Hunter Biden, Burisma, and Corruption: The Impact on U.S. Government Policy and Related Concerns

U.S. Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

U.S. Senate Committee on Finance
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II. INTRODUCTION

III. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

IV. THE VICE PRESIDENT’S OFFICE AND STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS WERE AWARE OF BUT IGNORED CONCERNS RELATING TO HUNTER BIDEN’S ROLE ON BURISMA’S BOARD.

V. SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN KERRY FALSELY CLAIMED HE HAD NO KNOWLEDGE ABOUT HUNTER BIDEN’S ROLE ON BURISMA’S BOARD.

VI. STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS VIEWED MYKOLA ZLOCHEVSKY AS A CORRUPT, “ODIOUS OLIGARCH,” BUT VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN WAS ADVISED NOT TO ACCUSE ZLOCHEVSKY OF CORRUPTION.

VII. WHILE HUNTER BIDEN SERVED ON BURISMA’S BOARD, BURISMA’S OWNER, ZLOCHEVSKY, ALLEGEDLY PAID A $7 MILLION BRIBE TO UKRAINE’S PROSECUTOR GENERAL’S OFFICE TO CLOSE THE CASE.

VIII. HUNTER BIDEN: A SECRET SERVICE PROTECTEE WHILE ON BURISMA’S BOARD.

IX. OBAMA ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS AND A DEMOCRAT LOBBYING FIRM HAD CONSISTENT AND SIGNIFICANT CONTACT WITH FORMER UKRAINIAN OFFICIAL ANDRII TELIZHENKO.

X. THE MINORITY FALSELY ACCUSED THE CHAIRMEN OF ENGAGING IN A RUSSIAN DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGN AND USED OTHER TACTICS TO INTERFERE IN THE INVESTIGATION.

XI. HUNTER BIDEN’S AND HIS FAMILY’S FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH UKRAINIAN, RUSSIAN, KAZAKH AND CHINESE NATIONALS RAISE CRIMINAL CONCERNS AND EXTORTION THREATS.

XII. CONCLUSION
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In late 2013 and into 2014, mass protests erupted in Kyiv, Ukraine, demanding integration into western economies and an end to systemic corruption that had plagued the country. At least 82 people were killed during the protests, which culminated on Feb. 21 when Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych abdicated by fleeing the country. Less than two months later, over the span of only 28 days, significant events involving the Bidens unfolded.

On April 16, 2014, Vice President Biden met with his son’s business partner, Devon Archer, at the White House. Five days later, Vice President Biden visited Ukraine, and he soon after was described in the press as the “public face of the administration’s handling of Ukraine.” The day after his visit, on April 22, Archer joined the board of Burisma. Six days later, on April 28, British officials seized $23 million from the London bank accounts of Burisma’s owner, Mykola Zlochevsky. Fourteen days later, on May 12, Hunter Biden joined the board of Burisma, and over the course of the next several years, Hunter Biden and Devon Archer were paid millions of dollars from a corrupt Ukrainian oligarch for their participation on the board.

The 2014 protests in Kyiv came to be known as the Revolution of Dignity — a revolution against corruption in Ukraine. Following that revolution, Ukrainian political figures were desperate for U.S. support. Zlochevsky would have made sure relevant Ukrainian officials were well aware of Hunter’s appointment to Burisma’s board as leverage. Hunter Biden’s position on the board created an immediate potential conflict of interest that would prove to be problematic for both U.S. and Ukrainian officials and would affect the implementation of Ukraine policy.

The Chairmen’s investigation into potential conflicts of interest began in August 2019, with Chairman Grassley’s letter to the Department of Treasury regarding potential conflicts of interest with respect to Obama administration policy relating to the Henniges transaction. During the Obama administration, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) approved a transaction that gave control over Henniges, an American maker of anti-vibration technologies with military applications, to a Chinese government-owned aviation company and a China-based investment firm with established ties to the Chinese government. One of the companies involved in the Henniges transaction was a billion-dollar private investment fund called Bohai Harvest RST (BHR). BHR was formed in November 2013 by a merger between the Chinese-government-linked firm Bohai Capital and a company named Rosemont Seneca Partners. Rosemont Seneca was formed in 2009 by Hunter Biden, the son of then-Vice President Joe Biden, by Chris Heinz, the stepson of former Secretary of State John Kerry, and others.

Access to relevant documents and testimony has been persistently hampered by criminal investigations, impeachment proceedings, COVID-19, and several instances of obstructive behavior. Accordingly, this investigation has taken longer than it should have. The Chairmen’s efforts have always been driven by our belief that the public has the right to know about wrongdoing and conflicts of interest occurring within government, and especially those conflicts brought about by the actions of governmental officials. This is a good-government oversight investigation that relies on documents and testimony from U.S. agencies and officials, not a Russian disinformation campaign, as our Democratic colleagues have falsely stated.

What the Chairmen discovered during the course of this investigation is that the Obama administration knew that Hunter Biden’s position on Burisma’s board was problematic and did interfere in the efficient execution of policy with respect to Ukraine. Moreover, this investigation has illustrated the extent to which officials within the Obama administration ignored the glaring warning signs when the vice president’s son joined the board of a company owned by a corrupt Ukrainian oligarch. And, as will be discussed in later sections, Hunter Biden was not the only Biden who cashed in on Joe Biden’s vice presidency.

This report not only details examples of extensive and complex financial transactions involving the Bidens, it also describes the quandary other U.S. governmental officials faced as they attempted to guide and support Ukraine’s anticorruption efforts. The Committees will continue to evaluate the information and evidence as it becomes available.

**Key Findings**

- In early 2015 the former Acting Deputy Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy in Kyiv, Ukraine, George Kent, raised concerns to officials in Vice President Joe Biden’s office about the perception of a conflict of interest with respect to Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board. Kent’s concerns went unaddressed, and in September 2016, he emphasized in an email to his colleagues, “Furthermore, the presence of Hunter Biden on the Burisma board was very awkward for all U.S. officials pushing an anticorruption agenda in Ukraine.”

- In October 2015, senior State Department official Amos Hochstein raised concerns with Vice President Biden, as well as with Hunter Biden, that Hunter Biden’s position on Burisma’s board enabled Russian disinformation efforts and risked undermining U.S. policy in Ukraine.

- Although Kent believed that Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board was awkward for all U.S. officials pushing an anti-corruption agenda in Ukraine, the Committees are only aware of two individuals — Kent and former U.S. Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs Amos Hochstein — who raised concerns to Vice President Joe Biden (Hochstein) or his staff (Kent).

- The awkwardness for Obama administration officials continued well past his presidency. Former Secretary of State John Kerry had knowledge of Hunter Biden’s role on
Burisma’s board, but when asked about it at a town hall event in Nashua, N.H. on Dec. 8, 2019, Kerry falsely said, “I had no knowledge about any of that. None. No.” Evidence to the contrary is detailed in Section V.

- Former Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs Victoria Nuland testified that confronting oligarchs would send an anticorruption message in Ukraine. Kent told the Committees that Zlochevsky was an “odious oligarch.” However, in December 2015, instead of following U.S. objectives of confronting oligarchs, Vice President Biden’s staff advised him to avoid commenting on Zlochevsky and recommended he say, “I’m not going to get into naming names or accusing individuals.”

- Hunter Biden was serving on Burisma’s board (supposedly consulting on corporate governance and transparency) when Zlochevsky allegedly paid a $7 million bribe to officials serving under Ukraine’s prosecutor general, Vitaly Yarema, to “shut the case against Zlochevsky.” Kent testified that this bribe occurred in December 2014 (seven months after Hunter joined Burisma’s board), and, after learning about it, he and the Resident Legal Advisor reported this allegation to the FBI.

- Hunter Biden was a U.S. Secret Service protectee from Jan. 29, 2009 to July 8, 2014. A day before his last trip as a protectee, Time published an article describing Burisma’s ramped up lobbying efforts to U.S. officials and Hunter’s involvement in Burisma’s board. Before ending his protective detail, Hunter Biden received Secret Service protection on trips to multiple foreign locations, including Moscow, Beijing, Doha, Paris, Seoul, Manila, Tokyo, Mexico City, Milan, Florence, Shanghai, Geneva, London, Dublin, Munich, Berlin, Bogota, Abu Dhabi, Nairobi, Hong Kong, Taipei, Buenos Aires, Copenhagen, Johannesburg, Brussels, Madrid, Mumbai and Lake Como.

- Andrii Telizhenko, the Democrats’ personification of Russian disinformation, met with Obama administration officials, including Elisabeth Zentos, a member of Obama’s National Security Council, at least 10 times. A Democrat lobbying firm, Blue Star Strategies, contracted with Telizhenko from 2016 to 2017 and continued to request his assistance as recent as the summer of 2019. A recent news article detailed other extensive contacts between Telizhenko and Obama administration officials.

- In addition to the over $4 million paid by Burisma for Hunter Biden’s and Archer’s board memberships, Hunter Biden, his family, and Archer received millions of dollars from foreign nationals with questionable backgrounds.

- Archer received $142,300 from Kenges Rakishev of Kazakhstan, purportedly for a car, the same day Vice President Joe Biden appeared with Ukrainian Prime Minister Arsemy Yasenyuk and addressed Ukrainian legislators in Kyiv regarding Russia’s actions in Crimea.

- Hunter Biden received a $3.5 million wire transfer from Elena Baturina, the wife of the former mayor of Moscow.
Hunter Biden opened a bank account with Gongwen Dong to fund a $100,000 global spending spree with James Biden and Sara Biden.

Hunter Biden had business associations with Ye Jianming, Gongwen Dong, and other Chinese nationals linked to the Communist government and the People’s Liberation Army. Those associations resulted in millions of dollars in cash flow.

Hunter Biden paid nonresident women who were nationals of Russia or other Eastern European countries and who appear to be linked to an “Eastern European prostitution or human trafficking ring.”
II. INTRODUCTION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (HSGAC) and the Senate Committee on Finance undertook this investigation into potential conflicts of interest, and the involvement of the Biden family in foreign business ventures while Joe Biden was vice president, following allegations that the Obama administration’s Ukraine policy could have been affected by Hunter Biden’s position on the board of Burisma, and that family members may have improperly sought to benefit from their relationship with the vice president.

The first letter written regarding potential conflicts of interest was sent by Chairman Grassley on Aug. 14, 2019, relating to the Henniges transaction.\(^3\) That was an Obama-era Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) approved transaction which gave control over Henniges, an American maker of anti-vibration technologies with military applications, to a Chinese government-owned aviation company and a China-based investment firm with established ties to the communist Chinese government. One of the companies involved in the Henniges transaction was a billion-dollar private investment fund called Bohai Harvest RST (BHR). BHR was reportedly formed in November 2013 by a merger between the Chinese government-linked firm Bohai Capital and a U.S. company named Rosemont Seneca Partners. Rosemont Seneca Partners was reportedly formed in 2009 by Hunter Biden, the son of then-Vice President Joe Biden, by Chris Heinz, the stepson of former Secretary of State John Kerry, and by others.\(^4\)

The direct involvement of Hunter Biden and Heinz in the acquisition of Henniges by the Chinese government creates a potential conflict of interest. Both are directly related to high-ranking Obama administration officials. The Department of State, then under Mr. Kerry’s leadership, is also a CFIUS member and played a direct role in the decision to approve the Henniges transaction. The appearance of a potential conflict of interest in this case was particularly troubling given Hunter Biden’s history of investing in and collaborating with Chinese companies, including at least one that clearly poses significant national security concerns. This history with China precedes and follows the 2015 Henniges transaction. This report will discuss Hunter Biden’s and Devon Archer’s corporate entities and their links to the communist Chinese government in more detail.

In 2019, newly released documents, made public as a result of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests and investigative reporting, brought fresh public attention and scrutiny to

---


potential conflicts of interest with respect to Ukraine policy in the Obama administration.\(^5\) Additionally, news reporting also raised questions about potential conflicts of interest with respect to Hunter Biden’s business dealings in China, Ukraine and Russia while Joe Biden was serving as vice president.\(^6\) Accordingly, on Nov. 6, 2019, Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson wrote a letter to the Department of State regarding potential conflicts of interest due to Hunter Biden’s position on the board of the corrupt Ukrainian gas company Burisma Holdings Limited while Vice President Biden was the “public face of the administration’s handling of Ukraine.”\(^7\)

The Committees’ investigation focused on determining whether Hunter Biden and Devon Archer sought to benefit financially from their relationship with then-Vice President Joe Biden or if they sought to influence U.S. policy in Ukraine on behalf of Burisma. Further, the Committees reviewed and evaluated the Obama administration’s handling of Ukraine policy to determine whether policy decisions related to Ukraine and Burisma were improperly influenced by the employment and financial interests of family members of the administration.

For example, after joining Burisma’s board, Biden and Archer subsequently requested meetings with senior State Department officials, including then-Secretary of State John Kerry and then-Deputy Secretary of State Antony Blinken.\(^8\) Further, a Democratic lobbying firm, Blue Star Strategies, working on behalf of Burisma, also invoked Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma while requesting a meeting with then-Under Secretary of State Catherine Novelli to discuss matters of concern related to the Department of State’s position that Burisma was a corrupt company.\(^9\)

In 2016, Ukraine’s top prosecutor, Viktor Shokin, had an active and ongoing investigation into Burisma and its owner, Mykola Zlochevsky.\(^10\) At the time, Archer and Hunter

---


\(^8\) Emails between Hunter Biden and U.S. Dep’t of St. employees (May 2015) (on file with Comms.), Email between U.S. Dep’t of St. employees (Mar. 2, 2016) (on file with Comms.).


\(^10\) Kenneth P. Vogel and Juliia Mendel, Biden Faces Conflict of Interest Questions That Are Being Promoted by Trump Allies, THE NEW YORK TIMES (May 1, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/01/us/politics/biden-son-ukraine.html; Oleg Sukhov,
Biden continued to serve on Burisma’s board of directors. According to news reports, then-Vice President Biden “threatened to withhold $1 billion in United States loan guarantees if Ukraine’s leaders did not dismiss [Shokin].”¹¹ After that threat, Ukraine’s Parliament fired Shokin.

Pursuant to the scope of this investigation, the Committees requested relevant Obama administration records from several U.S. federal government agencies and interviewed current and former U.S. government officials with firsthand knowledge of the Obama administration’s handling of U.S. policy in Ukraine. The Committees sent requests for information to the Department of State, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), U.S. Secret Service, Department of the Treasury, and the U.S. Democratic consulting firm Blue Star Strategies.¹² Accordingly, this investigation is based on Obama administration federal government records and records from a Democrat lobby shop, Blue Star Strategies.

Senate Resolution 70 gives HSGAC express authority “to study or investigate... the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the government, including the possible

---


existence of… corruption or unethical practices… [and] conflicts of interest.”

The Committee on Finance has broad jurisdiction over the United States government and, specifically, the Department of Treasury and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), which includes oversight jurisdiction over potential financial crimes.

---

III. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Federal regulation prohibits federal government employees from “us[ing] [] public office for [] private gain … or for the private gain of … relatives.”15 This regulation also seek “[t]o ensure that the performance of [] official duties does not give rise to an appearance of the use of public office for private gain or of giving preferential treatment[.]”16 This regulation, however, does not apply to the president or vice president.17

Other federal regulations require only the “consideration” of an appearance of a conflict of interest. “Where an employee … knows that a person with whom he has a covered relationship [e.g.,] is or represents a party to [a particular matter involving specific parties], and where the employee determines that the circumstances would cause a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts to question his impartiality on the matter, the employee should not participate in the matter unless he has informed [a designated superior] and received authorization[.]”18

According to the Office of Government Ethics (OGE), these rules and regulations help to ensure that federal employees “fulfill[] their responsibility to endeavor to act at all times in the public’s interest and avoid losing impartiality or appearing to lose impartiality in carrying out their official duties.”19 In the context of U.S. foreign policy, the Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM) sets forth the policies and procedures for State Department employees working abroad. The FAM includes ethical regulations that take into account foreign policy considerations and treaty and statutory obligations.20 Specifically, when a U.S. citizen employee of the State Department21 is serving abroad and subject to the authority of that country’s Chief of Mission, that employee’s family members may be prohibited from employment or other outside activity in any foreign country if the Chief of Mission in that country determines it could damage the interests of the United States.22 The FAM also requires employees to bring any violations of the FAM or any other applicable regulations to the attention of the appropriate official.23

Although OGE’s authority to investigate and recommend solutions to most employees for conflicts of interest issues is well-established, Congress did not extend this authority to the president and vice president in OGE’s establishment statute. This does not mean there is an absence of any authority to hold the President and Vice President accountable for conflict of interest issues; rather, it demonstrates that the responsibility for holding the President and Vice President responsible for conduct that implicates conflicts of interest lies elsewhere, namely, with Congress and the American people.

---

15 5 C.F.R. § 2635.702.
16 Id. at § 2635.702(d).
17 Id. at § 2635.102.
18 Id. at § 2635.502.
20 3 FAM 4121.3.
21 The FAM rules referenced in this section apply to Foreign Service, Foreign Service National, and Civil Service employees. 3 FAM 4123.2-2; 3 FAM 4125.
22 3 FAM 4125.
23 3 FAM 4139.13.
In certain instances, like self-dealing, the harm is plain. In others, the harm — a loss or apparent loss of impartiality — may be less concrete, but the effect is still the same.\textsuperscript{24} When the impartiality of decision makers is drawn into question, it creates a chilling effect on the credibility of their decision-making processing and the ultimate decision. That, in turn, could undermine the effectiveness of U.S. policy. Although these consequences may sometimes be difficult to measure or quantify, they certainly have an effect, or else there would be little reason to regulate them in the first instance. In the context of foreign affairs, because these subtleties matter, the FAM provides the Chief of Mission with the discretion to make these assessments.

\textsuperscript{24} The House of Representatives appears to think these issues matter. A House committee has been investigating President Trump and his family for “undisclosed conflicts of interest that may impair [the President’s] ability to make impartial policy decisions.” \textit{Trump v. Mazars}, 140 S. Ct. 2019 (July 9, 2020) (Quoting Rep. Elijah Cummings, Chairman of the House Oversight Committee.).
IV. THE VICE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE AND STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS WERE AWARE OF BUT IGNORED CONCERNS RELATING TO HUNTER BIDEN’S ROLE ON BURISMA’S BOARD.

a. Introduction

In early 2015, senior State Department official George Kent raised concerns to staff in the Office of the Vice President about Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board. Kent testified that he never heard anything back from the vice president’s office, and although Kent advised that Hunter Biden should step down from Burisma’s board to avoid the perception of a potential conflict of interest, his recommendation was not followed.

Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board continued to be an issue State Department officials had to manage when executing U.S. / Ukraine policy. More than a year after Kent reported his concerns to the vice president’s staff, he wrote to his superiors that Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board was “very awkward” to those on the front lines pushing anticorruption efforts in Ukraine on a daily basis. Kent testified that he felt the need to “prepar[e] everybody for ‘what about-ism,’ because we’re pushing what’s right … and we have to be prepared for people who are critics, opponents, to say, ‘Well, what about? What about Hunter Biden?’” Indeed, Kent testified further that he “would have advised any American not to get on the board of Zlochevsky’s company.” The Committees are also aware of at least one other senior State Department official, Amos Hochstein, who raised concerns directly to Vice President Biden about potential conflicts of interest relating to Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board. Although Hochstein declined to testify about the substance of his conversation with Vice President Biden, the New Yorker reported that Hochstein “did not go so far as to recommend that Hunter leave the board.” The Committees found that neither the Office of the Vice President nor the State Department ever took any action following these complaints.

b. In February 2015, Kent raised concerns about the perception of a conflict of interest regarding Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board.

According to Kent, in early 2015 when he was still Acting Deputy Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy in Kyiv, he learned that Hunter Biden was on the board of Burisma. Kent stated, “[s]oon after that, in a briefing call with the National Security staff in the Office of the Vice President on other matters, in February 2015, I raised my concern that Hunter Biden’s status as a board member could create the perception of a conflict of interest.” Kent continued:

---

25 Transcript of Interview at 224, S. Comm. on Fin. and S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff. Interview of George Kent (July 24, 2020). [Hereinafter George Kent Testimony].
26 George Kent Testimony at 221.
27 George Kent Testimony at 110.
28 Transcript of Interview at 98, S. Comm. on Fin. and S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff. Interview of Victoria Nuland (Sept. 3, 2020). [Hereinafter Victoria Nuland Testimony].
29 Amos Hochstein Testimony at 52-58.
31 George Kent Testimony at 16.
32 George Kent Testimony at 16.
I said that I had learned that Hunter Biden had been appointed to a board of this company, that I had just raised U.S. concerns about the owner of the company, who we believed had been engaged in money-laundering. … [T]he bottom line was, I said I believe that this creates the perception of a potential conflict of interest, given Vice President Biden’s role and his very strong advocacy for anticorruption action, and that I thought that someone needed to talk to Hunter Biden, and he should [step] down from the board of Burisma.33

When the Committees asked Kent who he spoke to in Vice President Biden’s office, he stated, “I can’t remember, to be perfectly honest. I don’t remember who I spoke to.”34 Kent told the Committees that, after raising this concern, he never heard anything back from the vice president’s office.35

c. Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma continued to be an “awkward” conflict of interest State Department officials had to manage.

Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma appeared in numerous State Department records, particularly when State officials discussed the company, its owner, and anticorruption efforts in Ukraine. According to records reviewed by the Committees, in 2016, Kent mentioned Hunter Biden when discussing Burisma with his colleagues. Kent told the Committees:

> For me it’s preparing everybody for “what about-ism,” because we’re pushing what’s right, and we do what’s right, and we have to be prepared for people who are critics, are opponents, to say, “Well, what about? What about Hunter Biden?”

So there was no time, as I’ve testified, that the U.S. government, the U.S. embassy ever made a decision about Zlochevsky or Burisma where we took the presence of a private citizen on the board into account. We made the decision on the merits. But others might think otherwise. And so everyone needed to be aware of what we were dealing with as we made the right decisions.36

The extent to which Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board affected U.S. policy toward Ukraine is not clear. But what is clear from the records, however, is that State Department officials, particularly Kent himself, regularly considered how Hunter Biden’s connection to Burisma might affect the execution of U.S. policy. Moreover, as described previously, this included having to respond to Russian actors attempting to exploit Hunter Biden’s position on

33 George Kent Testimony at 128-29 (emphasis added); see also George Kent Testimony at 110.
34 George Kent Testimony at 128.
35 George Kent Testimony at 226.
36 George Kent Testimony at 221 (emphasis added).
Burisma’s board to drive a wedge between Ukrainian and the U.S. in an effort to undermine U.S. policy toward Ukraine.

For example, Kent raised Hunter Biden’s connection to Burisma during multiple discussions over emails involving the Municipal Energy Reform Program (MERP). In those emails, Kent asked his colleagues, “[H]ow have we traditionally treated/engaged Burisma, given the Zlochevsky connection, but also perhaps US involvement beyond Hunter Biden?” In another email chain, Kent also pointed out that “[Zlochevsky] put Hunter Biden on the board of his Burisma Energy company.” When inquiring about the extent to which State Department officials researched Burisma’s past, in order to determine whether to associate with the company, Kent asked his colleagues whether any “know your partner” due diligence was done” before the partnership between MERP and Burisma was established. Kent then described old news stories involving the company: “Zlochevsky as a corrupt mal actor was a 2014 story [and] his control of Burisma, and the very sticky wicket of the Hunter Biden connection on Burisma’s board was circulating in 2015.” As part of that same email chain, Kent asked his colleagues if the U.S. government continues its association with Burisma:

[W]ould we want an article on the front page of the Washington Post (and in this case, the Kyiv Post, and on the FB pages of Sergiy Leshchenko and Mustafa Nayyem) commenting about this public private partnership with Burisma, the link to Hunter Biden, and the link to Zlochevsky, who almost certainly paid off the PGO in December 2014 (I had the then First deputy PG Danylenko tell me the bribe was $7 million) to have the case against him closed and his $23 million in assets frozen in the UK unfrozen?

---

37 Kent told the Committee that he mentioned Hunter Biden’s name in this context because he believed that “all U.S. Government officials need to be aware of all the factors involved in an issue.” George Kent Testimony at 113. When asked why Kent did not raise the names of other individuals on Burisma’s board he said, “the one American that I was aware of that was on the board [in August 2016] was Hunter Biden.” George Kent Testimony at 114. The MERP was a program funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). According to State Department documents, the MERP and Burisma entered into a Memorandum of Understanding on October 13, 2014. Email from Redacted, U.S. Dep’t of St., to George Kent, et al., U.S. Dep’t of St. (Aug. 12, 2016, 16:47:00), [STATE-2019-18-0000357] (attaching Memorandum of Understanding between the MERP in Ukraine and Burisma Holdings Limited (Oct. 13, 2014), [STATE-2019-18-0000361-364]). Kent testified that, “in 2015, there had been a set of awards given by this program implementer that had been funded by Burisma. They were planning another set of awards, a second set of awards in mid-September […] We pulled the plug and there was no second.” George Kent Testimony at 124. USAID “withdrew its [MERP] cooperation with Burisma” in September 2016. Email from Redacted, U.S. Dep’t of St., to George Kent, U.S. Dep’t of St. (Dec. 6, 2016, 00:18:23 -0500), [STATE-2019-18-0001205] (attaching Briefing Checklist: Ambassador Yovanovitch’s Meeting with Karen Tramontano, Blue Star Strategies [STATE-2019-18-0001207]).


So even though the total amount of time State Department officials spent accounting for Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma is unclear, the records show that it was an issue that had to be addressed repeatedly.

d. More than one year after Kent reported his concerns about Hunter Biden to the vice president’s office, he once again raised the issue — this time to his superiors at the State Department.

On Sept. 6, 2016, Kent wrote an email to senior State Department officials, including Deputy Assistant Secretary Bridget Brink and U.S. Ambassador Marie Yovanovitch, and offered his contemporaneous view of Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma. Kent wrote, “the presence of Hunter Biden on the Burisma board was very awkward for all U.S. officials pushing an anti-corruption agenda in Ukraine.” In testimony Kent expanded on this comment:

I meant that people who talk the talk need to walk the walk, and for the U.S. government, collectively, when we talk about the need to have high standards of integrity, again, as I’ve said, the presence of [Hunter Biden] on the board created the perception of a potential conflict of interest.

The Committees learned, through document requests, that Victoria Nuland, then-Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, also received a forwarded copy of Kent’s September 2016 email outlining his concerns about Hunter Biden being on Burisma’s board. Nuland testified that she “was always open to hearing the concerns of subordinates and trying to address them in an open and transparent manner.” Yet when the Committee asked Nuland to explain what actions she took when she received Kent’s email, she said that Kent’s concerns about Hunter Biden were “clearly, way deep down in an email, late in 2016” and “they were not brought to my specific attention by George Kent, who is an old friend and had plenty of opportunity to do so, had he so wanted.” Despite senior State Department officials clearly being made aware of the situation, Kent’s concerns remained unaddressed.

e. Hochstein spoke to Vice President Biden about concerns relating to Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board because, according to Hochstein, Russians were using it to advance disinformation.

According to testimony and public reports, Hochstein, then-U.S. Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs, raised concerns about Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board directly to Vice President Biden. Nuland told the Committees:

43 Email from George Kent, U.S. Dep’t of St., to Bridget Brink, et al., U.S. Dep’t of St. (Sept. 6, 2016, 09:55:14 -0400) [STATE-2019-18-0000345-347] (emphasis added).
44 George Kent Testimony at 220.
45 Victoria Nuland Testimony at 121.
46 Victoria Nuland Testimony at 121-22.
Amos Hochstein had had a conversation with the vice president and his staff about this, and he also had another conversation on the plane ride to Ukraine for that December 2015 trip.47

Public reporting also confirms Hochstein’s discussion with Vice President Biden. According to one report, “Amos Hochstein, the Obama Administration’s special envoy for energy policy, raised the matter with Biden, but did not go so far as to recommend that Hunter leave the board.”48 When Hochstein testified before the Committees, he declined on advice of counsel to testify about the substance of his conversation with Vice President Biden.49 The New Yorker, however, reported that Hochstein “did not go so far as to recommend that Hunter leave the board.”50 It is unclear how Vice President Biden responded to this conversation.

According to Hochstein, he raised this issue with Vice President Biden because he was concerned that the Russians were using Hunter Biden’s role with Burisma to sow disinformation.51 Hochstein recounted that he spoke with Vice President Biden in the West Wing of the White House in October 2015.52 When asked why he decided to raise the issue of Hunter Biden’s position on Burisma’s board with Vice President Biden, Hochstein testified:

Hochstein: We were starting to think about a trip to Ukraine, and I wanted to make sure that he [Vice President Biden] was aware that there was an increase in chatter on media outlets close to Russians and corrupt oligarchs-owned media outlets about undermining his message—to try to undermine his [Vice President Biden’s] message and including Hunter Biden being part of the board of Burisma.53

Hochstein also raised his concerns about Russian disinformation with Hunter Biden. Shortly after his conversation with Vice President Biden, Hunter Biden contacted Hochstein and asked to meet. According to Hochstein, Hunter became aware of Hochstein’s West Wing conversation with the Vice President, who had mentioned it to Hunter.54 Hochstein described what he and Hunter Biden discussed at this November 2015 meeting at a coffee shop in Georgetown:55

Question: And could you expand on that? Why did you discuss Burisma with him [Hunter Biden]?

47 Victoria Nuland Testimony at 98.
49 Amos Hochstein Testimony at 52-58.
50 Adam Entous, Will Hunter Biden Jeopardize His Father’s Campaign?, New Yorker (July 1, 2019).
51 Transcript of Interview at 50, S. Comm. on Fin. and S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff. Interview of Amos Hochstein Testimony (Sept. 17, 2020). [Hereinafter Amos Hochstein Testimony].
52 Id. at 51.
53 Id. at 112-13. (emphasis added).
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Hochstein: Well, he [Hunter Biden] asked me for a meeting. I think he wanted to know my views on Burisma and Zlochevsky. And so I shared with him that the Russians were using his name in order to sow disinformation—attempt to sow disinformation among Ukrainians.\textsuperscript{56}

During the November 2015 conversation with Hunter Biden, Hochstein did not recommend that Hunter leave Burisma’s board because he did not “believe that was my place to have that discussion, one way or the other.”\textsuperscript{57}

\textbf{f. Conclusion}

Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board hindered the efforts of dedicated career-service individuals who were fighting for anticorruption measures in Ukraine. Because the vice president’s son had a direct link to a corrupt company and its owner, State Department officials were required to maintain situational awareness of Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma. Unfortunately, U.S. officials had no other choice but to endure the “awkward[ness]” of continuing to push an anticorruption agenda in Ukraine while the vice president’s son sat on the board of a Ukrainian company with a corrupt owner, earning tens of thousands of dollars a month. As Kent testified, he “would have advised any American not to get on the board of Zlochevsky’s company.”\textsuperscript{58} Yet even though Hunter Biden’s position on Burisma’s board cast a shadow over the work of those advancing anticorruption reforms in Ukraine, the Committees are only aware of two individuals who raised concerns to their superiors. Despite the efforts of these individuals, their concerns appear to have fallen on deaf ears.
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V. SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN KERRY FALSELY CLAIMED HE HAD NO KNOWLEDGE ABOUT HUNTER BIDEN’S ROLE ON BURISMA’S BOARD.

a. Introduction

On Dec. 8, 2019, a reporter asked former Secretary of State John Kerry about his awareness of Hunter Biden on Burisma’s board during his time at the State Department. Kerry responded, “I had no knowledge about any of that. None. No.” The reporter pressed for more information and Kerry said, “What would I know about any—no. Why would I know about any company or any individual? No. The answer is no. No communication. No nothing.”

Testimony and documents obtained by the Committees call into question the accuracy of Kerry’s statement. On May 13, 2014, the day after Hunter Biden joined Burisma’s board, Secretary Kerry’s stepson, Christopher Heinz — who was also Hunter Biden’s business partner — emailed to inform Kerry’s chief of staff, and to distance himself, from that decision. Moreover, in May 2014, Secretary Kerry’s chief of staff, David Wade, briefed him about press inquiries specifically relating to Heinz, Hunter Biden, and Burisma. Separately, State Department officials wrote that they sent the secretary articles with the headlines, “Biden’s son joins Ukrainian gas company’s board,” “Biden’s son joins Ukrainian gas producer board,” and “White House says no issue with Biden’s son, Ukraine gas company.” Accordingly, these records suggest that Kerry did, in fact, know about Hunter Biden and Burisma.

b. In May 2014, Wade, Secretary Kerry’s chief of staff, briefed him about press inquiries relating to Heinz, Hunter Biden, and Burisma.

On May 13, 2014, State Department officials began fielding press inquiries relating to Hunter Biden joining Burisma’s board and the extent to which Secretary Kerry’s stepson, Heinz, was involved. That day Heinz emailed Secretary Kerry’s chief of staff about Burisma’s announcement in an apparent attempt to distance himself from Hunter Biden’s decision. Heinz wrote to Special Assistant Matt Summers and Chief of Staff Wade:

> Apparently Devon [Archer] and Hunter [Biden] both joined the board of Burisma and a press release went out today. I can’t to speak [sic] why they decided to, but there was no investment by our firm in their company.

---
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63 Christopher Heinz had business dealings with Hunter Biden and Devon Archer through their firm Rosemont Seneca. According to Heinz’s spokesman he “strongly warned Mr. Archer that working with Burisma was unacceptable” and “[t]he lack of judgment in this matter was a major catalyst for Mr. Heinz ending his business relationships with Mr. Archer and Mr. Biden.” Paul Sonne, Michael Kranish, Matt Viser, The gas tycoon and the vice president’s son: The story of Hunter Biden’s foray into Ukraine, THE WASHINGTON POST (Sept. 28, 2019), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/the-gas-tycoon-and-the-vice-presidents-son-the-story-of-hunter-bidens-foray-in-ukraine/2019/09/28/1aadf70-dfd9-11e9-8fd3-d943b4ed57e0_story.html.
64 Email from Chris Heinz to Matt Summers and David Wade, U.S. Dep’t of St. (May 13, 2014), https://www.scribd.com/document/433436789/CU-v-State-FOIA-Doc-Ukraine; see also Alana Goodman, John Kerry’s son cut
Wade testified that he did not recall receiving this email from Heinz, but he did, to the best of his recollection, reach out to speak with Heinz the following day to “try to confirm since we were being asked whether he, or that Rosemont Seneca was buying or investing in Burisma.” Wade testified that he spoke to Heinz on May 14, 2014, and confirmed, based only on Heinz’s assurances, that “Rosemont Seneca was not involved” with Burisma.

According to Wade, that same day he spoke to Secretary Kerry and “let him know that Chris Heinz and Rosemont Seneca were not involved [with Burisma], that the media questions [about Rosemont Seneca buying or investing in Burisma] were inaccurate, and that Chris Heinz was not buying or investing in a Ukrainian natural gas company, but that my understanding was that … Hunter Biden and Devon Archer, according to the stories, that that was accurate, that they were … joining a board.” Wade confirmed that Secretary Kerry learned about Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma through him:

Question: What was Secretary Kerry’s reaction to you informing him of these news inquiries about Mr. Heinz and the additional information regarding Mr. Archer’s [and] Mr. Hunter Biden’s connection and involvement with Burisma?

Wade: He knew nothing about it.

Question: So he learned about this information from you?

Wade: I believe so, yeah.

Question: And when you told him that the information that you were able to confirm with Mr. Heinz that Rosemont Seneca had … not invested or bought Burisma, what was Mr. Kerry's reaction to that?

Wade: If I recall, his reaction was that he was comfortable answering a press question if he got it.

. . . .

Question: [T]hat he was comfortable answering the media question regarding what?

Wade: Regarding … Christopher Heinz or Rosemont Seneca investing in — in a Ukrainian natural gas company or buying a Ukrainian natural gas

---
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company.

Question: And did you discuss with Mr. Kerry what his response to that type of inquiry would have been?

Wade: I'm sure — I'm sure I did. I don't — I don't … remember those details of the conversation. 68

c. In May 2014, State Department staff sent news articles to Secretary Kerry relating to Hunter Biden and Burisma.

David Thorne, who served as a senior adviser to Secretary Kerry, informed Wade that he sent the following collection of press clips and articles to the secretary on May 14, 2014.69

Thorne forwarded these clips to Wade and wrote, “I sent it to JK[.].”70 Wade told the Committees that “JK” stood for “John Kerry.”71 The headlines of the articles that Thorne sent to Kerry included, “Biden’s son joins Ukrainian gas company’s board,” “Biden’s son joins Ukrainian gas producer board,” and “White House says no issue with Biden's son, Ukraine gas company.”72

68 David Wade Testimony at 50-51 (emphasis added).
69 Email from David Thorne, U.S. Dep’t of St., to David Wade, U.S. Dep’t of St. (May 16, 2014, 20:52:30 +0000), [STATE-2019-18-0000733].
70 Email from David Thorne, U.S. Dep’t of St., to David Wade, U.S. Dep’t of St. (May 16, 2014, 20:52:30 +0000), [STATE-2019-18-0000733].
71 David Wade Testimony at 79.
72 Thorne’s email did not include the headlines of the articles, but it did contain links to the articles and a description of the article including the publication date and the author’s name. Based on this information, the Committees were able to find the headlines of the articles that Throne sent to Kerry. Emails between David Thorne, U.S. Dep’t of St., and David Wade, U.S. Dep’t of St. (May 16, 2014), [STATE-2019-18-0000733].
d. Conclusion

Former Secretary Kerry’s December 2019 denial of having any knowledge about Hunter Biden or Burisma is inconsistent with the evidence uncovered by the Committees. Kerry was briefed about Hunter Biden, Burisma and Heinz the day after Burisma announced Hunter Biden joined its board. Additionally, Secretary Kerry’s senior advisor sent him press clips and articles relating to Hunter Biden’s board membership. This appears to be yet another example of high-ranking Obama administration officials blatantly ignoring Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma.
VI. STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS VIEWED ZLOCHEVSKY AS A CORRUPT, “ODIOUS OLIGARCH,” BUT VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN WAS ADVISED NOT TO ACCUSE ZLOCHEVSKY OF CORRUPTION.

a. Introduction

The State Department clearly viewed Burisma and its owner, Mykola Zlochevsky, as corrupt, and did not want to have any association with either one. For example, as soon as Deputy Chief of Mission George Kent learned of a de minimis USAID arrangement with Burisma, and succeeded in severing that relationship. As U.S. officials pressed Ukrainian officials to hold Zlochevsky accountable for his actions, Vice President Biden was “leading the policy charge” of pushing anticorruption measures in Ukraine, which included confronting oligarchs. Yet as staff prepared talking points for Vice President Biden to answer questions about whether he viewed Zlochevsky as corrupt, they suggested that he “not … get into naming names or accusing individuals.” Biden’s spokeswoman told reporters, “the vice president does not endorse any particular company and has no involvement with this company.” This stands in stark contrast to the decision of then-Ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt to call out Zlochevsky by name as an example of corruption in a September 2015 speech. Biden’s unwillingness to confront a man whom State officials considered to be an “odious oligarch” demonstrated a lack of leadership, but also raises a serious question about why Vice President Biden would avoid linking Zlochevsky with corruption.

b. State Department officials viewed Zlochevsky and Burisma as corrupt.

According to testimony and documents obtained by the Committees, State Department officials viewed Burisma and its owner, Zlochevsky, as corrupt. Insofar as the link between Zlochevsky and corruption was not already clear to State Department officials, in early 2015 they learned that Zlochevsky likely bribed Ukrainian prosecutors to interfere in a United Kingdom criminal proceeding against him, which was subsequently closed. (Section VII of this report will describe this bribe and its consequences in more detail.) In short, State Department officials’ understanding of Zlochevsky’s actions relating to the U.K. criminal case strongly influenced their perspective of him and Burisma. Below are several examples of State Department officials sharing their perspective of Zlochevsky and Burisma:

- “Zlochevsky was viewed as corrupt, not just in Ukraine but by the USG/FBI[.]” – George Kent, Department of State, Sept. 2016

---
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• “[W]e have extensive concerns about corruption in Ukraine, and we believe Mr. Zlochevsky is an example.” – Memo to then-U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine Marie Yovanovitch, Dec. 201678

• “Burisma’s owner was a poster child for corrupt behavior[.]” – George Kent Testimony to the Committees79

• “I would have advised any American not to get on the board of Zlochevsky’s company.” – George Kent Testimony to the Committees80

• “The proliferation of Ukrainian companies clearly (and not so clearly owned/controlled by odious oligarchs or those who outright stole assets and absconded (like Zlochevsky) is likely a long one.” – George Kent, Department of State, Aug. 201681

• “Throughout 2015 and 2016, U.S. officials, particularly those at the U.S. Embassy in Kyiv, consistently pressed Ukrainian officials to hold Zlochevsky to account and made clear our negative view about Burisma.” – George Kent Testimony to the Committees82

• “…our focus was on [Zlochevsky’s] corrupt acts as minister when he abused the office to award national gas exploration contracts to companies that he controlled through shell companies.” – George Kent Testimony to the Committees83

• “[I]n the case of former Ecology Minister Mykola Zlochevsky, the U.K. authorities had seized $23 million in illicit assets that belonged to the Ukrainian people.” – Geoffrey Pyatt, then-U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine, Sept. 201584

• The closing of the U.K. case against Zlochevsky was a “gross miscarriage of justice that undermined months of U.S. assistance … [a]fter the FBI and MI5 spent months and arguably millions working to try to put together the first possible asset recover case (against former Minister of Ecology Zlochevsky)[.]” – George Kent, State Department, Aug. 201685

79 George Kent Testimony at 21.
80 George Kent Testimony at 110.
82 George Kent Testimony at 20 (emphasis added).
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• “[The] U.S. and U.K. were cooperating on a case to seize [Zlochevsky’s] corrupt assets overseas (which had passed through the U.S.).” – Geoffrey Pyatt, then-U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine, Dec. 2015

• There is “a moral hazard associated with publicly associating/promoting our assistance projects with companies/individuals seen in Ukrainian society as corrupt/compromised.” – George Kent on whether any U.S. agency should cooperate or associate with Burisma or Zlochevsky, Aug. 2016

• “[United States Government (USG)] cooperation on the project [with Burisma] would make us look bad. Not to mention the [Members of Parliament] on the energy committee and others would wonder how we speak about anti corruption [sic], but work with those that were associated with corrupt practices.” – Redacted State Department official in an email to colleagues, Sept. 2016

• “[There] is a clear link between the company and its primary owner. . . . From the rumors that we hear in the energy sector, there is no sense that Burisma has changed how it conducts its business. . . . I fall on the side of not having anything to do with the company to avoid undermining our broader efforts to promote transparency and [anticorruption].” – Redacted State Department official in an email to colleagues, Sept. 2016

c. State Department officials viewed Vice President Biden as a “warrior” and “leading the policy charge” on anticorruption measures in Ukraine.

According to testimony, former State Department officials saw Vice President Biden as a leading U.S. figure who pushed for anticorruption measures in Ukraine. Kent testified, “Vice President Biden was leading the policy charge, pushing President Poroshenko and Prime Minister Yatsenyuk to take more decisive anticorruption action.” Ambassador Victoria Nuland called Vice President Biden a “warrior” on this issue and said, “I was proud to work with Vice President Biden on Ukraine policy and especially on trying to help the Ukrainian period [sic] root out corruption in their country.”

On December 9, 2015, Vice President Biden spoke in Ukraine in front of the parliament of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada, and told the members that they are facing a “test of courage”

---
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and have an “obligation” to Ukrainians to reform their country to “build a united, democratic Ukrainian nation that can stand the test of time.”92 In doing so, Biden stated that Ukrainians have “a historic battle against corruption.”93 He said “[o]ligarchs and non-oligarchs must play by the same rules.”94 Biden called on the Rada to “[s]eize the opportunity. Build a better future for the people of Ukraine.”95 Biden’s speech, which pushed anticorruption measures, was, according to Nuland, “very powerful and powerfully received by the Rada.”96 Yet, while Vice President Biden called for members of the Rada to have courage to confront corruption in Ukraine, the vice president’s staff was advising otherwise.

d. Vice President Biden’s staff recommended he not link Zlochevsky with corruption.

Nuland told the Committees that by confronting oligarchs, the U.S. would send an anticorruption message.97 Yet as Vice President Biden’s staff responded to press inquiries relating to Burisma and Zlochevsky, one staffer wrote, “I am concerned about getting into anything relating to Mr. Zlochevsky directly.”98 Just a few days before the vice president gave his December 2015 speech at the Rada pushing anticorruption measures, his staff prepared talking points for him and included a response to the question: “Do you think Zlochevsky is corrupt?”99 His staff wrote:

I’m not going to get into naming names or accusing individuals. We have been working consistently to push the Ukrainian leadership to make meaningful changes in the Prosecutor General’s office and across the government to help ensure that the Ukrainian people are represented fairly and fully.100

It is clear that members of Vice President Biden’s staff wanted to distance him from an individual whom the State Department clearly believed was corrupt and an individual who employed his son. This stands in stark contrast to then-Ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt, who identified Zlochevsky by name as a corrupt actor during a September 2015 speech in Odessa, Ukraine. But the Committees were not able to locate any public statements Vice President Biden gave from 2014 to 2016 in which he called Zlochevsky corrupt. Instead, in December 2015,
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100 Email from Kate Bedingfield, Off. of the Vice President, to Michael Carpenter, Off. of the Vice President, et al. (Dec. 6, 2015, 6:04 PM), [STATE-2019-18-0000553-554] (emphasis added). Ambassador Pyatt recommended changing the last sentence of that answer to “Something like “… begin rooting out the cancer of corruption that has done so much over the years to hold back economic growth and sap the confidence of Ukrainians in those who govern them.”” Email from Geoffrey Pyatt, Ambassador to Ukraine, to Kate Bedingfield, Off. of the Vice President, et al. (Dec. 6, 2015, 11:13 AM), [STATE-2019-18-0000553].
Biden’s spokeswoman told reporters, “the vice president does not endorse any particular company and has no involvement with this company.”

**e. Conclusion**

In his December 2015 speech at the Rada, Vice President Biden told members to have courage to confront corruption and change the course of history for their country. Yet when it came to calling out an individual whom the State Department viewed as a “corrupt” and “odious oligarch,” Vice President Biden’s staff advised him to not accuse Zlochevsky of corruption. In December 2015, while in Ukraine, Biden did not link Zlochevsky with corruption and did not demonstrate the same level of courageousness that he encouraged Ukrainian political leaders to pursue.

Several witnesses highlighted efforts by certain U.S. officials to enable a successful investigation of Zlochevsky, and also noted that the U.S. decision to condition a $1 billion loan guarantee was made in part because of the then-Ukrainian prosecutor general’s failure to pursue a case against Zlochevsky. But at the end of the day, between 2014 through 2017, despite the concerted effort of many U.S. officials, not one of the three different Ukrainian prosecutor generals held Zlochevsky accountable.

---

VII. WHILE HUNTER BIDEN SERVED ON BURISMA’S BOARD, BURISMA’S OWNER, ZLOCHEVSKY, ALLEGEDLY PAID A $7 MILLION BRIBE TO UKRAINE’S PROSECUTOR GENERAL’S OFFICE TO CLOSE THE CASE.

On May 12, 2014, Burisma trumpeted the addition of Hunter Biden to its board of directors, stating, “Biden will be in charge of the [Burisma] Holdings’ legal unit and will provide support for the Company among international organizations.”102 In that same press release, Hunter Biden stated, “As a new member of the Board, I believe that my assistance in consulting the company on matters of transparency, corporate governance and responsibility, international expansion and other priorities will contribute to the economy and benefit the people of Ukraine.”103 The company’s release went on to say that, Hunter was “a well-known public figure,” but the release did not mention Hunter’s connection to a more well-known public figure, his father, the vice president of the United States.104

When Hunter Biden joined Burisma’s board in May 2014, the prosecutor general of Ukraine was Oleh Makhnitskyi. Makhnitskyi served as the acting prosecutor general for only a few months before resigning from the post.105 His resignation gave way to Vitaly Yarema, who on June 19, 2014, became the prosecutor general of Ukraine.106

George Kent, a career diplomat who served in a number of roles at the State Department over his career, including several tours in Ukraine, did not hold Prosecutor General Yarema or his team in high regard. In fact, he testified, “[Yarema’s] team failed to bring a single prosecution over a seven-month period, and which allegedly took a bribe from [Burisma’s owner] Zlochevsky to close the case against him and collapse our effort to recover the $23 million frozen in the United Kingdom”107

a. Allegations that Zlochevsky bribed Ukraine’s Prosecutor General Office

In January 2015, Kent arrived in Kyiv and learned that the U.S. embassy was not communicating with the Ukraine’s Prosecutor General’s Office (PGO).108 Shortly after his arrival, Kent asked a Department of Justice (DOJ) official posted at U.S. Embassy Kyiv to set up a high-level meeting with the PGO. According to Kent, the goal of this meeting was for U.S. officials to raise the money-laundering case against Burisma’s owner, Zlochevsky.109

---
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secured a Feb. 3, 2015, appointment with the First Deputy Prosecutor General, who was the “number two prosecutor in the country at the time, Anatoliy Danylenko.”

Kent testified that, during the Feb. 3, 2015 meeting with the PGO, he “confronted the First Deputy Prosecutor General, Anatoliy Danylenko, demanding to know who had paid the bribe and how much it was. I also demanded that the case against Zlochevsky be resumed.”

During testimony, Kent provided the Committees additional insight into what occurred during the Feb. 3, 2015, meeting at the PGO:

> When I asked the question [to Danylenko], ‘How much was the [Zlochevsky] bribe and who took it?’ [Danylenko] laughed and said, ‘That’s exactly what President Poroshenko asked us last week.’ And I [Kent] said, ‘So what did you tell the President [Poroshenko]?’ and [Danylenko] said, ‘Seven million dollars and last May [2014], before we came into office.’

Kent apparently did not believe that Zlochevsky’s bribe occurred in May 2014. He responded to Mr. Danylenko,

> “Nice try, but the letter that someone—some prosecutor in your office [PGO] wrote was signed in late December [2014], six months after you all [Yarema’s team] came into office.”

On Feb. 10, 2015, one week after Kent’s conversation with the PGO, President Poroshenko dismissed General Prosecutor Yarema and other members of his team.

b. George Kent reporting of the Zlochevsky’s bribe allegation to U.S. officials

Kent told the Committees that after the meeting with Danylenko, the DOJ official at U.S. Embassy Kyiv reported the allegation — that Zlochevsky paid the PGO a $7 million bribe — to the FBI. At this time, the Committees are seeking an explanation from the FBI about what, if any, actions they took after receiving this information from U.S. Embassy Kyiv.

Kent testified that it was not until sometime after the Feb. 3, 2015, meeting with the PGO that he became aware that Hunter Biden was on the board of Burisma.

---
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After Kent learned of the alleged Zlochevsky bribe, he became aware of Hunter Biden’s connection to Burisma. Soon after, Kent spoke with Vice President Biden’s office about his concerns. This conversation occurred sometime between Feb. 3 and Feb. 14, 2015, when Kent ended up on a phone call with a staffer from Vice President Biden’s office. He could not recall the exact date of the phone call, and when asked whether he apprised the staffer for Vice President Biden about Zlochevsky’s alleged bribe, Kent testified, “I can’t remember — to be perfectly honest, I don’t remember who I spoke to.” Kent told the Committees he did not memorialize this February 2015 phone call with Vice President Biden’s office.

Despite not recalling whether he mentioned the alleged Zlochevsky bribe to Vice President Biden’s office, or to a member of the Obama National Security Council, over the years, Kent did mention his knowledge of the alleged Zlochevsky bribe to high-ranking State Department officials. For example, on Aug. 31, 2016, Kent told State Department colleagues that “[Zlochevsky] who almost certainly paid off the PGO in December 2014 (I had the then First deputy PG Danylenko tell me the bribe was $7 million) to have the case against him closed and his $23 million in assets frozen in the UK unfrozen?”

c. Conclusion

Based on Kent’s testimony, the alleged $7 million bribe from Zlochevsky to Ukraine’s PGO likely occurred while Hunter Biden was on Burisma’s board. Hunter Biden has stated that his position on the board was to “consult on matters of transparency, corporate governance and responsibility[].” The Committees requested information from the FBI about what, if any, actions it took in regard to this allegation. The FBI has not yet responded to that request.

---
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VIII. HUNTER BIDEN: A U.S. SECRET SERVICE PROTECTEE WHILE ON BURISMA’S BOARD

When Vice President Biden traveled overseas on Air Force Two, he was often accompanied by members of his family.\textsuperscript{125} Hunter Biden joined his father on a number of trips and, as the son of the vice president, he could enroll as a protectee and receive armed protection from the U.S. Secret Service (USSS). In an effort to determine how much of Hunter Biden’s scheduled travel occurred as a protectee and whether that overlapped with his private business dealings, the Committees requested and received documents from the USSS detailing Hunter Biden’s scheduled travel as a protectee.\textsuperscript{126}

The Committees found that Hunter Biden scheduled travel as a protectee after joining Burisma’s board in May 2014.\textsuperscript{127} The Committees also determined that Hunter Biden declined USSS protection after a scheduled July 8, 2014, trip to Michigan City, Ind.\textsuperscript{128} At this time, the Committees have not determined why Hunter Biden declined USSS protection after July 8, 2014.

a. Hunter Biden, USSS protectee

According to USSS records, Hunter Biden enrolled as a protectee starting in January 2009, after his father was elected vice president.\textsuperscript{129} He remained a protectee for about 4.5 years, and records indicate an extensive amount of scheduled foreign travel as a protectee. Although the majority of his trips were domestic, the Committees identified nearly 70 trips that Hunter Biden scheduled to foreign countries while he was a protectee.\textsuperscript{130} Hunter Biden, here identified by the USSS using his full name, Robert H. Biden, scheduled foreign travel as a protectee to a wide array of foreign cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrival Date</th>
<th>Departure Date</th>
<th>City/Country</th>
<th>Protectee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


\textsuperscript{126} Letter from Ron Johnson, Chairman, S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff., and Charles Grassley, Chairman, S. Comm. on Fin., to Mr. James M. Murray, Director, U.S. Secret Serv., Dep’t of Homeland Sec. (Feb. 5, 2020); Letter from Faron K. Paramore, Assistant Dir., U.S. Secret Serv., U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec., to Chairman Ron Johnson, S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Gov. Affairs, and Chairman Charles Grassley, S. Comm. on Fin. (Apr. 6, 2020).

\textsuperscript{127} Protectee Visits Detail Reports for Robert H. Biden, U.S. Secret Serv., Date Range: January 1, 2008 - January 31, 2017. The U.S. Secret Service cannot confirm that the trips occurred or if protection was provided for the entirety of the trip due to the age of the records at issue.

\textsuperscript{128} Id.

\textsuperscript{129} Id.

\textsuperscript{130} Protectee Visits Detail Reports for Robert H. Biden, U.S. Secret Serv., Date Range: January 1, 2008 - January 31, 2017. The U.S. Secret Service cannot confirm that the trips occurred or if protection was provided for the entirety of the trip due to the age of the records at issue. The nearly 70 trips to foreign countries includes travel to cities within one foreign country.
Joe Biden has been asked about his son, Hunter, joining him on foreign trips to China while he was vice president. In response to questions about whether this arrangement was a conflict of interest, Joe Biden has told the media, “I have never spoken to my son [Hunter] about his overseas business dealings.” The USSS records indicate Hunter Biden scheduled at least six trips to China while a protectee, including a trip to Beijing in May 2014 right before he joined Burisma’s board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrival Date</th>
<th>Departure Date</th>
<th>City/Country</th>
<th>Protectee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2010</td>
<td>8/14/2010</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Denmark</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2011</td>
<td>10/21/2011</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2012</td>
<td>2/18/2012</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2013</td>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td>Milan, Italy</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td>8/6/2013</td>
<td>Florence, Italy</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2013</td>
<td>11/5/2013</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi, UAE</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2013</td>
<td>12/4/2013</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2013</td>
<td>12/6/2013</td>
<td>Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td>Robert H. Biden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


132 *Id.*
During his December 2013 trip to China, during which Hunter Biden flew on Air Force Two, Hunter Biden admitted he met with a Chinese banker. According to news reports, Hunter Biden appeared to be conducting his own private business during this specific trip and was working to secure a deal in the hopes of creating a Chinese equity fund.

b. Hunter Biden, USSS protectee and Burisma board member.

According to USSS records, Hunter Biden was a protectee at the time he joined Burisma’s board in May 2014. Hunter Biden scheduled at least seven trips after he joined Burisma’s board on May 13, 2014. These trips took him to the foreign cities of Doha, Qatar, and Paris, France, and stateside to New York, Newark, N.J., and Michigan City, Ind.:
The Committees did not determine why Hunter Biden declined USSS protection following the July 8, 2014, trip in Michigan City. But it should be noted that, the day before his last trip as a protectee, Time published an article describing Burisma’s ramped up lobbying efforts to U.S. officials and Hunter’s involvement in Burisma’s board.\textsuperscript{138} The Committees requested additional information from the USSS about the lack of records after July 8, 2014. The USSS did not provide greater detail other than Hunter Biden declined protection.

c. Conclusion

Hunter Biden scheduled hundreds of trips while he was a protectee. He was a Burisma board member while a protectee. Whether Hunter Biden conducted additional private business dealings while a protectee is unknown. Further, the Committees do not know why Hunter Biden declined USSS protection, and whether or not media scrutiny was a factor for Hunter to decline protection in July 2014.

IX. OBAMA ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS AND A DEMOCRAT LOBBYING FIRM HAD CONSISTENT AND SIGNIFICANT CONTACT WITH FORMER UKRAINIAN OFFICIAL ANDRII TELIZHENKO.

a. Introduction

Despite claims from Ranking Member Peters, Ranking Member Wyden and Democrat leadership, the Committees reject all assertions that this investigation has been influenced by Russian disinformation. To be crystal clear, the Committees’ work has focused only on Obama administration records from the State Department, National Archives and Records Administration, Department of Justice, other federal agencies, and the U.S. consulting firm Blue Star Strategies, as well as interviews with current and former U.S. government officials. The Committees have spoken with one foreign national about his ties to the Obama administration, a DNC operative, and Blue Star Strategies.

In 2016, Andrii Telizhenko was an official at the Ukrainian embassy in Washington. In that position, Telizhenko met several times with Obama administration officials, a consultant for the Democratic National Committee, and the Democrat lobbying firm, Blue Star Strategies (which later employed him from 2016 to 2017). Blue Star Strategies officials continued to contact and request his assistance as recently as the summer of 2019.

b. Communication and meetings between Obama administration officials and Telizhenko.

As far as the Committees are aware, the majority of Telizhenko’s interactions with Obama administration officials occurred during 2015 and 2016. The Committees possess records of some of these communications from their request to the National Archives.

According to documents, on July 19, 2013, Telizhenko attended a meeting at the White House with two other Ukrainians to meet with Lyn Debevoise. At that time, Telizhenko was the counselor to a deputy of the Verkhovna Rada, Ukraine’s Parliament. It is unknown what was discussed at this meeting.

---

139 The Committees attempted to obtain Telizhenko’s Blue Star Strategies documents that are subject to a non-disclosure agreement, but Democrat obstruction shielded Blue Star Strategies from providing these relevant documents.
140 Kenneth Vogel and David Stern, Ukrainian efforts to sabotage Trump backfire, Politico (Jan. 11, 2017).
141 Letter from Ron Johnson, Chairman, S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff., and Charles Grassley, Chairman, S. Comm. on Fin., to Hon. David S. Ferriero, Archivist, Nat’l Archives and Records Admin, (Nov. 21, 2019).
142 Email from Waves Request, U.S. Secret Serv. to Marisa Donelson (Jul. 11, 2013, 1:18 PM), [000064].
143 Email from Andrii Telizhenko, Counsellor to the Deputy of Verhovna Rada, to Lyn Debevoise (Aug. 5, 2013, 8:39 AM), [000217].
On July 21, 2015, Telizhenko was scheduled to meet in the Old Executive Office Building with Michael Carpenter, who was a foreign policy advisor to Vice President Biden. It is unknown what was discussed at this meeting.

c. January 2016 Ukrainian delegation visit to Obama’s White House.

Telizhenko’s interactions with Obama administration officials became more frequent starting in January 2016. According to a document with a DOJ logo, a Ukrainian delegation that included senior-level Ukrainian prosecutors arrived in Washington on Jan. 18, 2016. The agenda shows that their first official meeting was confirmed for Jan. 19, 2016, at the White House, from 11 a.m. to noon with “Eric Ciaramella, Elizabeth [sic] Zentos and others TBD, National Security Council.”

---

144 Email from Andrii Telizhenko to Frances Castro (Jul. 21, 2015, 10:01 AM), [000140].
145 Penn Biden Center for Diplomacy & Global Engagement, Michael Carpenter, https://global.upenn.edu/penn-biden-center/person/michael-carpenter. Michael Carpenter served in the White House as a foreign policy advisor to Vice President Joe Biden as well as on the National Security Council as Director for Russia.
146 Email from Eric Ciaramella, Nat’l Sec. Council, to Catherine Croft, U.S. Dep’t of St. (Jan. 19, 2016, 7:26 PM), [001753] (attaching Agenda for Examination of the U.S. Adversarial Criminal Justice System for senior-level Ukrainian prosecutors (Jan. 18, 2016 to Jan. 23, 2016), [001755]).
In the middle of the night on Jan. 19, 2016, Telizhenko contacted Elisabeth Zentos, a member of the Obama administration’s National Security Council (NSC) asking to join the NSC-Ukrainian delegation meeting scheduled at 11 a.m. that morning.\textsuperscript{147} It is not known if Zentos responded to Telizhenko’s email, but she did forward Telizhenko’s request to her colleague on the NSC, Eric Ciaramella, after the Jan. 19, 2016, meeting.\textsuperscript{148} According to Telizhenko’s email to Zentos, Artem Sytynk, Nazar Kholodnickyi, and David Sakvarelidze, among others, were listed as participants in the meeting with the NSC.\textsuperscript{149}
Over the next two days, Jan. 20-21, 2016, the Ukrainian delegation was scheduled to meet with a slew of U.S. officials, including representatives of the DOJ Office of the Inspector General, the DOJ, the FBI and the Department of State.\footnote{Email from Eric Ciaramella, Nat’l Sec. Council, to Catherine Croft, U.S. Dep’t of St. (Jan. 19, 2016, 7:26 PM), [001753] (attaching Agenda for Examination of the U.S. Adversarial Criminal Justice System for senior-level Ukrainian prosecutors (Jan. 18, 2016 to Jan. 23, 2016), [001755-001756]).}

At this time, the Committees have not confirmed whether all the scheduled meeting entries on the agenda occurred. Further, despite the Committees’ efforts, no U.S. officials have confirmed what was discussed at any of these January 2016 meetings with the senior-level Ukrainian prosecutors.\footnote{Transcript of Interview at 174-75, S. Comm. on Fin. and S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff. Interview of Elisabeth Zentos (July 20, 2020), [Hereinafter Elisabeth Zentos Testimony].}

d. Interactions between Obama NSC official Elisabeth Zentos and Andrii Telizhenko.

The Committees interviewed Zentos and during that interview discussed her interactions with Telizhenko. Zentos testified that she didn’t “remember exactly when [she] first communicated with [Telizhenko], but [she] believe[s] it was while [she] was working at the U.S. Embassy in Kyiv, so it would have been between 2012 and 2014.”\footnote{Elisabeth Zentos Testimony 182.} Zentos was less cooperative than any other witness the Committees interviewed. She refused to provide the
names of officials to whom she directly reported, nor would she name individuals who reported to her, either at the NSC or the State Department.\textsuperscript{153}

In relation to her meetings and communications with Telizhenko, starting in January 2016, Zentos testified that she met and communicated with Telizhenko as “he was a representative of the Ukrainian Government. Part of my job was to be in touch with the Ukrainian Government.”\textsuperscript{154} During the spring of 2016, records indicate, Zentos and Telizhenko would meet at coffee shops, among other venues, around Washington, and they met at least one time while in Ukraine. Overall, records indicate that they would meet a number of times during the first half of 2016. For example, on Feb. 9, 2016, less than a month after the White House meeting, Zentos and Telizhenko met at Cosi in Washington.\textsuperscript{155} It is not known what was discussed at this meeting. In addition, on Feb. 23, 2016, Telizhenko and Zentos emailed about meeting. In her reply, Zentos asked, “Ok if I bring my colleague Eric, who works on Ukraine with me?” She ended the email by asking, “[D]id you get Trump’s autograph for me?”\textsuperscript{156}

![Email exchange between Elisabeth Zentos and Andrii Telizhenko](image_url)

\textsuperscript{153} Elisabeth Zentos Testimony at 34 and 38.
\textsuperscript{154} Elisabeth Zentos Testimony at 187.
\textsuperscript{155} Email from Andrii Telizhenko to Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council (Feb. 9, 2016, 2:07 PM), [000021].
\textsuperscript{156} Emails between Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council, and Andrii Telizhenko (Feb. 23, 2016), [000058].
On March 1, 2016, Zentos and Telizhenko agreed over email to meet on March 3, 2016, at a Washington bar called The Exchange. Before the planned meeting, Zentos told Telizhenko, “I’ll see if my colleague Eric is up for joining.” When asked whether “Eric” was Ciaramella, Zentos declined to answer. This meeting ultimately occurred on March 4, 2016, but it is unclear what was discussed.157

Additional meetings between Zentos and Telizhenko included:

- **March 4, 2016:** Zentos and Telizhenko met at Swing’s coffee house in Washington.158 Telizhenko emailed Zentos after the meeting and discussed how an individual was seeking a meeting with Obama NSC official Charles Kupchan.

---

157 Emails between Andrii Telizhenko and Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council (Mar. 1, 2016), [000113-000114].
158 Emails between Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council, and Andrii Telizhenko (Mar. 4, 2016), [000018-000019].
• **March 10, 2016:** Telizhenko emailed Zentos asking to meet that afternoon for five minutes. Based on the email, it appears they met at 5 p.m. that day at Cosi.\(^{159}\) Despite this email, Zentos testified, “I do not remember if this occurred. As you can probably see from the email, Mr. Telizhenko likes to ask me to meet. I don’t remember if this specific meeting happened.”\(^{160}\)

• **April 13, 2016:** Zentos and Telizhenko apparently met.\(^ {161}\) When asked about this meeting, Zentos testified, “I do not recall when any specific meeting was with Mr. Telizhenko.”\(^ {162}\) Zentos said this despite her own email to Telizhenko saying, “No worries! Just got here. See you soon.”\(^ {163}\)

• **May 4, 2016:** Zentos and Telizhenko apparently met.\(^ {164}\)

• **July 9, 2016:** Zentos emailed Telizhenko suggesting they meet. The email suggested that Zentos was in Ukraine at this time, and Zentos testified that she joined Secretary Kerry’s delegation to Ukraine around this time.\(^ {165}\) Zentos does not recall if she met Telizhenko while she was in Ukraine despite emails indicating she planned to see Telizhenko and he was “downstairs in the lobby” on the next day.\(^ {166}\)

---

\(^{159}\) Emails between Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council, and Andrii Telizhenko (Mar. 10, 2016), [000043-000045].

\(^{160}\) Elisabeth Zentos Testimony at 193.

\(^{161}\) Emails between Andrii Telizhenko and Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council (Apr. 13, 2016), [000161].

\(^{162}\) Elisabeth Zentos Testimony at 195.

\(^{163}\) *Id.*

\(^{164}\) Emails between Andrii Telizhenko and Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council (May 4, 2016), [000109-000111].

\(^{165}\) Elisabeth Zentos Testimony at 198.

\(^{166}\) Emails between Andrii Telizhenko and Elisabeth Zentos, Nat’l Sec. Council (July 9, 2016), [000275-000276].
e. Blue Star Strategies’ relationship with Andrii Telizhenko.

Burisma hired Blue Star Strategies, a Democrat lobbying firm, in November 2015.\textsuperscript{167} Blue Star was founded by Chief Executive Officer Karen Tramontano and Chief Operating Officer Sally Painter. Both Tramontano and Painter interacted with Telizhenko when he was an official at the Ukraine embassy, and Blue Star eventually employed Telizhenko starting in July 2016.\textsuperscript{168} Telizhenko’s contract with Blue Star overlapped with the firm’s representation of Burisma.\textsuperscript{169} Blue Star refused to provide Telizhenko’s documents from his time as a contractor to the Committees, and it refused the Committees’ request to release Telizhenko from his non-disclosure agreement.

---

\textsuperscript{167} Transcript of Interview at 17, S. Comm. on Fin. and S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff. Interview of Karen Tramontano (Aug. 28, 2020), [Hereinafter Karen Tramontano Testimony].

\textsuperscript{168} Karen Tramontano Testimony at 57.

\textsuperscript{169} Transcript of Interview at 151, S. Comm. on Fin. and S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff. Interview of Sally Painter (Aug. 31, 2020), [Hereinafter Sally Painter Testimony].
March 2016 was a pivotal month for Blue Star and its work for Burisma. In response to calls for his termination by then-Vice President Biden, Prosecutor General Viktor Shokin was about to be removed, and Blue Star increased its outreach to, and meetings with, both U.S. officials and Ukrainian officials. On March 21, 2016, a Blue Star employee emailed State Department official Amos Hochstein to request a meeting with CEO Tramontano, COO Painter, and John Buretta, a private attorney, to discuss “a sensitive energy matter ahead of [Ukraine] President Poroshenko’s upcoming visit to DC next week.”

The next day, on March 22, 2016, Vice President Biden called President Poroshenko about U.S. loan guarantees. As Blue Star officials waited for a response from Hochstein, they met with Ukrainian officials. Specifically, Tramontano testified that she and Painter met with Ukrainian officials on March 22, 2016 at the Ukraine embassy. Telizhenko joined this meeting, and Tramontano testified that Burisma was a topic of discussion:

Question: So at this point in this discussion you referenced with Mr. Telizhenko, you had not brought up Burisma specifically?

Tramontano: Oh. No, we had — I’m sorry. To be clear, yes, we had brought up Burisma, and my — we did not bring up, you know, specific cases that were pending.

Question: I understand. And did you just bring up Burisma to Mr. Telizhenko, or did this come up in your meeting with Ms. [Oksana] Shulyar?

Tramontano: It came up in our meeting [March 22, 2016] with Ms. Shulyar that Mr. Telizhenko attended. We had the meeting to inform them of the clients we had, including Burisma, and the meetings that we were seeking. So, yes, it [Burisma] came up in that discussion.

170 Tramontano told the Committees that Blue Star Strategies engaged in “government relations assistance” for Burisma. Oddly, Painter said the exact opposite. See, Karen Tramontano Testimony at 39; Sally Painter Testimony at 39. Moreover, when questioned whether Blue Star Strategies engaged in “government relations assistance” in Ukraine on behalf of Burisma, Painter implied that it did: “I mean, we were engaging with the government, yes.” Sally Painter Testimony at 40. In addition, both Tramontano and Painter denied that they lobbied the U.S. Government on behalf of Burisma and denied that they intended to influence U.S. policy with respect to Burisma; however, that testimony is contradicted by Amos Hochstein’s. See Karen Tramontano Testimony at 48 (“We didn’t lobby the U.S. government.”) and 49 (“In our representation of Burisma, we did not try to influence U.S. policy with respect to Ukraine.”) and Sally Painter Testimony at 43 (Question: “When meeting with U.S. government officials, did you intend to influence U.S. policy towards Burisma?” Answer: “No.”) and 167 (“I do not consider them to be lobbying. I consider that to be exploring to understand the position of the U.S. government.”) compared to Amos Hochstein’s Testimony at 138 (“They did not like my answer, and they tried to convince me otherwise.”).

171 Email from Sean Keeley, Blue Star Strategies, to Amos Hochstein, U.S. Dep’t of St. (Mar. 21, 2016), [STATE-2019-18-0001124].


173 Karen Tramontano Testimony at 123.

174 Karen Tramontano Testimony at 124-25 (emphasis added).
According to documents, after their meeting at the Ukraine embassy, Tramontano replied to Telizhenko, asking him about scheduling a meeting with the Prosecutor General for Ukraine.\(^\text{175}\) Her email also informed Telizhenko that Buretta, an attorney and former DOJ official, planned to be in Ukraine for a day.\(^\text{176}\)

Additionally, the day after their meeting, Painter sent Shulyar and Telizhenko an email with the subject line: “Many Thanks.” Painter’s March 23, 2016, email noted, “As Karen said, please think of us as an extension of your team. We are available to be helpful in any way.”\(^\text{177}\) Further, Painter said that Blue Star was working with “Morgan Williams on their piece of the [Ukrainian] President’s visit and would be honored to help set up something for Mr. Lozhkin\(^\text{178}\) with Denis McDonough, the President’s Chief of Staff, or with anyone else he is interested in meeting.”\(^\text{179}\) Blue Star did not produce these company records to the Committees; instead, the Committees received them from Telizhenko.\(^\text{180}\)

---

\(^\text{175}\) Karen Tramontano Testimony at Exhibit 9.
\(^\text{176}\) Id.
\(^\text{177}\) Email from Sally Painter, Blue Star Strategies, to Oksana Shulyar and Andrii Telizhenko (Mar. 23, 2016).
\(^\text{178}\) “Mr. Lozhkin” most likely refers to Boris Lozhkin who served as the Head of the Presidential Administration for Ukraine from June 2014 to August 2016. See World Jewish Congress, Boris Lozhkin, https://www.worldjewishcongress.org/en/bio/boris-lozhkin.
\(^\text{179}\) Email from Sally Painter, Blue Star Strategies, to Oksana Shulyar and Andrii Telizhenko (Mar. 23, 2016).
\(^\text{180}\) Id.
On March 24, 2016 — three days after Blue Star requested a meeting to “discuss a sensitive energy matter” and two days after meeting with Telizhenko and Shulyar — Painter and Buretta met with Hochstein at the State Department. According to Painter, during this March 2016 meeting with Hochstein, she provided him a summary of Blue Star’s December 2015 meeting with Ambassador Pyatt. She also told the Committees that Buretta provided Hochstein a briefing on the U.K. court case. Hochstein testified that he decided to meet with Blue Star officials, “Because until that meeting I was still under the impression from the first meeting that they were looking to conduct a report. I was – I didn’t have an issue with meeting with them again and hearing where they were in their process.” He did not recall Blue Star providing him a report but they gave him a verbal view of where they stood and they also tried to “convince” him to change his position.

---

181 Email from Redacted, U.S. Dep’t of St., to Amos Hochstein, U.S. Dep’t of St. (Mar. 22, 2016, 10:43:00 -0400), [STATE-2019-18-0001125].
182 Sally Painter Testimony at 116.
183 Sally Painter Testimony at 117.
184 Amos Hochstein Testimony at 131-32.
185 Amos Hochstein Testimony at 132-33, 138.
f. Blue Star takes Telizhenko’s recommendation to remove Burisma’s name to secure a June 2016 meeting with the PGO.

While strategizing about how to secure a June 2016 meeting with Ukraine’s Prosecutor General’s Office, Blue Star officials and Telizhenko discussed how they should craft the meeting request to the PGO. Blue Star sought this meeting to discuss the ongoing PGO cases against Burisma and Zlochevsky. On June 7, 2016, Telizhenko offered his advice in an email to Tramontano:

I wanted to recommend to, in the official request letter, to take away Mr. Zlochevsky’s company name and his name. Just request a meeting an [sic] put just the topics you wanted to discuss, expect [sic] Zlochevsky. I will brief you more when you come to Kiev, but because the President [Poroshenko] does not really like Zlochevsky (he has personal issues), Mr. Lutsenko will deny the meeting if his name stays in the letter. You can raise the issue during the meeting, but on the official letters I would recommend to remove it. I spoke to the chief of staff. He is ready to meet, but please take off the name of the company and his name.186

On June 10, 2016, Tramontano replied to Telizhenko, saying, “Thank you for your assistance. I hope you received the revised letter.”187

Tramontano testified that some of Telizhenko’s recommendations were adopted:188

Question: Did Blue Star make the changes to the letter that was sent to the Prosecutor General that Mr. Telizhenko recommended?

Tramontano: John Buretta made the changes.

Question: And what changes did Mr. Buretta make?

---

186 Karen Tramontano Testimony at 136-37.
187 Karen Tramontano Testimony at 139.
188 Karen Tramontano Testimony at 139-140.
Tramontano: As I recall, and I believe this document is in the submission, he changed the agenda items to take the name of the company [Burisma] off the agenda items.\(^{189}\)

On June 22, 2016, Tramontano, Buretta and Burisma’s Vadym Pozharskiy met with Prosecutor General Lutsenko.\(^{190}\)

g. Blue Star official communicates with Telizhenko in 2019.

Blue Star’s contract with Telizhenko ended in May 2017, yet Blue Star officials continued to communicate with Telizhenko.

Tramontano testified that after ending the contract with Telizhenko, “we remained in contact, I would say, you know, from time to time. When he came to Washington, he would, you know, let us know. But I haven’t talked to him in quite some time, I would say.”\(^{191}\) When asked if this was the same for Painter, Tramontano replied, “I would think it’s the same.”\(^{192}\) Further, when Tramontano was asked whether Painter communicated more with Telizhenko, she responded, “I don’t even know how to answer that question. I’m sorry[.]”\(^{193}\)

When the Committees interviewed Painter, she explained how she communicated with Telizhenko:

Question: How did you communicate with Mr. Telizhenko?

Painter: We communicated by email and on the telephone.

Question: By telephone, you mean phone calls?

Painter: Yes.\(^{194}\)

At that point of the interview, Painter failed to mention that she communicated via WhatsApp with Telizhenko.\(^{195}\) The Committees have obtained some images of WhatsApp messages between Painter (white colored boxes) and Telizhenko (green colored boxes) starting in April 2019 and ending in August 2019. These texts show that Blue Star and Telizhenko maintained consistent contact even after he left their employment and that Blue Star continued to rely on his advice.

\(^{189}\) Id. (emphasis added).

\(^{190}\) Karen Tramontano Testimony at 140.

\(^{191}\) Karen Tramontano Testimony at 161.

\(^{192}\) Id.

\(^{193}\) Id.

\(^{194}\) Sally Painter Testimony at 150.

\(^{195}\) Sally Painter failed to produce any WhatsApp communications to the Committees, and the communications were provide by Andrii Telizhenko.
Messages exchanged between Sally Painter (white background) and Andrii Telizhenko (green background)\textsuperscript{196}

\textsuperscript{196} WhatsApp messages between Sally Painter, Blue Star Strategies, and Andrii Telizhenko (on file with Comms.).
Messages exchanged between Sally Painter (white background) and Andrii Telizhenko (green background)\textsuperscript{197}

\textsuperscript{197} Id.
Messages exchanged between Sally Painter (white background) and Andrii Telizhenko (green background)

198 Id.
Messages exchanged between Sally Painter (white background) and Andrii Telizhenko (green background)\textsuperscript{199}

\textsuperscript{199} Id.
When the Committees presented these WhatsApp messages to Painter, she confirmed that these messages were authentic:

**Question:** Did you text with Andrii Telizhenko?

**Painter:** I believe so, yes.

**Question:** Do these appear to be messages between yourself and Mr. Telizhenko?

**Painter:** Yes.

**Question:** How often do you text with Mr. Telizhenko?

**Painter:** I can't quantify. I don't recall the number.200

Painter did not provide these WhatsApp messages to the Committees despite repeated requests. When asked whether she still possessed these messages with Telizhenko, Painter testified, “I do not keep my WhatsApp messages.” And when questioned why she doesn’t keep the messages, Painter said, “I like to get rid of them. It makes me know that I finished a task. So I get rid of my texts and my WhatsApp and any of my traffic like that. I like to have a clean file.”201

When asked why she was communicating with Telizhenko in July 2019, Painter testified, “We had a fine rapport, and he would communicate with me periodically.”202

According to these messages, on April 30, 2019, Painter told Telizhenko to “please Take [sic] blue star off resume.” The Committees asked Painter about this message:

**Question:** It sounds like you're ordering him to do that [Remove Blue Star from his resume]. No?

**Painter:** As I stated before — this will be the third time — Mr. Telizhenko was working more and more with Mr. Giuliani, and we had a conversation about whether it would hurt him with the Republicans if he had Blue Star on his résumé. So this is not a characterization of our conversation.

**Question:** So is that connected to the message you sent above on April 26, 2019, that says, “Have you seen what Solomon has written about what you said?”

**Painter:** I don't think the — I can't comment on that because I don't think this is an accurate representation of the chain of events.

---

200 Sally Painter Testimony at 153-54 (emphasis added).
201 Sally Painter Testimony at 157 (emphasis added).
202 Sally Painter Testimony at 158 (emphasis added).
Question: So you’re advising Mr. Telizhenko how to better work with Rudy Giuliani and Republicans?

Painter: Ironically, Mr. Telizhenko was asking my advice.203

In another message, on June 18, 2019, Painter messaged Telizhenko, “Complaint filed.” The Committees asked Painter about this message and she explained:

Question: On June 18th, 2019, you wrote “Complaint filed.” What is this reference to?

Painter: I don't recall.

Question: You have no recollection?

Painter: I do not.

Question: Why would you have to tell Mr. Telizhenko that a complaint was filed?

Painter: I don't recall.204

h. Conclusion

The Obama administration and the Democrat lobby shop Blue Star Strategies had consistent and extensive contact with Andrii Telizhenko over a period of years. Yet despite these well-documented contacts with Democratic officials, Democrats have attempted to impugn this investigation for having received some Blue Star-related records from him. Some Democrats have even (incorrectly) identified Telizhenko as the Committees’ “star witness.”205 Although he produced a small number of Blue Star-related records to the Committees, the Committees never interviewed him as part of this investigation.206 Nonetheless, Democrats have claimed that Telizhenko is involved in a Russian disinformation campaign. Even though almost all of the Committees’ records are from U.S. agencies and U.S. officials or persons, Democrats have repeatedly misconstrued the facts of this investigation. In doing so, they conveniently have ignored their own long history of meeting with Telizhenko and his year-long work for a Democrat lobby shop. If Democrats are concerned that Telizhenko presents any risk of advancing disinformation, it is notable that the Ranking Members have not expressed any curiosity about his work with the Obama administration or Blue Star Strategies.
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206 The Committees received a small number of records from Telizhenko related to his communications with and subsequent work for Blue Star Strategies. Ranking Member Peters and Ranking Member Wyden have access to these records but have refused to receive or review them. Had they done so, they would have observed that the State Department, National Archives, and Blue Star Strategies (after it received a subpoena) produced most of the same records to the Committees. They also would have noticed the emails and text messages that Blue Star failed to produce to the Committees.
X. THE MINORITY FALSELY ACCUSED THE CHAIRMEN OF ENGAGING IN A RUSSIAN DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGN AND USED OTHER TACTICS TO INTERFERE IN THE INVESTIGATION.

a. Introduction

Since the majority began its investigation, the Ranking Members have attempted to mischaracterize its scope in an effort to cast doubt on its eventual findings. They have done so, in part, by spreading an unfounded conspiracy theory rooted in a foreign-sourced influence campaign publicly identified by the Intelligence Community (IC). Specifically, Democrats, not just the Ranking Members, relied upon materials and statements from foreign nationals who are attempting to influence U.S. politics to levy unsupported and demonstrably inaccurate allegations linking the majority’s investigation to those same unreliable foreign nationals.

As part of their efforts, Democrats laundered their unclassified speculation through classified analysis of intelligence reporting to fabricate a veneer of credibility in an effort to shield their claims from public scrutiny. Those false claims were then leaked to friendly media outlets, which reported them as fact. Together, these networks of Democratic offices and liberal press outlets have worked to weave fact with fiction in order to construct a false narrative designed to undercut and discredit the Chairmen’s investigation and its eventual findings. In the process, Democrats relied upon and disseminated disinformation from foreign sources, such as Ukrainian official Andriy Derkach, whom the IC has publicly warned are actively seeking to influence U.S. politics. Thus the Democrats, specifically the Ranking Members, have engaged in a disinformation campaign, not Chairmen Grassley or Johnson.

b. Beginnings of the investigation, early leaks, and unequal information sharing

On Nov. 15, 2019, Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson wrote a non-public letter to the Department of Treasury’s Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), seeking Suspicious Activity Reports (SARs) on individuals and entities, including Hunter Biden, Burisma Holdings (Burisma), and others. Although most of the letters sent during the investigation have been released to the public shortly after being transmitted, this letter was not released at the time because of the sensitive nature of the underlying records and the need to ensure the integrity of the investigation with respect to those records. SARs often contain evidence of potential criminal activities, such as money laundering and fraud, and at the time, there was no evidence that SARs existed for the individuals mentioned in the request. The letter was, however, shared with Ranking Member Peters’ office. Just one week later, on Nov.
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22, 2019, a copy of the letter was leaked to Reuters, which published an article containing a link to a full and unredacted copy of the letter. According to the Treasury, the department’s protocol requires stamping the document, which the leaked version did not contain.

The next major leak came in February 2020, just one day after the Committees sent a public letter to the Secret Service requesting Hunter Biden’s travel records. The Committees had requested the travel records in order to assess claims that Hunter Biden may have used government-sponsored travel to conduct private business. The leaks were unrelated to the Secret Service letter but they were designed to undermine the Treasury request. For example, these disclosures to the media included the fact that the Treasury had been producing information responsive to the Committees’ requests as well as the approximate date when the Treasury had begun its production to the Committees. The Yahoo News article also stated, “[t]he senators’ requests to the Treasury have borne fruit, according to the ranking Democratic senator on the Finance Committee, Ron Wyden of Oregon.” Senator Wyden’s spokesperson was also quoted as saying, “the Treasury Department [is] rapidly complying with Senate Republican requests — no subpoenas necessary — and producing ‘evidence’ of questionable origin.” The Yahoo News article stated that the Department of Treasury had “complied with Republican senators’ requests for highly sensitive and closely held financial records about Hunter Biden and his associates.” Further, on the same day the Yahoo News article published, Buzzfeed News reported that the Committees had begun coordinating interviews with potential witnesses.

Contrary to the allegation that the Chairmen have not included the Ranking Members in the Chairmen’s investigation, Ranking Member Wyden and Ranking Member Peters are not a party to the majority’s investigation. However, Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson have included them in all document productions and interviews even though the Ranking Members have failed to abide by the same principles of inclusion with respect to their investigations. As one example, on July 1, 2020, Ranking Member Wyden and Ranking Member Peters released a COVID-19 report that included non-public government information that was not shared with
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Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson or their staff. The Ranking Members failed to include the Chairmen and their staff in all document production requests related to this review. Moreover, Ranking Member Wyden and Ranking Member Peters provided Chairmen’s staff with a draft of this report that totaled 30 pages in length and represented that it was the final version, to be publicly released. Days later, the Ranking Members made public the “final” report, which was 98 pages in length, not the 30 pages that was represented to the Chairmen and their staff.

As another example, Ranking Member Wyden conducted a year-long investigation into Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Administrator Seema Verma with the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, and the minority on the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. On Sept. 9, 2020, at 6:16 p.m., Ranking Member Wyden’s staff notified Chairman Grassley’s staff that the report would be issued the following morning. Ranking Member Wyden’s staff did not include Chairman Grassley’s staff in any document productions, witness interviews, report drafts, or communications relating to that investigation.

Further, the Ranking Members have repeatedly made public previously undisclosed and non-public information pertaining to the majority’s investigation. On Feb. 11, May 6, and July 7, 2020, Ranking Member Wyden used the majority’s investigation to request sensitive materials from the State Department relating to Ukraine. In doing so, the May 6 and July 7 letters also made unauthorized releases of previously non-public information, including details regarding the number of documents produced by the State Department in response to Committees’ requests, information which they would not have known if they were not included in the document productions. News outlets used that information to report that the administration was responding to the Chairmen’s requests with unusual speed, which was false.

Moreover, staff for the Chairmen and Ranking Members had a phone call with Victoria Nuland’s attorneys on Aug. 29, 2020. During the course of that phone call, staff for Ranking
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Member Wyden attempted to disclose to Nuland’s counsel the transcribed testimony of another witness. The Chairmen’s staff immediately interceded to stop the communication and made clear that such a disclosure would negatively affect the integrity of the investigation. In addition, the Ranking Members’ staff have had contact with counsel for the witnesses without the Chairmen’s staff present; in the context of an investigation conducted by only the Chairmen and opposed by the Ranking Members, this unilateral contact raises concerns about any communications, purposeful or inadvertent, that might harm the integrity of the investigation.

House Democrats have also tried to involve themselves in this inquiry. On May 21, 2020, Representative Eliot Engel, who serves as Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, wrote to the State Department to request that the documents provided to the Senate Committees be provided to his committee as well.\(^\text{226}\) (Of course, Ranking Member Wyden and Ranking Member Peters received contemporaneous productions of all records provided to the Committees.) Citing Ranking Member Wyden, Chairman Engel did not request the materials in connection with any investigation of his own.\(^\text{227}\) Instead, he merely requested all records that have been produced to the Committees.\(^\text{228}\) His inadequately predicated request appears to be another effort to gather information for the purpose of running political interference. Further, Chairman Engel has subpoenaed records and, in an attempt to strong-arm Secretary Pompeo into turning over documents, has threatened to initiate contempt proceedings against him.\(^\text{229}\) Based on communications with the State Department, Chairman Engel’s actions have directly interfered with the State Department producing records to the Chairmen. On Sept. 18, 2020, the State Department provided copies of records produced to the Committees to Chairman Engel without providing any prior notice to the Chairmen.

c. Conspiracy theory claims

On July 13, 2020, Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, Senator Mark Warner, Speaker Nancy Pelosi, and Representative Adam Schiff sent a letter, with a classified attachment, to the FBI to express a purported belief that Congress is the subject of a foreign disinformation campaign.\(^\text{230}\) In that letter, which was publicly released on July 20, 2020, they requested a defensive briefing on foreign efforts to interfere in the 2020 U.S. presidential election.\(^\text{231}\) The classified attachment included unclassified elements that, among other things, attempted — and failed — to tie the joint Committees’ investigation to foreign disinformation.
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One of those elements was an unclassified paragraph that summarized an open source document created by Russia-aligned Ukrainian Andriy Derkach, which mentions the Chairmen along with other Republican senators and administration officials. In that document, the Chairmen are labeled as individuals who are fighting against Ukrainian corruption and under their pictures is an envelope icon. The Democrats speculated that the envelope icon possibly suggests that the Chairmen might have received information from this Ukrainian national. Liberal media outlets picked up that reference, clearly from a leak, even though the Chairmen had not received any information from that Ukrainian national, including any alleged tapes. Those media outlets reported that the Chairmen had in fact received information from Derkach, which is false.232 Indeed, clicking on the envelope icon in the document produces a collection of public letters the Chairmen have sent during the investigation, not any additional documents that Derkach allegedly sent to them. Although the Democrats’ letter and attachment from July 13 targeted the Chairmen’s investigation, they were not copied on the letter and were not granted access to the classified portion until two weeks after it was sent to FBI and one week after portions of it were publicly reported.

On July 16, mere days before the Democrats’ July 13 letter became public, Ranking Member Peters and Ranking Member Wyden wrote to the Chairmen to request a briefing from the FBI’s Foreign Influence Task Force and other relevant members of the IC on matters related to the Committees’ investigation.233 On July 28, 2020, the Chairmen responded to the Ranking Members and reminded them that in March 2020, the FBI and relevant members of the IC had briefed the Committees regarding the investigation and provided assurances at that time that there was no reason that the Committees should not continue their investigation.234 Those assurances were provided with knowledge of public reporting that Andrii Telizhenko provided records to the Committees. Notably, Telizhenko had extensive and consistent contact with Obama administration officials and a DNC consultant, and worked for the U.S.-based Democrat firm Blue Star Strategies on matters relevant to the Committees’ investigation. As such, the only records he provided to the Committees related to his work for Blue Star Strategies and his interactions with Obama administration officials. Additionally, during that briefing, the agencies made clear to the Committees’ staff that they did not have any additional information to provide and that the relevant written products, which members have had access to for months, speak for themselves. Subsequently, on Aug. 6, 2020, Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson received another briefing from the FBI on behalf of the IC, in which the FBI stated that it is not attempting to “quash, curtail, or interfere” in the investigation in any way.
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233 Letter from Ranking Member Ron Wyden, S. Comm. on Fin., and Ranking Member Gary Peters, S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff., to Chairman Grassley, S. Comm. on Fin., and Chairman Ron Johnson, S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff. (July 16, 2020), https://www.hsac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/200716_Letter_WydenGrassley%20IntelligenceBriefingRequest.pdf.

On July 20, 2020, Politico reported on the contents of the Democrats’ July 13, 2020 letter. Unnamed sources for the article alleged that the classified attachment cited the investigation into Hunter Biden and others as “one of the sources of … concern.” A subsequent Politico article, again citing unnamed sources, reported that in 2019, Derkach allegedly sent information to several members of Congress, including the Chairmen and Ranking Member Wyden and Ranking Member Peters. The article then further suggested that these weak parallels reinforced the “suspicions” of some Democrats that the Committees’ investigation was “‘laundering’ a foreign influence campaign to damage Biden.” The Politico article also suggested that Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs George Kent and several other individuals have been the subject of Committee information requests.

The Chairmen repeatedly rejected claims that they had any engagement with Derkach. In August 2020, Derkach was publicly identified by the IC as a proponent of a foreign-sourced influence campaign to influence the 2020 election. He was later sanctioned by the U.S. Department of Treasury for the same activity. Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson praised the Treasury for imposing those sanctions.

Since the offices of Chairman Johnson and Chairman Grassley did not receive, and were unaware of, the information that Derkach had allegedly sent, it is impossible that Derkach’s efforts could have shaped the Committees’ investigation in any way. Furthermore, it should now be clear that Derkach’s core claims are in no way a part of the Committees’ investigative work. For example, according to media reports, Derkach is responsible for spreading allegations that Burisma made direct payments to Joe Biden in the amount of $900,000, which were allegedly funneled to Biden through his son’s consulting firm, Rosemont Seneca Partners, and marked for “consultative services.” This claim about direct payments made to Joe Biden is not evaluated in the Committees’ report of investigation, nor has it ever been cited as a predicate for any of the Committees’ information requests. However, during the Chairmen’s staff interview of George Kent, Ranking Member Peters’ staff inserted into the interview record the same Derkach-created
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document that Democrats relied on in their July 13 letter to falsely accuse the Chairmen of relying on disinformation.\textsuperscript{243} Kent described Derkach’s document as disinformation, but Ranking Member Peters’ staff used it anyway.\textsuperscript{244} Thus, the Ranking Members introduced disinformation into the record, not the Chairmen.\textsuperscript{245}

In summary, the Democrats’ July 13, 2020, letter relied on foreign disinformation to create a false and harmful innuendo about the Chairmen’s oversight work. That innuendo was then wrapped in a classified attachment in an apparent effort to fabricate a veneer of credibility and shield their analysis from public scrutiny before being disseminated to news media, which reported their speculation as fact. Ironically, the Democrats relied on and disseminated foreign-sourced disinformation to falsely accuse Republicans of relying on that same foreign-sourced disinformation.

Despite its inaccuracies, the Democrats’ false narrative has continued to be picked up, amplified and circulated by a broad network of Democrat-friendly media outlets and Democratic members of Congress. MSNBC has reported extensively on the Derkach allegations.\textsuperscript{246} Further, on Aug. 7, 2020, Senator Richard Blumenthal published an op-ed in \textit{The Washington Post} in which he repeated many of these baseless allegations as if they were fact.\textsuperscript{247} He wrote:

\[\text{[I]t now appears that … disinformation and deception are gaining a toehold in Congress as well: On Wednesday, The Post reported that Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wis.), chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, is moving ahead with an investigation into presumptive Democratic presidential nominee Joe Biden’s family using documents provided to the senator by the son of a former KGB officer. Johnson’s actions are of such concern to the CIA, according to news reports, that the agency has refused to brief him. Think of it: Congress may become a forum for debunked conspiracy theories peddled by Kremlin proxies. There is no excuse for perpetuating Russian disinformation in the U.S. Senate, just as there is no excuse for barring the American public from learning more about the genuine foreign threats to the November election.}\textsuperscript{248}

Senator Blumenthal’s reference to documents provided by a former KGB officer is a reference to the debunked conspiracy theory that Derkach sent documents to the Chairmen. His reference to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) briefing relates to false allegations spread in an Aug. 5, 2020, Politico article that suggested that the CIA has refused to cooperate with an offer to brief
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the Committees because its officers have “deep skepticism of the probe[.]”249 In reality, the CIA declined to provide a briefing because it considers any additional briefings to be unnecessary. The FBI is the lead agency for the IC in matters related to foreign election interference, and the FBI already has repeatedly briefed the Committees on behalf of the IC. As previously noted, at a March 2020 briefing, which included the Ranking Members’ staff, the FBI informed the Committees that there was no reason they should not continue with their investigation. On Aug. 6, 2020, the FBI reiterated the same to the Chairmen.

The Chairmen responded to Senator Blumenthal, as well as Senator Chris Van Hollen’s false statements regarding the investigation.250 In their response, the Chairmen reasserted that they have not received any information from Derkach and that their focus is on government records from the Obama administration and records from a Democrat lobby shop. The Chairmen also noted to both senators that for years the senators peddled and pushed the now-debunked Russian collusion narrative and used the “Steele dossier” — a Democrat bought-and-paid-for document filled with Russian disinformation — to do so.251 Senators Blumenthal and Van Hollen never responded to the Chairmen.

d. Ongoing leaks

While these false narratives have developed and spread, leaks to the media have continued. The same team of writers responsible for the above-referenced July 23, 2020, Politico article have published several other pieces that contained leaked Committee information related to the Ukraine investigation. On July 16, 2020, Politico published the names of individuals who the Committees requested to interview, including David Wade, Antony Blinken, Amos Hochstein, Victoria Nuland and Catherine Novelli.252 The article detailed areas of interest for the investigation and stated that subpoenas could be issued as soon as July 22, 2020.253 None of this information was made public by the Chairmen. Although the sources for the leaked information contained in the article are unknown, the article states that a spokesman for Chairman Johnson declined to comment on ongoing discussions with witnesses and Chairman Grassley has not confirmed to the media any interviewees, whether potential or actual.254 On July 22, Politico published an article stating that the Committees had secured an interview with Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs George Kent.255 The article contained non-public scheduling details and indicated that Kent could be interviewed as
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early as July 24, 2020.\textsuperscript{256}

e. Preferential treatment

Throughout this investigation, the Ranking Members have tried to create the narrative that the Chairmen have received preferential treatment from the executive branch. The Ranking Members have asserted that the executive branch has been too quick and too thorough in its responses to Committee information requests.\textsuperscript{257} Ranking Member Wyden has made this allegation repeatedly and has said they are legitimate efforts to raise awareness of a “double standard of Trump administration cooperation with Congress.”\textsuperscript{258} The suggested implication is that the Trump administration is working to quickly release information to the Committees because the investigation includes Hunter Biden, the son of Joe Biden, President Trump’s political opponent in the 2020 presidential election.

Allegations suggesting the existence of a double standard ring hollow. By no stretch has the Trump administration responded to all of the Committees’ requests in a timely manner. The Chairmen have dozens of outstanding requests related to the investigation, and on literally hundreds of occasions, the Chairmen’s staff have had to remind the executive branch, particularly the State Department, to comply with their requests.\textsuperscript{259} Indeed, in some cases, the Committees have received relevant records from the administration after interviewing witnesses who could have been asked about the information. That is the absence of cooperation.

Finally, recently released emails show that in the past, Democrats have exhibited the very type of behavior they are now accusing Republicans of engaging in. These documents show officials in the Obama administration scrambling to produce highly sensitive documents in response to requests made by Democrat offices on Capitol Hill during the final days of the Obama administration and before President Trump assumed office. In one email on Jan. 13, 2017, a State Department staffer pointedly remarked, “The clock is ticking.”\textsuperscript{260} That same day, another urged, “Both Senators [Cardin and Warner] want the package by Thursday Jan. 19.”\textsuperscript{261}

\textsuperscript{256} Id.
\textsuperscript{259} See Letters from Chairman Charles Grassley, S. Comm. on Fin., and Chairman Ron Johnson, S. Comm. on Homeland Sec. and Governmental Aff., to U.S. Dep’t of St., U.S. Dep’t of Just., Fed. Bureau of Investigation, Off. of the Dir. of Nat. Intelligence, and Cent. Intelligence Agency (July 28, 2020) (on file with Comms.) (Each letter indicates that there is a number of outstanding requests for records and information from each respective department.).
\textsuperscript{260} Email from Naz Durakoglu, U.S. Dep’t of St., to Kerem Bilge, Eric Green, and Maria Germano, U.S. Dep’t of St. (Jan. 13, 2017, 10:56 a.m. EST) (on file with Comms.).
\textsuperscript{261} Email from Naz Durakoglu, U.S. Dep’t of St., to Elizabeth Lawrence, Hera Abbasi, Kerem Bilge, Katherine Harris, Eric Green, Christopher Robinson, et al., U.S. Dep’t of St. (Jan. 18, 2017, 3:10 p.m. EST) (on file with Comms.).
As the deadline for President Trump’s inauguration approached, on Jan. 18, one of the same individuals wrote, “Is it possible for me to act as the courier and drop [the information] off to the Hill tomorrow? There is a time sensitivity to these docs.”

f. Conclusion

Many of the allegations Democrats have made against Republicans — that they are relying on foreign disinformation, that they are carrying out a politicized investigation in an effort to bring down their political opponents, and that they are working covertly with the executive branch to quickly release sensitive information for political reasons — reflect the very patterns of behavior that Democrats themselves have engaged in, and continue to engage in, on a regular basis.

Let us not forget how the Democratic National Committee and the Hillary Clinton campaign paid for the Steele dossier, which was created by a foreign national, a former MI6 employee, and is based on Russian government sources.

Some of those Russian government sources were part of the Russian presidential administration and supported Hillary Clinton. Moreover, in January 2017 and February 2017, the FBI received reporting, some from the IC, that assessed portions of the Steele dossier were the product of a Russian disinformation campaign. That’s no surprise, since the Russian Intelligence Services were also aware of the dossier in early 2016 before the FBI opened Crossfire Hurricane. Thus, the Steele dossier was the perfect vehicle for disinformation to affect multiple elections and to sow discord and chaos. Yet Democrats had no qualms about disseminating information from the dossier far and wide, reading parts of the dossier into the congressional record, and using its allegations as the basis for years of investigations and false claims against the Trump administration. Moreover, since the Chairmen made public in April 2020 the fact that the Steele dossier contained Russian disinformation, it does not appear that any Democrats have commented upon this revelation or expressed concern about their previous reliance on Russian disinformation. Here, the Democrats are again relying on unverified foreign disinformation to falsely accuse their political rivals of doing the same.

Congressional oversight can and should be nonpartisan. It should be focused on exposing wrongdoing regardless of who is involved and on ensuring transparency and accountability in government on behalf of the American people. Efforts to discredit legitimate oversight, especially using foreign disinformation to sow discord, only serves to benefit our foreign adversaries at the expense of our own democratic institutions.
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XI. HUNTER BIDEN’S AND HIS FAMILY’S FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH UKRAINIAN, RUSSIAN, KAZAKH, AND CHINESE NATIONALS RAISE CRIMINAL CONCERNS AND EXTORTION THREATS.

Hunter Biden was paid as much as $50,000 per month to serve on the board of Burisma, a Ukrainian natural gas company with a corrupt owner, while his father was the public face of the Obama administration’s Ukraine policy. But Burisma was not the only example of Hunter Biden seeking to monetize his family name. During the course of our investigation, Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson uncovered additional examples of Hunter Biden, other family members, and their business associates pursuing financial arrangements with foreign nationals in various parts of the world.

The Treasury records acquired by the Chairmen show potential criminal activity relating to transactions among and between Hunter Biden, his family, and his associates with Ukrainian, Russian, Kazakh and Chinese nationals. In particular, these documents show that Hunter Biden received millions of dollars from foreign sources as a result of business relationships that he built during the period when his father was vice president of the United States and after. In addition to providing new and descriptive details about the nature, origin and extent of payments from Burisma Holdings to Hunter Biden, the documents acquired by the Committees also shed light on a much broader array of questionable financial transactions involving Hunter Biden, other members of the Biden family, and their associations with foreign nationals. These foreign nationals have questionable backgrounds that have been identified as being consistent with a range of criminal activities, including but not limited to organized prostitution and/or human trafficking, money laundering, fraud, and embezzlement.267

The following transactions are designed to illustrate the financial associations between and among subjects in the inquiry. Much has been reported about Hunter Biden and Devon Archer and their corporate entities and foreign and domestic financial associations. The transactions discussed below do not illustrate the full extent of the material the Committees possess. The transactions discussed below are designed to illustrate the depth and extent of some questionable financial transactions. Moreover, the financial transactions illustrate serious counterintelligence and extortion concerns relating to Hunter Biden and his family. The Committees will continue to analyze the records in their possession.


267 There is extensive public reporting concerning Hunter Biden’s alleged involvement with prostitution services. Records on file with the Committees do not directly confirm or refute these individual reports. However, they do confirm that Hunter Biden sent thousands of dollars to individuals who have either: 1) been involved in transactions consistent with possible human trafficking; 2) an association with the adult entertainment industry; or 3) potential association with prostitution. Some recipients of those funds are Ukrainian and Russian citizens. The records note that it is a documented fact that Hunter Biden has sent funds to non-resident alien women in the United States who are citizens of Russia and Ukraine and who have subsequently wired funds they have received from Hunter Biden to individuals located in Russia and Ukraine. The records also note that some of these transactions are linked to what “appears to be an Eastern European prostitution or human trafficking ring.”
a. **Burisma Holdings Limited**

On April 15, 2014, Burisma Holdings (Burisma), a Ukrainian private oil and gas company owned by corrupt Ukrainian oligarch Mykola Zlochevsky, sent two wires totaling $112,758.15 to Rosemont Seneca Bohai LLC. Rosemont Seneca Bohai is an apparent shell entity owned by Hunter Biden’s long-time business associate, Devon Archer, which was first registered in Delaware on Feb. 13, 2014.

According to Real Clear Politics, on the following day, April 16, 2014, Archer visited Vice President Biden at the White House. One week later, on April 22, 2014, Vice President Biden appeared with Ukrainian Prime Minister Arsemy Yasenyuk and addressed Ukrainian legislators in Kyiv regarding Russia’s actions in Crimea. That same day, Burisma announced that Archer had joined its board of directors. In the wake of Vice President Biden’s visit, the press described him as “the public face of the administration’s handling of Ukraine.”

The earliest payment from Burisma related to Hunter Biden appears to have been made to Boies, Schiller, and Flexner LLP (Boies Schiller), the Washington law firm where he was employed as a counsel in 2014. On May 7, 2014, mere weeks after Vice President Biden took lead of the Obama administration’s Ukraine policy, Burisma sent Boies Schiller a payment of $250,000. Approximately one week later, on May 12, 2014, Hunter Biden joined Archer on Burisma’s board of directors. Burisma made a second payment to Boies Schiller on Sept. 16, 2014, in the amount of $33,039.77. Both the May 7 and Sept. 16 payments state in the transaction notes that they were “for Legal and Consulting Services.”

---

268 CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT 1 (on file with Comms.).
269 See id.
275 Id.
277 CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT 2 (on file with Comms.).
278 Id.
Payments from Burisma to Boies Schiller have been the subject of past news reporting.279 According to Hunter Biden’s attorney, George Mesires, at Biden’s urging, Boies Schiller performed the following services for Burisma:

[E]ngaged Nardello & Co., a leading global investigative firm, to assess, among other things, Burisma’s corporate structure and government practices. Burisma agreed to pay the legal expenses of Boies Schiller to support Hunter in developing corporate reform initiatives.280

However, according to statements made at the time by both Hunter Biden and Burisma, these were Hunter Biden’s responsibilities as a member of Burisma’s board of directors. In a press release issued on May 12, 2014, Biden stated:

I believe that my assistance in consulting the Company on matters of transparency, corporate governance and responsibility, international expansion and other priorities will contribute to the economy and benefit the people of Ukraine.281

Alan Apter, the chairman of Burisma’s board of directors, also said “[t]he company’s strategy is aimed at the strongest concentration of professional staff and the introduction of best corporate practices, and we’re delighted that Mr. Biden is joining us to help us achieve these goals.” 282

It is unclear whether any of the funds sent from Burisma to Boies Schiller were used to pay for services that Hunter Biden was supposed to provide to Burisma as a member of the board. Additionally, if Burisma was paying Boies Schiller for consulting services provided by third-party firm Nardello & Co, as Mesires has indicated, it remains unclear why Hunter Biden did not provide or arrange those services himself, on his own time, in exchange for the compensation he was receiving from Burisma as a member of the board.

Between May 15, 2014 and Feb. 12, 2016, Burisma sent another 48 wires to Rosemont Seneca Bohai, totaling $3,489,490.78.283 Of the 48 transactions, 39 are described as “Consulting Services” and 39 of the 48 are in the amount of $83,333.33, with the last of the payments occurring on Feb. 12, 2016.284 Between June 5, 2014, and Oct. 5, 2015, Rosemont Seneca Bohai sent 38 wires totaling $701,979 to three of Hunter Biden’s bank accounts.285 These transfers
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may represent the final step in the flow of funds from Burisma to Rosemont Seneca Bohai to Biden during this period.

The nature of the payment arrangement between Biden and Burisma appears to have changed over time. In May 2016, Hunter Biden’s business partner, Archer, and five others were arrested and criminally charged in a scheme to defraud investors and a tribal entity of millions of dollars. Starting Jan. 25, 2016, Burisma began sending regular payments for Biden to his Washington law firm, Owasco PC (Owasco). Owasco was incorporated on Jan. 19, 2006, lists an agent address in Washington, and lists its executing officer and governor as Robert Hunter Biden.

Payments from Burisma to Owasco continued throughout most of 2016 and ceased eight days after Donald Trump defeated Hillary Clinton in the Nov. 8, 2016 presidential election. Between Jan. 25, 2016, and Nov. 16, 2016, Burisma sent nine wires totaling $752,054.99 to Owasco with each of the nine transactions listing “Owasco, PC/Robert Biden” as the recipient. Of the nine, two payments were for $83,333.33, five were for $83,333 one was for $84,992.33, and one was for $83,731. The records acquired by the Committees show the last documented payment was made on Nov. 16, 2016. Biden continued to serve on Burisma’s board of directors until April 2019.

In addition to being the owner of Burisma, Zlochevsky made at least two large cash transfers to Burisma during the time that Archer and Biden served on its board of directors. On April 30, 2014, around the dates when Archer and Hunter Biden first joined Burisma’s board of directors, Zlochevsky wired $12.3 million from another one of his companies, Brociti Investments Limited (Brociti), to Burisma. Brociti is based in Kyiv, Ukraine, and is registered in Limassol, Cyprus. Zlochevsky sent another wire from Brociti to Burisma on April 20, 2015, in the amount of $212,000. It’s unclear exactly how much, if any, of the funds wired by Zlochevsky on April 30, 2014, and April 20, 2015, were used to cover the payments made from Burisma to Rosemont Seneca, Owasco, and Boies Schiller. However, these transactions,
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including those to Biden and his companies, were identified for potential financial criminal activity.

b. **Russia**

Hunter Biden and his associate, Archer, had a financial relationship with Russian businesswoman Elena Baturina. Baturina is the former wife of the late Yuri Luzhkov, who was the mayor of Moscow and was fired in 2010 by then-Russian president Dmitry Medvedev over corruption allegations. Baturina became Russia’s only female billionaire when her plastics company, Inteko, received a series of Moscow municipal contracts while her husband was mayor. According to reporting, “Luzhkov used his position as mayor to approve over 20 real estate projects that were built by a Baturina-owned construction company and ultimately generated multibillion-ruble profits for his family.”

In addition, a Russian investigation led to a criminal case against the former head of the Bank of Moscow, Andrey Borodin, who “allegedly used money from the Moscow City Budget to lend money to shell companies, which ultimately transferred $443 million to Baturina.”

On Feb. 14, 2014, Baturina wired $3.5 million to a Rosemont Seneca Thornton LLC (Rosemont Seneca Thornton) bank account for a “Consultancy Agreement DD12.02.2014.” Rosemont Seneca Thornton is an investment firm co-founded by Hunter Biden that was incorporated on May 28, 2013 in Wilmington, Del. According to The Financial Times, Rosemont Seneca Thornton is a consortium that consists of Rosemont Seneca Partners and the Thornton Group, a Massachusetts-based firm. In June 2009, Biden co-founded Rosemont Seneca Partners with Archer and Christopher Heinz. The Thornton Group’s website states that it has offices in Boston and Beijing, lists Rosemont Seneca Partners among its list of alliances and clients, and includes photographs from multiple events attended by Hunter Biden.
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Separately, between May 6, 2015 and Dec. 8, 2015, Baturina sent 11 wires in the amount of $391,968.21 to a bank account belonging to BAK USA LLC (BAK USA).\(^{307}\) Nine of the 11 transactions, totaling $241,797.14 were sent from Baturina’s accounts to a Rosemont Seneca Thornton bank account, which then transferred to the money to BAK USA.\(^{308}\) The 11 transactions all listed “Loan Agreement” in the payment details section.\(^{309}\) BAK USA was a startup technology company headquartered in Buffalo, N.Y., that produced tablet computers in cooperation with unnamed Chinese business partners.\(^{310}\) BAK USA filed for bankruptcy on March 29, 2019, with a reported loss of $39 million.\(^{311}\) These transactions were identified because of Baturina’s reported criminal activity.

c. Kazakhstan

On April 22, 2014, Vice President Joe Biden appeared with Ukrainian Prime Minister Arsemy Yasenyuk and addressed Ukrainian legislators in Kyiv regarding Russia’s actions in Crimea.\(^{312}\) The same day, Novatus Holding PTE. LTD. (Novatus Holding), a private holding company in Singapore, used a Latvian bank to wire $142,300 to Archer’s company, Rosemont Seneca Bohai.\(^{313}\) The currency transaction report states, “For Rosemont Seneca Bohai LLC, … For a Car.”\(^{314}\)

According to a Securities and Exchange Commission report, Kenges Rakishev of Kazakhstan is the sole shareholder of Novatus Holding and has a business address associated with a company in Kazakhstan called SAT & Company.\(^{315}\) Rakishev is the son-in-law of now-retired Kazakhstan politician, Imangali Tasmagambetov.\(^{316}\) At the time that Rakishev sent the money to Rosemont Seneca Bohai, Tasmagambetov was serving as the mayor of Astana (now called Nur-Sultan), the capital city of Kazakhstan.\(^{317}\) Tasmagambetov is reportedly a longtime
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confidant of then-President Nursultan Nazarbayev. Tasmagambetov has since served as prime minister of Kazakhstan as well as Kazakh ambassador to Russia.

At the time of Vice President Biden’s visit to Kyiv, there were divided opinions in Kazakhstan over Russia’s annexation of Crimea and the international situation had produced tension in the region generally. Nazarbayev’s government reportedly shifted positions over time, and Nazarbayev reportedly made some statements supportive of Russia’s actions. Given Rakishev’s close connection to political leadership in Kazakhstan, the tense political situation, Hunter Biden’s longstanding relationship with Archer and involvement in transactions with Rosemont Seneca Bohai, and the fact that the payment was timed perfectly with Vice President Biden’s visit to Kyiv to discuss U.S. sanctions against Russia for the invasion of Crimea, the April 22, 2014 payment from Rakishev to Rosemont Seneca Bohai raises serious questions. It is unclear why a foreign company, Novatus Holding, would purchase a $142,300 car for Rosemont Seneca Bohai when the company does not deal in vehicles.

d. **China**

Hunter Biden and Devon Archer engaged in numerous financial transactions with Chinese nationals who had deep connections to the Communist Chinese government. These Chinese nationals included Ye Jianming, founder of CEFC China Energy Co. Ltd (CEFC) and chairman of the board for its subsidiary, the China Energy Fund Committee (CE Fund). They also included Gongwen Dong, who was Ye Jianming’s associate and reportedly executed transactions for his companies. Ye’s connections to the Communist government are extensive and, as explained below, he has been previous affiliations with the People’s Liberation Army. Based on the information received by the Committees, Ye was also financially connected to Vice President Biden’s brother, James Biden. Thus, there exists a vast web of corporate connections and financial transactions between and among the Biden family and Chinese nationals.

i. **Hunter Biden Has Extensive Financial Connections to the Chinese Government.**

Hunter Biden has extensive connections to Chinese businesses and Chinese foreign nationals that are linked to the Communist government. Those contacts bore financial fruit when his father was vice president and after he left office. For example, in June 2009, Hunter Biden had co-founded Rosemont Seneca Partners with Archer and Heinz. During 2010-2011, as a representative of Rosemont Seneca, Hunter Biden networked with representatives from Chinese state-owned enterprises and representatives of the Boston-based Thornton Group.
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which today describes itself as “a cross-border capital intermediary.” On its current website, the Thornton Group includes among its alliances and clients a variety of Chinese state-owned enterprises, including actors linked to Ye Jianming and his associates.

Ye Jianming is a Chinese businessman and a frequent figure in Hunter Biden’s financial dealings in China. Based on public reports that were available in 2015, when his contact with Biden began to ramp up, Ye was a founder of CEFC China Energy Co. Ltd (CEFC) and served as chairman of the board for its subsidiary, the China Energy Fund Committee (CE Fund). CEFC had a reported income estimated at $33.4 billion, according to 2013 figures that were available at the time. Although CEFC reportedly remained a private company until state-owned enterprises assumed control of it in 2018, reporting in 2017 indicated that it received financing from the China Development Bank, “hired a number of former top officials from state-owned energy companies” and had “layers of Communist Party committees across its subsidiaries — more than at many private Chinese companies.” Thus, it had significant connections to the Communist government and its subsidiaries had associations with the Thornton Group. For example, according to the Thornton Group’s website, its list of Chinese partners currently includes:

- the Agricultural Bank of China
- the Bank of Beijing
- the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade
- the Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs
- the CAIFC
- the China Electricity Council
- CITIC Group
- China Life
- the China State Construction Engineering Corporation
- the China Railway Construction Corporation
- the Council for Industrial and Commercial Development
- the Chinese International Economy Cooperation Association
- the China Mining Association
- the government-owned Founder Group
- the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China Limited
- and Peking University.

A Thornton Group press release dated April 12, 2010, provides an example of an early event in China involving Rosemont Seneca Partners and the Thornton Group. It states the following:

Thornton Group and its US partner Rosemont Seneca Chairman Hunter Biden (the second son of the US Vice President Joe Biden) and other high-level officials visited Chinese financial institutions.
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and fund companies from April 7th to 9th. Including China Investment Co., Ltd., National Council of Social Security Funds, China Life Asset Management Co., Ltd., Postal Savings Bank of China, Hillhouse Capital and Founder Group, etc., aiming to further deepen mutual understanding and explore the possibility of commercial cooperation and opportunity. The Chinese companies and financial institutions visited expressed a warm welcome to Thornton Group and Rosemont Seneca, and hoped to strengthen exchanges, in-depth discussions and reach cooperation.

The delegation was led by James Bulger, Chairman of Thornton Group, and Lin Junliang, Chief Executive Officer, to visit and meet Chinese personnel including: Gao Xiqing, General Manager and Chief Investment Officer of China Investment Corporation, Equity Assets Department (Industrial Investment Department) of the National Council of Social Security Fund person in charge Ji Guoqiang, Vice President Cui Yong of China Life Asset Management Co. Ltd., Peng Zuogang, General Manager of Postal Savings Bank of China, Zhang Lei, Founder of Hillhouse Capital, Wei Xin, Chairman of Founder Group, and Xia Yangjun, Vice President of Founder Group.  

Pictures from the event posted by the Thornton Group show Hunter Biden standing with the chairman of the Founder Group, general manager of the China Investment Corporation, the vice president of the China Life Asset Management Company, the general manager of the Postal Savings Bank, and others.

In 2012, Archer and Biden reportedly spoke with Jonathan Li of the Chinese private equity fund Bohai Capital about the possibility of forming a company, Bohai Harvest RST (Shanghai) Equity Investment Fund Management Co. (BHR), that would invest Chinese capital in companies outside of China. BHR was eventually formed as an investment fund and is reportedly “controlled and funded primarily by large Chinese government-owned shareholders” and is 80% controlled by Chinese entities. That list of entities includes the government’s postal savings bank, with which Hunter Biden had networked in 2011, its main development bank, as well as the Bank of China. Hunter Biden served on its board of directors and
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“joined based on his interest in seeking ways to bring Chinese capital to international markets.” He served unpaid but reportedly acquired a 10% stake in the company in 2017. Prior to its creation, in December 2013 and one month after the shareholders signed contracts relating to the creation of the company, Hunter Biden reportedly flew aboard Air Force Two with then-Vice President Biden to Beijing. While in China, Hunter Biden reportedly helped arrange for Li to “shake hands” with Vice President Biden. Afterward, Hunter Biden met with Li for what was reportedly a “social meeting.” After the China trip, BHR’s business license was reportedly approved.

In September 2014, BHR had become a private equity shareholder in Sinopec Chemical Commercial Holding Company Limited, a subsidiary of Sinopec. Sinopec is reportedly the second largest oil and gas company in China and the largest refiner of oil in Asia. In 2016, Ye announced at a board meeting that he wanted CEFC “to become a second Sinopec … by acquiring global assets and consolidating ‘teapot’ [independent] refineries.” Hunter Biden’s position of influence and connections to Chinese business interests, which were further strengthened while his father was vice president, most likely appealed to Ye, a man who The New York Times has since described as “[wanting] access to the corridors of power in Washington.”

BHR’s extensive connections to Chinese government intertwined its existence with the decision-making of Communist party rulers. For example, the China Development Bank (CDB) is one member of a consortium that controls 30% of BHR. Other members of that particular consortium are the government’s postal savings bank and the Bank of China. Importantly, the CDB appears to have been connected to Ye Jianming’s CEFC. Records acquired by the Committees note that, according to reports, after CEFC and Ye fell out of favor with the Chinese government in 2018, “at the orders of President Xi Jinping, China Development Bank abruptly pulled its lines of credit on offshore bonds for CEFC[.]” Moreover, the former chairman of the CDB, Hu Huaibang, was accused in a 2018 court case of helping a CEFC subsidiary to obtain billions in financing during his time at the CDB and of
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channeling bribes on behalf of Ye while serving in a previous position at the Bank of Communications, another Chinese government entity.\textsuperscript{347}

Hunter Biden’s business associations in China were not limited to investment funds like BHR and those additional connections created questionable associations with Communist government elements. For example, in 2015, while his father was vice president, Hunter Biden reportedly met with an aide to Ye.\textsuperscript{348} In addition to the Communist government, Ye also had reported connections and affiliations to the People’s Liberation Army (PLA).\textsuperscript{349} For example, from 2003 to 2005, Ye reportedly served as deputy secretary general of the China Association for International Friendly Contacts (CAIFC), which is the public name for the PLA General Political Department’s International Liaison Department.\textsuperscript{350} Additionally, in 2014, under Ye’s leadership, CE Fund had co-organized events with the China Huayi Broadcasting Corporation (CHBC), a company incorporated by the PLA General Political Department.\textsuperscript{351} The CEO of CHBC, Wang Shu, was commander of the PLA General Political Department base “[a]t the forefront of applied psychological operations and propaganda directed against Taiwan,” which was managed by a training center that was funded by a subsidiary of CEFC.\textsuperscript{352} The general manager of that subsidiary, Lan Huasheng, was deputy secretary general of Ye’s CE Fund.\textsuperscript{353} Wang reportedly attended the 2014 CE Fund and CHBC event along with Xu Jialu, a man who was associated with the PLA’s CAIFC as well as CE Fund and China’s Confucius Institutes.\textsuperscript{354} Huasheng served as executive director of CE Fund’s China Institute of Culture Limited (CIOC), “a nationally supported organization in charge of ‘promoting Chinese culture.’”\textsuperscript{355} Accordingly, Ye and his associates had robust relationships with China’s military units, some of which were involved in matters in direct opposition to U.S. policy in the region.
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It is unclear whether Hunter Biden was aware of Ye’s close relationship with the PLA or involvement in efforts to develop and spread Chinese propaganda at the time of his 2015 meeting with Ye’s associate. However, public reporting did make those connections.\(^{356}\)

Hunter Biden’s connections with Ye continued into the summer of 2017, when he met with Ye while soliciting donations for World Food Program USA in his capacity as a member of its board of directors.\(^{357}\) At the time, Ye continued to operate the CE Fund, which has since been found to have engaged in criminal activities.\(^{358}\) During their interactions in 2017, Hunter Biden reportedly agreed to assist Ye by using his contacts to help Ye locate potential investments for CEFC in the United States.\(^{359}\) In keeping with that agreement, after meeting Ye, Hunter Biden stated that he began working on a deal for Ye that involved a $40 million investment in a natural gas project on Monkey Island in Louisiana that reportedly fell through the following year.\(^{360}\) Around the same time that Hunter Biden began this work, Ye raised concerns with Hunter Biden that one of his associates, Patrick Ho, was under investigation by U.S. law enforcement.\(^{361}\) Hunter Biden subsequently agreed to represent Ho.\(^{362}\)

On Sept. 8, 2017, a $9.1 billion deal was announced whereby Ye’s company, CEFC, would acquire a stake in the state-owned Russian energy company, Rosneft.\(^{363}\) Ye’s efforts to acquire a stake in Rosneft appear fully consistent with his vision of turning CEFC into a “second Sinopec” with holdings across the world.\(^{364}\)

**ii. Hunter Biden and his Family had Extensive Financial Connections to Ye Jianming, Gongwen Dong and other Chinese Nationals.**

On the same day that the impending Rosneft deal was announced, Hunter Biden and Gongwen Dong, a Chinese national who has reportedly executed transactions for limited liability companies controlled by Ye Jianming, applied to a bank and opened a line of credit under the business name Hudson West III LLC (Hudson West III).\(^{365}\) Hunter Biden, James Biden, and James Biden’s wife, Sara Biden, were all authorized users of credit cards associated with the
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The Bidens subsequently used the credit cards they opened to purchase $101,291.46 worth of extravagant items, including airline tickets and multiple items at Apple Inc. stores, pharmacies, hotels and restaurants. The cards were collateralized by transferring $99,000 from a Hudson West III account to a separate account, where the funds were held until the cards were closed. The transaction was identified for potential financial criminal activity. The Committees prepared the following chart which displays transactions related to the line of credit:

Hudson West III was incorporated on April 19, 2016, more than a year before the credit cards were issued. Hudson West III, which is now dissolved, changed ownership at some unknown point. After that change, ownership was divided between Hunter Biden’s law firm, Owasco PC (50%) and Coldharbour Capital LLC (50%). Although ownership in Coldharbour Capital is equally divided between two individuals, Mervyn Yan and Tian Zhang, it has a business address identified as the address of Gongwen Dong. According to records on file with the Committees, Hudson West III checking accounts were opened on Aug. 3, 2017, and Sept. 6, 2017, with Yan and Robert Hunter Biden. Gongwen Dong was a former signer, which suggests that at one time he was associated with Hudson West III’s bank accounts and finances.
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On Aug. 4, 2017, CEFC Infrastructure Investment (US) LLC, a subsidiary of Ye Jianming’s CEFC China Energy Company that listed Gongwen Dong as its director, sent Hunter Biden’s law firm, Owasco, a payment for $100,000.375 This transaction was identified for potential criminal financial activity.376 One of the investment entities of CEFC Infrastructure Investment is reportedly Shanghai Huaxin Group, a Chinese state-owned enterprise “engaged in petroleum products.”377 That company is owned by CEFC Shanghai International Group Ltd., which is controlled by Shanghai Guosheng Group, another state-owned enterprise.378 According to reporting, CEFC Shanghai was a CEFC subsidiary linked to the aforementioned corruption allegations involving the head of the China Development Bank.379 These examples further illustrate the deep financial connections between Biden, Owasco, and the Chinese government.

On Aug. 8, 2017, CEFC Infrastructure Investment wired $5 million to the bank account for Hudson West III.380 These funds may have originated from a loan issued from the account of a company called Northern International Capital Holdings, a Hong Kong-based investment company identified at one time as a “substantial shareholder” in CEFC International Limited along with Ye.381 It is unclear whether Hunter Biden was half-owner of Hudson West III at that time. However, starting on Aug. 8, the same day the $5 million was received, and continuing through Sept. 25, 2018, Hudson West III sent frequent payments to Owasco, Hunter Biden’s firm.382 These payments, which were described as consulting fees, reached $4,790,375.25 in just over a year.383

There are conflicting explanations for an additional $1 million sent to Hudson West III by CEFC Limited Foundation (CEFC Limited) on Nov. 2, 2017, that appears to have been refunded to CEFC Limited on Nov. 21, 2017 with a memo marked “refund.”384 According to records on file with the Committees:

[Records indicated that] ‘CEFC paid the consultation fee to HW III for the purpose of conducting a market investigation of [a] natural gas project; however, the project was deemed unnecessary at the time so CEFC Limited decided to postpone the market investigation. Therefore, HW III provided the refund to CEFC Limited’. In another email correspondence dated 4/2/2018, Mr. Biden stated that the incoming wire amounting to $1MM on 11/2/2017 from CEFC Limited foundation should have gone to Owasco LLC, however, he provided the wrong wire instructions, and due to the large amount
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the transactions was not corrected until 3/22/2018, which consisted of an outgoing wire for the same amount benefiting Owasco LLC.385

On March 22, 2018, a $1 million payment was sent from Hudson West III to Owasco with a memo line for “Dr Patrick Ho Chi Ping Representation.”386 In his alternative explanation, Hunter Biden indicated that the misdirected $1 million was related to his representation of Ye’s associate, Patrick Ho.387 These transactions illustrate the financial connections between Gongwen Dong’s Hudson West III, Ye Jianming’s CEFC, and Hunter Biden’s Owasco. Biden stated that:

Boies Schiller Flexner is co-counsel for Dr. Patrick Ho’s case. Hudson West III LLC has no involvement with Patrick Ho Chi Ping’s case and won’t expect further transaction related to Dr. Patrick Ho Chi Ping trial for Hudson West III LLC. Owasco LLC and co- Counsel Boies Schiller Flexner will represent Dr. Patrick Ho Chi Ping trial.388

During the same period, there is also evidence that Hunter Biden moved large sums of money from his firm, Owasco, to James Biden’s consulting firm, the Lion Hall Group.389 Between Aug. 14, 2017 and Aug. 3, 2018, Owasco sent 20 wires totaling $1,398,999 to the Lion Hall Group, a consulting firm that lists James Biden and his wife, Sara Biden, on the bank account.390 This transaction was identified for potential criminal financial activity. These transfers began less than one week after CEFC Infrastructure Investment wired $5 million to Hudson West III and Hudson West III sent its first payment of $400,000 to Owasco.391 Most of the payments from Owasco to the Lion Hall Group had vague notes in the memo lines, 15 of which simply indicated that they were for further credit to James Biden; however, the memo line for one of the payments read “HW3,” which indicates some of the transferred money could be from Hudson West III.392 When the bank contacted Sara Biden regarding the overall wire activity, she stated that the Lion Hall Group and Owasco provide international and business consulting and that the Lion Hall Group was assisting Owasco with an international client through a contract that had since terminated.393 Sara Biden told the bank that she would not provide any supporting documentation, and she also refused to provide additional information to more clearly explain the activity.394 Consequently, the bank submitted the account for closure.395 The Committees created the following chart with respect to this transaction.
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Hudson West III also sent funds directly to the Lion Hall Group. According to records on file with the Committees, James B. Biden is the principal contact for the Lion Hall Group, and between January 2018 and October 2018, Hudson West III sent the Lion Hall Group outgoing wires totaling $76,746.15 with the memo, “office expense and reimbursement.” These transactions illustrate a direct financial link between Hudson West III (which was connected to CEFC, the Chinese government, and Gongwen Dong) and James Biden.

On Aug. 17, 2017, three days after the first transfer from Owasco to The Lion Hall Group, it was publicly announced that Ye’s CEFC Energy was in talks to purchase a stake in the Russian state-owned energy company Rosneft, which, as noted, later fell through.

Around the same time, there were also outgoing wires from Hudson West III to various accounts associated with Ye and Gongwen, including CEFC Infrastructure Investment, Coldharbour Capital (located at Gongwen Dong’s address), Gongwen’s personal bank account, a separate bank account for Hudson West V, and Bo Jian Group Investment Company (a company with a complex ownership structure controlled by Ye in which Gongwen Dong is also reportedly a part owner). These transactions and the transacting entities begin to paint a mosaic of the complex corporate structure that existed between entities linked to Hunter Biden and his associates and family and Chinese companies linked to the Communist government.

iii. **Financial Transactions by these Companies Illustrate a Complex Web of Corporate Entities, Money Transfers and Potential Criminal Financial Activity.**

The Committees were able to confirm that Hunter Biden’s associate, Gongwen Dong, is connected to seven of the eight numbered Hudson West corporate entities. The exception is
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Hudson West II; however, that entity shares a permanent mailing address with Hudson West V, which has a bank account that is connected to Gongwen. Thus, it appears that Hudson West II is most likely connected to him. The Hudson West entities are important entities in the flow of funds among and between Ye, Gongwen, and Hunter Biden and his associates. There are frequent fund transfers across these numbered Hudson West entities, and transactions involving all eight have been identified for potential criminal financial activity. For example, Hudson West III was not the only Hudson West entity associated with CEFC, Ye’s business. According to reporting, Hudson West V maintains an ownership interest in CEFC Infrastructure Investment, a subsidiary of CEFC. By extension, this means Hudson West V is linked to Ye and the aforementioned $5 million payment to Hudson West III on Aug. 8, 2017. Hudson West V also reportedly had ownership in a series of other companies: Hudson West Partners LLC, Hudson West Aggregator LLC, Hudson West VIII LLC, and Hudson West VII LLC which begins to show the complex corporate structure at play.

Between July 2017 and November 2018, Hudson West V received wires totaling $20,310,396.79 with $20,893,505.07 leaving that same account. All but $259,845 of the total amount transferred out of the account went to U.S. bank accounts for various LLCs, most of which were documented to be involved in the business of real estate investment and management. Several of those LLCs are also tied to Gongwen.

Twenty million dollars of the $20,310,396.79 going into the aforementioned Hudson West V US account was transferred into that account from another Hudson West V account at the Bank of China. Between Feb. 9, 2017, and April 12, 2017, a Hudson West V Bank of China account received three incoming wires totaling $27,917,665.45 from an entity called Kaiyan US Fund III LP and one wire for $100,000 from a company called Foxwood Asset Management Co. Limited. Both Kaiyan US Fund III LP and Foxwood Asset Management Co Limited have addresses in Beijing. On March 19, 2018, Kaiyan US Fund III LP also sent one wire for $50,551.79 directly to a different account for Hudson West V, which is included in the aforementioned $20,310,396.79 total of incoming wires for that account.

These transactions offer a window into a much larger web of transactions carried out among a vast network of corporate entities, many with complex ownership structures, variously owned and operated by Gongwen Dong, Ye Jianming, an individual named Shan Gao, and other individuals associated with CEFC China energy, Chinese state-owned enterprises, and unknown
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individuals based primarily in China. Little is known about Shan Gao, other than the fact that banks found her, through complex ownership structures, to be the owner of multiple entities involved in the transactions. For multiple entities involved in these transactions, banks were not able to determine ownership at all.

As an example of the size and scope of the networks involving Gongwen, between Oct. 23, 2017, and Dec. 20, 2018, Hudson West I, for which Gongwen is also listed as an account signer, received incoming wires totaling over $114 million and sent outgoing wires totaling over $113 million. Between Jan. 25, 2018, and Dec. 28, 2018, Hudson West Aggregator, another LLC associated with Gongwen that was involved in three transactions with Hudson West V, received incoming transfers totaling more than $3 million and sent outgoing transfers totaling more than $13 million. Records examining these transactions by Gongwen and his associates explained:

We opt to include wires, which appear to be conducted for investment purposes, as we believe that fund movement is ultimately conducted in an effort to layer funds. Conclusion: Unusual movement of funds between various entities with a complex ownership structures, at times involving funds originating from Chinese [state-owned enterprises] SOE, Chinese based entities registered with [a] high-risk tax heaven country, and [politically exposed persons] PEPs. It is to note that fund movement appears to be an effort to introduce foreign funds from unknown sources into in [sic] the U.S. by investing in large projects and by purchasing luxury goods and properties. Total [] filing amounts to $902,200,297.

Certain transactions involving Hudson West III, CEFC Infrastructure, and Hudson West V were among those identified as potential efforts to layer funds.
iv. **Chinese Nationals Linked with Hunter Biden Faced Criminal Probes.**

In November 2017, Ye Jianming’s associate and Hunter Biden’s reported client, Patrick Ho, was arrested and charged with violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, international money laundering, and conspiracy to commit both. The first call that he reportedly made was to James Biden, who reportedly referred him to Hunter Biden. Ho was convicted in March 2019 on charges of money laundering, conspiracy, and violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and was sentenced to three years in U.S. prison for his role in a multimillion-dollar scheme to bribe officials in Chad and Uganda in exchange for business advantages for CEFC, Ye’s company. Department of Justice documents describe Ye as Patrick Ho’s boss and, again, note that Ye’s company supplied funding to the China Energy Fund Committee. Ho worked as the secretary-general of the committee during the period when he was carrying out his illegal schemes.

In February 2018, it was reported that Ye was also under investigation in China for “suspected economic crimes.” Ye was subsequently detained, and to date, there have been no reports of his release.

Shortly thereafter, on May 4, 2018, there were reports that the deal for CEFC to purchase a stake in Rosneft had fallen through. The credit cards used by the Bidens for the $100,000 spending spree were closed the same month, and the last payments for the account were made on May 25, 2018. It is not clear who made the fund transfer payments that were used to cover the charges.

After Ye was detained by the Chinese government in February 2018, there were reports that Shanghai Guosheng Group, a Chinese agency reportedly controlled by Shanghai’s municipal government, had taken over management and daily operations at CEFC. Additionally, in
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March 2018, it was announced that the Chinese state-owned enterprise Citic Group was negotiating to take a stake of up to 49 percent in CEFC’s European unit.\textsuperscript{426} Again, Citic is listed among the Chinese partners and alliances of the Thornton group.\textsuperscript{427} Following these Chinese government takeovers, the payments from Hudson West III to Owasco appear to have continued through September 2018.\textsuperscript{428}

e. Conclusion

The records acquired by the Committees show that Hunter Biden and his family were involved in a vast financial network that connected them to foreign nationals and foreign governments across the globe. Hunter Biden and Archer, in particular, formed significant and consistent financial relationships with the corrupt oligarch Mykola Zlochevsky during their time working for Burisma and their firms made millions of dollars from that association while Joe Biden was vice president and the public face of the Obama administration’s Ukraine policy. Rosemont Seneca Thornton, an investment firm co-founded by Hunter Biden, received $3.5 million in a wire transfer from Elena Baturina, who allegedly received illegal construction contracts from her husband, the former mayor of Moscow. Moreover, Archer’s apparent receipt of money for a car from Kenges Rakishev of Kazakhstan while Vice President Biden was in Kyiv is especially concerning in light of the timing. And finally, Biden and Archer’s work with Chinese nationals connected to the Communist regime illustrate the deep financial connections that accelerated while his father was vice president and continued after he left office.

Biden and Archer found willing partners in Chinese nationals connected to the Communist regime. Their work in China began at least in 2009, with the creation of Rosemont Seneca Partners with Heinz, Secretary of State John Kerry’s stepson. Then, several years later, Biden and Archer formed BHR with Bohai Capital and received their business license approval in China shortly after Biden visited China with his father, Vice President Biden.

Hunter Biden’s connections and financial associations appear to have accelerated significantly after he associated himself with Ye Jianming, who had deep connections with the Communist regime and PLA. However, that didn’t seem to have any impact on Hunter Biden, who made millions from the relationship. Indeed, Hunter Biden and his family, to include James and Sara Biden, associated with other Chinese nationals such as Gongwen Dong. In one case, the three of them went on a $100,000 global spending spree after Gongwen Dong and Hunter Biden opened a joint account. In addition, Hunter Biden received millions of dollars over a period of years from Gongwen Dong’s companies. According to records acquired by the Committees, many of these transactions involved potential criminal financial activity.

The records acquired by the Committees show consistent, significant and extensive financial connections among and between Hunter Biden, James Biden, Sara Biden, Devon Archer, and Chinese nationals connected to the Communist regime and PLA as well as other foreign nationals with questionable backgrounds. These connections and the vast amount of
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money transferred among and between them don’t just raise conflicts of interest concerns, they raise criminal financial, counterintelligence and extortion concerns. The Committees will continue to evaluate the evidence in their possession.
XII. CONCLUSION.

As the Chairmen’s report details, Hunter Biden’s role on Burisma’s board negatively impacted the efforts of dedicated career-service individuals who were fighting to push for anticorruption measures in Ukraine. Because the vice president’s son had a direct link to a corrupt company and its owner, State Department officials were required to maintain situational awareness of Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma. Unfortunately, U.S. officials had no other choice but to endure the “awkward[ness]” of continuing to push an anticorruption agenda in Ukraine while the vice president’s son sat on the board of a Ukrainian company with a corrupt owner. As George Kent testified, he “would have advised any American not to get on the board of Zlochevsky’s company.”429 Yet, even though Hunter Biden’s position on Burisma’s board cast a shadow over the work of those advancing anticorruption reforms in Ukraine, the Committees are only aware of two individuals who raised concerns to their superiors. Despite the efforts of these individuals, their concerns appear to have fallen on deaf ears.

Former Secretary Kerry’s December 2019 denial of having any knowledge about Hunter Biden or Burisma is inconsistent with the evidence uncovered by the Committees. Kerry was briefed about Hunter Biden, Burisma and Christopher Heinz the day after Burisma announced Hunter Biden joined its board. Additionally, Secretary Kerry’s senior advisor sent him press clips and articles relating to Hunter Biden’s board membership. This appears to be yet another example of high-ranking Obama administration officials blatantly ignoring Hunter Biden’s association with Burisma.

Several witnesses highlighted efforts to enable a successful investigation of Zlochevsky, and also noted that the U.S. decision to condition a $1 billion loan guarantee was made in part because of the then-Ukrainian prosecutor general’s failure to pursue a case against Zlochevsky. But at the end of the day, between 2014 through 2017, despite the concerted effort of many U.S. officials, not one of the three different Ukrainian prosecutor generals held Zlochevsky accountable.

The Obama administration and the Democrat lobby shop Blue Star Strategies had consistent and extensive contact with Andrii Telizhenko over a period of years. Yet despite these well-documented contacts with Democratic officials, Democrats have attempted to impugn this investigation for having received some Blue Star-related records from Telizhenko. Some Democrats have even (incorrectly) identified Telizhenko as the Committees’ “star witness.”430 Although he produced a small number of Blue Star-related records to the Committees, the Committees never interviewed him as part of this investigation.431

429 George Kent Testimony at 110.
431 The Committees received a small number of records from Telizhenko related to his communications with and subsequent work for Blue Star Strategies. Ranking Member Peters and Ranking Member Wyden have access to these records but have refused to receive or review them. Had they done so, they would have observed that the State Department, National Archives, and Blue Star Strategies (after it received a subpoena) produced most of the same records to the Committees. They also would have noticed the emails and text messages that Blue Star failed to produce to the Committees.
Even though almost all of the Committees’ records are from U.S. agencies and U.S. officials or persons, Democrats have repeatedly misconstrued the facts of this investigation and have smeared it as a Russian disinformation campaign. In doing so, they conveniently have ignored their own long history of meeting with Telizhenko and his yearlong work for a Democrat lobby shop. If Democrats are concerned that Telizhenko presents any risk of advancing disinformation, it is notable that the Ranking Members have not expressed any curiosity about his work with the Obama administration or Blue Star Strategies.

The records acquired by the Committees also show that Hunter Biden and his family were involved in a vast financial network that connected them to foreign nationals and foreign governments across the globe. Hunter Biden and Devon Archer, in particular, formed significant and consistent financial relationships with the corrupt oligarch Mykola Zlochevsky during their time working for Burisma, and their firms made millions of dollars from that association while Joe Biden was vice president and the public face of the Obama administration’s Ukraine policy. Rosemont Seneca Thornton, an investment firm co-founded by Hunter Biden, received $3.5 million in a wire transfer from Elena Baturina, who allegedly received illegal construction contracts from her husband, the then-mayor of Moscow. Moreover, Archer’s apparent receipt of money for a car from Kenges Rakishev of Kazakhstan while Vice President Biden was in Kyiv is especially concerning in light of the timing. And finally, Biden and Archer’s work with Chinese nationals connected to the Communist regime illustrate the deep financial connections that accelerated while Joe Biden was vice president and continued after he left office.

The Chairmen’s investigation has faced many obstacles from the minority and from executive agencies that have failed to comply with document requests. Accordingly, there remains much work to be done.