

ROGER STONE DESCRIBES 67% OF THE CONTENT OF SEALED WARRANT AFFIDAVITS FOR HIS CO- CONSPIRATORS

One of the reasons I believe Roger Stone knows he's getting a pardon is because, in spite of the fact that he's got six named attorneys on his team, his filings are unbelievably sloppy, as if the lawyers are letting their children submit them.

I'm just now reading a second one he submitted last Friday (it's bolloxed in PACER but that may not be Stone's fault), a reply on his request to have all his search warrants suppressed based on Bill Binney's bogus claim that a document that is *entirely* unrelated to the charges against Stone was copied onto a thumb drive, and even if it were would be irrelevant to the question of whether Russia hacked the DNC.

The filing couldn't have been reviewed before submission, because it gets key dates wrong:

This is especially so since Stone did not possess any of the stolen information, all of which these communications occurred well after June 22nd, 2016 – the first dissemination of the DNC emails on Wikileaks. [this should be July]

And includes sentence fragments:

Congress did not subpoena any documents regardless of form from Stone. But left it to Stone to determine which documents he should turn over that were not “widely available” or that “reasonably could lead to the discovery of any facts

within the investigations publicly-announced parameters.”

[snip]

Comments about “friends at the embassy” by Corsi were made up. Speculation about an anticipated upcoming data dump was wrong.

And includes grammatical mishmash:

Even with knowledge of its early dissemination, is not a crime.

[snip]

The FBI has stated that they has conducted no direct research, nor collected any evidence of the DNC breach directly, which was confirmed by thenFBI director James Comey.

And a reference to paragraphs in exhibits that don't list the paragraphs:

(Doc. 100 Ex. 17),

(Doc. 100 Ex. 18).

In short, the filing – like a number submitted beforehand in this case – shows utter contempt for the process.

But along the way, Stone describes at least 67% of the paragraphs of one of the affidavits (Exhibit 1) laying out probable cause for a CFAA change.

- ¶¶1-7: Gap
- ¶8: Jerome Corsi, Ted Malloch, Julian Assange, and Roger Stone “speak to each other about politics WikiLeaks, and ‘about phishing with John

Podesta, ' "

- ¶¶19-19: Description of WikiLeaks receiving DNC data from Russian state.
- ¶¶20-25: Gap
- ¶26: Stone and he are friends, Manafort resigned as Chairman of the Trump Campaign, Manafort worked in for Washington, D.C. lobbying firms to influence U.S. policy toward Ukraine.
- ¶¶27-37: Gap
- ¶38: Stone and Assange were not really communicating about anything of relevance or consequence.
- ¶¶39-40: Gap
- ¶¶41-57: Corsi, Malloch, and Stone discussion what WikiLeaks is going to publish.
 - ¶47: Claim to Sam Nunberg that Stone had dinner with Assange.
 - ¶¶54-56: Description of Corsi's "friends at the embassy" comment.
- ¶¶58-65: References the infamous outtake footage from "Access Hollywood." ... Corsi and Stone spoke.
 - ¶65: Charles Ortel sent an email written to Stone and Stone sent it to Corsi after WikiLeaks disseminated

Podesta's emails. The email was titled "WikiLeaks - The Podesta Emails."

- ¶¶66-79: Stone is accused of having advanced knowledge of Podesta's emails.
- ¶¶80-81: Post-Podesta's July 2016 [sic] release by WikiLeaks, Malloch said he would connect Corsi with Assange.
- ¶¶82-83: Gap
- ¶¶84-85: Corsi took credit for predicting the release of Podesta's emails.
- Unknown: Stone had Facebook accounts that he used to perpetuate his political writings including the writings about Podesta.

Included in that virtual recitation of what a document that remains under seal and covered by a protective order says, Stone makes it clear that the government obtained evidence of Stone talking with someone (it's not clear who!) about John Podesta being phished, which Stone excuses this way:

They speak to each other about politics WikiLeaks, and "about phishing with John Podesta," which may imply Podesta was phishing, or that Assange or Malloch were phishing Podesta, but clearly neither seem to be the point of the allegation. Doc. 100-1, ¶8.

In short, this is not a filing intended to win the argument in court (which is lucky for Stone, because legally the filing is crap). Rather, it

is a disguised attempt to communicate with some potentially unidentified co-conspirator what the government actually knows about Stone's knowledge of the phishing of John Podesta.

As I disclosed last July, I provided information to the FBI on issues related to the Mueller investigation, so I'm going to include disclosure statements on Mueller investigation posts from here on out. I will include the disclosure whether or not the stuff I shared with the FBI pertains to the subject of the post.