

MAGATS OUTRAGED COMEY INDICTMENT DISMISSED ON SAME “TECHNICALITY” TRUMP’S WAS!

In the wake of Judge Cameron Currie’s order dismissing the Jim Comey and Letitia James’ indictments, right wing Trump supporters have contorted themselves into knots trying to claim that Comey and James got special treatment, rather than simply the application of clear precedent to their case.

A technicality!!!!!!

The funniest wail from these MAGAts is their claim that Comey and James only got off on a “technicality,” so we can go ahead and consider them guilty.

In point of fact, Comey pointed out in a filing last week that the Loaner AUSAs have yet to point to *any* instance that fits the terms of their claimed alleged lie.

Here, the government has repeatedly failed to provide a coherent factual basis for its theory that Mr. Comey authorized Mr. Richman to be an “anonymous source” in news reports regarding the Midyear Exam investigation while Mr. Richman was “at the FBI.” Of the communications following Mr. Comey’s October 28, 2016 letter that the government cites in both briefs, none reflect Mr. Comey authorizing Mr. Richman to be an anonymous source. For instance, the communications show Mr. Richman discussed materials that were already public, like Mr. Comey’s letter to Congress. See, e.g., Opp. at 3 (“Wittes and I are spending a lot of

time saying your letter means exactly, and only what it says.” (emphasis added)); id. at 3-4 (quoting the defendant as telling Mr. Richman that Richman’s contributing to a New York Times Opinion piece “would [be] shouting into the wind,” and “that they would ‘figure it out’” without Richman’s contributions). And even where the government alleges that Mr. Comey encouraged Mr. Richman to speak to the press in late October and early November 2016, there is no indication that Mr. Richman did so anonymously; to the contrary, one of the exhibits the government cites references Mr. Richman’s televised interview with Anderson Cooper. Opp. at 4 (citing ECF No. 138-6, 138- 7). The remaining communications cited by the government in its Opposition to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Indictment Based on Vindictive and Selective Prosecution suffer from numerous defects, but most critically, all occurred after February 7, 2017, when Mr. Richman left the FBI. This alone makes the government’s theory that Mr. Richman was “at the FBI” when these communications occurred incomprehensible.

And exhibits another Loaner AUSA submitted in the government’s response to James’ vindictive prosecution claim show that Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer was gaslighting Anna Bower when she was stalking her.

You should read the indictment 12m ⓘ

It says she received thousand(s) of dollars in rent 12m ⓘ

I can't tell you grand jury stuff 12m ⓘ

I read the NY Times report as saying that Nakia testified that she lived in the house for years without paying rent. Though the indictment says there were thousands of dollars of rent paid *at one point,* I don't see that as inconsistent with her testimony as reported by the NY Times. James's ethics disclosures report between \$1,000-\$5,000 in rent back in 2020. But after that, she didn't disclose additional rental income. I'm still not sure I understand what's incorrect about the NY Times account or my summary of it. Now ⓘ🔒

More astonishing, though, is that these indictments were dismissed on the very same “technicality” – that the prosecutor was unlawfully appointed – that Judge Aileen Cannon invoked to dismiss Trump’s far better substantiated stolen document case (though Cannon was a newbie judge departing from decades of precedent, while Currie is a senior judge simply following existing precedent).

Indeed, Judge Currie even *cites* Cannon’s opinion dismissing Trump’s indictment for the principle that everything had to be unwound.

In such a case, “the proper remedy is invalidation of the ultra vires action[s]” taken by the actor. *United States v. Trump*, 740 F. Supp. 3d 1245, 1302 (S.D. Fla. 2024). “Invalidation ‘follows directly from the government actor’s lack of authority to take the challenged action in the first place. That is, winning the merits of the constitutional challenge is enough.’” *Id.* (quoting *Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. All Am. Check Cashing, Inc.*, 33 F.4th 218, 241 (5th Cir. 2022) (Jones, J., concurring)).

To make things more awkward, in the hearing on

this, Judge Currie asked Pam Bondi's Counselor, Henry Whitaker, about that precedent and he partly disavowed it, and in doing so, noted that Bondi had *other* means she could have put Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer in place to indict Comey and James, means she did not take.

THE COURT: Mr. Whitaker, let me ask you one last question. Do you believe that U.S. v. Trump, decided by Judge Cannon, in, I believe, 2021, was wrongly decided?

MR. WHITAKER: Well, I think it's certainly not controlling here, Your Honor, because in United States v. Trump, Judge Cannon held that various statutes that existed, some of which I've cited here today, did not authorize the appointment of a special counsel. But here, in a very important distinction between this case and Trump, is that we have available to us a number of statutes that the United States did not have available in making those arguments. For example, you know, you couldn't have appointed Jack Smith as an AUSA under 542. I mean, we could have – we certainly could have done that with Ms. Halligan. You couldn't have appointed Jack Smith as an assistant to a United States attorney under 543. We certainly could have done that with regard to Ms. Halligan.

But, I mean, look, to the extent that – and I do think that mostly what was driving Judge Cannon's decision in that case was sort of the unique and broad authority that the special counsel possessed sort of free of supervision, which, of course, is an element that we do not have here. But I will say this: Like, look, to the extent you can read Judge Cannon's decision as suggesting that the Department of Justice does not have authority under, for example, 28

U.S.C. Section 510 to appoint Main Justice attorneys, which would basically knock out most of the Department of Justice as it existed for the past, like, 50 years, yes, we certainly do disagree with that, and we agree that the attorney general has full authority to make appointments under statutes like 28 U.S.C. Section 510 and 509, and that source of authority would fully support Ms. Halligan being an authorized attorney to the government even though there may have been a paperwork error, a citation error in her appointment order.

A Clinton appointee swooping in to steal the case

Which brings us to the second complaint: that it was somehow improper for Currie, a Clinton appointed senior judge from South Carolina, to swoop into EDVA and end the case.

But that is precisely the process used in the three other districts where judges have ruled similar interim appointments unlawful, with a fourth (also involving Tish James) still in process.

When Julien Giraud, father and son, and Cesar Humberto Pino challenged Alina Habba the Parking Garage Lawyer's involvement in their cases, the Chief Judge from the Third Circuit appointed an out of District judge to preside, Matthew Brann, a Republican appointed by Obama.

Shortly thereafter, the Honorable Michael A. Chagares, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, designated me for service in the District of New Jersey pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 292(b) and reassigned this matter "and all related cases" to me.³⁶

When a bunch of defendants in Nevada challenged Sigal Chattah the election denier lawyer's involvement in their cases, the Chief Judge from the Ninth Circuit appointed an out of District judge to preside, David Campbell, a George W Bush appointee.

The Nevada District Court Judges recused from hearing these motions to dismiss, presumably because the motions implicate their own power to appoint an Acting U.S. Attorney. See 28 U.S.C. § 546(d). Exercising her authority under 28 U.S.C. § 292(b), Ninth Circuit Chief Judge Mary Murguia designated the undersigned judge to hear and decide these motions. Doc. 21.

When some Los Angeles defendants challenged liar for ICE goons Bill Essayli's involvement in their cases, the Chief Judge from the Ninth Circuit appointed a different out of District judge, Michael Seabright, another George W Bush appointee, to preside over their challenges.

ORDER (U.S.C. § 292(b)) by Chief Circuit Judge Mary H. Murguia as to Defendant Jaime Hector Ramirez: Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 292(b), I hereby designate the Honorable Michael Seabright, United States Senior District Judge for the District of Hawaii, to temporarily perform the duties of United States District Judge on an as-needed basis for the Central District of California beginning on 9/8/2025, and ending on 12/31/2025, and for such additional time required in advance to prepare or thereafter to complete unfinished business.

And when Letitia James challenged subpoenas issued by John Sarcone after he falsely claimed NDNY judges had named him as US Attorney, the Chief Judge from the Second Circuit appointed an out of District judge to preside over that

challenge, Lorna Schofield, another Obama appointee.

Of note, *all* these challenges to Pam Bondi's playacting US Attorneys had started before Bondi installed Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer on September 22, and Judge Brann had already ruled Alina Habba's appointment to be unlawful.

Bondi was on notice that what she was doing with Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer was going to be challenged and *had been* successfully challenged. And she didn't even attempt any of the gimmicks she is using elsewhere to keep Trump hacks in place, those means cited by her own Counselor in court – in part because she couldn't. She had already used one of those tricks, installing Maggie Cleary as First AUSA, when Trump insisted it had to be Lindsey the Insurance Lawyer.

These cases might have been dismissed on other grounds. But the unlawful appointment dismissals are entirely of Bondi's doing.

Stop blaming judges appointed by whichever President when Bondi is 100% to blame.

The Blue Slip gaslight special

Finally, there are even right wing dumbasses claiming that this is about Blue Slips, the Senate tradition that US Attorneys and Judges must have the support of both Senators before being confirmed.

To be fair, Todd Blanche *did* go on Fox News and falsely claim that is what this is about.

The way you know Blanche is lying is because Trump told us himself, when he ordered Bondi to install Halligan.



Donald J. Trump  
@realDonaldTrump

Pam: I have reviewed over 30 statements and posts saying that, essentially, "same old story as last time, all talk, no action. Nothing is being done. What about Comey, Adam "Shifty" Schiff, Leticia??? They're all guilty as hell, but nothing is going to be done." Then we almost put in a Democrat supported U.S. Attorney, in Virginia, with a really bad Republican past. A Woke RINO, who was never going to do his job. That's why two of the worst Dem Senators PUSHED him so hard. He even lied to the media and said he quit, and that we had no case. No, I fired him, and there is a GREAT CASE, in many lawyer, and legal pundits, say so. Lindsey Halligan is a really good lawyer, and likes you, a lot. We can't delay any longer, it's killing our reputation and credibility. They impeached me twice, and indicted me (5 times!), OVER NOTHING. JUSTICE MUST BE SERVED, NOW!!! President DJT

15.8k ReTruths 52.6k Likes

Sep 20, 2025, 11:44 PM

"[W]e almost put in a Democrat [sic] supported U.S. Attorney, in Virginia, with a really bad Republican past. A Woke RINO, who was never going to do his job."

What he's talking about is that Trump himself nominated Siebert with the support of both Mark Warner and Tim Kaine.

Siebert was someone *everyone agreed on* – Trump installed him, EDVA's judges reinstalled him, Trump nominated him – until Siebert concluded, apparently with Blanche's concurrence, that there was not probable cause to indict Jim Comey.

All this whining is nothing other than cope.

If you complain that Democrats aren't supporting qualified nominees, you should be outraged that Trump pulled Siebert.

If you complain that unconflicted judges decide these issues, you've got one.

If you really had a problem with appointments clause dismissals, you should be demanding that Trump stand trial for stealing nuclear documents and stashing them in a bathroom.

But what you shouldn't do is blame anyone other than the person responsible, Attorney General Pam Bondi.