
From: Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)
To: Burton, Faith (SMO)
CC: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Sent: 4/28/2011 3:39:16 PM
Subject: RE: Do we know for a fact that Issa staff have contacted "witnesses" rather than just the one cw we've discussed?

On "witnesses" vs. "witness," we only know for sure that staff has contacted one witness (a cooperating FFL). We also can strongly infer that they have had contact with another witness (another cooperating FFL) because a # of the docs attached to one of Issa's letters could only have come from him.

From: Burton, Faith (SMO)
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2011 3:31 PM
To: Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)
Cc: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: RE: Do we know for a fact that Issa staff have contacted "witnesses" rather than just the one cw we've discussed?

Also, do we know whether Issa staff allowed the ATF attorney to attend today's interviews? Ok to wait on that if you can't get the answer in the same phone call with AZ. Thanks.

From: Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2011 3:30 PM
To: Burton, Faith (SMO)
Cc: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: RE: Do we know for a fact that Issa staff have contacted "witnesses" rather than just the one cw we've discussed?

I'm checking.

From: Burton, Faith (SMO)
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2011 3:29 PM
To: Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)
Cc: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: Do we know for a fact that Issa staff have contacted "witnesses" rather than just the one cw we've discussed?

Note that the DAG's draft refers to "witnesses" in the 2nd line of 1st para and 3rd line of 2nd para. Is it plural?