

Combining Appeals Across FY

- NARA Massive FOIA Fraud
- Decertify FOIA.gov
- DOJ OIP Cannot Accept NARA FY22 Annual FOIA Report
- Administrative Procedures Act Sanctions

December 31, 2022

by

Robert (Bob) Hammond, foiacompliance@gmail.com

[@foiacompliance](https://twitter.com/foiacompliance) (Twitter)

Copy to:

United States Associate Attorney General Vanita Gupta

Attorney General Merrick Garland

Designed by pngtree

OUTLINE

- [Preface – NARA FOIA Misconduct, combining multiple appeals across FY – No individualized tracking number](#)
- [Administrative Procedures Act – Judicial Review](#)
- [Recommendations](#)
- [Email FW: Second Installment Massive NARA FOIA Fraud](#)
- [RE: Freedom of Information Act Request NGC23-26A](#)
- [RE: Freedom of Information Act Request NGC23-27A](#)
- [Hammond Public Comments](#)

PREFACE

(DOJ continues to approve known false annual FOIA reports in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act, and FOIA.gov data is garbage.)

See DOJ OIP Compliance Inquiry attached.

- This presentation is to compel needed change and to document the public record for future audit as needed – who knew what, when did they know it, and what did they do?
- NARA has perhaps the worst published FOIA statistics, yet even those statistics are massively false. Further, NARA's FOIA Officer, Gary Stern, under the direction of Acting Archivist and NARA Appellate Authority, Debra Wall, is cheating like hell.
- As noted in the December 20, 2022 example (NGC23-026A Appeal Denial of Exp Processing Signed – Send) regarding NARA NGC-0026A, NARA combined **56** FY 2022 appeals into the single appeal number NGC22-037A and **66** FY 2022 appeals under NGC-056A then combined those **122** appeals into a single FY 2023 appeal tracking number NGC23-26A crossing fiscal years to avoid FY 2022 reporting.
- In the December 19, 2022 example (NGC23-027A Appeal Denial of Exp Processing Final Send) regarding appeal NGC22-056A, NARA improperly assigned that same appeal number to three FY 2022 appeals, then reassigned them to FY 2023 appeal number NGC23-027A, crossing fiscal years in an apparent attempt to not report the appeals in FY 2022. Note: NARA does not cite any NARA individualized tracking numbers for the underlying FOIA requests.
- Per DOJ OIP's website (<https://www.justice.gov/oip/assigning-tracking-numbers-and-providing-status-information-requests->

[updated-guidance](#)):

“Subsection (a)(7)(A) of the FOIA **mandates** that agencies "assign an individualized tracking number for each request received that will take longer than ten days to process." Thus, if the request will take longer than ten days to process, agencies are required to assign tracking numbers to each such request and to provide that number to the requester.”

- See prior related public comments,
 - “NARA FY 2022 Data Stripped From FOIA.gov” (documenting massive fraud)
 - “Individualized Tracking Numbers. NARA Fraud. Hatch Act Violations.”

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT

Scope of Judicial Review Under the APA

For cases that fall within its ambit, the APA defines the scope of courts' review of agency actions. Specifically, the APA authorizes federal courts to (1) decide all relevant questions of law; (2) interpret constitutional and statutory provisions; and (3) determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an agency action. By default, the U.S. district courts have jurisdiction to hear APA challenges, but Congress has vested review in other courts, such as the federal courts of appeals, in specific circumstances. The APA authorizes courts reviewing agency actions to

1. compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and
2. hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be—
 - a. arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;
 - b. contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;
 - c. in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, limitations, or short of statutory right;
 - d. without observance of procedure required by law;
 - e. unsupported by substantial evidence in a case subject to Sections 556 and 557 of Title 5 or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute; and
 - f. unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court. In making these determinations, the court must review the agency's administrative record. In addition, the court must take "due account" of the rule of prejudicial error.

RECOMMENDATIONS

DOJ OIP:

- Do not accept NARA's materially inaccurate FY 2022 annual FOIA report; and place a disclaimer on FOIA.gov that data generally is materially inaccurate and cannot be relied upon.

FOIA Advisory Committee and Chief FOIA Officers Council:

- Seek DOJ OIP and OGIS advisories articulating that there is no circumstance where an individualized tracking number is not required for a request that will take longer than ten days to process. This includes instances where an agency has aggregated requests for fee determination purposes (though NARA has not claimed this in relation to their malfeasance).
- Seek a posted disclaimer that FOIA.gov data is materially false and cannot be used for any purpose. Only certified agency data (per below) may be used.
- Require agencies to certify that: 1) their FOIA quarterly and annual FOIA report data is accurate to the best of their knowledge or 2) that such data is known to be inaccurate (no in between). Further, such certifications be publicly posted for FOIA.gov and annual FOIA reports/annual FOIA raw data.
- Seek FOIA.gov development and sustainment records to ascertain functional requirements and execution.
- Seek a NARA OIG audit of NARA FOIA data and processes.
- Reiterate the requirement for all federal agencies to post their contemporaneous FOIA logs now, per two FOIA Advisory Committee past recommendations.

FW: Second Installment Massive NARA FOIA Fraud

From: foiacompliance@gmail.com <foiacompliance@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2022 10:09 PM
To: debra.wall@nara.gov; garym.stern@nara.gov; 'NARA General Counsel FOIA Office' <foia@nara.gov>
Cc: alina.semo@nara.gov; 'FOIA Advisory Committee' <foia-advisory-committee@nara.gov>; alina.semo@nara.gov; bobak.Talebian@usdoj.gov; Vanita.Gupta19@usdoj.gov; foiacompliance@gmail.com; OIP.ComplianceInquiry@usdoj.gov; dod.foia.pa@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Second Installment Massive NARA FOIA Fraud. + DOJ's FOIA.gov. Unlawfully Combining Multiple Appeals into two individualized appeal numbers, then combining them into one FY 2023 tracking number

Ms. Wall (Acting Archivist and NARA Appellate Authority) and Gary Stern (NARA Chief FOIA Officer and FPL):

NARA MASSIVE FALSE FOIA REPORTING. NARA has not submitted any quarterly data to FOIA.gov for FY 2022, nor can they.

- (Ms. Gupta and Mr. Talebian, NARA's data is so massively false that DOJ OIP cannot accept NARA's FY 2022 annual FOIA report and must place a disclaimer on FOIA.gov that NARA data and others' is false and unusable for any purpose. See below.)

INDIVIDUALIZED TRACKING NUMBERS AND ECDs. As mandated by the FOIA and reaffirmed by Alina Semo and Bobby Talebian, NARA is required to provide me individualized FOIA tracking numbers for each FOIA request and appeal and to provide me for each estimated dates of completion (ECDs), regardless of whether NARA asserts that some are completed. Please do so promptly.

UNLAWFULLY COMBINING REQUESTS.

As noted in the December 20, 2022 example (NGC23-026A Appeal Denial of Exp Processing Signed – Send) regarding NARA NGC-0026A, NARA combined **56** FY 2022 appeals into the single appeal number NGC22-037A and **66** FY 2022 appeals under NGC-056A then combined those **122** appeals into a single FY 2023 appeal tracking number NGC23-26A crossing fiscal years to avoid FY 2022 reporting.

In the December 19, 2022 example (NGC23-027A Appeal Denial of Exp Processing Final Send) regarding appeal NGC22-056A, NARA improperly assigned that same appeal number to three FY 2022 appeals, then reassigned them to FY 2023 appeal number NGC23-027A, crossing fiscal years in an apparent attempt to not report the appeals in FY 2022. Note: NARA does not cite any NARA individualized tracking numbers for the underlying FOIA requests.

With my deep respect,

Robert (Bob) Hammond

From: foiacompliance@gmail.com <foiacompliance@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2022 4:36 PM

To: 'FOIA Advisory Committee' <foia-advisory-committee@nara.gov>; debra.wall@nara.gov;

Vanita.Gupta19@usdoj.gov; media@usdoj.gov; AskDOJ@usdoj.gov

Cc: debra.wall@nara.gov; garym.stern@nara.gov; FOIA@nara.gov; 'FOIA Advisory Committee' <foia-advisory-committee@nara.gov>;

alina.semo@nara.gov; bobak.Talebian@usdoj.gov;

Vanita.Gupta19@usdoj.gov; foiacompliance@gmail.com; OIP.ComplianceInquiry@usdoj.gov;

dod.foia.pa@gmail.com; foiacomplaine@gmail.com

Subject: Second Installment Massive NARA FOIA Fraud. + DOJ's FOIA.gov. Unlawfully Combining Multiple Appeals into two individualized appeal numbers, then combining them into one FY 2023 tracking number

DOJ OIP,

Please accept this and my email below of December 19, 2022 4:45 PM as examples of NARA unlawfully combining multiple FY 2022 appeals into single FY 2022 appeal tracking numbers, then unlawfully combining those FY 2022 appeals in a single FY 2023 FOIA appeal tracking number to avoid FY 2022 FOIA reporting. In NARA NGC -0026A, NARA combined **56** FY 2022 appeals into the single appeal number NGC22-037A and **66** FY 2022 appeals under NGC-056A then combined those **122** appeals into a single FY 2023 appeal tracking number NGC23-26A to avoid FY 2022 reporting. Provide me DOJ OIP's individual compliance inquiry case number.

As stated below these examples are the tip of the iceberg. See my public comment "NARA FY 2022 Data Stripped from FOIA.gov"

As my time permits, I will provide countless other examples and potentially prepare written public comments, which may include this correspondence.

This appears to be malfeasance with intent to defraud on a MASSIVE SCALE, in my view. NARA response/clarification requested. Reply to all.

FOIA.gov data is garbage. DOJ OIP cannot accept NARA's FY 2022 annual FOIA report submission until and unless all identified discrepancies are corrected. Filing late or not at all is a better option.

--/

Ms. Wall, as Acting Archivist and NARA Appellate Authority please shut this unlawful activity down now. Direct a NARA OIG Investigation. Immediately direct that NARA assign individualized FOIA request and appeal tracking numbers as mandated by law and DOJ OIP policy. Direct NARA staff to immediately correct all discrepancies that I have identified in my public comments.

This is a massive fraud on the American citizens, the Attorney General and Congress, in my view.

--/

Ms. Gupta (U.S Associate Attorney General),

Please:

- Direct OIP not to accept NARA's FY 2022 annual FOIA reports until NARA certifies that all issues have been corrected and the report is true and accurate to best of Gary Stern's knowledge – meaning that every publicly disclosed error has been corrected.
- Direct that OIP place a banner on FOIA.gov that information therein is inaccurate and cannot be relied upon for any purpose whatsoever.
- Should DOJ OIP accept an errant annual FOIA report, review in other venues may be appropriate.

With my deep respect,

Robert Hammond

Copy to:

NARA OIG

GAO

Other

From: [\[Robert \(Bob\) Hammond Email\]](#)

Sent: Monday, December 19, 2022 4:45 PM

To: 'FOIA Advisory Committee' <foia-advisory-committee@nara.gov>

Cc: 'debra.wall@nara.gov' <debra.wall@nara.gov>; 'garym.stern@nara.gov' <garym.stern@nara.gov>;

'FOIA@nara.gov' <FOIA@nara.gov>; 'FOIA Advisory Committee' <foia-advisory-committee@nara.gov>;

'alina.semo@nara.gov' <alina.semo@nara.gov>; 'bobak.Talebian@usdoj.gov'

<bobak.Talebian@usdoj.gov>; 'Vanita.Gupta19@usdoj.gov' <Vanita.Gupta19@usdoj.gov>;

'foiacompliance@gmail.com' <foiacompliance@gmail.com>

Subject: NARA FOIA Fraud. FW: NGC23-027A Appeal Response of Denial of Expedited Processing

FOIA Advisory Committee,

First installment of NARA first unlawfully combining multiple FY 2022 appeals under a single individualized FOIA tracking number NGC22-056A and now assigning them to an FY 2023 FOIA tracking number NGC23-027A to cross fiscal years and avoid reporting appeals in FY 2022.

This is the tip of the iceberg. As my time permits, I will provide countless other examples and potentially prepare written public comments.

This appears to be malfeasance with intent to defraud, in my view. NARA response/clarification requested. Reply to all.

FOIA.gov data is garbage. DOJ OIP cannot accept NARA's FY 2022 annual FOIA report submission.

With my respect,

Robert Hammond
Copy to NARA OIG; formal OIG complaint

From: NARA NGC General Counsel FOIA <foia@nara.gov>
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2022 11:53 AM
To: [[Robert \(Bob\) Hammond Email](#)]
Cc: FOIA <FOIA@nara.gov>
Subject: NGC23-027A Appeal Response of Denial of Expedited Processing

Dear Mr. Hammond:

This is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) appeal to the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), General Counsel's Office in relation to the denial of Expedited Processing for three of your FOIAonline submissions.

Please see the full response attached to this email.

Sincerely,

NGC FOIA Team
Deputy Freedom of Information Act Officer/Archivist
National Archives and Records Administration
Office of General Counsel
College Park, MD
FOIA@nara.gov

RE: Freedom of Information Act Request NGC23-26A



Archivist of the
United States

[Sent via email to \[Robert \(Bob\) Hammond email\]](#)

Robert Hammond [\[Robert \(Bob\) Hammond email\]](#)

December 12, 2022

RE: Freedom of Information Act Request NGC23-26A

Dear Mr. Hammond:

This is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) appeal to the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), General Counsel’s Office in relation to the denial of Expedited Processing for ten of your requests for unauthorized disposition case files and Emails. Your appeals (listed below), were submitted either via *FOIAonline* or through FOIA@nara.gov and originally assigned either NGC22-037A or NGC22-056A and have now been aggregated and assigned NGC23-026A:

Appeal FOIAonline #	Request FOIAonline #	NGC FOIA Case #	Requester #
NARA-NGC-2022-000417	NARA-NGC-2021-001018	NGC21-546	NARA 21-A
NARA-NGC-2022-000418	NARA-NGC-2021-001019	NGC21-547	NARA 21-B
NARA-NGC-2022-000419	NARA-NGC-2021-001020	NGC21-548	NARA 21-C
NA	NARA-NGC-2022-000368	NGC22-145	NARA 22-U.C.
NA	NARA-NGC-2022-000369	NGC22-146	NARA 22-U.D.
NARA-NGC-2022-000507	NARA-NGC-2022-000380	NGC22-155	NARA 22-U.H..
NARA-NGC-2022-000508	NARA-NGC-2022-000381	NGC22-156	NARA 22-U.I.
NA	NARA-NGC-2022-000387	NGC22-163	NARA 22-U.J..
NA	NARA-NGC-2022-000388	NGC22-164	NARA 22-U.K.
NA	NARA-NGC-2022-000389	NGC22-165	NARA 22-U.L.

Background

Your ten original requests were for records, emails, and records of communication in relation to a specific unauthorized disposition case files that were identified in your request. You also requested a fee waiver and expedited processing.

Your request for expedited processing under the above FOIA requests raise three arguments:

1. “Information is urgently needed to inform the public concerning some actual or alleged government activity to inform the public during the December 9, 2021 FOIA Advisory Committee meeting.” You state that the meeting was unlawful and cite your YouTube and Webex chat comments as evidence of interest in the meeting and that you need the records for the December 9, 2021 FOIA Advisory Committee meeting, which was broadcast live on You Tube and viewed on WEBEX. You also state that the subjects of the UD complaints allege misconduct and violations of law. NARA’s Chief Records Officer oversees unauthorized disposition, destruction or alienation of federal records complaints or voluntary agency reports. You state you are an “individual/organization primarily engaged in the dissemination of information who can prove the information is urgently needed to inform the public concerning some actual or alleged government activity and that your primary activity is informing the public, which I do through a variety of means, such as open meeting public comments, blogs, etc., and I may from time to time collaborate on articles.”
2. There is strong evidence of widespread and exceptional media interest in the meeting because it “will be viewed by thousands.”
3. “There is a reasonable expectation of an imminent loss of a substantial due process right in connection with statutory times for FOIA actions.”

Through *FOIAonline*, an NGC staff member responded to your request for expedited processing, stating,

“The requester has not provided sufficient information to establish he meets one of the criteria required under the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) regulation 36 C.F.R. 1250.28 (a) to justify expedited processing. Specifically, you have not provided evidence that there is an urgent need to inform the public of a government activity, or widespread and exceptional media interest involving questions affecting public confidence in the Government’s integrity that can be addressed by the records you seek.”

Through *FOIAonline* and FOIA@nara.gov you appealed the denial of your request for expedited

processing for all the above cases stating:

Basis for Appeal.

1. My FOIA request sought expedited processing; therefore, this appeal must be expedited.
2. The Agency's expedited processing determination did not address the specific issues raised warranted expedited processing and why they did not meet standards
3. I sought expedited processing under multiple criteria. The Agency did not read them all and address them all in the Agency's expedited processing determination.
4. My expedited processing justifications for each of my FOIA requests are not all the same. The Agency cannot apply a blanket determination that does not address all criteria.

Analysis

NARA processes FOIA requests on an expedited basis if it is determined that the request meets one or more of the following criteria described in its FOIA Regulation, at 36 C.F.R. § 1250.28:

- (1) A reasonable expectation of an imminent threat to an individual's life or physical safety;
- (2) A reasonable expectation of an imminent loss of a substantial due process right;
- (3) An urgent need to inform the public about an actual or alleged Federal Government activity (this criterion applies only to those requests made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information to the public); or
- (4) A matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions that affect public confidence in the Government's integrity.

After carefully reviewing your initial request for expedition as well as your appeal, I have determined that expedited treatment is not warranted under the criteria you cited. You have not identified any substantial due process right that would be threatened if your requests are processed under standard processing timelines. You have not demonstrated that the records you requested are a matter of current exigency to the American public, or shown that processing the request in the non-expedited queue would negatively impact a significant, recognized interest. Your request does not satisfy the fourth criteria for expedited processing because the interest of a single requester does not constitute widespread and exceptional media interest affecting public

confidence in government integrity. The fact that an event may be viewed by a large number of people does not demonstrate that there has been widespread and exceptional media coverage of the event.

Your appeal asserts that your requests for expedited processing were incorrectly decided because your “expedited processing justifications . . . are not all the same,” and thus NARA “cannot apply a blanket determination that does not address all criteria.” In reviewing your appeal, NARA considered each of the arguments you raised and found that you failed to satisfy any of the criteria you cited. As such, your three requests for expedited processing were properly denied.

For your information, the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS), the Federal FOIA Ombudsman’s office, offers mediation services to resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation. Using OGIS’s mediation services does not affect your right to pursue litigation. You may contact OGIS in any of the following ways noted below:

Office of Government Information Services
National Archives and Records Administration
8601 Adelphi Road – OGIS
College Park, MD 20740-6001
ogis@nara.gov
ogis.archives.gov
202-741-5770
1-877-684-6448

Your administrative remedies are now exhausted. If you are dissatisfied with my action on your appeal, the FOIA permits you to file a lawsuit in federal district court in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B). You may seek judicial review in the District of Columbia, in the United States District Court for the judicial district in which you reside or do business, or the judicial district where you believe the records are located – in this instance, in the U.S. District of Maryland.

Sincerely,



For

DEBRA STEIDEL WALL
Deputy Archivist of the United States

Debra Steidel Wall · T: 202.357.5900 · F: 202.357.5901 · debra.wall@nara.gov

National Archives and Records Administration · 8601 Adelphi Road · College Park, MD 20740 · www.archives.gov

RE: Freedom of Information Act Request NGC23-27A



Archivist of the
United States

December 16, 2022

[Sent via email to \[Robert \(Bob\) Hammond Email\]](#)

[\[Robert \(Bob\) Hammond Email\]](#)

Dear Mr. Hammond:

This is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) appeal to the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), General Counsel's Office in relation to the denial of expedited processing for three FOIA requests, which you submitted through *FOIAonline* and later withdrew. Your appeals (listed below) were submitted via *FOIAonline* and originally assigned tracking number NGC22-056A. The appeals have been aggregated and assigned tracking number NGC23-027A:

Appeal FOIAonline #	Request FOIAonline #	NGC FOIA Case #	Requester #
NARA-NGC-2022-000450	NARA-NGC-2022-000184	NA	NARA 22-P.A.
NARA-NGC-2022-000451	NARA-NGC-2021-000185	NA	NARA 21-P.B.
NARA-NGC-2022-000452	NARA-NGC-2021-000187	NA	NARA 21-P.C.

Background

Your original FOIA requests requested all emails (with attachments) from David S. Ferriero (NARA-NGC-2022-000184); Swarnali Halder (NARA-NGC-2022-0004185); and Valorie Findlater (NARA-NGC-2022-000187) that include the words "Joe Biden", "Bernie Sanders", "Donald Trump", or "Trump". You requested expedited processing, raising the following two arguments:

1. "The subject is of widespread and exceptional media interest and the information sought involves possible questions about the government's integrity that affect public confidence." You further state, "There is extraordinary, off the charts interest in the subject matter of this meeting and NARA's execution."

2. You are an “individual/organization primarily engaged in the dissemination of information who can prove the information is urgently needed to inform the public concerning some actual or alleged government activity” and your “primary activity is informing the public, which [you] do through a variety of means, such as open meeting public comments, blogs, etc., and [you] may from time to time collaborate on articles.”

Through *FOIAonline*, you withdrew the three FOIA requests listed above. Therefore, your requests for expedited processing are moot.

You appealed the denial of your requests for expedited processing for all three of the above cases stating:

Basis for Appeal.

1. My FOIA request sought expedited processing; therefore, this appeal must be expedited.
2. The Agency’s expedited processing determination did not address the specific issues raised warranted expedited processing and why they did not meet standards
3. I sought expedited processing under multiple criteria. The Agency did not read them all and address them all in the Agency’s expedited processing determination.
4. My expedited processing justifications for each of my FOIA requests are not all the same. The Agency cannot apply a blanket determination that does not address all criteria.

Analysis

Since the FOIA submissions listed above were all withdrawn in *FOIAonline*, your expedited processing requests and appeals are moot and will be administratively closed.

Please note that you requested the same information for these three FOIA requests in *FOIAOnline* submission numbers NARA-NGC-2022-000190; NARA-NGC-2022-000191; and NARA-NGC-2022-000192. These three *FOIAonline* submissions were aggregated with other similar submissions and assigned FOIA case number NGC22-105.

For your information, the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS), the Federal FOIA Ombudsman's office, offers mediation services to resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation. Using OGIS's mediation services does not affect your right to pursue litigation. You may contact OGIS in any of the following ways noted below:

Office of Government
Information Services National
Archives and Records
Administration 8601 Adelphi
Road – OGIS
College Park, MD 20740-6001
ogis@nara.gov ogis.archives.gov
202-741-5770
1-877-684-6448

Your administrative remedies are now exhausted. If you are dissatisfied with my action on your appeal, the FOIA permits you to file a lawsuit in federal district court in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B). You may seek judicial review in the District of Columbia, in the United States District Court for the judicial district in which you reside or do business, or the judicial district where you believe the records are located – in this instance, in the U.S. District of Maryland.

Sincerely,



For
DEBRA STEIDEL WALL
Deputy Archivist of the United States

Debra Steidel Wall · T: 202.357.5900 · F: 202.357.5901 · debra.wall@nara.gov
National Archives and Records Administration · 8601 Adelphi Road · College Park, MD 20740 · www.archives.gov

Hammond Public Comments

#	Hammond Public Comments. Document Cloud Alphabetical (25 per page on web, not alphabetical) https://www.documentcloud.org/app?q=%2Buser%3Arobert-hammond-106693%20
1	2022- 2024 FOIA Advisory Committee Bylaws - Recommended Changes
2	2022- 2024 FOIA Advisory Committee Inaugural Meeting. DOJ OIP OGIS Grossly Underfunded
3	All Panelist Chat to June 9 2022 FOIA Advisory Committee Meeting. OGIS DOJ Funding + Miss
4	Combining Appeals Across FY NARA Massive FOIA Fraud
5	Comments to Unlawful Chief FOIA Officers Meeting of November 17 2021
6	DOD FOIA Misconduct Part IV. FY 2018 Appeals Disappeared + DOJ OIP & OGIS Underfunded, Thus Ineffective
7	DOD FOIA Misconduct Part V. Navy FY 2018 Appeals Dispositions Bases Not Reported
8	DOD Massive False FOIA Reporting. Part 1. Letter to SECDEF, Complaint to DOJ OIG
9	DOD MASSIVE FALSE REPORTING PART II + Still Interested Abuse. Updated July 27, 2022
10	DOD Massive False Reporting Part III. 5-year Late Acknowledgements Unusual Circumstances Abuse +
11	DOD' Cites Change to CFR 32 CFR part 286.4 as Unlawful Basis for Omitting OGIS Mediation Rights
12	DOJ OIP (Inaccurate) CFO Report Assessment 2022
13	DOJ OIP Compliance Inquiries
14	DOJ OIP Improper and Unlawful Standard Glomar Responses With Implicit (b)(1) & (b)(7)
15	Failure - FOIA Compliance Oversight & Funding. Part 2. No Joking Matter
16	FOIA Advisory Committee December 1, 2022 Meeting Hammond Comments
17	FOIA Line-Item Budgets Now. Let the citizens be heard. Retire FOIA Bob.
18	FOIAonline - Recommended System Changes
19	Foreseeable Harm Standard Vanita Gupta. November 3, 2022 CFO Meeting
20	Foreseeable Harm Standard. DOJ OIP Misinformation + Navy Misconduct and Idiocy?
21	Hammond Questions Comments for September 8 2022 Meeting. OGIS and DOJ OIP Lack of Funding w.attach1
22	Hammond Recommendations and Chat Comments to 4.7.2022 FOIA Advisory Committee Meeting
23	HOT! Semo OGIS. Budget Numbers do not Comport w. NARA Published Budgets!

Hammond Public Comments

24	Individualized Tracking Numbers. NARA Fraud. Hatch Act Violations
25	Mandatory Right to OGIS Dispute Resolution - OGIS Malfeasance 20220616
26	Moot Appellate Determinations
27	NARA FOIA & Financial Malfeasance \$789,730 + Alteration of Records and Loss of Public Trust
28	NARA FY 2022 Data Stripped From FOIA.gov
29	NARA, PLEASE FUND OGIS!! (PART 1). Robert Hammond September 9, 2021 Speaker Notes
30	Navy FOIA Fraud - False Reporting, Refusal of FOIA.gov, etc.
31	Navy FOIA Misconduct. No IDA Letter & Fee Abuse. DON-NAVY-2023-000588
32	Navy FY 2018 FOIA Appeals Disappeared
33	OGIS & DOJ OIP Misstate Recommendation to Post FOIA Logs - Why
34	OGIS & Navy FOIA Fraud. Mediation, ECDs, False FOIA Reporting
35	OGIS Funding and Case Accountability Logs
36	OGIS Negligence Generally & Improper June 29, 2022 FOIA Meeting
37	OGIS Posting Policy for Public Comments
38	Posting FOIA Logs. Tech Committee Recommendation #2. FOIA Ombudsman Inaccurate Citation
39	Preserve FOIAonline Records + Decertify FOIA.gov + Audit NARA + Post FOIA Logs
40	QUESTIONS for June 29, 2022 OGIS Annual FOIA Meeting v2
41	Response to Hon. David S. Ferriero June 10 2021 Comments to FOIA Advisory Committee
42	Sample FOIA Template to Combat Agency Misconduct 20220616
43	Senate-hearing-on-foia.-dojs-lack-of-enforcement-malfeasance-open-the-government-statement.v2
44	Senator Grassley - DOJ OIP'S Position Doesn't Pass the "Common Sense Test"
45	Senators Unite to Slam FOIA Compliance + POGO
46	Subpoena Threat and Congressional Demand for OGIS to Release Records. OMB Kills Recommendations
47	Sued into Oblivion. Foreseeable Harm Standard
48	Violations of the ADA in FOIA Redactions, Simple Solution