CREW

CITIZENS FOR
RESPONSIBILITY &
ETHICS IN WASHINGTON

October 22, 2026

Valeree Villanueva
Acting Chief, Initial Request Staff
Office of Information Policy
Department of Justice
6th Floor
441 G St 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 to the U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ") pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and DOJ regulations.

Specifically, CREW requests the following records from August 1, 2026, to October 19, 2026:

1. All communications with Meta[1] concerning the No Kings movement; No Kings protest or demonstrations; or any Facebook, Instagram, or Threads account(s) associated with No Kings. This request includes:

    a. Any request from the DOJ to Meta for user account information, subscriber information, content, or other data concerning the No Kings movement; No Kings protests or demonstrations; or any Facebook, Instagram, or Threads account(s) associated with No Kings.

    b. Any request, referral, or recommendation by the DOJ to Meta—or by any other federal agency transmitted through or copied to the DOJ—that Meta remove, suspend, restrict, label, or otherwise take action against any account, page, group, or post during the request period.

    Relevant communications may include, but are not limited to, communications with the following email domains: @meta.com; @metamail.com; @global.metamail.com; @fb.com; @facebook.com; @facebookmail.com; @instagram.com; and @threads.net.

[1] For purposes of this request, "Meta" includes Meta Platforms, Inc. and its subsidiaries, including Instagram, Facebook, Threads, as well as any officer, employee, agent, contractor, or representative of Meta Platforms, Inc. or any Meta subsidiary.

2. All calendar entries, agendas, attendee lists, talking points, notes, and read-outs from any meeting, call, briefing, or other engagement between the DOJ and Meta concerning No Kings or platform content moderation, security, or "election integrity" practices during the request period.

3. All internal DOJ communications concerning the No Kings movement; No Kings protests or demonstrations; or any Facebook, Instagram, or Threads account(s) associated with No Kings.

4. All records connected to the implementation of the National Security Presidential Memorandum 7 ("NSPM-7") that concern any designation, assessment, referral, watchlist entry, or investigative lead related to No Kings, any No Kings-affiliated organization, or any social media account associated with No Kings.

   CREW's request is limited to custodians within the following DOJ offices:

   - Office of the Attorney General; and
   - Office of the Deputy Attorney General,
     - This includes, but is not limited to custodians serving on—or working with—Joint Task Force Vanguard.

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 that 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. 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) and agency regulations, 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 significantly better understanding of the relevant government activities by CREW and the general public. *See id.* § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). 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).

No Kings is a broad pro-democracy coalition.[2] Since the summer of 2025, it has organized several nationwide demonstrations opposing actions by the federal government. On October 17, 2026, the No Kings coalition organized approximately 2,500 "events" around the country in support of these objectives.[3] It advertised the mobilization to its 22.3K Instagram followers in the days and weeks leading up to October 17.[4] On the day of the demonstrations, the No Kings account—@nokingscoalition—"was suspended for roughly 90 minutes."[5] The account administrators were "unable to access the account's backend for [an additional] four hours, preventing them from posting or communicating with their network."[6] No Kings conveyed to Newsweek that "[t]his suspension deprived the movement of a crucial platform right as communities were joyfully and nonviolently mobilizing[.]"[7]

As outlined in the subsequent section, the public has an urgent need to understand whether the account suspension amounted to censorship or otherwise violated their First Amendment rights. CREW seeks the records enumerated above in order to shed light on any such violations.

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

---

[2] No Kings, *Partners*, https://www.nokings.org/partners (last visited Oct. 19, 2026).
[3] Corina Knoll, *New Round of 'No Kings' Rallies Focuses on Getting Out the Vote*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 17, 2026), https://www.nytimes.com/2026/10/17/us/no-kings-early-voting-midterms.html.
[4] @nokingscoalition, https://www.instagram.com/nokingscoalition/ (last visited Oct. 19, 2026). The number of followers included here is current as of October 19, 2026.
[5] Newsweek, *'No Kings' Says Meta Cut Off Access to Instagram Account on Key Protest Day* (Oct. 17, 2026), https://www.newsweek.com/no-kings-protest-mets-12584351.
[6] *Id.*
[7] *Id.* (quoting a statement from a No Kings spokesperson).

media. *See Nat'l Sec. Archive v. U.S. Dep't of Defense*, 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989) (holding a non-profit to be 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").

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 FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552 and 28 C.F.R. § 16. CREW is entitled to expedited processing because there is an "urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government Activity," and CREW "is primarily engaged in disseminating information," 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II). In addition, the DOJ should grant expedited processing because this is "[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(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,'" but "publishing information 'need not be [the organization's] sole occupation.'" *Protect Democracy Project, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Def.*, 263 F. Supp. 3d 293, 298 (D.D.C. 2017) (internal citation omitted). CREW routinely disseminates information obtained through FOIA to the public in several ways. For example, CREW's website receives thousands of 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, the facts demonstrate that (1) the request concerns a matter of current exigency to the American public; (2) the consequences of delaying a response would compromise a significant recognized interest; and (3) the request concerns federal government activity. *Al-Fayed v. C.I.A.*, 254 F.3d 300, 310 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

This request, which focuses on the take-down of a social media account during a nationwide demonstration, concerns a matter of current exigency to the American public. No Kings has a broad reach: it comprises over three hundred partners,[8] and it has mobilized "millions of [individuals] since 2025."[9] Moreover, the coalition's activities have consistently garnered significant media attention.[10] Meta's suspension of the @nokingscoalition

---

[8] *Partners*, *supra* note 2.
[9] Judd Legum, *Meta shuts down 'No Kings' account during major anti-Trump protest,* Popular Information (Oct. 19, 2026), https://popular.info/p/meta-shuts-down-no-kings-account.
[10] *See, e.g., No Kings Protests Across the United States,* N.Y. Times (June 14, 2025), https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/14/us/protests-cities-no-kings.html; Owen Tucker-Smith and Jared Mitovich, *Across the Nation, 'No Kings' Protesters Rally to Oppose Trump*, Wall St. J. (Oct. 18, 2025), https://www.wsj.com/us-news/no-kings-protests-ebd5a596.

Instagram account prompted a slew of articles from national news organizations[11] and criticism from at least one U.S. Senator.[12]

Following the account suspension, "Meta said access was disabled in error because of an automated action."[13] The company first attributed the mistake to "'very high frequencies'" of communication from the @nokingscoalition account.[14] It later claimed the error stemmed from "the use of a Claude tool."[15] No Kings responded with skepticism via Threads and Instagram on October 18.[16] In subsequent posts, the coalition claimed it had "received reports that #NoKings and early voting content was inaccessible, restricted, or seemed suppressed across Meta platforms."[17]

The suspension and the coalition's allegations of content suppression are particularly concerning given the close ties between Meta and the Trump administration.[18] According to reporting by Popular Information, Meta's actions have also resulted in the "censorship of Trump critics," including Brazilian presidential candidate Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva and "Albanian groups protesting Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner."[19] Meta attributed both instances to error. However, the company has confirmed that it removed at least one account at the behest of the Trump administration—a Facebook page called "ICE Sighting-Chicagoland," which reportedly violated Facebook policy.[20] Meta did not respond when Popular Information asked "if it had received any communications regarding No Kings from the Trump administration or allied groups."[21]

Any delay in the processing of CREW's request would compromise significant First

---

[11] *See, e.g.,* Legum, *supra* note 9; Newsweek, *supra* note 5; Ryan Mancini, *Meta apologizes for suspending 'No Kings' Instagram account, blaming bot traffic increase*, The Hill (Oct. 19, 2026), https://thehill.com/policy/technology/6157957-meta-apologizes-no-kings-account-suspension/; María Paula Mijares Torres, *Meta Says Claude AI Tool Triggered No Kings Instagram Suspension*, Bloomberg (Oct. 18, 2026), https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2026-10-18/meta-says-claude-ai-tool-triggered-no-kings-instagram-suspension.

[12] Chris Murphy on X (Oct. 18, 2026), https://x.com/ChrisMurphyCT/status/2111947122815742012; Mancini, *supra* note 11 (quoting Sen. Murphy's post).

[13] Newsweek, *supra* note 5.

[14] *Id.* (quoting Andy Stone, Meta spokesperson, on X (Oct. 17, 2026), https://x.com/andymstone/status/2111579972116824545).

[15] Legum, *supra* note 9 (quoting Andy Stone, Meta spokesperson, on X (Oct. 18, 2026), https://x.com/andymstone/status/2111920686306627816).

[16] @nokingscoalition (Oct. 18, 2026), https://www.threads.com/@nokingscoalition/post/DenR0s0jsXI; @nokingscoalition on Instagram (Oct. 18, 2026), https://www.instagram.com/nokingscoalition/.

[17] @nokingscoalition (Oct. 18, 2026), https://www.threads.com/@nokingscoalition/post/DeqGsLlDi70; @nokingscoalition on Instagram (Oct. 18, 2026), https://www.instagram.com/nokingscoalition/.

[18] *See, e.g.,* Legum, *supra* note 9; Newsweek, *supra* note 5; PBS News, *Meta agrees to pay $25 million settlement to Trump over Jan. 6 suspension lawsuit* (Jan. 29, 2025), https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/meta-agrees-to-pay-25-million-settlement-to-trump-over-jan-6-suspension-lawsuit.

[19] Legum, *supra* note 9.

[20] Legum, *supra* note 9; Fox 32, *Meta removes ICE-tracking Facebook page in Chicago at the request of the Justice Department* (Oct. 14, 2025), https://www.fox32chicago.com/news/ice-tracking-facebook-page-chicago.

[21] Legum, *supra* note 9.

Amendment interests in advance of the midterm elections on November 3, 2026. No Kings is focused on encouraging participation in the 2026 midterm elections and ensuring that the elections are carried out in accordance with the law. These nonpartisan objectives implicate core rights, including the freedom of speech and the right to vote. The public is entitled to participate in communications concerning the 2026 elections without facing censorship or other potential violations of their First Amendment rights. The public has a "significant recognized interest" in "obtaining in a timely fashion information vital to the current and ongoing debate surrounding the legality of a high-profile government action." *Protect Democracy Project*, 263 F. Supp. 3d 293, 299–300 (D.D.C. 2017) (citation modified).

This request concerns federal government activity. CREW seeks records documenting the DOJ's own conduct, including its communications with Meta, any requests or referrals to restrict No Kings–related accounts or content, and its implementation of NSPM-7 in connection with No Kings.

Additionally, there has been "widespread and exceptional" media interest in the No Kings account suspension. Newsweek, Reuters, Bloomberg, The Guardian, The Hill, The New Republic, and Popular Information have published articles on the subject.[22] Some have highlighted Meta's connections to the Trump administration, as well as No Kings' skepticism over Meta's proffered explanation for the suspension.[23] Popular Information also "asked a spokesperson [for Meta] if [the company] had received any communications regarding No Kings from the Trump administration or allied groups," but it did not receive a response.[24] Any government involvement in chilling Americans' First Amendment rights would raise considerable concerns regarding free speech, and thus "about the government's integrity that affect public confidence." 28 C.F.R. § 16(e)(1)(iv).

For these reasons, CREW is entitled to expedited processing of its FOIA request. The undersigned certifies that the representations in this expedited processing request are true and correct to the best of his 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 kfarchadi@citizensforethics.org and foia@citizensforethics.org or call me at (202) 408-5565. Also, if CREW's request for a fee waiver or expedited processing is denied, please contact our office immediately upon making such a determination.

---

[22] *See, e.g.,* Legum, *supra* note 9; Newsweek, *supra* note 5; Mancini, *supra* note 11, Torres, *supra* note 11; Sanya Mansoor, *Outrage after Meta suspends No Kings Instagram account during protests*, The Guardian (Oct. 18, 2026), https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/oct/18/no-kings-instagram-account-suspended-during-protests; Reuters, *Meta apologizes after suspending "No Kings" Instagram account* (Oct. 19, 2026), https://www.reuters.com/technology/meta-apologizes-after-suspending-no-kings-instagram-account-2026-10-19/; Edith Olmstead, *Meta Weakly Defends Blocking No Kings Instagram in the Middle of Event*, The New Republic (Oct. 19. 2026), https://newrepublic.com/post/216799/meta-defends-blocking-no-kings-instagram-voting.

[23] *See, e.g.*, Legum, *supra* note 9; Olmstead, *supra* note 22.

[24] Legum, *supra* note 9.

Where possible, please produce records in electronic format. Please send the requested records to kfarchadi@citizensforethics.org and foia@citizensforethics.org or by mail to Kayvan Farchadi, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, P.O. Box 14596, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Sincerely,

Kayvan Farchadi
Senior Counsel