

Judicial Watch Files Motion to Force Hillary to Answer Its Questions

Thursday, the government watchdog group Judicial Watch announced it had filed a motion to compel former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to answer three interrogatory questions she refused to answer under oath.

The questions were allowed via court order issued by U.S. District Court Judge Emmet G. Sullivan in August. Judicial Watch's attorneys argue Clinton "failed to provide sufficient reasons for refusing to answer them, and the limited reasons she provides do not warrant sustaining her objections."

In her responses sent to Judicial Watch and the court on Oct. 13, Hillary Clinton refused outright to answer questions about:

- the creation of her email system;
- her decision to use the system despite warning from State Department officials; and
- the basis for her claim that the State Department had "90 to 95 percent" of her emails.

She also responded she "does not recall" 20 times to questions about her private email server. In its motion to compel, Judicial Watch argues:

Pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, "[t]he grounds for objecting to an interrogatory must be stated with specificity. ... In addition, the party objecting to the interrogatory 'bears the burden of 'show[ing] why discovery should not be permitted.'" Although she objected to the three interrogatories, Secretary Clinton failed to provide sufficient reasons for refusing to answer them, and

the limited reasons she provides do not warrant sustaining her objections.

“By refusing to answer our simple questions, Hillary Clinton is obstructing our efforts to get basic information about her email practices,” Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton said. “Because she has not—and cannot—demonstrate that her refusal to answer our questions is proper, Hillary Clinton should be required by the court to answer them promptly.”