

THE OHRS' ACTIVITIES RAISE NEW QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DECEMBER 13 DOSSIER REPORT

In recent days, Republicans have leaked details about the actions of Bruce and Nellie Ohr with respect to the Fusion GPS dossier on Trump. Yesterday, Glenn Simpson confirmed those details in a filing in Fusion's efforts to prevent the House Intelligence Committee from obtaining more details about Fusion's finances.

The bank records reflect that Fusion contracted with Nellie Ohr, a former government official expert in Russian matters, to help our company with its research and analysis of Mr. Trump[.]

[snip]

I disclosed that I met with Bruce Ohr, at his request, after the November 2016 election to discuss our findings regarding Russia and the election[.]

In short, this revelation means that Fusion employed the wife of then Associate Deputy Attorney General Bruce Ohr to conduct research on Trump's Russian ties. Ohr met with Christopher Steele before the election, and met with Simpson after the election.

This probably means that this reference, in HPSCI's request for documents, is to Nellie Ohr.

██████████ – Transaction Nos. 74-81

The Committee seeks re-production of five Fusion payments to research and Russia expert ██████████ and production of three additional payments.

Which in turn would mean that Fusion paid Ohr on March 22, April 6, May 25, July 13, August 2, September 1, October 5, November 1.

That would mean the payments to Steele are

either item 2 or 4 in this analysis. That's significant because both of those entities received payments in January.

I'm interested in all that for two reasons. First, the record conflicts on whether DOJ ever paid Steele.

WaPo reported that Steele had reached a verbal agreement that the FBI would pay him to continue his investigation of Russia's involvement with Trump after still unnamed Democrats stopped paying him after the election. CNN then reported that FBI actually *had* paid Steele for his expenses. Finally, NBC reported Steele backed out of the deal before it was finalized.

If Ohr met with Steele after the election (and after Perkins Coie reportedly stopped paying for Steele's work), it means it's possible DOJ paid him, contrary to some reports. Steele has claimed (in otherwise dubious court filings) that he was neither paid nor affirmatively solicited information for the last report, dated December 13.

The December 13 report was by far the most inflammatory one, alleging that Trump's campaign paid for the hack of the DNC. It's also at the center of some of the lawfare surrounding the dossier, Webzilla's multiple lawsuits.

This is by no means definitive. But the circumstances of the December 13 report will come out one way or another. Thus far, the story about it is bad. And it could get far worse.