

August 14, 2026

Submitted via email: CRT.FOIArequests@usdoj.gov

FOIA/PA Branch
Department of Justice Civil Rights Division
4CON, Room 6.153
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear FOIA Officer:

Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (“CREW”) submits this request for records pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552 and Department of Justice (“DOJ”) regulations.¹

Specifically, from March 1, 2026 to the date this request is processed, CREW requests:

1. Records sufficient to show the methodology, criteria, and analytical process used to generate the following the numerical claims made publicly by DHS and the President on or about July 16 and 17, 2026 regarding non-citizens registered to vote, including:
 - a. The claim that over 250,000 non-citizens are illegally registered to vote in California, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Nevada;
 - b. The state-specific figures of 190,832 (California), 35,152 (New Jersey), 15,903 (Nevada), and 14,576 (Pennsylvania);
 - c. The claim that approximately 278,000 non-citizens are registered to vote in federal elections;
 - d. The figure of 118,003 registrants across the four states whose names, dates of birth, addresses, and Social Security numbers were said to match non-citizens in DHS records; and
 - e. The claims that the SAVE system enabled participating states to identify over 400,000 deceased registrants and over 28,000 non-citizen registrants.

This request includes, but is not limited to, records sufficient to show: the data sources used to generate these figures; the matching criteria, thresholds, and confidence levels; any code, scripts, queries, models, or algorithms used; any

¹ See 28 C.F.R. §§ 16.1–16.11.

documentation distinguishing "potential," "possible," and confirmed matches; and any documented or estimated error, false-positive, or false-negative rates.

2. All records reflecting internal assessments of the accuracy, reliability, or limitations of these numerical claims or of the underlying matching process, including quality assurance, validation, testing, sampling, and audit records, and any concerns, objections, caveats, or dissenting views raised by agency personnel.
3. All communications concerning the preparation, clearance, and approval of the DHS fact sheet titled "Preventing Alien Voting" or the DHS press release of July 17, 2026.

The above request excludes agency records consisting solely of news articles, press clippings, and other publicly-available material, so long as the records include no accompanying discussion by agency officials.

Please search for responsive records regardless of format, medium, or physical characteristics. We seek records of any kind, including paper records, electronic records, audiotapes, videotapes, photographs, data, and graphical material. Our request includes without limitation all correspondence, letters, emails, text messages, facsimiles, telephone messages, voice mail messages, and transcripts, notes, or minutes of any meetings, telephone conversations, or discussions. Our request also includes any attachments to emails and other records, and anyone who was cc'ed or bcc'ed on any emails.

If it is your position any portion of the requested records is exempt from disclosure, CREW requests that you provide it with an index of those documents as required under *Vaughn v. Rosen*, 484 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1973). If some portions of the requested records are properly exempt from disclosure, please disclose any reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the requested records. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). If it is your position that a document contains non-exempt segments, but that those non-exempt segments are so dispersed throughout the document as to make segregation impossible, please state what portion of the document is non-exempt, and how the material is dispersed throughout the document. See *Mead Data Central v. U.S. Dep't of the Air Force*, 566 F.2d 242, 261 (D.C. Cir. 1977).

Please be advised that CREW intends to pursue all legal remedies to enforce its rights under FOIA. Accordingly, because litigation is reasonably foreseeable, the agency should institute an agencywide preservation hold on all documents potentially responsive to this request.

Fee Waiver Request

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii) and 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1), CREW requests a waiver of fees associated with processing this request for records. The subject of this request concerns the operations of the federal government, and the disclosures likely will contribute to a better understanding of relevant government procedures by CREW and the general public in a significant way. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); accord 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1). Moreover, the request primarily and fundamentally is for non-commercial purposes. See, e.g., *McClellan Ecological v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1285 (9th Cir. 1987).

On July 16, 2026, President Trump told a national audience that the administration had identified approximately 278,000 non-citizens registered to vote in federal elections, and DHS simultaneously released a fact sheet asserting that over 250,000 non-citizens are illegally registered to vote in California, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Nevada.² The following day, Secretary Mullin wrote to those states' chief election officials with state-by-state figures totaling roughly 256,000, describing the analysis as a preliminary review, and demanded that they confirm their intent to cooperate with DHS.³ Weeks later, the American public still do not know how the numbers were produced: DHS has declined to disclose its methodology despite election officials in at least three of the four states demanding it.⁴ Independent experts have said the figures cannot be evaluated and should not be credited without a transparent methodology.⁵

The gap between the claim and the evidence is consequential because the President has directed states to remove flagged voters immediately while Secretary Mullin has warned officials in non-participating states of possible fines and criminal sanctions.⁶ And despite the fact that the DOJ sued these and more than twenty other states to obtain voter files containing partial Social Security and driver's license numbers and largely lost,⁷ DHS's letters indicate it matched registrants on precisely those fields.⁸ Furthermore, a federal court vacated DHS's modified SAVE system after finding its creation unlawful and its results prone to errors that could disenfranchise eligible voters.⁹

CREW's requested seeking the data and methodology behind these figures would likely contribute significantly to the public's ability to evaluate whether the federal government's central factual claim about the integrity of the 2026 elections is credible, and whether eligible voters are at risk of being removed from the rolls on the basis of unverified matches.

² The White House, *President Trump Delivers an Address to the Nation*, at 34:33–35:23 (YouTube, July 16, 2026), <https://www.youtube.com/live/illqG0untYM?si=K3WOzEgelNPB6bpv&t=2073>; Press Release, U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., *Preventing Alien Voting* (July 16, 2026).

³ Press Release, U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., *DHS Secretary Markwayne Mullin Sends Letters to Secretaries of State Warning About Non-Citizens on Voter Rolls* (July 17, 2026), <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2026/07/17/dhs-secretary-markwayne-mullin-sends-letters-secretaries-state-warning-about-non>; Secretary Markwayne Mullin (@SecMullinDHS), X (July 17, 2026), <https://x.com/SecMullinDHS/status/2078172229934760403?s=20>.

⁴ *States push DHS to explain its noncitizen voter claims*, NBC News (Aug. 2026), <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/elections/states-push-dhs-explain-noncitizen-voter-claims-rcna589999>.

⁵ Jude Joffe-Block & Miles Parks, *Trump's Claims of 250,000 Non-U.S. Citizens on Voter Rolls Leave Some States Baffled*, NPR (July 31, 2026), <https://www.npr.org/2026/07/31/nx-s1-5906708/trump-claim-noncitizens-midterms-election-interference-voter-rolls>.

⁶ U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., *Secretary Mullin Delivers Remarks on President Trump's Update on Election Integrity Efforts*, at 15:29–16:19 (YouTube, July 17, 2026), <https://www.youtube.com/live/jjuVaRAEpe4?si=pTn36LsEKqW4J4-U&t=929>.

⁷ Nick Corasaniti, *Federal Appeals Panel Rejects Trump's Effort to Gather Voting Data From States*, N.Y. Times (June 24, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/06/24/us/politics/trump-voter-rolls-data-ruling.html>.

⁸ Secretary Markwayne Mullin (@SecMullinDHS), *supra* note 3.

⁹ *League of Women Voters v. DHS*, No. CV 25-3501 (SLS), 2026 WL 1784297, *35 (D.D.C. June 22, 2026).

CREW is a non-profit corporation, organized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. CREW is committed to protecting the public's right to be aware of the activities of government officials, to ensuring the integrity of those officials, and to highlighting and working to reduce the influence of money on politics. CREW uses a combination of research, litigation, and advocacy to advance its mission. CREW intends to analyze the information responsive to this request and to share its analysis with the public through reports, press releases, or other means. In addition, CREW will disseminate any documents it acquires from this request to the public through its website, www.citizensforethics.org. The release of information obtained through this request is not in CREW's financial interest.

CREW further requests that it not be charged search or review fees for this request pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II) because CREW qualifies as a member of the news media. *See Nat'l Sec. Archive v. U.S. Dep't of Defense*, 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989) (holding non-profit a "representative of the news media" and broadly interpreting the term to include "any person or organization which regularly publishes or disseminates information to the public").

CREW routinely disseminates information obtained through FOIA to the public in several ways. For example, CREW's website receives over 150,000 page views every month. The website includes blogposts that report on and analyze newsworthy developments regarding government ethics, corruption, and money in politics, as well as numerous reports CREW has published to educate the public about these issues. These reports frequently rely on government records obtained through FOIA. CREW also posts the documents it obtains through FOIA on its website.

Under these circumstances, CREW satisfies fully the criteria for a fee waiver.

Expedited Processing Request

CREW requests expedited processing of this FOIA request pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E) and 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e). CREW is entitled to expedited processing because CREW "is primarily engaged in disseminating information" and there is an "urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity." 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II); *accord* 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1)(ii). In addition, this request warrants expedited processing because it concerns "[a] matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government's integrity that affect public confidence." 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1)(iv).

CREW is "primarily engaged in disseminating information" to the public. This standard "requires that information dissemination be the main [and not merely an incidental] activity of the requestor, although it need not be their sole occupation." *Landmark Legal Found. v. EPA*, 910 F. Supp. 2d 270, 276 (D.D.C. 2012) (quoting H.R. Rep. No. 104-795, at 26 (1996)) (emphasis deleted). CREW routinely disseminates information obtained through FOIA to the public in several ways. For example, CREW's website receives over 150,000 page views every month. The website includes blogposts that report on and analyze newsworthy developments regarding government ethics, corruption, and money in politics, as well as numerous reports CREW has published to educate the public about these

issues. These reports frequently rely on government records obtained through FOIA. CREW also posts the documents it obtains through FOIA on its website. CREW is a credible requestor and disseminator of information often relied on by major media outlets.

Further, there is an “urgency to inform the public” about the requested records because (1) they concern a matter of current exigency to the American public; (2) the consequences of delaying a response would compromise a significant recognized interest; and (3) they describe federal government activity. *See Al-Fayed v. CIA*, 254 F.3d 300, 310 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

First, the government’s unexplained non-citizen registration figures present a matter of acute current exigency. On July 16, DHS “blindsided” California, Pennsylvania, Nevada, and New Jersey with letters alleging that tens of thousands of non-citizens were registered to vote in each state.¹⁰ The same day, the President publicly ordered DHS to direct states to remove ineligible voters “immediately.”¹¹ The next day, the Secretary of Homeland Security threatened officials in non-complying states with fines and criminal penalties.¹² In addition, three deadlines loomed: the two-week deadline in DHS’s letters,¹³ the August 5 beginning of the “quiet period” under the National Voter Registration Act (“NVRA”), after which systematic removals from the rolls are prohibited,¹⁴ and the November 3 election itself. But the states had no way to verify DHS’s claims; it failed to provide any underlying data or methodology, in the letters or otherwise.¹⁵ Moreover, state officials worried that similar unverified figures released closer to the election could be used as a pretext for federal interference in the counting of ballots.¹⁶ States are grappling with these problems now, under immense time pressure, and records released after the election will come too late to be of use.

Second, delay would compromise the public’s significant recognized interests in preventing the disenfranchisement of eligible voters and safeguarding the integrity of elections. *See Protect Democracy Project, Inc. v. DOJ*, 498 F. Supp. 3d 132, 140 (D.D.C. 2020) (delay would compromise significant recognized interests in voting rights and election integrity); *CREW v. DOJ*, 826 F. Supp. 3d 73, 87–89 (D.D.C. 2026) (delay would compromise significant recognized interests in voting rights and voter privacy). The public needs the requested records in order to evaluate DHS’s unsubstantiated claims that over a quarter of a million non-citizens are currently registered to vote. Left unchecked, these claims stoke fears about voter fraud, undermine public confidence in election administration, and may ultimately reduce voter participation in the upcoming election. Moreover, without evidence that the data is inaccurate, states may comply with the President’s demands to remove flagged individuals from the rolls, and in the process, disenfranchise eligible voters. That

¹⁰ Secretary Markwayne Mullin (@SecMullinDHS), *supra* note 3; Gabe Cohen, Priscilla Alvarez, & Tierney Sneed, *Markwayne Mullin Uses Homeland Security to Further Trump’s Voter Fraud Crusade*, CNN (Aug. 12, 2026), <https://www.cnn.com/2026/08/12/politics/trump-homeland-security-voter-fraud-crusade>.

¹¹ The White House, *supra* note 2 at 39:36–39:47.

¹² U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec., *supra* note 6 at 15:29–16:19.

¹³ Secretary Markwayne Mullin (@SecMullinDHS), *supra* note 3.

¹⁴ 52 U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)(A).

¹⁵ Joffe-Block & Parks, *supra* note 5.

¹⁶ *Id.*

harm is not easily undone. Wrongful removal could not only deprive individuals of the chance to vote in the next election, but discourage them from reregistering in the future. The public needs these records now in order to evaluate the truth of DHS's claims, respond appropriately, and restore confidence in the election process ahead of the midterm elections.

Delay would also compromise the public's interest in ensuring that the government acts within the confines of the law. See *Protect Democracy Project, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Def.*, 263 F. Supp. 3d 293, 299–300 (D.D.C. 2017) (delay would compromise significant recognized interest because it would preclude public “from obtaining in a timely fashion information vital to the current and ongoing debate surrounding the legality of a high-profile government action” (citation modified)); see also *CREW v. U.S. DOGE Serv.*, 769 F. Supp. 3d 8, 27 (D.D.C. 2025) (similar). The requested records bear on a number of questions about the legality of DHS's actions. First, it is not clear how DHS could have compiled these statistics through legal means. California, Pennsylvania, Nevada, and New Jersey each refused to share their complete voter rolls with DOJ, and federal courts subsequently rejected DOJ's bids to demand the data from three of the four states.¹⁷ Another federal court barred DHS from using the modified SAVE system.¹⁸ It is not clear how DHS could have conducted mass searches of sensitive voter information without illegally accessing these resources. Second, the federal government's demands may pressure states to violate the NVRA. President Trump demanded that states remove flagged voters “immediately,”¹⁹ and Secretary Mullins threatened election officials with fines and criminal sanctions for noncompliance.²⁰ While there is no indication that the four states have begun removing voters,²¹ if they change course, they risk violating the NVRA's ban on systematically removing voters from the rolls in the “quiet period” preceding an election. The American people have a time-sensitive interest in curbing potentially illegal conduct and preventing further harm.

Third, the requested records concern federal government activity. The analysis of state voter files by DHS, the operation of the SAVE system, and the demands made of state election officials are squarely activities of the federal government.

Separately, this matter has generated widespread and exceptional media interest that raises questions about the government's integrity. The claims announced on July 16 and 17 have drawn sustained national coverage and fact-checking from outlets including CNN,

¹⁷ Miles Parks, *A Federal Judge Dismisses the DOJ's Effort to Get Voter Data from California*, NPR (Jan. 15, 2026), <https://www.npr.org/2026/01/15/nx-s1-5678969/doj-voter-data-california-dismissal>; Alex Clearfield, *Pennsylvania Sheds DOJ's Demand for Unredacted State Voter Rolls*, Bloomberg Law (June 28, 2026), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/litigation/pennsylvania-sheds-doj-demand-for-unredacted-state-voter-rolls>; McKenna Ross, *Nevada Pushes Back Against DOJ's Lawsuit for Unredacted Voter Rolls*, Las Vegas Review-Journal (Jan. 28, 2026), <https://www.reviewjournal.com/news/politics-and-government/nevada/nevada-pushes-back-against-doj-lawsuit-for-unredacted-voter-rolls-3613062/>; Joey Fox, *Federal Judge Rejects DOJ Attempt to Obtain Unredacted NJ Voter Rolls*, Politico (July 29, 2026), <https://www.politico.com/news/2026/07/29/judge-rejects-doj-obtain-nj-voter-rolls-01015607>.

¹⁸ *League of Women Voters v. DHS*, *supra* note 9.

¹⁹ The White House, *supra* note 2 at 39:36–39:47.

²⁰ U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., *supra* note 6 at 15:29–16:19.

²¹ Joffe-Block & Parks, *supra* note 5.

Fox News, NPR, The New York Times, and The Washington Post.²² The coverage raises questions about the government's integrity, as much of it focuses on the government's refusal to substantiate the figures it has asked the public to accept.

For these reasons, CREW's request warrants expedited processing. The undersigned certifies that the representations in this expedited processing request are true and correct to the best of her knowledge and belief.

Conclusion

If you have any questions about this request or foresee any problems in fully releasing the requested records, please email me at [REDACTED] or call me at [REDACTED]. Also, if CREW's request for a fee waiver is denied, please contact our office immediately upon making such a determination.

Where possible, please produce records in electronic format. Please send the requested records to [REDACTED] or by mail to Lauren Bingham, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, P.O. Box 14596, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Sincerely,

Lauren Bingham
Senior Litigation Counsel

²² See, e.g., Melissa Quinn, *What to Know About the Trump Administration's Claim That 250K Noncitizens Are Registered to Vote in 4 States*, CBS News (July 18, 2026), <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-markwayne-mullin-non-citizens-registered-voters-california-new-jersey-nevada-pennsylvania/>; Tierney Sneed & Gabe Cohen, *Trump DHS Using Unverified Figures to Attack Election Officials on Non-citizen Voting*, CNN (July 17, 2026), <https://www.cnn.com/2026/07/17/politics/election-officials-voting-mullin-save>; Preston Mizell & Stephen Sorace, *More Than a Quarter-million Noncitizens May Be Registered to Vote in 4 Key States, DHS Alleges*, Fox News (July 16, 2026), <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/quarter-million-noncitizens-registered-vote-4-key-states-dhs-alleges>; Rebecca Shabad, *Homeland Security Secretary Markwayne Mullin Threatens States Over Elections*, NBC News (July 17, 2026), <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/elections/homeland-security-secretary-markwayne-mullin-threatens-states-election-rcna588002>; Joffe-Block & Parks, *supra* note 5; Nick Corasaniti & Alexandra Berzon, *Trump Again Makes Unverifiable Claims of Noncitizen Voting*, N.Y. Times (July 16, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/07/16/us/politics/trump-again-makes-unfounded-claims-of-noncitizen-voting.html>; John Sakellariadis & Maggie Miller, *Ahead of Trump Speech, DHS Says It Found Thousands of Noncitizens on Voter Rolls*, Politico (July 16, 2026), <https://www.politico.com/news/2026/07/16/dhs-says-it-found-thousands-of-non-citizens-on-voter-rolls-in-four-states-01002326>; Perry Stein et al., *Trump Says 278,000 Noncitizens Are on Voting Rolls. Experts Say That's Wrong.*, Wash. Post (July 17, 2026), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2026/07/17/trump-said-278000-noncitizens-are-voting-rolls-experts-say-thats-wrong/>.