the Committee at my confirmation hearing.¹³ Today, I learned that the third whistleblower claims to have a recording of a February 14, 2025 video meeting in which I asked members of DOJ’s Public Integrity Section (PIN) to work internally to identify signatories for DOJ’s motion to dismiss the charges against Mayor Eric Adams. I have seen a purported transcription of that recording that originated from counsel for the third whistleblower. This “evidence” is not new. The *Washington Post* article indicated that the whistleblower “shared” it “first with [Senator] Booker,”¹⁴ which led Senator Booker to baselessly accused me of perjury immediately after my confirmation hearing.¹⁵ Rather than giving me a chance to address this issue at the hearing or in QFRs, the Democrats stalled for weeks before launching an attack on the eve of the anticipated floor vote on my nomination. Surely if the Senators’ allegations were as strong as their rhetoric and the *Washington Post*’s appetite for left-leaning clickbait, this evidence would have been presented in a procedurally appropriate setting so that I could review the recording in its entirety and address the allegations line by line. The failure to follow protocol speaks volumes about the underlying motivation, and the strategic timing of this release is an implicit admission about these claims’ lack of merit.

The four cherry-picked alleged statements attributed to me by the third whistleblower do not support efforts to derail my nomination. In fact, the whistleblower’s transcription proves conclusively that **I testified truthfully at the confirmation hearing in response to compound, yes/no questions that sought to attribute words to me that I did not use during the February 14, 2025 video meeting.**

- Regarding the whistleblower’s first allegation, Senator Booker’s question included phrases that do not appear in the alleged quote that the whistleblower attributes to me, including “their job,” “follow orders,” and “no room.” Because I did not use those phrases, I answered Senator Booker’s question, “No.”¹⁶ That is true, which is confirmed by the fact that Senator Booker’s phrases do not appear in the whistleblower’s transcription.

¹² <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/press/rep/releases/grassley-opens-executive-business-meeting-speaks-on-bove-nomination>.

¹³ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2025/07/28/emil-bove-nomination-judge-mislead>.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ <https://newjerseyglobe.com/judiciary/emil-bove-accused-of-perjury-evasiveness-at-tough-senate-hearing-for-federal-judgeship>.

¹⁶ “Senator Booker: During the meeting, you told attorneys that it is their job to implement the President’s agenda, and that they have to follow orders from the President, and that there’s no

- The same is true of the second allegation. Senator Booker’s question suggested that I told the PIN attorneys to “find” attorneys to sign the motion. To my understanding, all PIN attorneys were assembled in the video meeting, and they did not need to go “find” anyone to accomplish what I was seeking. Moreover, at no point in the call did I assert, as Senator Booker suggested at the hearing, that PIN attorneys “weren’t allowed to ask questions.”¹⁷ Here, too, my testimony was truthful, which is confirmed by the whistleblower’s transcription.
- Regarding the third allegation, Senator Booker used the term “reassigned” in two successive questions. I was clear at the hearing that “I didn’t understand” that part of the first question, and I answered the second question in the negative because Senator Booker essentially repeated himself.¹⁸ The alleged quote attributed to me by the whistleblower does not include the word “reassigned,” and that word does not appear in the transcription. My testimony was accurate.
- The fourth allegation relates to suggestions by Ranking Member Durbin and Senator Booker at the hearing that I tried to improperly induce PIN attorneys to sign the motion. That is not true. In fact, according to the whistleblower’s transcription, I told the PIN attorneys: “I completely respect that people personally may differ . . . with the conclusions that I reached” regarding the *Adams* case, and “I don’t want to put pressure on” on any particular PIN attorney to sign the motion. In addition, the alleged quote that is the focus of the fourth allegation does not connect signing the motion with personnel decisions DOJ had to make because of then-recent resignations. Rather, if the alleged quote is correct, I indicated during the meeting that PIN’s new leaders would be “people who are willing to follow the Chain of Command” and “willing to implement orders from the highest leadership of the Department.” That type of personnel decision is not, as Ranking Member Durbin suggested at the hearing, some kind of “reward” or treating people “differently.”¹⁹ Everyone at DOJ should be held to that standard, which, according to the transcription, I

room for dissent in the chain of command. Is that correct? // Mr. Bove: No.” Tr. 89:24-90:4 (emphasis added).

¹⁷ “Senator Booker. You told them that they had one hour to find two attorneys to sign the motion, they weren’t allowed to ask questions. Is that correct? // Mr. Bove. No.” Tr. 90:5-8 (emphasis added).

¹⁸ “Senator Booker. I will state again. You started the meeting by emphasizing to the line attorneys that Danielle Sassoon and Hagan Scotten had failed to follow orders and that Ms. Sassan would was going to be reassigned before she resigned. Is that correct? // Mr. Bove. No.” Tr. 90:16-21 (emphasis added).

¹⁹ “Senator Durbin. Did you state suggest or imply that any individual who agreed to sign the brief would be rewarded? // Mr. Bove. I’m sorry, I don't follow the question. // Senator Durbin. Well, you needed somebody to sign that brief and those two stepped forward, was there any suggestion they be treated any differently because of it? // Mr. Bove. No.” Tr. 38:3-10 (emphasis added).

clarified during the meeting “means following orders from the President and from the Attorney General, unless we view them as unlawful or unethical.” Following the chain of command in that way is the bare minimum required of mid-level management in an Executive Branch agency of unelected officials charged with helping the President implement the will of the electorate. Thus, as with the first three allegations, my testimony in connection with the fourth allegation was accurate.

More broadly, as Chairman Grassley made clear in QFR #4, I “did not have an opportunity to fully respond on the record” to these questions at the hearing. I believe that is because Senator Booker and others were trying to set a trap—at times, reading from a script based on a recording they already possessed—instead of participating in good faith in the advice-and-consent process. They failed. As I explained in response to Chairman Grassley’s QFR #4:

“It was never my intention to coerce, pressure, or induce any DOJ attorney—through adverse employment actions, threats, rewards, or otherwise—to sign the motion to dismiss the charges against Mayor Adams. To the contrary, I intended to convey during the February 14, 2025 video meeting that (1) I wished to move past the resignations and return to [PIN’s] remaining work, (2) no one would be terminated if they declined to sign the motion, and (3) attorneys who comported themselves in a manner consistent with the zealous advocacy principles set forth in the Attorney General’s February 5, 2025 memorandum would be considered for existing vacancies in the supervisory chain of [PIN].”

The purported transcription of the meeting is consistent with each of those points.

Finally, the fact that the third whistleblower’s claims are being used as part of a coordinated political attack is underscored by Ryan Crosswell’s editorial, published on the day of the markup, claiming that I made comments he “understood as threats” during the February 14 video meeting.²⁰ Mr. Crosswell resigned from DOJ shortly after that meeting. He subsequently entered the Democrat primary field in Pennsylvania’s 7th District, where Republican Representative Ryan Mackenzie is the incumbent, by touting his resignation and attacking President Trump.²¹ Like the second whistleblower’s counsel,²² Mr. Crosswell is soliciting donations by attacking me.²³ He has also been featured in attacks against me by the Justice Connection, which began around the time of my confirmation hearing with a video that featured Mr. Crosswell and another former DOJ attorney.²⁴ As noted above, the Justice Connection is a group of former DOJ attorneys funded by

²⁰ <https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/senate-republicans-do-right-thing-trumps-unfit-judicial-nominee>.

²¹ https://x.com/Ryan_Crosswell/status/1932039852410974320; <https://www.msnbc.com/way-too-early/watch/former-federal-prosecutor-announces-candidacy-for-congress-241158213728>; <https://ryancrosswell.com>.

²² <https://bsky.app/profile/wbaidlaw.bsky.social/post/3luxc2ekclc2q>.

²³ https://x.com/ryan_crosswell/status/1946678954884014389?s=10; https://x.com/ryan_crosswell/status/1946679627612578216?s=10.

²⁴ https://x.com/justice_cxn/status/1937146340888170778?s=10.

Mr. Reuveni’s counsel at GAP. Senator Booker has promoted the Justice Connection’s exaggerated claims in connection with these proceedings,²⁵ and the group has sought to amplify the whistleblower allegations against me.²⁶ For example, the Justice Connection claims to have “previewed” the third whistleblower’s claims on Friday, July 25, *i.e.*, days before the claims were reported in the *Washington Post*.²⁷

Regardless of Mr. Crosswell’s decision to launch a political career by working with others to engage in baseless attacks on my integrity, I am sympathetic if he found his job to be hard on February 14, 2025. Because I did too, and the whistleblower’s purported transcription reflects that. But unlike him, I did not shy away from my duties. And I did not threaten anyone, which is also abundantly clear from the purported transcription of the meeting. Long before former DOJ attorneys had incentives to build their post-government careers by attacking my nomination, *The Guardian* reported on the February 14 meeting in a way that is entirely consistent with my testimony and the whistleblower’s purported transcription:

“[A]ccording to two people who were on the [video] call,” “[Bove] told them that it had been a long week and that **he wanted all of them to be able to move on.**” “[Bove] told them **he didn’t want to get anyone in trouble**, the people said, so **he didn’t want to know who was opposed to signing the motion** to dismiss – just that he needed two trial attorneys to attach their names because that was standard practice and because it was easier to have a team than being alone.”²⁸

These accounts corroborate my testimony at the hearing and responses to QFRs. For all of these reasons, it is apparent that these eleventh-hour claims were timed to delay and distract rather than shed light on my fitness to serve in the judiciary.

* * *

²⁵ <https://www.thejusticeconnection.org/justice-connection-opposing-bove-nomination/>;
https://x.com/Justice_CXN/status/1937146340888170778;
<https://www.instagram.com/reel/DLQBB5BS2YX>.

²⁶ <https://www.thejusticeconnection.org/justice-connection-opposing-bove-nomination/>;
https://x.com/Justice_CXN/status/1937146340888170778;
https://x.com/justice_cxn/status/1949917676060684524?s=10.

²⁷ https://x.com/justice_cxn/status/1949974133694984581?s=10.

²⁸ <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/19/donald-trump-eric-adams-justice-department>.

The partisan smear campaign against me is a sham, which has only served to escalate the type of rhetoric and threats that Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee have claimed to abhor. I understand that a lifetime appointment to a federal court of appeals is a serious matter. I welcome serious scrutiny of my record and my service to this country. My record includes 32 appeals, 13 trials, nearly a decade as a federal prosecutor, clerkships in federal trial and appellate courts, successfully defending the President of the United States, and helping lead the Department of Justice. Principled evaluation of that record, separated from the raw political warfare by Democrats that has tainted this process, confirms that I will be a fearless, independent judge committed to justice and the rule of law.

Respectfully submitted,

Emil Bove