

JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
CHAIRMAN

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
JERROLD NADLER, New York
ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Virginia
MELVIN L. WATT, North Carolina
ZOE LOFGREN, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
MAXINE WATERS, California
WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
PEDRO, PIERLUISI, Puerto Rico
MIKE QUIGLEY, Illinois
LUIS V. GUTIERREZ, Illinois
BRAD SHERMAN, California
TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin
CHARLES A. GONZALEZ, Texas
ANTHONY D. WEINER, New York
ADAM B. SCHIFF, California
DANIEL B. MAFFEI, New York
LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida

LAMAR S. SMITH, Texas
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Wisconsin
HOWARD COBLE, North Carolina
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California
DARRELL E. ISSA, California
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
STEVE KING, Iowa
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
LOUIE GOHMERT, Texas
JIM JORDAN, Ohio
TED POE, Texas
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
THOMAS ROONEY, Florida
GREGG HARPER, Mississippi

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6216

(202) 225-3951

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary>

August 28, 2009

The Honorable Christopher J. Christie
Former United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey
46 Corey Lane
Mendham, NJ 07945-3309

Dear Mr. Christie:

The Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Commercial and Administrative Law is in receipt of your letter, dated August 20, 2009, responding to the Subcommittee's follow-up questions to your testimony at the hearing on June 25, 2009 entitled "Accountability, Transparency, and Uniformity in Corporate Deferred and Non-Prosecution Agreements."

I was a bit surprised at your view that answering most of the questions was unnecessary in light of your written statement and oral testimony. A witness' statements, testimony, and answers to questions are required by law to be accurate. Follow-up questions provide an important opportunity for both Subcommittee Members and witnesses to clarify and supplement testimony provided at a hearing. This helps ensure a complete and factually accurate record, while avoiding the necessity of keeping witnesses at the hearing for successive rounds of questioning or bringing them back for successive days of hearings.

The cooperation of our witnesses is essential to our efforts to accomplish that goal, which is in not only the Subcommittee's interest, but the witnesses' interest as well. We would think that, as someone who asked for the Subcommittee's indulgence regarding your unusual time constraints on that day, leaving before even one round of questioning could be completed, you would be particularly appreciative of those efforts.

Given your background as a U.S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey who prominently used deferred and non-prosecution agreements as tools to dispense with corporate prosecutions, you were a key witness, whose answers we expected would be of particular benefit in helping inform the Subcommittee as it considers whether or not to reform the use of these tools.

The Honorable Christopher J. Christie
Page Two
August 28, 2009

So the manner in which you responded is particularly unsatisfactory. For all but two of the questions, you responded with a general assertion that the questions were answered in your oral and written testimony. At times you cited page numbers in the unofficial hearing transcript, which on further inspection appear not to contain anything responsive, and which in any event will be confusing to those who will have only the official published hearing record, of which your letter will be a part. Finally, even for the two questions for which you provided answers, the answers are incomplete.

I would respectfully request that you carefully review the questions submitted and provide complete answers to each of them. As considerable time has now passed, I would ask that you provide your answers no later than September 4, 2009. Responses and any questions should be directed to the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law office, H2-362 Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 (tel: 202-226-7680; fax: 202-225-3746).

Sincerely,



Steve Cohen
Chairman

Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law

cc: The Honorable Trent Franks

Enclosure

Questions for the Record
Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law
Hearing on Accountability, Transparency, and Uniformity in Corporate Deferred and
Non-Prosecution Agreements
June 25, 2009

The Honorable Christopher J. Christie, Former United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey

Questions from the Honorable Steve Cohen, Chairman

- 1. In an email from Zimmer attorney Rick Robinson to you on October 17, 2007, Mr. Robinson states that “the parties have reached an impasse on certain key issues.” The first issue he mentions is the “Flat Fee Provision.”**
 - A. How do you reconcile that email with your written statement on page 7, where you state: “Intervention by the Office would only occur if the company and the monitor were at a genuine impasse in fee negotiations. No such impasse occurred.”**
 - B. Under what circumstances would you have considered a dispute between a monitor and a corporation to have reached a “genuine impasse”? Who makes such a determination? Please explain.**

- 2. In an e-mail on October 15, 2007 from Zimmer attorney Rick Robinson to Michele Brown in the New Jersey U.S. Attorney’s Office, Zimmer’s attorney indicates that he is “shocked by the proposed fee agreement.” Two days later in an October 17, 2007 email from Mr. Robinson to you, he further states that the proposed fee agreement would require “Zimmer pay to the Ashcroft Group a monthly flat fee of \$750,000 as compensation for the time of its three senior executives: General Ashcroft, David Ayres and Stacy Taylor. ... We believe that this request, in both concept and amount, is unreasonable.”**
 - A. How did you respond to the October 17, 2007 email from Mr. Robinson? Please explain.**
 - B. Did you raise the conflict between Zimmer and the Ashcroft Group over fees with anyone in the Justice Department, including staff of the New Jersey U.S. Attorney’s Office? Please provide the dates of communications, who participated in the communications, and the content of the communications.**
 - C. How was the impasse regarding fees between Zimmer and the Ashcroft Group resolved?**

- D. In your view, was Zimmer forced to accede to the Ashcroft Group's demands on fees because Zimmer had no other avenue to challenge what they considered to be an unjustified fee?**
 - E. Did any other corporations that entered into a deferred or non-prosecution agreement ever raise concerns to you or your staff about the fees charged by the monitor you selected? Please list the corporations and describe the nature of the concerns.**
 - F. What opportunity did Zimmer or the other corporations that entered into deferred or non-prosecution agreements with the New Jersey U.S. Attorney's Office have to appeal or object to any of Mr. Ashcroft's or the other monitors' decisions regarding monitor fees or implementation of the deferred or non-prosecution agreement?**
 - G. Should a disinterested third party rather than the Department of Justice be available to resolve disputes and impasses between monitors and corporations in deferred and non-prosecution agreements? Please explain.**
 - H. Should monitor fees be standardized or capped at particular rates? Do you support a fee schedule? Please explain.**
- 3. In an October 17, 2007 email to you, Mr. Robinson also criticized the lack of transparency with respect to the Ashcroft Group's bills, writing that the bills contained "absolutely no detail regarding the number of hours spent, what tasks were performed to justify the aggregate fee or who performed those tasks."**
- A. How did you respond to Zimmer's complaint?**
 - B. In order to promote transparency, should monitors be required to provide detailed billing records to justify fees?**
 - C. Do you believe the Ashcroft Group's billing method justifying millions of dollars of fees was appropriate?**
 - D. What role should the Justice Department have in assuring that monitor billing is transparent?**
- 4. For the seven deferred and non-prosecution agreements that the U.S. Attorney's Office in the District of New Jersey entered into during your tenure as U.S. Attorney, how were the monitors selected?**
- A. Did you unilaterally select the monitors?**

- B. Was there public notice or bidding prior to the selection?
 - C. What was the basis for your selection?
 - D. Please name all of candidates considered for each monitorship.
 - E. How did you determine which monitor would be assigned to which company?
 - F. What reporting requirements were in place for each federal monitor appointed?
 - G. What criteria were used to ensure that monitors completed all of their responsibilities under the deferred or non-prosecution agreement?
 - H. What performance standards and oversight were used to ensure the monitors were doing their job?
5. With respect to the selection of corporate monitors, you stated in your law review article that the monitor should be strong and independent. Can a monitor truly be either strong or independent if he or she had a longstanding prior relationship with one of the parties to a deferred or non-prosecution agreement?
- A. What was the nature of your relationship with Mr. Ashcroft at the time that you recommended him to be the monitor in the Zimmer case? What was the nature of your relationship with the other monitors you selected?
 - B. In light of your position that a corporate monitor should be strong and independent, how do you justify the selection of your former superior, Mr. Ashcroft, to be a monitor in the Zimmer case?
6. Prior to your appointment as U.S. Attorney, did you have any experience as a prosecutor or criminal defense attorney? Did you have any prior experience in formulating pre-trial diversion agreements like deferred or non-prosecution agreements?
- How did you know which provisions should be in the agreements?
7. You testified that Herbert Stern was the only monitor that you appointed who subsequently donated money to your gubernatorial campaign.

- A. Did any members of the monitors' firms contribute to your campaign? If so, please identify the individual and the total amount contributed.**

- B. Did family members of any of the monitors contribute to your campaign? If so, please identify the individual and the total amount contributed.**