

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**In the Matter of December 15, 2021,
Subpoena Issued by the United States
House of Representatives Select Committee
to Investigate the January 6th Attack on
the United States Capitol**

PLAINTIFF,)
)
c/o Brand Woodward Law)
1808 Park Road Northwest)
Washington, District of Columbia 20010,)
)
v.)
)
VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC.,)
c/o Verizon Security Subpoena Compliance)
180 Washington Valley Road)
Bedminster, New Jersey 07921)
)
DEFENDANT.)
)

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff, by and through the undersigned counsel, brings this action for declaratory and injunctive relief alleging as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff is the recipient of correspondence from Defendant Verizon Communications Inc. (“Verizon”) advising that certain phone records associated with the phone number Plaintiff maintains with Defendant Verizon have been subpoenaed by the United States House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (“Select Committee”). Concomitantly with the docketing of this Complaint, Plaintiff will file a Motion to proceed in this action anonymously. *See In re Sealed Case*, 931 F.3d 92 (D.C. Cir. 2019).

2. Defendant Verizon Communications Inc., is a Delaware Corporation with its principal place of business in New York City, New York. Plaintiff has been advised that communications regarding the subpoena in question are to be directed to Verizon’s Verizon Security Subpoena Compliance division.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. This case challenges the validity of a subpoena issued by the United States House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. It raises claims regarding the scope of the investigative power of Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, claims under the Stored Communications Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2701, and claims under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. § 222.

4. Venue is proper before this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of the events giving rise to these claims – the issuance of the subpoena at issue – was occurred within this District.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

5. In a well-known episode on January 6, 2021, a large group of protestors in Washington, D.C., entered the United States Capitol, breached security, and disrupted the counting of the Electoral College votes until order was restored. The United States Department of Justice has arrested and charged more than 725 individuals in connection with the events of January 6th.

6. On June 28, 2021, Speaker Nancy Pelosi introduced House Resolution 503, “Establishing the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol.” Two days later, the House passed H. Res. 503.

7. H. Res. 503 instructs the Speaker of the House to appoint thirteen Members to the Select Committee and to designate one Member to serve as chair of the Select Committee. *See* H. Res. Sec. 2. Speaker Pelosi appointed and designated Rep. Bennie Thompson (D-MS 2nd Dis.) to serve as Chairman of the Select Committee.

8. H. Res 503 Section 3 establishes the Select Committee for three purposes:
- a. To investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes relating to the January 6, 2021, domestic terrorist attack upon the United States Capitol Complex (hereafter referred to as the “domestic terrorist attack on the Capitol”) and relating to the interference with the peaceful transfer of power, including facts and causes relating to the preparedness and response of the United States Capitol Police and other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in the National Capital Region and other instrumentalities of government, as well as the influencing factors that fomented such an attack on American representative democracy while engaged in a constitutional process.
 - b. To examine and evaluate evidence developed by relevant Federal, State, and local governmental agencies regarding the facts and circumstances surrounding the domestic terrorist attack on the Capitol and targeted violence and domestic terrorism relevant to such terrorist attack.
 - c. To build upon the investigations of other entities and avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts by reviewing the investigations, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of other executive branch, congressional, or independent bipartisan or nonpartisan commission investigations into the domestic terrorist attack on the Capitol, including investigations into influencing factors related to such attack.

9. H. Res. 503 Section 4 establishes three “functions” of the Select Committee: (1) to “investigate the facts, circumstances, and causes relating to the domestic terror attack on the Capitol”; (2) to “identify, review, and evaluate the causes of and the lessons learned from the domestic terrorist attack on the Capitol”; and (3) to “issue a final report to the House containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures described in subsection (c) as it may deem necessary.”

10. Subsection (c) of Section 4 describes three categories of “corrective measures”: “changes in law, policy procedure, rules, or regulations that could be taken” (1) “to prevent future acts of violence, domestic terrorism, and domestic violent extremism, including acts targeted at American democratic institutions”; (2) “to improve the security posture of the United States Capitol Complex while preserving accessibility of the Capitol Complex for all Americans”; and (3) “to strengthen the security and resilience of the United States American democratic institutions against violence, domestic terrorism, and domestic violent extremism.”

11. H. Res. 503 Section 5(c)(4) authorizes the Chair of the Select Committee to “issue subpoenas pursuant to clause 2(m) of Rule XI [*subpoena power*] in the investigation and study conducted pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of this resolution.”

12. On December 15, 2021, Chairman Thompson, on behalf of the Select Committee, issued a subpoena to Defendant Verizon seeking records concerning phone numbers listed in “Section B, below.”

13. On December 17, 2021, Defendant Verizon wrote Plaintiff, copying the undersigned counsel, to advise that it “ha[d] received a subpoena requiring the production of certain records associated with the phone number referenced above” and attaching “[a] copy of the subpoena” excluding “Section B, which identifies the phone number referenced above but also those of other Verizon subscribers.”

14. In other words, nowhere within the copy of the Select Committee’s subpoena provided to Plaintiff is Plaintiff’s identify, or any other customer whose records are sought, disclosed. A copy of the subpoena provided to Plaintiff by Verizon is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

15. The Select Committee’s subpoena instructs Defendant Verizon to produce subscriber information and cell phone data associated with Plaintiff’s personal cell phone. The subscriber information requested includes subscriber names and contact information, authorized users, time of service provided, account changes, associated IP addresses, and other metadata. The cell phone data requested could include all calls, text messages, and other records of communications associated with the phone number. This data can be used for historic cell site analysis. The subpoena seeks this information from November 1, 2020 through January 31, 2021.

COUNT I
(Declaratory Relief Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201)

16. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, and incorporates the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 15 as if set forth herein.

17. Congress’s broad “power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function.” *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 174 (1927). Accordingly, Congress and its duly authorized committees may issue a subpoena where the information sought “is related to, and in furtherance of, a legitimate task of Congress,” *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187 (1957), and the subpoena serves a “valid legislative purpose.” *Quinn v. United States*, 349 U.S. 155, 161 (1955). At the same time, because Congress’s subpoena power “is justified as an adjunct to the legislative process, it is subject to several limitations,” *Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP*, 140 S. Ct. 2019, 2031 (2020), limitations which stem directly from the Constitution. *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168, 182-89 (1880).

18. Specifically, the Constitution permits Congress to enact only certain kinds of legislation, *see, e.g.*, U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, and Congress’s power to investigate “is justified as an adjunct to the legislative process, it is subject to several limitations.” *Mazars*, 140 S. Ct. at

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.