

Table of Contents:

Acknowledgements	3
I. Introduction	13
A. The Independent Counsel's Investigation	14
B. Arkansas Bar Proceeding	18
C. Resolution of Criminal Allegations Against President Clinton Relating to His Testimony About Monica Lewinsky	20
II. Scope of Report	21
III. Findings	23
A. Summary of Findings	23
B. Factual Background	24
1. Evidence From Monica Lewinsky Relating to the Truthfulness of President Clinton's Testimony	24
2. President Clinton's Civil Discovery Responses	26
3. Monica Lewinsky as a Witness in <i>Jones v. Clinton</i>	28
4. President Clinton's Deposition Testimony in <i>Jones v. Clinton</i>	29
5. President Clinton's Conduct after His Deposition	32
6. President Clinton's Grand Jury Testimony	35
a. Regarding President Clinton's Intent during the <i>Jones v. Clinton</i> Deposition	36
b. Regarding Sexual Relations	37
c. Regarding President Clinton's Statements to Betty Currie	38
d. Regarding President Clinton's Statements to Monica Lewinsky	38
e. Regarding the Nature of President Clinton's Relationship with Monica Lewinsky	39
7. United States District Judge Susan Webber Wright Sanctioned President Clinton for His Conduct Relating to His <i>Jones v. Clinton</i> Deposition	40
IV. Analysis of Potential Violations of Federal Criminal Law	41
A. Sufficient Evidence Existed to Prosecute President Clinton	42
B. The Principles of Federal Prosecution Authorize Declination of Criminal Matters Even When Evidence Sufficient to Obtain and Sustain a Conviction Exists	44
1. There Were Substantial Federal Interests to be Served in the Prosecution of President Clinton	44

2. President Clinton Received Significant Administrative Sanctions for His Actions in the Civil Deposition and Before the Federal Grand Jury	45
V. Conclusion	51
Appendix A–1—Materials Relating to the Independent Counsel’s January 19, 2001 Resolution of the Investigation of President William Jefferson Clinton	53
Press Release, Office of the Independent Counsel, Agreement Reached with President Clinton (Jan. 19, 2001)	55
Letter from David E. Kendall, private counsel to President Clinton, to Robert W. Ray, Independent Counsel (Jan. 19, 2001)	58
Letter from Robert W. Ray, Independent Counsel, to David E. Kendall, private counsel to President Clinton (Jan. 19, 2001)	61
Statement by President Clinton, Office of the Press Secretary (Jan. 19, 2001)	62
Televised Statement of Independent Counsel Robert W. Ray (Jan. 19, 2001)	63
Appendix A–2—Materials Relating to the Arkansas Supreme Court’s Resolution of the Disbarment Proceedings Against President William Jefferson Clinton	65
Complaint for Disbarment, <i>Neal v. Clinton</i> , Civ. No. 2000–5677 (Cir. Ct. of Pulaski Co., Ark. June 30, 2000)	67
Letter from James A. Neal, Executive Director, Committee on Prof. Conduct to Leslie Steen, Clerk, Arkansas Supreme Court (May 22, 2000)	72
Answer, <i>Neal v. Clinton</i> , No. Civ. 2000–5677 (Cir. Ct. of Pulaski Co., Ark. Aug. 29, 2000)	73
Agreed Order of Discipline, <i>Neal v. Clinton</i> , No. Civ. 2000–5677 (Cir. Ct. of Pulaski Co., Ark. Jan. 19, 2001)	77
Letter from Stephen Engstrom, Esq., Wilson, Engstrom, Corum & Coulter to Lynn Williams, Esq. (Mar. 20, 2001)	82
Appendix B—Investigation of Allegations Made by Kathleen E. Willey	85
A. Willey’s Allegations	88
B. Evidence Concerning Willey’s Allegations	90
1. Willey’s Statements to Others	90
2. Communications by Willey with President Clinton Following the Alleged Incident	92
3. Willey’s Testimony to the Grand Jury about the Alleged Incident Differed Materially from Her Deposition Testimony Given in <i>Jones v. Clinton</i>	92
4. Willey’s Statements to this Office	92

C. Analysis of Potential Statutory Violations Relating to President Clinton’s Testimony about the November 1993 Incident with Willey	93
--	----

Appendix C—Unfounded Allegations of Criminal and Professional Misconduct and Spurious

Claims of Privilege	95
I. Introduction	97
II. No Person in This Office Was Found to Have Violated Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)	99
III. Charges that this Office Intentionally Disclosed the Existence of a Grand Jury Investigating President Clinton Were False	101
IV. All Complaints to the Department of Justice of Professional Misconduct Were Rejected	103
A. Four Allegations Were Rejected on the Ground That, Even if Substantiated, They Would Not Have Warranted the Removal of Independent Counsel Starr	104
B. Three Allegations Were Rejected as Having No Factual Basis	105
C. One Complaint, Which Included Two Subsidiary Complaints, Regarding the Steele Investigation was Rejected.	105
D. The Independent Counsel Accepted the Conclusion of a Special Counsel Concerning the January 16, 1998 Contact with Monica Lewinsky that No Attorney Committed Professional Misconduct	106
1. The Independent Counsel Accepted the Determination that No Attorney Had Committed Professional Misconduct	107
2. The Independent Counsel Rejected the Special Counsel’s Finding of Poor Judgment	107
V. Allegations Concerning The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas Were All Dismissed	109
A. The Complaints of Mandanici, Smith, and Steele Were Rejected	109
B. Judge Nangle Rejected the Claims of the Judges of the Eastern District of Arkansas	111
VI. The Courts Ruled in Every Case that the Independent Counsel and the Grand Jury Were Entitled to Evidence from White House Employees	113
A. Privilege Litigation	113
B. Secret Service “Protective Function” Privilege	115
C. Attorney-Client Privilege (Crime-Fraud)	117

VII. The Independent Counsel’s Announcement of His Findings and Conclusions in the Madison Guaranty/Whitewater investigation Was Entirely Lawful and Appropriate	119
VIII. Conclusion	121
Appendix D—The White House’s Non-Compliance with Subpoena Requests for Electronically Maintained Documents	123
A. The Office of the Independent Counsel Concluded Its Investigation Regarding the White House’s Failure to Properly Search Electronic Records in Compliance with Lawfully Issued Subpoenas	125
1. Reconstructed E-mails for January 1993 through July 1994 ...	126
2. The Mail2 and User-D Problems that Prevented E-mails from Being Records Managed	126
3. The Searches of Hard Drives of Former Employees	127
4. E-mail from the Quorum System and the Executive Residence	127
B. The Independent Counsel Declined to Prosecute Allegations of Threats Made to Northrop Grumman Employees to Conceal the E-mail Problem	128
1. Witnesses Differed on the Nature of the Alleged Threats	128
2. There Was No Substantial Evidence that Senior White House Officials Unlawfully Prevented Northrop Grumman Employees from Providing Information to Investigators	128
C. The White House’s Failure to Produce All Relevant Documents Concerning Foster	129
Conclusion	131
Appendix E—Financial Information Regarding the Office of the Independent Counsel for the Period August 5, 1994 to March 31, 2001	133
Appendix F—Investigation Chronology, <i>In re: Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan Association</i>, Div. No. 94–1 (D.C. Cir. [Spec. Div.] Jan. 16, 1998) (regarding Monica Lewinsky and others)	147
Comments	155