Court Orders Clinton to Answer Email Questions About Email Google Execs Helped Create

- Watch Video
- Listen to Audio

Email Print Text Size

Federal Court Orders Hillary Clinton to Answer Additional Email Questions Under Oath
Our Team Is Back in South Florida Monitoring the Election Recount
DOJ Charges Hotel with Discrimination for Not Hiring an Immigrant

Federal Court Orders Hillary Clinton to Answer Additional Email Questions Under Oath

Apparently, no one in the federal bureaucracies cares to fully investigate Hillary Clinton's email misconduct, but we are doing it, and we're making progress.

This week U.S. District Court Judge Emmet G. Sullivan ruled that within 30 days Clinton must answer under oath two additional questions about her controversial email system.

In 2016, she was **required to submit** under oath written answers to our questions. Clinton objected to and refused to answer questions about the creation of her email system; her decision to use the system despite warnings from State Department cybersecurity officials; and the basis for her claim that the State Department had "90-95%" of her emails.

After **a lengthy hearing** Judge Sullivan ruled that Clinton must address two **questions** that she refused to answer under oath.

- Describe the creation of the clintonemail.com system, including who decided to create the system, the date it was decided to create the system, why it was created, who set it up, and when it became operational.
- During your October 22, 2015 appearance before the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Benghazi, you testified that 90 to 95 percent of your emails "were in the State's system" and "if they wanted to see them, they would certainly have been able to do so." Identify the basis for this statement, including all facts on which you relied in support of the statement, how and when you became aware of these facts, and, if you were made aware of these facts by

> or through another person, identify the person who made you aware of these facts.

Judge Sullivan read his opinion from the bench, deciding that the question about the creation of the email system was within the scope of discovery. Judge Sullivan rejected Clinton's assertion of attorney-client privilege on the question about the emails "in the State's system."

The court refused **Judicial Watch's and media's requests** to unseal the deposition videos of Huma Abedin, Cheryl Mills and other Clinton State Department officials. And it upheld Clinton's objections to answering a question about why she refused to stop using her Blackberry despite warnings from State Department security personnel. Justice Department lawyers for the State Department defended Clinton's refusal to answer certain questions and argued for the continued secrecy of the deposition videos.

This **hearing** and court ruling is the latest development in our Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) **lawsuit** about the controversial employment status of Huma Abedin, former deputy chief of staff to Clinton. The lawsuit, which seeks records regarding the authorization for Abedin to engage in outside employment while employed by the Department of State, **was reopened** because of revelations about the clintonemail.com system (***Judicial Watch v. U.S. Department of State*** (No. 1:13-cv-01363)). The court also granted discovery to Judicial Watch to help determine if and how Clinton's email system thwarted FOIA.

It is good news that a federal court ordered Clinton to answer more questions about her illicit email system. But it is shameful that our attorneys must continue to battle the State and Justice

Departments, which still defend Hillary Clinton, for basic answers to our questions about Clinton's email misconduct.

The public and the media have a right to a full accounting about the Clinton State Department. In lieu of a much-needed, new and untainted investigation by the FBI, the continued work of Judicial Watch in the courts is clearly the only hope of bringing sunlight into the Clinton email issue and completing the public record.