## LINDSEY HALLIGAN'S SEVEN TIMES 18-MINUTE GAP

It's time to return to the mystery of the magical disappearing Jim Comey grand jury transcript.

On October 28, Senior Judge Cameron McGowan Currie — the woman presiding over Jim Comey and Letitia James' challenge to Lindsey Halligan's appointment, ordered the government to provide her, no later than Monday, November 3, 2025, at 5:00 pm, all documents relating to the indictment signer's participation in the grand jury proceedings, along with complete grand jury transcripts.

On November 3, Currie revealed that when prosecutors gave her the transcripts on October 31, they hadn't given her the part she most needed — revealing what Lindsey Halligan said to the grand jury — and ordered them to try again, asking them to provide a complete transcript and/or recording of what Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer did.

On Friday, October 31, 2025, the court received a package containing, inter alia, a "Transcript of Grand Jury proceedings on September 25, 2025." This court has reviewed the transcript and finds it fails to include remarks made by the indictment signer both before and after the testimony of the sole witness, which remarks were referenced by the indictment signer during the witness's testimony. In addition, the package contains no records or transcripts regarding the presentation of the threecount indictment referenced in the Transcript of the Return of Grand Jury Indictment Proceedings before the Magistrate Judge. See ECF No. 10.

Accordingly, the Government is directed

to submit, no later than Wednesday, November 5, 2025, at 5:00 pm, for in camera review, a complete Transcript and/or recording of all statements made by the indictment signer to the grand jury on September 25, 2025, to include statements made prior to and after the testimony of the witness and during the presentation of the three-count and subsequent two-count indictments.

On the morning of November 5, Magistrate Judge William Fitzpatrick, presiding over Comey's challenge to DOJ's bid to breach his privilege, ordered the government to provide all of that to Comey.

As part of this, I am going to order the government to disclose to the defense all grand jury materials, not just the testimony of the agent, but anything that was said during the course of the grand jury. How the grand jury was instructed, any presentation to the grand jury, any questions that were asked of either the agent or the United States Attorney, all of that is to be disclosed because I think the defense needs that in order to marry up the information that they have or the information that they will get to how it was used.

Among the concerns Pat Fitzgerald raised was that Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer had presented materials pertaining to the "Clinton Plan" that had been rejected during her first attempt as part of her obstruction charge.

And on top of that, Your Honor, I think there's another motion coming from us, in light of some disclosures that were made Monday, where we think that the government is expanding its case, we believe, to include the conduct that was no true billed in Count One as part of

its proof of Count Two, which raises serious issues for us. So we'll do everything we can, but to do all that while getting Mr. Comey access to materials...

Later that day, November 5, Loaner AUSA Tyler
Lemons submitted a filing claiming he had
complied with Currie's order; he explained they
had previously only provided the grand jury
transcript that "was previously provided to the
government [passive voice] by the transcription
service." But now, in response to Judge Currie's
order, they were providing "the complete
recording."

The Court had previously Ordered the government to provide, for in camera review, all documents relating to the indictment signer's participation in the grand jury proceedings, along with complete grand jury transcripts. [DE 95]. In response, the government provided the transcript of the Grand Jury proceedings that was previously provided to the government by the transcription service.

The Court's subsequent Order at Docket Entry 148 additionally requested the recording from the Grand Jury presentation. Upon receiving this order, the government immediately contacted the transcription service and requested the complete recording.

But Loaner AUSA Lemons did not make the grand jury transcript available to Comey. Instead, on November 6 (and in this order), he (or rather James Hayes, the guy at Main DOJ who keeps writing these things but who has not filed an appearance) claimed he would comply with the order to provide all the material seized from Dan Richman. Then he (or rather Hayes) appealed the order to share grand jury transcripts.

The next day, November 7, Judge Currie noted she had received the grand jury materials on November 5.

In advance of a hearing on November 10, Comey revealed that Loaner AUSA Lemons had not complied with Magistrate Judge Fitzpatrick's order.

This Court subsequently entered a written order denying the government's motion for implementation of a filter protocol and compelling production of seized materials4 and the grand jury materials, together with restrictions on further government review.

4 On November 6, 2025, the government produced various copies of what appear to be the raw returns for the search warrants at issue, unscoped for responsiveness and filtered for Mr. Richman's privileges. But the government provided incorrect passwords to large subsets of those materials. The defense engaged a vendor who worked throughout the weekend to load and process those materials; the government provided the correct passwords on November 9, 2025.

5 The Order also required the government to provide, in writing, by the same deadline: "Confirmation of whether the Government has divided the materials searched pursuant to the four 2019 and 2020 warrants at issue into materials that are responsive and non-responsive to those warrants, and, if so, a detailed explanation of the methodology used to make that determination; A detailed explanation of whether, and for what period of time, the Government has preserved any materials identified as non-responsive to the four search warrants; A description identifying which materials have been identified as responsive, if any; and A description identifying which materials have

previously been designated as privileged." ECF No. 161 at 1-2.

Despite certifying on November 6 that it had complied with the Court's Order, ECF No. 163, the government did not provide this information until the evening of November 9, 2025, in response to a defense inquiry. The government told the defense that it "does not know" whether there are responsive sets for the first, third, and fourth warrants, or whether it has produced those to the defense, and said that in that regard, "we are still pulling prior emails" and the "agent reviewed the filtered material through relativity but there appears to be a loss of data that we are currently trying to restore." [my emphasis]

Nevertheless, Fitzpatrick adopted the government request that he first review the "transcript" to see whether Comey's suspicions about privilege and Fourth Amendment violations could result in the dismissal of the entire transcript.

Later that day, November 10, the government submitted what should have been the grand jury materials for Fitzpatrick's review.

At that point, both Judge Currie and Magistrate Judge Fitzpatrick should have had a record of everything Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer did in her attempt to indict Jim Comey.

In spite of the urgency, we haven't heard from Fitzpatrick yet; I was wondering if he wanted to get a sense of how the Currie hearing today went.

But maybe he's having the same problem Currie did.

In the disqualification hearing today, Currie revealed (ABC; CNN; Politico) that nothing from 4:28 on was recorded.

Currie also laid into Whitaker during the hearing on whether Attorney General Pam Bondi had reviewed the grand jury transcript in James Comey's case, noting there was no record of anything that happened after 4:28pm ET that day. Comey wasn't indicted for nearly two hours after that, according to available court transcripts.

"It became obvious to me that the attorney general could not have reviewed" the entire proceeding, Currie said, adding that it appeared "there was no court reporter present" at the time of the missing portion.

In preparation for Thursday's hearing, Currie privately reviewed the transcripts and said previously that she thought looking at the transcripts was "necessary to determine the extent of the indictment signer's involvement in the grand jury proceedings."

That's what I said, Judge Currie!! Pam Bondi couldn't have reviewed the transcripts when she claimed to ratify this prosecution on October 31!

If Lindsey presented in the order of the exhibit numbers, the latter part of this presentment focused on the Mike Schmidt communications and the "Clinton plan" documents — the things Comey expressed particular interest in. Plus, if you're missing the latter bit of the presentment, you don't have proof the grand jury voted to indict.

Remember that the foreperson did not specify that just one of the charges was no-billed (though there definitely were two indictments, both of which Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer signed).

Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer has done Rosemary Woods one, two, three, four, five, six, seven better, creating a gap of 139 minutes, from 4:28 until 6:47, over seven 18-minutes worth long.

Not bad for a rookie.

Update: Per CNN, DOJ claims nothing is missing.

In a statement to CNN following the hearing, a representative for the Justice Department denied that there was anything missing from the transcript.

"There is no 'missing two hours.' That time period refers to when the jurors were deliberating behind closed doors, which would not be included in a transcription," the statement said.

The DOJ, however, did not offer an explanation for the gap in court.

Update: I think the answer is that the last bit of Lindsey's instruction is missing, plus the entirety of the deliberation, which wouldn't be recorded.