United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

September 23, 2026

Todd Blanche
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Blanche:

In June, we wrote to you about potential corruption related to the Department of Justice's (DOJ's) decision to drop its criminal case against Gautam Adani when initial reports indicated that Mr. Adani had offered to make a large investment in the United States if the DOJ agreed to drop its prosecution of him – seemingly a quid-pro-quo attempt by a billionaire to purchase criminal immunity.[1] Now, a key fact of these reports was confirmed in federal court – Mr. Adani admitted that he "offered to invest $10 billion in the United States as part of the resolution of his criminal case."[2] The DOJ sought to dismiss the case against Mr. Adani, but struggled to provide the Court with satisfactory information about its decision, and the charges remained pending until earlier last month.[3] As described by the overseeing judge, this case contains "concerning" "irregularities" and the conduct of a senior DOJ official was "'highly unusual' and 'unbecoming of his office.'"[4] These and other new revelations in this matter raise additional questions about the DOJ's sense of judgement and willingness to enforce the law equally against all defendants.

DOJ's Questionable Dismissal of Charges Against Mr. Adani

In June, we wrote to you in the wake of the DOJ's decision to seek to dismiss criminal charges against Mr. Adani.[5] In 2024, Mr. Adani was indicted in the Eastern District of New York as part of an alleged multi-billion dollar scheme that involved bribing Indian government officials and lying about these actions to investors, including U.S. based investors who invested at least $175 million.[6] Approximately eighteen months later, the DOJ sought to dismiss the charges in a "terse" motion filed on May 18, 2026 with no rationale provided beyond that the DOJ had

---

[1] Letter from U.S. Senators Elizabeth Warren & Richard Blumenthal to Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, June 11, 2026, https://www.warren.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/media/doc/letter_to_doj_re_adani.pdf.

[2] New York Times, "Indicted Tycoon Says $10 Billion Offer Did Not Spur U.S. to Drop Charges," Santul Nerkar and Nicole Hong, July 15, 2026, https://www.nytimes.com/2026/07/15/nyregion/gautam-adani-corruption-dropped.html.

[3] Politico, "Judge dismisses Adani case — but slams DOJ official's 'highly unusual' conduct," Erica Orden, August 10, 2026, https://www.politico.com/news/2026/08/10/gautam-adani-justice-department-case-01031470.

[4] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 49 (E.D.N.Y. August 10, 2026) https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.49.0.pdf at 28, 45.

[5] Letter from U.S. Senators Elizabeth Warren & Richard Blumenthal to Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, June 11, 2026, https://www.warren.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/media/doc/letter_to_doj_re_adani.pdf.

decided, "not to devote further resources to these criminal charges against individual defendants."[7] The court granted the DOJ's motion to dismiss the charges against Mr. Adani on August 10, 2026.[8] The DOJ's motion to dismiss the case came following widespread reporting that Mr. Adani had hired a personal lawyer of President Trump and then offered to invest $10 billion in the United States if the DOJ dropped its prosecution of him.[9]

From the initial reporting, it appeared that Mr. Adani, or his counsel, proposed a blatant quid-pro-quo, and if true, raised grave concerns about corruption in the current administration.[10] As we previously described to you, "The DOJ's decision g[ave] the appearance that Mr. Adani – with the help of one of the President's personal lawyers – bought his way to criminal immunity, trading the promise of an investment in the United States for immunity from an alleged multi-billion dollar bribery scheme."[11] In our letter, we sought additional information regarding if this offer was made and to whom, how the DOJ came to its decision to seek dismissal of the charges, and the role of the White House in the DOJ's decision making.

Court Filings Confirm Mr. Adani Made a Quid-Pro-Quo Offer to the DOJ

To date, you have failed to respond to our letter and provide the requested information about the reported offer. However, in the interim, Mr. Adani, his counsel, and the DOJ have made a series of filings with the court overseeing this case, and in doing so, confirmed that Mr. Adani did in fact make a $10 billion offer, on behalf of the Adani Group, to resolve his criminal case. As reported, "Gautam Adani, acknowledged … that he had offered to invest $10 billion in the United States as part of the resolution of his criminal case."[12] As further described by his counsel, "[o]n two occasions during our discussions with the DOJ, [Sullivan and Cromwell] stated that as part of any resolution of these matters on the merits, the Adani Group would be

---

[6] United States Attorney's Office Eastern District of New York, "Billionaire Chairman of Conglomerate and Seven Other Senior Business Executives Indicted in Connection With Scheme to Pay Hundreds of Millions of Dollars in Bribes and Conceal Bribery Scheme From U.S. Investors," press release, November 20, 2024, https://www.justice.gov/usao-edny/pr/billionaire-chairman-conglomerate-and-seven-other-senior-business-executives-indicted; U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, "SEC Charges Three Senior Executives in Two Actions Alleging Massive Bribery Scheme Involving Indian Energy Companies Adani Green and Azure Power," press release, November 21, 2024, https://www.sec.gov/enforcement-litigation/litigation-releases/lr-26177.

[7] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 23 (E.D.N.Y. May 18, 2026) https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.23.0.pdf; United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 36 (E.D.N.Y. June 26, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.36.0.pdf at page 4.

[8] New York Times, "Judge Grants Justice Dept. Request to Dismiss Case Against Indian Tycoon," Santul Nerkar, August 10, 2026, https://www.nytimes.com/2026/08/10/nyregion/adani-fraud-case-dismissed-trump-administration.html.

[9] Letter from Senators Elizabeth Warren and Richard Blumenthal to Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, June 11, 2026, https://www.warren.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/media/doc/letter_to_doj_re_adani.pdf.

[10] *Id.*

[11] *Id.*

[12] New York Times, "Indicted Tycoon Says $10 Billion Offer Did Not Spur U.S. to Drop Charges," Santul Nerkar and Nicole Hong, July 15, 2026, https://www.nytimes.com/2026/07/15/nyregion/gautam-adani-corruption-dropped.html.

amenable to following through on a public statement by Gautam Adani regarding the Group's willingness to invest $10 billion in the United States as a means of promoting the U.S.-India trade relationship."[13]

The audacity of this statement is astounding: the legal team led by the president's personal lawyer[14] swore under oath that his firm conveyed a $10 billion investment offer from a foreign company *"as part of any resolution"* of a multi-billion dollar federal criminal case against one of the wealthiest men in the world.[15] This appears to be an offer of a quid-pro-quo for individual criminal immunity. Even the overseeing judge noted that he was "[t]aking no position on the ultimate propriety of Mr. Giuffra's repeat attempts to resolve this bribery case with monetary offers."[16]

The DOJ's response and handling of this case was seemingly so outside of the bounds of regular order that the overseeing federal judge felt it necessary to comment. In particular, the overseeing judge went out of his way in his opinion to remark that Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General (PADAG) McCotter, who described himself as "the final and sole decisionmaker to seek dismissal of the charges,"[17] "came to this decision largely in collaboration with defense counsel, and seemingly without input from the FBI and SEC agents who investigated the alleged misconduct, or the attorneys from the Department, SEC, and U.S. Attorney's Office who brought the case, [which] appears to be highly unusual."[18] He further stated that the "irregularities in the decision to dismiss the Indictment are concerning."[19]

In addition, we note that from these filings, it appears the main action PADAG McCotter took in response to the confirmed $10 billion investment offer on behalf of a criminal defendant was to direct or authorize another lawyer to send an email stating that the reason for the dismissal was not this investment offer.[20] However, no further information has been provided about how the DOJ responded to these offers at the time they were made, why Sullivan and Cromwell made the offer at least twice,[21] or any additional actions taken in response to such a remarkable situation. The information available in these filings must also be read in light of the regular failure of DOJ attorneys to provide candor to the courts during the Trump administration,[22] raising further questions about how the DOJ handled this matter.

---

[13] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 40-2 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2026) at ¶9.

[14] New York Times, "U.S. Set to Drop Charges Against Indian Billionaire Accused of Fraud," Nicole Hong, Ben Protess, William K. Rashbaum, et al., May 14, 2026, https://www.nytimes.com/2026/05/14/nyregion/gautam-adani-billionaire-doj-trump.html.

[15] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 40-2 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2026) at ¶9.

[16] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 49 (E.D.N.Y. August 10, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.49.0.pdf at 45.

[17] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 37 (E.D.N.Y. July 4, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.37.0.pdf at page 3.

[18] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 49 (E.D.N.Y. August 10, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.49.0.pdf at 45

[19] *Id.*

[20] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 40-2 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2026) at ¶12; United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 47 (E.D.N.Y. July 17, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.47.0.pdf.

[21] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 40-2 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2026) at ¶9.

Further, PADAG McCotter stated that he "was the final and sole decisionmaker to seek dismissal of the charges" against Mr. Adani.[23] However, he has made seemingly contradictory statements about whether he had been approached with the investment offer when he decided to drop the DOJ's prosecution. At one point he said "[b]efore that topic [of an investment offer] first arose, I had already firmly concluded I would seek dismissal of the securities charges no matter what."[24] However, in his same filing, Mr. McCotter stated that he "made the decision to dismiss these charges after conducting numerous meetings with defense counsel (two of which featured a dozen-plus attorneys)."[25] Given that Mr. Adani's lawyers made the investment offer twice, at least one of which was at a meeting with the DOJ, we request that Mr. McCotter explain precisely when he decided to drop the charges and what information he had at the time.

Concerningly, the DOJ and Mr. Adani's counsel seemed unable to tell the Court a coherent story about why the DOJ is seeking to drop charges against Mr. Adani. Instead, the Court noted that "the parties [the DOJ and Mr. Adani] continue to provide information [to the court]…in a piecemeal fashion…[and] continue to volunteer information not requested by this court, prompting new questions and *appearing to contradict previous representations*."[26] While the Court ultimately received sufficient information to fulfill its Rule 48 role, if the fact pattern was as simple as the DOJ implies it to be,[27] then its filings likely should have reflected this rather than take the Court on a long winding goose chase for the entire truth.

Questions about the Role and Influence of the President's Personal Lawyers

We are also concerned about the involvement of two of President Trump's personal lawyers in this case, and the extent to which they reveal potential political influence and special treatment for well-connected insiders at the DOJ. As we noted in our earlier letter, Mr. Adani "hired a new legal team led by Robert J. Giuffra Jr., one of President Trump's personal attorneys," in what appeared to be "transparent influence-peddling."[28]

But new information indicates that another of the President's personal lawyers and advisors, Boris Epshteyn, became involved in this tangle of influences. Mr. Epshteyn is another of the President's personal lawyers and has been described as his "legal coordinator" and the

---

[22] Just Security, "The "Presumption of Regularity" in Trump Administration Litigation (4th edition)," Ryan Goodman, Siven Watt, Audrey Balliette, et al., March 19, 2026, https://www.justsecurity.org/120547/presumption-regularity-trump-administration-litigation/#post-134271-_Toc224729318.

[23] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 37 (E.D.N.Y. July 4, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.37.0.pdf at 3.

[24] *Id* at 9.

[25] *Id* at page 6.

[26] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 45 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2026) at page 2 (emphasis added).

[27] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 37 (E.D.N.Y. July 4, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.37.0.pdf at pages 6, 9.

[28] Letter from U.S. Senators Elizabeth Warren & Richard Blumenthal to Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, June 11, 2026, https://www.warren.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/media/doc/letter_to_doj_re_adani.pdf.

"quarterback [of] the president's legal fights."[29] Mr. Epshteyn was reportedly involved in both connecting you to the President, when "[a]fter Epshteyn put in a good word for [you], Trump's team brought [you] on to fight multiple prosecutions spanning from New York to Florida during the interregnum" before you were elevated to deputy attorney general, and now Attorney General of the United States.[30] Further, it was reported that "Epshteyn had pushed for McCotter to get a Justice Department posting."[31]

Mr. Epshteyn also reportedly "operat[es] as a connector for clients with business before the Trump Administration" where "[h]e offer[s] to help potential clients solve issues before the administration in exchange for a monthly fee of as much as six figures."[32] The new reports indicate that Mr. Adani's family had tried to determine "if he was truly an insider in the Trump administration,"[33] and as early as summer of last year, he began working on behalf of the Adani family.[34] Mr. Epshteyn's role reportedly became known to the DOJ, where his "presence was discussed inside the Justice Department and among others familiar with the case."[35] Mr. Epshteyn and others have denied the accuracy of this reporting, calling it "falsehood-ridden," but it is yet another in a series of troubling reports about this case.[36]

Conclusion and Questions

A series of public reports and documents filed with the court appear to indicate that (i) Mr. Adani's attorneys conveyed an offer to invest $10 billion in the United States "as part of any resolution of" a criminal matter,[37] (ii) the DOJ then sought to dismiss the case against Mr. Adani, but struggled to ultimately provide the Court with satisfactory information about the process by which this occurred, and (iii) Mr. Adani's legal team may be attempting to politicize the judicial process working with attorneys with close personal connections to the President. These fresh details continue to raise concerns about the judgment of the DOJ, and the extent to which the DOJ is willing and able to prosecute white collar criminals under President Trump.

To better understand the full extent of DOJ's actions and its current operating practices, we again request answers to the questions posed on June 11, and the following additional questions no later than October 7, 2026:

1. Provide the following information for each time an investment offer was made on behalf of any defendant in this matter to the DOJ:

---

[29] The Wall Street Journal, "Trump's Personal Lawyer Was Said to Be Part of a Billionaire's Criminal Defense," Joe Palazzolo, Rebecca Ballhaus, C. Ryan Barber, et al., June 15, 2026, https://www.wsj.com/politics/policy/boris-epshteyn-indian-billionaire-adani-592e9ede.

[30] *Id.*

[31] *Id.*

[32] *Id.*

[33] *Id.*

[34] *Id.*

[35] *Id.*

[36] *Id.*

[37] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 40-2 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2026) at ¶9.

   a. The date on which such offer was made;
   b. The setting in which the offer was made (e.g. via a phone call, via email, via a slide deck, in person conversation, etc.);
   c. The names and titles of the DOJ employees present when the offer was made;
   d. The precise wording and terms of the offer;
   e. The legal entity that would be making the investment;
   f. The explanation provided by any defendant or their representative(s), if any, as to why Mr. Adani or the Adani Group could not make this investment before the DOJ dropped its charges;
   g. A description of how the DOJ employees present when the offer was made reacted to the offer; and
   h. A description of how any other DOJ employees aware of the offer reacted to the offer.

2. In his filing on July 4, 2026,[38] Mr. McCotter stated that:
   a. "Before that topic [of an investment offer] first arose, I had already firmly concluded I would seek dismissal of the securities charges no matter what, because they were so indefensible,"; and
   b. "I made the decision to dismiss these charges after conducting numerous meetings with defense counsel (two of which featured a dozen-plus attorneys) and also separate meetings with only Department counsel, after reviewing hundreds of pages of materials prepared both by defense counsel and by Department counsel in response to questions I raised, and after conducting my own research and analysis."

   Please clarify:
   a. When Mr. McCotter decided to dismiss the charges against Mr. Adani;
   b. What information Mr. McCotter had been presented with or consulted prior to making his decision; and
   c. Whether one or both of the statements in question 2 are inaccurate. If either or both are inaccurate, please provide a correction and an explanation for why Mr. McCotter filed an inaccurate statement(s) with the court.

3. Did employees at the DOJ determine that Mr. Epshteyn was working on behalf of Mr. Adani and, if so, how? Did Mr. Epshteyn, or any agent working on his behalf, have any contact with any employee at the DOJ regarding Mr. Adani? If yes, provide the name of the employee(s), the date(s) of communication, and a summary of the contents of any such communication(s).

4. Did Mr. Donald Trump Jr., or any agent working on his behalf, have any contact with any employee at the DOJ regarding Mr. Adani? If yes, provide the name of the employee(s), the date(s) of communication, and a summary of the contents of any such communication(s).

[38] United States of America v. Adani et al., No. 24-CR-0433, Document 37 (E.D.N.Y. July 4, 2026), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760/gov.uscourts.nyed.522760.37.0.pdf at pages 6, 9.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Warren
United States Senator

Richard Blumenthal
United States Senator