

EMPOWER OVERSIGHT

Whistleblowers & Research



EMPOWR.us

August 12, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: FOIAPA@SEC.GOV

Olivier Girod, Acting Chief FOIA/PA Officer
Office of FOIA Services
100 F Street NE
Washington, DC 20549-2465

RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST

Dear FOIA Officer:

Introduction

Empower Oversight Whistleblowers & Research (“Empower Oversight”) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit educational organization dedicated to enhancing independent oversight of government and corporate wrongdoing. We work to help insiders safely and legally report waste, fraud, abuse, corruption, and misconduct to the proper authorities, and seek to hold those authorities accountable to act on those reports by, among other means, publishing information to inform the public.

Background

We write today seeking information regarding the appearance of conflicts of interest by former high-level officials at the SEC relating to cryptocurrencies. It is in the public’s interest that the government’s emerging regulatory approach to cryptocurrencies is based on objective legal principles, without the appearance that conflicted SEC officials may be picking cryptocurrency winners and losers based on personal financial interests. The way in which these former SEC officials declared whether particular cryptocurrencies were securities—and thus subject to SEC regulation—raises public integrity concerns.

As publicly reported, Mr. William Hinman worked as the Director of the Division of Corporate Finance at the SEC from May 2017 through December of 2020, having previously been a partner at the law firm Simpson Thacher.¹ Mr. Hinman reportedly continued to receive millions of dollars from Simpson Thacher while employed at the

¹ “William Hinman Named Director of Division of Corporation Finance,” SEC ([May 9, 2017](#)).

SEC.² Notably, Simpson Thacher is a member of the Enterprise Ethereum Alliance, an “industry organization whose objective is to drive the use of Enterprise Ethereum.”³ In a June 2018 speech in his official capacity as an SEC official, Mr. Hinman declared that the Ethereum cryptocurrency, Ether, was not a security, stating that “based on my understanding of the present state of Ether, the Ethereum network and its decentralized structure, current offers and sales of Ether are not securities transactions.”⁴ After his declaration, Ether’s value then rose significantly.⁵ When Mr. Hinman departed the SEC in December of 2020, he rejoined Simpson Thacher as a partner.⁶

That same month, the SEC filed a lawsuit against one of Ethereum’s rivals, Ripple, alleging that its XRP cryptocurrency was a security, such that the company’s offering and sales of XRP had been in violation of federal securities laws.⁷ The value of XRP fell 25% immediately after the announcement of the SEC lawsuit.⁸ Of note, the leader of the SEC’s Enforcement Division that brought the suit, Marc Berger, then left the SEC shortly thereafter, joining Mr. Hinman as a partner at Simpson Thacher.⁹

Additionally, there are potential concerns regarding former SEC Chairman Jay Clayton. As with Mr. Hinman and Ether, while at the SEC, Mr. Clayton publicly stated that Bitcoin was not a security,¹⁰ and the value of Bitcoin rose.¹¹ The SEC’s lawsuit against Ripple was filed at the end of Mr. Clayton’s tenure there. Shortly after he left, he reportedly joined One River Asset Management, a cryptocurrency hedge fund that focuses exclusively on Bitcoin and Ether—not XRP.¹²

The SEC’s handling of cryptocurrency issues is of significant public importance, and these appearances of conflicts of interest raise substantial issues. Transparency from the SEC is the only way to ensure accountability to the public. In light of this, we are filing this FOIA request to seek the facts.

Records Request

1. All records relating to communications from May of 2017 through December of 2020 between William Hinman and any personnel from Simpson Thacher, including calendar

² “A top SEC official was receiving a \$1.6 million law-firm pension from Simpson Thacher that was 7 times his government salary,” *Business Insider* ([Jan 29, 2021](#)).

³ Enterprise Ethereum Alliance (<https://entethalliance.org/about/>).

⁴ “Digital Asset Transactions: When Howey Met Gary (Plastic),” William Hinman ([Jun 4, 2018](#)).

⁵ “Crypto Market Rallies on SEC’s Official’s Ether Stance,” *Wall Street Journal* ([Jun 14, 2018](#)).

⁶ “Former SEC Division of Corporation Finance Director Bill Hinman Returns to Simpson Thacher,” Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP ([Jan 12, 2021](#)).

⁷ “SEC Charges Ripple and Two Executives with Conducting \$1.3 Billion Unregistered Securities Offering,” SEC ([Dec 22, 2020](#)).

⁸ “XRP Plummeted 25% after SEC’s \$1.3 Billion Lawsuit against Ripple,” *Finance Magnates* ([Dec 23, 2020](#)).

⁹ “Marc P. Berger, Former Acting Director of the SEC’s Enforcement Division, to Join Simpson Thacher,” Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP ([Apr 15, 201](#)).

¹⁰ “SEC chairman: Cryptocurrencies like bitcoin are not securities,” *CNBC* ([Jun 6, 2018](#)).

¹¹ “Cryptocurrency Rally Builds Steam as Bitcoin Surpasses \$7,500,” *Bloomberg* ([Jul 17, 2018](#)).

¹² “Former SEC chair Jay Clayton will advise digital asset hedge fund One River on crypto,” *Markets Insider* ([Mar 29, 2021](#)).

entries, notes, or emails between Mr. Hinman and any email address from the domain “@stblaw.com”;

2. All records relating to communications from May of 2017 through December of 2020 between William Hinman and any personnel from the Enterprise Ethereum Alliance, including calendar entries, notes or emails between Mr. Hinman and any email address from the domain “@entethalliance.org”;
3. All records relating to communications, including calendar entries, notes or emails between Mr. Hinman and any personnel in the SEC’s Office of the Ethics Counsel regarding Mr. Hinman’s continued payments from Simpson Thacher while employed at SEC, his potential recusals or conflicts related to his prior or future employment at Simpson Thacher, as well as his discussions and negotiations with Simpson Thacher regarding rejoining the firm;
4. All records relating to communications from May of 2017 through January of 2021 between Marc Berger and any personnel from Simpson Thacher, including calendar entries, notes or emails between Mr. Berger and any email address from the domain “@stblaw.com”;
5. All records relating to communications from May of 2017 through January of 2021 between Marc Berger and any personnel from the Enterprise Ethereum Alliance, including calendar entries, notes or emails between Mr. Berger and any email address from the domain “@entethalliance.org”;
6. All records relating to communications, including calendar entries, notes, or emails between Mr. Berger and any personnel in the SEC’s Office of the Ethics Counsel, regarding Mr. Berger’s discussions and negotiations with Simpson Thacher, including all communications regarding potential recusals or conflicts related to his potential employment with Simpson Thacher;
7. All records relating to communication from May of 2017 through December of 2020 between Jay Clayton and personnel from One River Asset Management, including calendar entries, notes or emails between Mr. Clayton and any email address from the domain “@oneriveram.com”;
8. All records of communications, including calendar entries, notes or emails between Mr. Clayton and personnel in the SEC’s Office of the Ethics Counsel regarding Mr. Clayton’s discussions and negotiations with One River Asset Management, including all communications regarding potential recusals or conflicts related to his potential employment with One River Asset Management.

Definitions

“COMMUNICATION(S)” means every manner or method of disclosure, exchange of information, statement, or discussion between or among two or more persons, including but not limited to, face-to-face and telephone conversations, correspondence, memoranda, telegrams, telexes, email messages, voice-mail messages, text messages, meeting minutes, discussions, releases, statements, reports, publications, and any recordings or reproductions thereof.

“DOCUMENT(S)” or “RECORD(S)” mean any kind of written, graphic, or recorded matter, however produced or reproduced, of any kind or description, whether sent, received, or neither, including drafts, originals, non-identical copies, and information stored magnetically, electronically, photographically or otherwise. As used herein, the terms “DOCUMENT(S)” or “RECORD(S)” include, but are not limited to, studies, papers, books, accounts, letters, diagrams, pictures, drawings, photographs, correspondence, telegrams, cables, text messages, emails, memoranda, notes, notations, work papers, intra-office and inter-office communications, communications to, between and among employees, contracts, financial agreements, grants, proposals, transcripts, minutes, orders, reports, recordings, or other documentation of telephone or other conversations, interviews, affidavits, slides, statement summaries, opinions, indices, analyses, publications, questionnaires, answers to questionnaires, statistical records, ledgers, journals, lists, logs, tabulations, charts, graphs, maps, surveys, sound recordings, data sheets, computer printouts, tapes, discs, microfilm, and all other records kept, regardless of the title, author, or origin.

“PERSON” means individuals, entities, firms, organizations, groups, committees, regulatory agencies, governmental entities, business entities, corporations, partnerships, trusts, and estates.

“REFERS,” “REFERRING TO,” “REGARDS,” “REGARDING,” “RELATES,” “RELATING TO,” or “PERTAINS TO” mean containing, alluding to, responding to, commenting upon, discussing, showing, disclosing, explaining, mentioning, analyzing, constituting, comprising, evidencing, setting forth, summarizing, or characterizing, either directly or indirectly, in whole or in part.

Instructions

The words “and” and “or” shall be construed in the conjunctive or disjunctive, whichever is most inclusive.

The singular form shall include the plural form and vice versa.

The present tense shall include the past tense and vice versa.

In producing the records described above, you shall segregate them by reference to each of the numbered items of this Freedom of Information Act request.

Fee Waiver Request

Empower Oversight agrees to pay up to \$25.00 in applicable fees, but requests a waiver of any fees that may be associated with processing this request, in keeping with 5 U.S.C. § 552 (a)(4)(A)(iii).

Empower Oversight is a non-profit educational organization as defined under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, and has no commercial interest in making this request. Accordingly, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552 (a)(4)(A)(ii)(II), it is subject only to “reasonable standard charges for document duplication.”

Moreover, the information that Empower Oversight seeks is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to the public understanding of the operations or activities of the government.

The public has a significant interest in understanding (1) the facts and circumstances surrounding senior SEC officials past and future private sector employment, (2) whether any such relationships presented potential conflicts or public integrity concerns related to their official actions at the SEC, and (3) whether, how, and to what extent the SEC and its ethics officials properly mitigated any such issues.

Empower Oversight is committed to government accountability and public integrity and is committed to public disclosure of documents via its website, and by providing these documents to the media for public dissemination. Hence, information it receives that either confirms or dispels the public integrity concerns described above will be published to empower Americans to accurately assess the proper level of public confidence they should have in the integrity of the SEC—making this request undeniably eligible for a waiver or reduction of fees under 5 U.S.C. § 552 (a)(4)(A)(iii)

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Cordially,

[/Jason Foster/](#)

Jason Foster
Founder & President