

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO: 22-14102-CIV-MIDDLEBROOKS

DONALD J. TRUMP,

Plaintiff,

v.

HILLARY R. CLINTON, et al.

Defendants.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA’S MOTION TO REDACT
ADDRESSES OF FORMER FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
EMPLOYEES FROM THE PUBLIC RECORD**

The United States of America—by and through the undersigned counsel and pursuant to Rule 5.2(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—hereby moves for an order redacting, from the public record, the addresses of the former Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) employees named as defendants in this action; and, in support thereof, states the following:

On March 24, 2022, Plaintiff filed a copy of the Complaint for Damages and Demand for Trial by Jury [D.E. 1] (Complaint) together with a copy of the unsigned and signed relevant summonses, [D.E. 1-24 – D.E. 1-28] and [D.E. 7] at p.24-28. The relevant copies of the summonses filed in the public record include the addresses of the following former FBI employees: James Comey, Andrew McCabe, Peter Strzok, Lisa Page, and Kevin Clinesmith. The addresses of the former FBI employees are not relevant to the current litigation. Moreover, the named former FBI employees include former law enforcement officers and disclosure of their personal information may lead to them being harassed, threatened, or otherwise having their safety jeopardized. In this regard, these former FBI employees have received death threats in the past. The addresses should be redacted.

Rule 5.2 expressly requires the exclusion of information enumerated in section (a) of that Rule. Fed.R.Civ.P. 5.2(a). In addition, section (e) allows that “the court may by order in a case [] require redaction of additional information” when “good cause” is shown. Fed.R.Civ.P. 5.2(e). Here, good cause is shown. The information sought to be redacted—the addresses of former FBI employees—has no relevance to the current litigation, and as explained above, the disclosure of that information may lead to harassment, threats, or endangerment of these individuals. Federal law recognizes the need to protect such information. See, e.g., 18 U.S.C. § 119 (providing protections for the home addresses of any officer or employee of the United States); 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(7)(C) (precluding from production under the Freedom of Information Act “information compiled for law enforcement purposes” that “could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy”); see also Fla. Stat. § 119.071(4)(d) (providing an exception to the inclusion in public disclosures the “home addresses . . . of active or former sworn law enforcement personnel”).

Rule 7.1 Certification

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(a)(3), the undersigned called Plaintiff’s counsel to inquire as to Plaintiff’s position as to the relief sought herein. Undersigned counsel was instructed to send an email with the request. Undersigned counsel sent the requested email, and Plaintiff’s counsel has not yet responded to the email inquiry. In light of the sensitive nature of the information needing to be redacted, the United States files this motion as early as possible in an abundance of caution.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the United States of America moves for an order redacting the addresses of the former FBI employees included in [D.E. 1-24 – D.E. 1-28] and [D.E. 7] at p.24-28. As a courtesy, the United States will file redacted version of [D.E. 1-24 – D.E. 1-28] and [D.E. 7] at p.24-28 on Monday that may be substituted for the presently filed offending

versions.

Respectfully submitted,

JUAN ANTONIO GONZALEZ
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: **Anthony Erickson-Pogorzelski**
ANTHONY ERICKSON-POGORZELSKI
ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
Florida Bar No. 619884
E-mail: Anthony.Pogorzelski@usdoj.gov
99 N.E. 4th Street, Suite 300
Miami, Florida 33132
Telephone: (305) 961-9296
Counsel for the United States of America