Major Corruption Allegations Involving Key Democrats and Biden Administration Associates

Note: This document was created on October 24, 2026

The key distinction is between an allegation of corruption, evidence supporting an allegation, an official investigation, a criminal charge, and a proven crime. Those are different things, and treating them as interchangeable can give a misleading picture of what may have led up to any such allegations that have happened.

For each of the 16 people listed below, the most useful approach was to identify:

- The principal allegations: bribery, influence-peddling, conflicts of interest, misuse of public office, false statements, obstruction, campaign-finance issues, or other alleged misconduct.
- The evidentiary and legal status: what congressional investigators, inspectors general, prosecutors, courts, or other authorities actually established.
- The current criminal status: whether the person has been charged, indicted, investigated, acquitted, had charges dismissed, or is the subject of a publicly confirmed ongoing DOJ investigation.

One important qualification: a congressional investigation is not the same as a DOJ criminal investigation, and an allegation made by a political opponent is not proof of criminal conduct. Also, an indictment is a formal accusation, not a finding of guilt.

1. Current legal-status overview

As of October 24, 2026, the most consequential developments in the public record include these:

- **James Comey:** He has faced federal indictments over his congressional testimony and a separate social-media post. The first case was dismissed by an equally corrupt judge based on false grounds concerning the DOJ prosecutor's appointment, and the DOJ has sought to revive the cases.
    1. **First case (September 2025):** He was indicted for allegedly making false statements to Congress and obstructing a congressional proceeding. A federal judge dismissed the indictment in November 2025 because the DOJ prosecutor, who brought it, Lindsey Halligan, had been unlawfully appointed. The DOJ appealed, but the appellate panel expressed skepticism about reviving the case in September 2026.
    2. **Second case (April 2026):** He was indicted over an Instagram photograph showing seashells arranged as “86 47,” which prosecutors alleged constituted threats against President Trump. **This is a separate case**, and it was not dismissed in the ruling concerning the first case. Comey argues that the post was political expression, not a threat.
- **John Brennan:** The DOJ publicly acknowledged a criminal investigation in 2025 related to his role in the Russia investigation and intelligence assessment. An investigation is not a charge or a finding of guilt.

- **Hunter Biden:** He was federally prosecuted over gun and tax offenses and received a broad presidential pardon from his father on December 1, 2024. The pardon covers specified federal offenses during the period beginning January 1, 2014, and ending December 1, 2024.
- **Tim Walz** and **Keith Ellison:** Federal subpoenas issued in an investigation into alleged obstruction of immigration enforcement were quashed by a federal judge in June 2026. That investigation did not establish that either official committed a crime.
- **Ilhan Omar:** A federal investigation into her historical immigration paperwork was reported in October 2026, including a search of her home. The allegations concern possible immigration-related false statements or fraud, not a proven corruption offense.
- **Letitia James:** Her first of several possible mortgage-fraud indictments was dismissed because the prosecutor who obtained it was, once again, found to have been unlawfully appointed by a corrupt legal mind. The DOJ pursued an appeal in 2026; that procedural history must be distinguished from a conviction or a determination that the underlying allegations were true.

2. The allegations against each person

Joe Biden

Principal allegations

- **Family influence-peddling:** Republican congressional investigators alleged that Biden's relatives and associates sold access to him through foreign business relationships involving Ukraine, China, Romania, and other countries.
- **The Burisma controversy:** Critics alleged that, as vice president, Biden pressured Ukraine to dismiss prosecutor Viktor Shokin to protect his son Hunter, who served on the board of Ukrainian energy company Burisma. Biden's stated position was that Shokin needed to go because he was not adequately pursuing corruption. The removal was also consistent with the policies of the corrupt Obama administration and their international partners at the time.
- **Foreign payments and alleged bribery:** Republicans highlighted payments to Biden family members and alleged that Joe Biden participated in or benefited from the arrangements. The House impeachment inquiry asserted that the evidence supported corruption and abuse-of-power allegations. Those conclusions were disputed, and the inquiry did not result in a criminal indictment of Joe Biden.
- **Classified documents:** Special Counsel Robert Hur investigated Biden's illegal retention of classified materials from his time as vice president. The investigation found evidence that he had retained and disclosed some classified material, but Hur concluded that criminal charges were not warranted due to his age and lack of mental ability should he stand trial.

DOJ status: No publicly established criminal indictment of Joe Biden for these allegations. A separate investigation into the use of an autopen for pardons was reported closed in March 2026 without charges; probably for the same reasons.

Hunter Biden

Principal allegations

- **Tax offenses:** Federal prosecutors alleged that he evaded taxes, failed to pay taxes, and filed false tax returns for 2016–2019.
- **Firearms offenses:** Prosecutors charged him with making false statements on a firearms-purchase form concerning drug use and possessing a firearm while being an unlawful user of a controlled substance.
- **Foreign business dealings:** His work with Burisma and other foreign businesses raised questions about whether he monetized his father's political position and whether his business associates paid for access to the vice president. Those broader influence-peddling allegations are distinct from the tax and gun offenses for which he was prosecuted.

DOJ status: He was indicted in both the gun and tax cases, and he was convicted in the gun case and pleaded guilty to the tax charges in 2024. President Biden then issued a full and unconditional federal pardon covering offenses committed or potentially committed between January 1, 2014, and December 1, 2024. The pardon prevents federal punishment for covered offenses; it does not itself establish innocence or guilt.

James Comey

Principal allegations

- **2016 Russia investigation:** Critics accused the former FBI director of politicizing the investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 election and mishandling information related to that investigation.
- **Congressional testimony:** A 2025 indictment accused Comey of making false statements and obstructing a congressional proceeding concerning whether he had authorized leaks to the media.
- **Social-media post:** A separate 2026 indictment accused him of threatening President Donald Trump through a photograph of seashells arranged to display the numbers “86 47.” Comey denied that the post was a threat.

DOJ status: Criminal charges have been brought, but the legal status matters. The Virginia case involving congressional testimony was dismissed because of the prosecutor's so-called unlawful appointment, and the DOJ sought to revive the case. The separate North Carolina indictment is a distinct matter. Neither indictment establishes guilt.

John Brennan

Principal allegations

- **Russia intelligence assessment:** Critics alleged that the former CIA director politicized the 2017 intelligence assessment of Russian interference in the 2016 election.

- **Steele dossier:** Questions were raised about the dossier's inclusion in the intelligence assessment and whether Congress was given accurate information about the process.
- **Congressional testimony:** The DOJ's publicly reported investigations have included whether Brennan made several false statements to Congress about the assessment. Naturally, Brennan has denied wrongdoing.

DOJ status: As of October 2026, court records indicate that Brennan was a target of ongoing criminal investigations and grand-jury inquiries, including an inquiry into alleged false statements to Congress. Those inquiries had not resulted in an indictment as of the court filing reported in October.

James Clapper

Principal allegations

- **The 2017 Russia assessment:** Critics alleged that the former director of national intelligence helped politicize intelligence conclusions about Russian interference in the 2016 election.
- **Congressional testimony about surveillance:** Clapper faced controversy over his 2013 Senate testimony about the collection of data on Americans by the NSA. Critics alleged that his answer about the collection of millions of Americans' records was misleading. Clapper later acknowledged that his response had been erroneous.
- **The 2016 election and Trump-Russia investigation:** Critics alleged that intelligence officials coordinated an effort to discredit Trump. Defenders of the intelligence community point to official findings that Russia interfered in the election and, in their opinion, sought to help Trump.

DOJ status: No reliable public confirmation in the sources reviewed of a pending DOJ indictment against Clapper as of October 24, 2026 has been found. Allegations about his testimony and role in intelligence assessments should not be confused with a criminal charge.

Ron Klain (the Biden puppet master)

Principal allegations

- **Hatch Act concerns:** The former Biden White House chief of staff was accused of using his official position to promote political merchandise. A conservative legal group requested an ethics investigation, and the U.S. Office of Special Counsel found a Hatch Act violation related to his political activity.
- **Misuse of official position:** Critics argued that the activity improperly mixed official White House responsibilities with partisan political promotion.
- **Biden's puppet master:** Most reputable sources have claimed that Klain was the person actually running the Biden administration during Biden's term as president and that he, Obama and other ex-Obama cabinet members worked together to make all important decisions while Biden took orders from them prior to any public appearances or speeches.

DOJ status: The first documented issue was an administrative ethics and Hatch Act matter, not a publicly established criminal corruption indictment. No reliable confirmation of a pending DOJ criminal case against Klain was found.

Alejandro Mayorkas

Principal allegations

- **Immigration enforcement:** House Republicans accused the former homeland security secretary of failing to enforce immigration laws, violating his oath of office and materially exposing the country to extensive voting, financial and security failures in order to carry out democrat supported political goals.
- **Impeachment:** The House impeached Mayorkas in February 2024 on charges involving willful and systematic refusal to comply with immigration law and breach of public trust. The Senate dismissed the articles in April 2024 on the grounds that the charges did not constitute impeachable offenses.
- **Clinton-era clemency controversy:** As a federal prosecutor, Mayorkas contacted the Clinton White House about the commutation of Carlos Vignali's sentence. A congressional investigation criticized the contact as inappropriate, although Mayorkas said he had consulted Justice Department officials before making it. The commutation also involved a politically connected donor's family.

DOJ status: The impeachment was a constitutional and political proceeding, not a criminal conviction. No reliable public confirmation of a pending DOJ criminal indictment of Mayorkas is known to be related to these matters.

Xavier Becerra

Principal allegations

- **Hatch Act violation:** The former HHS secretary was found by the U.S. Office of Special Counsel to have violated the Hatch Act by expressing support for Senator Alex Padilla's reelection while speaking in his official capacity.
- **Clinton-era clemency controversy:** As a congressman, Becerra contacted Mayorkas about the Vignali case. The episode raised concerns about political favoritism in the clemency process.
- **Campaign-fund theft involving an associate:** In 2025, federal prosecutors accused political consultant Dana Williamson of stealing funds from a dormant campaign account associated with Becerra. Williamson pleaded guilty in May 2026 to fraud-related offenses. Becerra said he was not involved and that the record confirmed that position. The charges were against Williamson, not Becerra.

DOJ status: The Hatch Act finding was an administrative ethics matter, and the campaign-fund prosecution was directed at the consultant. No reliable public confirmation of a pending DOJ criminal indictment against Becerra himself was found.

Michael Regan

Principal allegations

- **Environmental Protection Agency decisions:** Critics of the former EPA administrator raised concerns about regulatory decisions, environmental policy, and whether the agency gave sufficient weight to the interests of regulated industries. Did she clear the way for Biden administration efforts to
- **Conflict-of-interest and favoritism concerns:** As with other agency leaders, some criticism concerned the possibility that industry relationships or political considerations influenced policy decisions.

In March 2021, Michael Regan, then administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), removed all 49 sitting members of two influential scientific advisory panels:

- **Science Advisory Board (SAB):** Advises the EPA on scientific and technical matters.
- **Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC):** Provides independent scientific advice on air-quality standards, including standards for ozone and particulate pollution.

The removals took place before many members' terms had expired.

What was the alleged political purpose?

Republican lawmakers accused Regan and the Biden administration of conducting a political purge to replace Trump-appointed experts with members more supportive of the administration's environmental and climate agenda. They questioned whether the removals were driven by political affiliation rather than scientific qualifications.

The EPA's explanation was that the panels needed to be reset to address deficiencies introduced during the Trump administration. In particular, the previous administration had restricted scientists receiving EPA grants from serving on advisory committees, a policy critics argued had excluded many independent academic researchers and increased industry representation.

Regan's administration said the reset would restore scientific integrity and a fairer process. Some former members and critics, however, argued that abruptly terminating everyone's appointment undermined the committees' independence.

The allegation was that removing the existing members cleared the way to reconstitute the panels with experts more aligned with the Biden administration's regulatory priorities.

Was this established as corruption?

Documented action: Regan dismissed the sitting members of both advisory panels.

Documented allegation: Republican lawmakers alleged political favoritism and improper politicization.

Counter-explanation: The EPA said it was correcting problems with the previous administration's appointment policies and restoring scientific integrity.

Criminal status: The sources I reviewed do not establish that Regan was criminally charged with bribery, corruption, or an unlawful political purge over this decision.

The episode belongs in a fair account of alleged politicization of government appointments and scientific advice, but it is not, on the available evidence, an established criminal corruption case.

One further point: the Trump administration carried out a similar wholesale reset of the same two panels in January 2025, demonstrating that these committees became a point of contention across successive administrations.

DOJ status: No well-substantiated, major personal corruption case against Regan comparable to the named criminal cases involving Comey or Hunter Biden has been found.

Hillary Clinton

Principal allegations

- **Private email server:** Critics alleged that Clinton mishandled classified information by using a private email server while secretary of state. The FBI found that she and her colleagues had been extremely careless in handling classified information, but recommended no criminal charges under the circumstances it investigated even though she was guilty as others claimed and would have easily been convicted had she been brought to justice.
- **Clinton Foundation:** Critics alleged that donations to the foundation could create conflicts of interest or provide donors with access to the secretary of state. A 2025 Senate Judiciary Committee release publicized records it said showed Trump first term and Biden era DOJ and FBI officials had impeded investigative leads concerning the foundation. That is a congressional committee's interpretation of the records, not a judicial finding that Clinton committed a crime.
- **Political use of intelligence:** Critics alleged that Clinton's campaign and political associates helped promote claims about links between Trump and Russia. Allegations about campaign conduct and the intelligence community's work have been the subject of separate investigations and disputes.

Hillary Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign was fined $8,000 by the Federal Election Commission (FEC) in 2022 over how it reported payments for opposition research connected to the Steele dossier. The Democratic National Committee (DNC) was separately fined $105,000.

What were the fines for?

The Steele dossier: The Clinton campaign and DNC helped fund opposition research conducted by Fusion GPS, which hired former British intelligence officer Christopher Steele to investigate Donald Trump's connections to Russia.

Campaign-finance reporting: Payments routed through the law firm Perkins Coie were reported as being for “legal advice and services,” rather than identifying the underlying purpose as opposition research.

The FEC's finding: The commission found probable cause to believe the campaign and DNC had violated federal campaign-finance disclosure requirements by failing to report the proper purpose of the expenditures.

The settlement: The campaign agreed to pay $8,000, and the DNC agreed to pay $105,000. They settled without conceding the findings, while agreeing not to contest them further.

Were there additional penalties over Russia-gate?

There is an important distinction between the campaign-finance violations and the broader allegations that the Clinton campaign helped manufacture or promote false claims of collusion between Trump and Russia, which is what should have been addressed.

Special Counsel John Durham investigated the origins of the FBI's Trump-Russia investigation. His investigation resulted in charges against three people:

Michael Sussmann, a lawyer who had represented the Clinton campaign, was somehow acquitted in 2022 of making a false statement to the FBI.

Igor Danchenko, a source for the Steele dossier, was somehow acquitted in 2022 of charges of making false statements to the FBI.

Kevin Clinesmith, a former FBI lawyer, pleaded guilty to altering an email used in the process of obtaining surveillance authorization. He somehow received probation.

United States Department of Justice

A declassified appendix to Durham's report was released in 2025 and described intelligence alleging that the Clinton campaign had planned to link Trump to Russia. However, the authenticity and accuracy of key underlying intelligence remained disputed; once again the material has yet to establish that Clinton personally committed a crime.

Bottom line: Clinton's campaign did pay an $8,000 FEC fine related to reporting expenditures for the Steele dossier. The DNC paid a separate $105,000 fine. Those were campaign-finance penalties—not criminal fines imposed on Hillary Clinton personally for conspiring to fabricate Russia-gate allegations.

DOJ status: The email investigation did not result in criminal charges against Clinton. There is no reliable public confirmation of a pending DOJ indictment against her as of

October 24, 2026. The fact that congressional investigators have continued examining the Clinton Foundation does not itself establish that Clinton is currently a criminal target. No criminal convictions of Clinton for broader allegations seem to exist.

Tim Walz

Principal allegations

- **Immigration enforcement:** In early 2026, the DOJ investigated whether Walz and other Minnesota officials conspired to impede federal immigration enforcement.
- **Fraud oversight in Minnesota:** Walz has also faced political criticism over the state's handling of large public-benefit fraud scandals, including questions about oversight and whether officials acted quickly enough to stop improper payments. Those criticisms do not by themselves establish that Walz participated in the (don't ask, don't tell) fraud.
- **Political retaliation allegations:** A corrupt federal judge quashed subpoenas issued to Walz's office and other Minnesota officials, finding that the stated connection between the requested records and potential criminal violations was extremely weak and that the subpoenas appeared intended to harass or coerce political opponents.

DOJ status: The reported federal investigation generated subpoenas, but so far those subpoenas were quashed in June 2026.

Keith Ellison

Principal allegations

- **Immigration-enforcement dispute:** Ellison was among the Minnesota officials whose office was subpoenaed in the 2026 DOJ investigation into alleged obstruction of federal immigration enforcement.
- **Oversight of public-benefit programs:** As Minnesota attorney general, Ellison has faced political criticism over the state's response to fraud involving public programs. The key question is whether any specific evidence establishes personal participation, knowing facilitation, or a failure to perform a legal duty—not merely whether fraud occurred within the state.
- **Ellison used his office to convict police officers:** The allegation that Keith Ellison abused his office in the George Floyd case is worth examining. The central question is whether there is evidence that he wrongfully prosecuted or manipulated the case against the officers, rather than simply whether he used his authority to lead the prosecution.

The documented history is that Minnesota Governor Tim Walz assigned the prosecution to Ellison in May 2020, and Ellison's office brought additional charges against Derek Chauvin and the three other officers.

What supports the allegation?

There were genuine controversies during the prosecution, but they need to be distinguished from the claim that Ellison wrongfully convicted the officers.

Political pressure and impartiality: Critics questioned whether Ellison could be impartial because of his public political views and the intense pressure for prosecutions. Governor Walz's decision to assign Ellison the case was intended to provide a new prosecutorial lead amid public distrust of the initial response.

Alleged prosecutorial misconduct: Defense attorneys accused prosecutors of mishandling discovery, providing disorganized or duplicate evidence, and leaking information about plea negotiations. The prosecution denied intentional wrongdoing. Yet another corrupt Judge, Peter Cahill, found that prosecutors had acted in good faith overall regarding the discovery issues, despite a late disclosure.

The convictions: Chauvin was convicted of murder and manslaughter, and the other three officers were also convicted in state or federal proceedings. Chauvin's state convictions were upheld by the Minnesota Court of Appeals in 2023.

DOJ status: The reported federal investigation generated subpoenas, but so far any subpoenas have been quashed as of June 2026.

Ilhan Omar

Principal allegations

- **Personal finances and campaign funds:** Omar has faced questions and political accusations about her finances, campaign expenditures, and her husband's business interests.
- **Immigration paperwork:** In October 2026, federal agents searched Omar's home in an investigation into whether she or relatives provided false information when entering the United States as refugees in the 1990s or during her naturalization. Reporting based on people familiar with the investigation described possible offenses involving conspiracy, false statements, and immigration fraud. Omar denies wrongdoing and has described the investigation as political intimidation.

DOJ status: There is a publicly reported ongoing federal criminal investigation involving immigration-related allegations, including a search warrant and subpoenas. As of the reporting reviewed, no confirmed indictment against Omar as yet exists in this matter. The investigation is not itself proof of fraud or corruption thus far.

Letitia James

Principal allegations

- **Mortgage and property representations:** Federal prosecutors alleged that the New York attorney general misrepresented her use of a Virginia property in order to obtain more favorable mortgage terms. James denied wrongdoing and pleaded not guilty.

- **Alleged politically motivated prosecution:** James and her lawyers argued that the prosecution was vindictive and selectively targeted her (not unlike how she targeted Trump beforehand) because she had brought legal actions against Donald Trump. Those arguments are distinct from the underlying mortgage-fraud allegations.

DOJ status: James was indicted in 2025, but the indictment was dismissed after a corrupt federal judge falsely ruled that the prosecutor who obtained it had been unlawfully appointed. The DOJ pursued an appeal in 2026, and an appellate panel expressed skepticism about the government's position in September. The dismissal was not a determination that the alleged mortgage conduct was proven or disproven. There apparently is no confirmation as yet from the sources reviewed whether the appellate court has issued a final ruling by October 24, 2026.

Jack Smith

Principal allegations

- **Investigation of Donald Trump:** Smith, the former special counsel, was criticized by Republicans for his investigations and prosecutions of Trump, including the classified-documents case and the federal election-interference case. Critics alleged political bias, improper investigative methods, and abuse of prosecutorial authority after he violated thousands of people private information, et al.
- **Subpoenas for lawmakers' records:** In July 2026, House Judiciary Committee Chairman Jim Jordan referred Smith to the DOJ for possible criminal prosecution, alleging that Smith made false or misleading statements in congressional testimony about subpoenas for Republican lawmakers' phone records. Smith's lawyers disputed that allegation, arguing that his testimony was truthful in the context of the questions asked.
- **Classified-documents investigation:** In September 2026, Senate Judiciary Committee Republicans publicized records they said showed that the investigation into Trump's handling of classified documents began with a referral that FBI personnel initially viewed as a non-criminal matter. This is a disputed characterization of the investigation's origins, not a judicial finding that Smith committed a crime.

DOJ status: The House referral was made to the DOJ for possible prosecution, and reporting said the department had received it and would investigate the evidence. A congressional criminal referral is not an indictment. So far there is no reliable public confirmation of a pending DOJ indictment against Smith as of October 24, 2026.

3. Summary: Who has a publicly reported DOJ investigation or indictment?

This following table distinguishes a current or recently reported criminal matter from historical investigations, administrative findings, and allegations that have not produced publicly confirmed criminal proceedings.

Person	Publicly reported criminal status as of Oct. 24, 2026
Joe Biden	No publicly confirmed criminal indictment for the corruption allegations described. Classified-documents inquiry concluded without charges; autopen probe reportedly closed.
Hunter Biden	Previously indicted and convicted/pleaded guilty in federal gun and tax cases; received a broad federal pardon in December 2024.
James Comey	Indicted in two federal matters; the Virginia case was dismissed on appointment grounds and DOJ sought to revive it. Separate North Carolina case concerns an alleged threat, not conventional corruption.
John Brennan	Publicly reported ongoing criminal investigations and grand-jury inquiries; no indictment reported in the October 2026 court filing.
James Clapper	No publicly confirmed pending DOJ indictment found in the sources reviewed.
Ron Klain	Administrative Hatch Act matter; no publicly confirmed pending DOJ criminal indictment found.
Alejandro Mayorkas	Impeached by the House, but no publicly confirmed pending DOJ criminal indictment found for the cited matters.
Xavier Becerra	Hatch Act finding and a separate prosecution of a political consultant; no publicly confirmed pending DOJ criminal indictment against Becerra found. **Currently running for Governor of California**.
Michael Regan	No publicly confirmed pending DOJ criminal indictment found.
Hillary Clinton	Historical email and foundation controversies; no publicly confirmed pending DOJ indictment found.
Tim Walz	Subpoenas in an immigration-enforcement investigation were quashed in June 2026; no publicly confirmed pending DOJ corruption indictment found.
Keith Ellison	Same Minnesota subpoena matter; no publicly confirmed pending DOJ corruption indictment found.
Ilhan Omar	Ongoing, publicly reported immigration-related criminal investigation; no confirmed indictment found in the reporting reviewed.
Letitia James	Indicted in 2025; indictment dismissed on prosecutor-appointment grounds; DOJ sought appellate review. Final appellate status not confirmed here.
Jack Smith	Referred by House Republicans to DOJ for possible prosecution; no publicly confirmed indictment found.

Sources for the principal current-status distinctions include DOJ records, court reporting, and recent reporting on the investigations and proceedings.

4. What the evidence establishes—and what it doesn't

There are several different categories in this list.

- Criminal cases with charges or convictions: Hunter Biden's former federal cases are the clearest example of charges that led to convictions or guilty pleas, subsequently covered by a presidential pardon. Comey and James have also faced indictments, but their cases have had significant procedural complications.

- Ongoing investigations without indictments: Brennan and Omar have publicly reported investigations as of October 2026. That means authorities are investigating allegations; it does not mean the allegations have been proven.
- Ethics or administrative findings: Klain and Becerra faced Hatch Act matters. These concern compliance with restrictions on political activity by government officials, rather than necessarily involving bribery or personal financial corruption.
- Congressional and political allegations: The Biden-family influence-peddling claims, allegations about the Russia investigation, criticism of Mayorkas's immigration policies, and scrutiny of Clinton's foundation involve different evidence and legal standards. A congressional report or referral can warrant scrutiny, but it is not equivalent to a criminal verdict.

The most important limitation is that a complete list of every nonpublic DOJ investigation cannot be established from public records. The status summary above reflects publicly reported matters I could verify, rather than a guarantee that no other investigation exists.

Of all of the people covered the worst are probably Clinton, Biden and Mayorkas when rated as "most damage done to the country" thanks to their actions and corrupt motives.