JASON SMITH
MISSOURI,
CHAIRMAN

MATT MEYER, STAFF DIRECTOR
(202) 225–3625

RICHARD E. NEAL
MASSACHUSETTS,
RANKING MEMBER

BRANDON CASEY, STAFF DIRECTOR
(202) 225–4021

U.S. House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
1139 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
Washington, DC 20515

July 21, 2026

Andrew D. Herman
Founder
Law Office of Andrew D. Herman
1099 14th St, NW 8th Floor West
Washington, DC 20005

Mara Verheyden-Hilliard
Co-Founder and Executive Director
Partnership for Civil Justice Fund
617 Florida Ave NW
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Herman and Ms. Verheyden-Hilliard:

This letter responds to the May 18, 2026, letter submitted by the Law Office of Andrew D. Herman and the Partnership for Civil Justice Fund (collectively, "Counsel") on behalf of BreakThrough Bt Media Inc. ("BreakThrough News").[1] In its May 4, 2026 letter, the Committee on Ways and Means ("Committee") reemphasized the basis for its inquiry in response to Counsel's February 23, 2026 letter declining the Committee's request for information. Your responses have failed to include a single responsive document and misrepresented both the scope and purpose of the Committee's oversight. Instead, Counsel has raised a series of legal objections that are without merit. Accordingly, the Committee is invoking compulsory process to obtain the requested materials.

Counsel contends that the Committee's legislative purpose has "changed materially" between its February 9, 2026 letter and its May 4, 2026 letter, and that this shift prevents BreakThrough News from performing the "pertinency analysis" derived from *Watkins v. United States*. This characterization misreads both the record and the applicable legal standard. The Committee's legislative purpose has remained consistent: examining whether existing legal standards governing tax-exempt status adequately account for foreign influence and control. The May 4 letter refined and focused the Committee's articulation of its legislative purpose in direct response to Counsel's prior correspondence as well as based on information obtained from further investigation. For example, in March 2026, a new report found that from 2022 to 2023, $1,098,000 flowed from Mr. Singham's donor-advised fund to BreakThrough News, which is

[1] Letter from Partnership for Civil Justice Fund and Law Firm of Andrew D. Herman, PLLC, letter to The Hon. Jason Smith, Chairman, Comm. on Ways and Means (May 18, 2026), (Letter on file with the Committee).

precisely the type of funding arrangement the Committee is examining in considering whether legislative reform is warranted.[2] That funding continued after the arrangement had been the subject of extensive public reporting,[3] until, in early 2024, Goldman Sachs terminated the donor-advised fund.[4] The fact that the flow of foreign-linked funds through this conduit was completed by a private financial institution and only publicly disclosed due to their own exercise of discretion, rather than by any statutory disclosure obligation, illustrates the gap in existing law that the Committee is examining and that legislative reform may require to close. The Supreme Court has made clear that the legitimacy of a congressional inquiry is not "defined by what it produces" and that "[t]o be a valid legislative inquiry there need be no predictable end result." *See Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 509 (1975). The very nature of legislative inquiry is that it develops as information is gathered. That the Committee has refined its articulation of purpose as its investigation has proceeded is entirely consistent with, and not in violation of, the framework Counsel invokes.

Counsel further argues that the Committee's document requests were not "recalibrated" to match its revised legislative purpose, and that requests directed at internal records of BreakThrough News are inconsistent with a generalized inquiry into the laws governing the attainment and retention of tax-exempt status. The Committee is not conducting a survey of hypothetical regulatory gaps in the abstract. It is examining a specific, concrete funding arrangement of over $1 million flowing to BreakThrough News from Neville Roy Singham, channeled through shell companies and donor-advised funds, that raises significant concerns regarding foreign influence over a tax-exempt organization.

This arrangement directly informs the Committee's legislative inquiry. The Committee is examining whether existing standards governing tax-exempt status adequately account for foreign funding that reaches an organization indirectly through intermediary entities and donor-advised funds that, by design, obscure the original source of the contribution. BreakThrough News's financing presents these features in concrete form due to the presence of foreign-linked capital layered through shell entities and donor-advised funds which is reaching a tax-exempt organization. Understanding how funds moved through this structure, including the intermediaries used and the disclosures made or omitted under existing law is what allows the Committee to evaluate whether current law meaningfully constrains foreign influence over tax-exempt organizations or leaves gaps that legislative reform must close. Congress cannot assess the adequacy of existing law by examining the statute in isolation; it must understand how that law operates when applied to an actual funding arrangement of this kind. Targeted requests

---

[2] Asra Q. Nomani, *Power Couple of Chaos: How a tycoon and activist built a 'Revolutionary Base' at the House of Singham*, Fox News (March 23, 2026), https://www.foxnews.com/us/power-couple-chaos-how-tycoon-activist-built-revolutionary-base-house-singham.

[3] William Bredderman, *U.S. Tech Mogul Bankrolls Pro-Russia, Pro China News Network*, DAILY BEAST (May 28, 2023,), https://www.thedailybeast.com/neville-singham-funded-breakthrough-news-is-pushing-moscow-beijing-propaganda/; Mara Hvistendahl et al., *A Global Web of Chinese Propaganda Leads to a U.S. Tech Mogul*, NEW YORK TIMES (Aug. 10, 2023),https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/05/world/europe/neville-roy-singham-china-propaganda.html.

[4] Asra Q. Nomani, *Power Couple of Chaos: How a tycoon and activist built a 'Revolutionary Base' at the House of Singham*, Fox News (March 23, 2026), https://www.foxnews.com/us/power-couple-chaos-how-tycoon-activist-built-revolutionary-base-house-singham.

directed to the organization at the center of that inquiry are pertinent and indispensable to the Committee's legislative purpose. *See Trump v. Mazars*, 591 U.S. at 862 ("Without information, Congress would be shooting in the dark, unable to legislate 'wisely or effectively.'" (quoting *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 175 (1927)). The fact that such requests are directed at BreakThrough News specifically, rather than organizations across the political spectrum, reflects the focused and evidence-based nature of this inquiry, not an improper purpose.

Counsel's First Amendment objections fare no better. The Committee's initial letter expressly stated that "[u]nder the First Amendment, Americans have a right to peacefully express their views, even if those views are reprehensible." But the First Amendment does not categorically shield an organization from congressional inquiry. As the Supreme Court has held, where Congress investigates in furtherance of a legitimate legislative purpose, any incidental burden on First Amendment activity yields to that purpose, and the government interest and the individual interest must be weighed accordingly. *See Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 127 (1959). Both conditions are satisfied here. The Committee's inquiry is directed at the financing arrangements and organizational structure of BreakThrough News, not at its speech, editorial positions, or political viewpoints. Counsel's invocation of *NAACP v. Alabama* and *Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta* is misplaced, because those cases addressed compelled disclosure of membership lists and donor information in contexts untethered to any legitimate governmental interest. The Committee's interest in understanding the source and flow of foreign-aligned funds into a tax-exempt organization is precisely the kind of substantial governmental interest that the Supreme Court has recognized can outweigh associational privacy concerns. *See Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 64 (1976) (per curiam) (requiring "a 'relevant correlation' or 'substantial relation' between the governmental interest and the information required to be disclosed").

Counsel's suggestion that the Committee's inquiry is analogous to a "witch-hunt" conducted by the House Un-American Activities Committee ("HUAC") is both historically inapt and legally irrelevant. HUAC's investigations were directed at rooting out political beliefs and compelling witnesses to expose their associations.[5] In contrast, the Committee's inquiry here is directed at financial arrangements and organizational structure, specifically whether existing tax-exempt law adequately guards against foreign-influenced funding networks of the kind documented in public reporting about Mr. Singham's activities. That is a legitimate legislative purpose, well within the Committee's jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the Committee is issuing compulsory process to obtain the documents and material needed to fulfill its oversight and legislative obligations. Please find the enclosed subpoena compelling production of the requested documents by August 7, 2026.

---

[5] The First Amendment Right of Political Privacy Chapter 1 – The Edgerton Dissent, Wiley Rein LLP (November 2018), https://www.wiley.law/newsletter-The-First-Amendment-Right-of-Political-Privacy-Chapter-1-The-Edgerton-Dissent.

Sincerely,

Jason Smith
Chairman
Committee on Ways and Means

Cc: The Honorable Richard E. Neal, Ranking Member

Enclosure

JASON SMITH
MISSOURI,
CHAIRMAN

MATT MEYER, STAFF DIRECTOR
(202) 225–3625

RICHARD E. NEAL
MASSACHUSETTS,
RANKING MEMBER

BRANDON CASEY, STAFF DIRECTOR
(202) 225–4021

U.S. House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
1139 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
Washington, DC 20515

July 21, 2026

Ms. Andrew D. Herman
Founder
Law Office of Andrew D. Herman
1099 14th St, NW 8th Floor West
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. Herman:

This letter responds to the May 18, 2026, letter submitted by the Law Office of Andrew D. Herman ("Counsel") on behalf of Tricontinental: Institute for Social Research ("Tricontinental").[1] In its May 4, 2026 letter, the Committee on Ways and Means ("Committee") reemphasized the basis for its inquiry in response to Counsel's February 23, 2026 letter declining the Committee's request for information. Your responses have failed to include a single responsive document and misrepresented both the scope and purpose of the Committee's oversight. Instead, Counsel has raised a series of legal objections that are without merit. Accordingly, the Committee is invoking compulsory process to obtain the requested materials.

Counsel contends that the Committee's legislative purpose has "changed materially" between its February 9, 2026 letter and its May 4, 2026 letter, and that this shift prevents The People's Forum from performing the "pertinency analysis" derived from *Watkins v. United States*. This characterization misreads both the record and the applicable legal standard. The Committee's legislative purpose has remained consistent: examining whether existing legal standards governing tax-exempt status adequately account for foreign influence and control. The May 4 letter refined and focused the Committee's articulation of its legislative purpose in direct response to Counsel's prior correspondence as well as based on information obtained from further investigation. For example, in March 2026, a new report found that from 2017 to 2022, over $16 million flowed from Mr. Singham's donor-advised fund to Tricontinental, which is precisely the type of funding arrangement the Committee is examining in considering whether legislative reform is warranted.[2] That funding continued after the arrangement had been the subject of extensive public reporting,[3] until, in early 2024, Goldman Sachs terminated the donor-

---

[1] Letter from the Law Office of Andrew D. Herman, letter to The Hon. Jason Smith, Chairman, Comm. on Ways and Means (May 18, 2026), Letter on file with the Committee.
[2] Asra Q. Nomani, *Power Couple of Chaos: How a tycoon and activist built a 'Revolutionary Base' at the House of Singham*, Fox News (March 23, 2026), https://www.foxnews.com/us/power-couple-chaos-how-tycoon-activist-built-revolutionary-base-house-singham.
[3] William Bredderman, *U.S. Tech Mogul Bankrolls Pro-Russia, Pro China News Network*, DAILY BEAST (May 28, 2023,), https://www.thedailybeast.com/neville-singham-funded-breakthrough-news-is-pushing-moscow-beijing-

advised fund.[4] The fact that the flow of foreign-linked funds through this conduit was completed by a private financial institution and only publicly disclosed due to their own exercise of discretion, rather than by any statutory disclosure obligation, illustrates the gap in existing law that the Committee is examining and that legislative reform may require to close. The Supreme Court has made clear that the legitimacy of a congressional inquiry is not "defined by what it produces" and that "[t]o be a valid legislative inquiry there need be no predictable end result." *See Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 509 (1975). The very nature of legislative inquiry is that it develops as information is gathered. That the Committee has refined its articulation of purpose as its investigation has proceeded is entirely consistent with, and not in violation of, the framework Counsel invokes.

Counsel further argues that the Committee's document requests were not "recalibrated" to match its revised legislative purpose, and that requests directed at internal records of Tricontinental are inconsistent with a generalized inquiry into the laws governing the attainment and retention of tax-exempt status. The Committee is not conducting a survey of hypothetical regulatory gaps in the abstract. It is examining a specific, concrete funding arrangement of over $16 million flowing to Tricontinental from Neville Roy Singham and his wife, channeled through shell companies and donor-advised funds, that raises significant concerns regarding foreign influence over a tax-exempt organization.

This arrangement directly informs the Committee's legislative inquiry. The Committee is examining whether existing standards governing tax-exempt status adequately account for foreign funding that reaches an organization indirectly through intermediary entities and donor-advised funds that, by design, obscure the original source of the contribution. Tricontinental's financing presents these features in concrete form due to the presence of foreign-linked capital layered through shell entities and donor-advised funds which is reaching a tax-exempt organization. Understanding how funds moved through this structure, including the intermediaries used and the disclosures made or omitted under existing law is what allows the Committee to evaluate whether current law meaningfully constrains foreign influence over tax-exempt organizations or leaves gaps that legislative reform must close. Congress cannot assess the adequacy of existing law by examining the statute in isolation; it must understand how that law operates when applied to an actual funding arrangement of this kind. Targeted requests directed to the organization at the center of that inquiry are pertinent and indispensable to the Committee's legislative purpose. *See Trump v. Mazars*, 591 U.S. at 862 ("Without information, Congress would be shooting in the dark, unable to legislate 'wisely or effectively.'" (quoting *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 175 (1927)). The fact that such requests are directed at Tricontinental specifically, rather than organizations across the political spectrum, reflects the focused and evidence-based nature of this inquiry, not an improper purpose.

---

propaganda/; Mara Hvistendahl et al., *A Global Web of Chinese Propaganda Leads to a U.S. Tech Mogul*, NEW YORK TIMES (Aug. 10, 2023),https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/05/world/europe/neville-roy-singham-china-propaganda.html.

[4] Asra Q. Nomani, *Power Couple of Chaos: How a tycoon and activist built a 'Revolutionary Base' at the House of Singham*, Fox News (March 23, 2026), https://www.foxnews.com/us/power-couple-chaos-how-tycoon-activist-built-revolutionary-base-house-singham.

Counsel's First Amendment objections fare no better. The Committee's initial letter expressly stated that "[u]nder the First Amendment, Americans have a right to peacefully express their views, even if those views are reprehensible." But the First Amendment does not categorically shield an organization from congressional inquiry. As the Supreme Court has held, where Congress investigates in furtherance of a legitimate legislative purpose, any incidental burden on First Amendment activity yields to that purpose, and the government interest and the individual interest must be weighed accordingly. *See Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 127 (1959). Both conditions are satisfied here. The Committee's inquiry is directed at the financing arrangements and organizational structure of Tricontinental, not at its speech, editorial positions, or political viewpoints. Counsel's invocation of *NAACP v. Alabama* and *Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta* is misplaced, because those cases addressed compelled disclosure of membership lists and donor information in contexts untethered to any legitimate governmental interest. The Committee's interest in understanding the source and flow of foreign-aligned funds into a tax-exempt organization is precisely the kind of substantial governmental interest that the Supreme Court has recognized can outweigh associational privacy concerns. *See Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 64 (1976) (per curiam) (requiring "a 'relevant correlation' or 'substantial relation' between the governmental interest and the information required to be disclosed").

Accordingly, the Committee is issuing compulsory process to obtain the documents and material needed to fulfill its oversight and legislative obligations. Please find the enclosed subpoena compelling production of the requested documents by August 7, 2026.

Sincerely,

Jason Smith
Chairman
Committee on Ways and Means

Cc: The Honorable Richard E. Neal, Ranking Member

Enclosure

JASON SMITH
MISSOURI,
CHAIRMAN

MATT MEYER, STAFF DIRECTOR
(202) 225-3625

RICHARD E. NEAL
MASSACHUSETTS,
RANKING MEMBER

BRANDON CASEY, STAFF DIRECTOR
(202) 225-4021

U.S. House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
1139 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
Washington, DC 20515

July 21, 2026

Ms. Mara Verheyden-Hilliard
Co-Founder and Executive Director
Partnership for Civil Justice Fund
617 Florida Ave NW
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Ms. Verheyden-Hilliard:

This letter responds to the Partnership for Civil Justice Fund's ("PCJF") May 18, 2026, letter submitted on behalf of The People's Forum.[1] In its May 4, 2026 letter, the Committee on Ways and Means ("Committee") reemphasized the basis for its inquiry in response to PCJF's September, 18, 2025 letter declining the Committee's request for information. Your responses have failed to include a single responsive document and misrepresented both the scope and purpose of the Committee's oversight. Instead, PCJF has raised a series of legal objections that are without merit. Accordingly, the Committee is invoking compulsory process to obtain the requested materials.

PCJF contends that the Committee's legislative purpose has "changed materially" between its September 4, 2025 letter and its May 4, 2026 letter, and that this shift prevents The People's Forum from performing the "pertinency analysis" derived from *Watkins v. United States*. This characterization misreads both the record and the applicable legal standard. The Committee's legislative purpose has remained consistent: examining whether existing legal standards governing tax-exempt status adequately account for foreign influence and control. The May 4 letter refined and focused the Committee's articulation of its legislative purpose in direct response to PCJF's prior correspondence as well as based on information obtained from further investigation. For example, in March 2026, a new report found that from 2017 to 2022, over $22 million flowed from Mr. Singham's donor-advised fund to The People's Forum, which is precisely the type of funding arrangement the Committee is examining in considering whether legislative reform is warranted.[2] That funding continued after the arrangement had been the subject of extensive public reporting,[3] until, in early 2024, Goldman Sachs terminated the donor-

---

[1] Letter from Partnership for Civil Justice Fund, letter to The Hon. Jason Smith, Chairman, Comm. on Ways and Means (May 18, 2026), Letter on file with the Committee.
[2] Asra Q. Nomani, *Power Couple of Chaos: How a tycoon and activist built a 'Revolutionary Base' at the House of Singham*, Fox News (March 23, 2026), https://www.foxnews.com/us/power-couple-chaos-how-tycoon-activist-built-revolutionary-base-house-singham.
[3] William Bredderman, *U.S. Tech Mogul Bankrolls Pro-Russia, Pro China News Network*, DAILY BEAST (May 28, 2023,), https://www.thedailybeast.com/neville-singham-funded-breakthrough-news-is-pushing-moscow-beijing-

advised fund.[4] The fact that the flow of foreign-linked funds through this conduit was completed by a private financial institution and only publicly disclosed due to their own exercise of discretion, rather than by any statutory disclosure obligation, illustrates the gap in existing law that the Committee is examining and that legislative reform may require to close. The Supreme Court has made clear that the legitimacy of a congressional inquiry is not "defined by what it produces" and that "[t]o be a valid legislative inquiry there need be no predictable end result." *See Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 509 (1975). The very nature of legislative inquiry is that it develops as information is gathered. That the Committee has refined its articulation of purpose as its investigation has proceeded is entirely consistent with, and not in violation of, the framework PCJF invokes.

PCJF further argues that the Committee's document requests were not "recalibrated" to match its revised legislative purpose, and that requests directed at internal records of The People's Forum are inconsistent with a generalized inquiry into the laws governing the attainment and retention of tax-exempt status. The Committee is not conducting a survey of hypothetical regulatory gaps in the abstract. It is examining a specific, concrete funding arrangement of over $22 million flowing to The People's Forum from Neville Roy Singham and his wife, channeled through shell companies and donor-advised funds, that raises significant concerns regarding foreign influence over a tax-exempt organization.

This arrangement directly informs the Committee's legislative inquiry. The Committee is examining whether existing standards governing tax-exempt status adequately account for foreign funding that reaches an organization indirectly through intermediary entities and donor-advised funds that, by design, obscure the original source of the contribution. The People's Forum's financing presents these features in concrete form due to the presence of foreign-linked capital layered through shell entities and donor-advised funds which is reaching a tax-exempt organization that in turn sends funds to downstream entities. Understanding how funds moved through this structure, including the intermediaries used, the disclosures made or omitted under existing law, and the downstream flow to sponsored projects, is what allows the Committee to evaluate whether current law meaningfully constrains foreign influence over tax-exempt organizations or leaves gaps that legislative reform must close. Congress cannot assess the adequacy of existing law by examining the statute in isolation; it must understand how that law operates when applied to an actual funding arrangement of this kind. Targeted requests directed at the organization at the center of that inquiry are pertinent and indispensable to the Committee's legislative purpose. *See Trump v. Mazars*, 591 U.S. at 862 ("Without information, Congress would be shooting in the dark, unable to legislate 'wisely or effectively.'" (quoting *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 175 (1927)). The fact that such requests are directed at The People's Forum specifically, rather than organizations across the political spectrum, reflects the focused and evidence-based nature of this inquiry, not an improper purpose.

---

propaganda/; Mara Hvistendahl et al., *A Global Web of Chinese Propaganda Leads to a U.S. Tech Mogul*, NEW YORK TIMES (Aug. 10, 2023),https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/05/world/europe/neville-roy-singham-china-propaganda.html.

[4] Asra Q. Nomani, *Power Couple of Chaos: How a tycoon and activist built a 'Revolutionary Base' at the House of Singham*, Fox News (March 23, 2026), https://www.foxnews.com/us/power-couple-chaos-how-tycoon-activist-built-revolutionary-base-house-singham.

PCJF's First Amendment objections fare no better. The Committee's initial letter expressly stated that "[u]nder the First Amendment, Americans have a right to peacefully express their views, even if those views are reprehensible." But the First Amendment does not categorically shield an organization from congressional inquiry. As the Supreme Court has held, where Congress investigates in furtherance of a legitimate legislative purpose, any incidental burden on First Amendment activity yields to that purpose, and the government interest and the individual interest must be weighed accordingly. *See Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 127 (1959). Both conditions are satisfied here. The Committee's inquiry is directed at the financing arrangements and organizational structure of The People's Forum, not at its speech, editorial positions, or political viewpoints. PCJF's invocation of *NAACP v. Alabama* and *Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta* is misplaced, because those cases addressed compelled disclosure of membership lists and donor information in contexts untethered to any legitimate governmental interest. The Committee's interest in understanding the source and flow of foreign-aligned funds into a tax-exempt organization is precisely the kind of substantial governmental interest that the Supreme Court has recognized can outweigh associational privacy concerns. *See Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 64 (1976) (per curiam) (requiring "a 'relevant correlation' or 'substantial relation' between the governmental interest and the information required to be disclosed").

PCJF's suggestion that the Committee's inquiry is analogous to a "witch-hunt" conducted by the House Un-American Activities Committee ("HUAC") is both historically inapt and legally irrelevant. HUAC's investigations were directed at rooting out political beliefs and compelling witnesses to expose their associations.[5] In contrast, the Committee's inquiry here is directed at financial arrangements and organizational structure, specifically whether existing tax-exempt law adequately guards against foreign-influenced funding networks of the kind documented in public reporting about Mr. Singham's activities. That is a legitimate legislative purpose, well within the Committee's jurisdiction.

PCJF's assertion that the Committee's investigative authority does not extend to any element of FARA mischaracterizes the nature and purpose of the inquiry. As was made clear in its May 4 letter, this investigation is grounded in the Committee's well-established jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code and tax-exempt organizations under Rule X, clause 1(t) of the House Rules, not in FARA enforcement, which remains solely within the purview of the Department of Justice.[6] The September 4 letter referenced FARA as contextual background to illustrate the broader concern of whether existing tax-exempt law adequately accounts for an organization's connections to foreign nationals and whether such status is being used to facilitate or obscure foreign influence. That is a legislative question squarely within the Committee's delegated jurisdiction and authority. As the May 4 letter noted, the Committee's investigation has continued to develop and its informational needs have become more focused accordingly, a natural feature of any congressional inquiry.

---

[5] The First Amendment Right of Political Privacy Chapter 1 – The Edgerton Dissent, Wiley Rein LLP (November 2018), https://www.wiley.law/newsletter-The-First-Amendment-Right-of-Political-Privacy-Chapter-1-The-Edgerton-Dissent.
[6] 22 U.S. Code Chapter 11 Subchapter II; 28 CFR Part 5; Foreign Agents Registration Act, U.S. Department of Justice, https://www.justice.gov/nsd-fara.

Accordingly, the Committee is issuing compulsory process to obtain the documents and material needed to fulfill its oversight and legislative obligations. Please find the enclosed subpoena compelling production of the requested documents by August 7, 2026.

Sincerely,

Jason Smith
Chairman
Committee on Ways and Means

Cc: The Honorable Richard E. Neal, Ranking Member

Enclosure