

July 20, 2023

Savannah Chrisley  
[Address/redacted]  
Nashville, TN 37205

Senate Judicial Oversight Committee  
Washington, D.C.  
216 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Members:

Chairman Dick Durbin, Senator from Illinois  
Ranking Member Lindsey Graham, Senator from South Carolina

Dianne Feinstein, Senator from California  
Sheldon Whitehouse, Senator from Rhode Island  
Amy Klobuchar, Senator from Minnesota  
Chris Coons, Senator from Delaware  
Richard Blumenthal, Senator from Connecticut  
Mazie Hirono, Senator from Hawaii  
Cory Booker, Senator from New Jersey  
Alex Padilla, Senator from California  
Job Ossof, Senator from Georgia  
Peter Welch, Senator from Vermont  
Church Grassley, Senator from Iowa  
John Cronyn, Senator from Texas  
Mike Lee, Senator from Utah  
Ted Cruz, Senator from Texas  
Josh Hawley, Senator from Missouri  
Tom Cotton, Senator from Arkansas  
John Kennedy, Senator from Louisiana

Dear Senators:

I am sure that your office receives hundreds, perhaps thousands of letters a month. All different types of requests for help and assistance. I never imagined I would become one of those who is desperately reaching out for help, but I am indeed in **desperate need of help**. Last night I sat eating dinner with my brother and sister who, because I have officially adopted them and now serve as their legal guardian, are also my son and daughter. As we were eating dinner, we were watching the hearings on the corruption being exposed within the FBI. Despite the fact that I have told my family and siblings that I am doing absolutely everything in my power to get our parents back home, I realized that I needed to take another step and begin pursuing help from

anyone and anywhere that I can find a captive audience and someone who is willing to just listen. I need to be heard. My family needs to be heard. My siblings who ask me every single day, "when are mom and dad going to come home", they need to be heard. So I am turning to you now and asking you to please read this letter with an open mind. If even one piece of this information strikes you as a government overreach, I ask that you please contact me and let me provide you with the actual evidence that substantiates my claims. Please let me show you what has happened to my family. I am hoping that through that process maybe we can undo this injustice and bring my family home.

We live in America. The greatest nation on earth. A nation that prioritizes freedom, liberty and justice for all. I believe personally in justice. I am not in any way trying to get preferential treatment or a free pass for my parents. If the government can honestly and ethically prove their case, then I will absolutely accept that outcome, but that is absolutely **NOT** what has happened.

Our case, our trial, and our entire experience with the justice department has been riddled with errors and inconsistencies. At every turn the blindfolds of justice that we were supposed to protect, were allowed to be lifted. Instead of facts being presented as the basis of the prosecution, our family name was highlighted as an attempt to arouse and alarm the jury. When our name was not incendiary enough, the prosecution decided to invoke the name of Donald Trump. In what is the most democratic county of all of Georgia, the opening remarks within our trial were, "ladies and gentlemen of the jury, what we have here are the Trump's of the South".

Why those words? That isn't evidence. That isn't about presenting facts or providing members of the jury with actual documentation or reliable information. These are just remarks intended to create a strong, negative, emotional response that would taint the jury and prejudice them against my family. Why? If their case was so strong, why go to such great lengths to create an emotional reaction versus a logical one?

I fully and completely believe it is because the attorneys working for the government on this case were so blind to the facts and were after my parents because of the notoriety it brought them and their office. This case was a career advancer. But that is not about justice and this is not the way our country is supposed to operate. I do not want to offer you sensational statements and try to do what the government did to our family. I want to briefly provide you with facts that outline and prove that what I am stating is both accurate and true.

As a part of the effort for the government to prove its case against my family, they relied on two key witnesses. The government's bank fraud case rested largely on the testimony of my parents' former business partner, Mark Braddock, who was granted immunity for testifying that he facilitated the fraud. This meant the government was willing to overlook and not prosecute all the fraud he admittedly committed, including stealing numerous properties from my parents and misallocating millions of dollars, all so that they could focus exclusively on my parents. Our defense to these fraud charges was that Mark Braddock committed the crimes without my parents' knowledge. A defense we absolutely still hold as true.

The other key witness the government used in efforts to establish my parents' "criminal intent" was IRS Officer Betty Carter. Officer Carter was the first IRS investigator involved in the matter. Officer Carter testified at length on the first and second days of trial. At that time, she testified that she prepared for her testimony by examining the relevant tax payment records in the IRS's internal systems. Specifically, she said that she reviewed the IRS's "integrated data system," which, "shows returns that are filed, taxes that are due, payments that are made, basically the activity on the money side of the account." Purportedly based on her review of these records, Officer Carter testified that my parents failed to pay taxes for various years and still owed the IRS money for those years. For example, she said that, based on her review of the IRS's records, which she claimed she completed the morning before her testimony, my parents still owed taxes for 2010, and 2014. Officer Carter also testified on cross-examination that my parents owed money for 2015 and 2016. While she could not recall the exact amount, she told defense counsel that she would let them know what those amounts were.

Officer Carter did not contact defense counsel with these alleged balances during the trial. Instead, **after the government had obtained its convictions**, she contacted my parents' accountant, Bruce Seckendorf, and admitted that the couple **did NOT owe the IRS** the money she claimed at trial that they did. Officer Carter told Seckendorf that my parents were actually **current** on their taxes for 2014, 2015, and 2016 but **the IRS had failed to apply the payments** to their account. In later emails with Seckendorf, Officer Carter confirmed that the IRS's system showed that my parents had in fact made payments for 2014, 2015, and 2016 that **exceeded the amounts owed for those years**. Yet her testimony left the misimpression that my parents still owed substantial sums to the IRS when in fact the IRS had been failing to apply payments that my parents previously made. All told, **the IRS owed US substantial refunds**, not the other way around. At no time during or after trial did Officer Carter or the prosecutors attempt to correct the record on these questions.

Based on Officer Carter's false testimony and the government's failure to correct it, my parents raised a Giglio claim in their motion for a new trial and requested an evidentiary hearing on it. The government's response admitted (albeit in a footnote) that the prosecution team **knew during the trial that Officer Carter's testimony was false, and that they did nothing to correct it**. These are facts. This is **NOT** hype. This isn't emotional pandering to try and create a false narrative. These are facts found in the transcripts within the court documents. However, even in the face of these admissions, the district court declined to hold a hearing on the motion for a new trial. **Not even a hearing**. Instead the court simply denied the new trial motion in one paragraph of a brief order without stating any reasons.

Three days **after** the court ruled denying the request for a new trial, we received documents in response to a records request to the IRS that they had made many months prior. These records (internal IRS audit trails) substantiated my parents' Giglio claims and refuted the government's assertion that Officer Carter's false testimony was unintentional and that the prosecutors were unaware of the payments. Based in part on this evidence, we filed a motion for reconsideration, once again asking for a new trial. This renewed motion stated, among other things, that the prosecutors and Officer Carter had planned to mislead the jury and the court by basing Officer

Carter's testimony about the tax payments on an IRS database that they knew to be incorrect. Our motion provided factual support through affidavits and is corroborated by the government's own admissions in its response to the new trial motion.

This motion for new trial stated in part, "Shortly after the criminal investigation began, in 2018, the prosecutors at trial (AUSAs Peters and Krepp) knew that the Defendants had paid their tax liability for at least 2014 and 2015. They **did not want the jury to know this information**, so shortly before trial they filed a motion to exclude any evidence of the payments. Even at sentencing, the government claimed that Officer Carter's testimony was "literally true" based on the IRS's incorrect records and remained silent about Officer Carter's and the prosecutors' actual knowledge of the payments. After filing the motion to exclude the truth that these taxes were paid, AUSAs Peters and Krepp filed a "Notice" about it with the Court. In this pleading, filed a week before Officer Carter's testimony, the prosecutors acknowledged that they were **aware** "that Todd and Julie Chrisley filed amended tax returns and paid off their tax liabilities after February 2018." The Court denied the government's motion to exclude this evidence on May 10, 2022.

As a result, AUSAs Peters and Krepp knew that the Defendants' tax payments from 2018 to the present, in the so-called "post-conspiracy" period, would be admissible at trial and were likely to be introduced by the Defendants in their case. A few days later, AUSAs Peters and Krepp met with Officer Carter to prepare her for her testimony. During that meeting, both prosecutors and Officer Carter knew that the Defendants made the necessary payments to extinguish much, if not all, of their tax liability for all tax years before trial. Consistent with their motion, however, AUSAs Peters and Krepp did not want to leave the jury with the impression that the Defendants had paid their outstanding tax liability, **even though the prosecutors knew that they had**. At some point in their trial prep conversations, AUSAs Peters and Krepp and Officer Carter discussed the fact that the IRS Employee User Portal ("EUP") failed to reflect the payments the Defendants had made after 2018 and incorrectly showed outstanding tax balances. The prosecutors and Officer Carter knew that the balances reflected in the EUP were **incorrect**. Nonetheless, AUSAs Peters and Krepp told Officer Carter that she could "rely upon the IRS account transcripts from EUP," rather than the other knowledge she possessed from her review of the Defendants' tax records, which showed conclusively that the payments made exceeded the balances that the EUP incorrectly claimed were due. To be clear, AUSAs Peters and Krepp told Officer Carter her testimony would be "truthful and accurate" so long as she testified to "what the EUP database reflected regarding the untimely filed 2014, 2015, and 2016 joint returns for the Chrisley Defendants." And this is what Officer Carter tried to do, she did so **even though she knew that her answers were misleading**; she knew from her hundreds of searches through the Defendants' tax records that they had made payments in excess of what the EUP incorrectly said they owed. **This testimony was intentionally misleading, as detailed above, and both AUSA Krepp and Officer Carter knew that it was.**

Is this America? Is this how we do justice in this country? Hiding the facts in order to sway the jury to an outcome we desire? Shouldn't the truth be presented without prejudice? Shouldn't we

prioritize the facts above all? Isn't it the responsibility of the prosecutors and agents of the court to ethically present the truth and let the jury decide on the outcome based on those facts?

This is not the only major issue within my parents' case. In 2014, the then-chief criminal investigator of the Georgia Department of Revenue, Josh Waites, began taking an "unusual" interest in my father, Todd Chrisley. Mr. Waites, who had a picture of my dad on a dartboard in his office, initiated and led a **warrantless search of a locked warehouse** where my parents stored personal items. Waites arrived at the warehouse with his police lights flashing, although he later told fellow Department of Revenue officers to lie by "telling people he had not been there." This is absolutely a statement of fact, it is both accurate and provable within the court transcripts and I can provide you with exact documentation. With no warrant, this rogue group displayed a piece of paper to the manager at the warehouse and demanded entry inside. When the manager initially refused, they threatened the manager with arrest. Again, I can provide proof of these statements. Based on these threats, the Department of Revenue officers forced their way into the warehouse and hauled off its contents. The seized items included massive amounts of furniture, personal property, and about 20 boxes containing documents. Before a court could order the return of my parents' belongings, the FBI and the U.S. Attorney's Office met with the Georgia Department of Revenue to discuss how best to transfer the illegally-obtained records to federal agents. They decided to obtain federal search warrants allowing them to seize my family's property from the Department of Revenue's possession. IRS Special Agent Larry Arrow then reviewed the materials seized from the illegal warehouse search. Shortly after, Arrow sought and obtained a federal search warrant for my parents' personal emails held by America Online ("AOL") and Google. Federal agents also issued subpoenas for various other records based on what they had seen in those documents.

Long before trial, we filed two motions to suppress evidence relating to the warehouse documents and the emails obtained from AOL and Google, each raising separate and distinct grounds for relief. The first motion asked the Court to suppress the documents and records seized at the warehouse along with all evidence derived from them. After a two-day evidentiary hearing on the separate motions, Magistrate Judge Justin Anand entered a Report and Recommendation on each motion. The Magistrate Judge determined that the district court should exclude all documents and materials seized at the warehouse and all documents and materials derived from the illegal search. Thus, the court's ultimate suppression ruling on the Warehouse Motion extended beyond the physical documents seized from the warehouse: It suppressed all information, documents, and records the government obtained that flowed from information it learned because of the illegal search. At the final pretrial hearing before the Magistrate Judge, the government suggested that it might have "independent sources" for some evidence linked to the warehouse search, including specifically digital copies of some of the documents found there. In response, we filed a "Motion to Require the United States to Establish Admissibility of Suppressed Evidence." This motion specified five categories of evidence that derived from information the Georgia Department of Revenue illegally obtained at the warehouse. These categories included not only the results of the AOL and Google search warrants, but also all information the FBI and IRS obtained after looking at the warehouse documents.

The question this motion posed to the district court was straightforward: Did the government have a valid legal basis to admit this evidence even though it was a fruit of the illegal warehouse search? The government understood the issue perfectly, arguing that it had such a basis. Namely, the government claimed that the evidence it sought to use at trial met two exceptions to the exclusionary rule: (1) it came from an independent source untainted by the illegal warehouse searches, or (2) the government would have inevitably discovered it. In the end, the government asked the court for an evidentiary hearing so that it could “perfect the record” to establish an exception to the exclusionary rule. Despite the government joining my parents’ request for an evidentiary hearing, the trial court declined to hold one. It took the matter under advisement, later issuing a very short ruling. The following is the entirety of the court’s order on this issue: “Motion to require proof of admissibility is DENIED. After taking this matter under advisement at the pretrial conference, the Court further reviewed the pleadings, and Order on this issue and determined that the emails at issue here were previously allowed into evidence at trial pursuant to the Court’s denial of Defendants’ motion to suppress search warrants for emails and electronically stored information. Thus, the motion currently before the Court is untimely.”

As a result, the district court admitted much of the previously suppressed evidence without requiring the government to prove that this contested evidence had been obtained from an “independent source” or was otherwise admissible. The previously suppressed evidence made up much more than half of the government’s case and related to each of the charges in the indictment.

So what does this mean? It means that in our country, where property rights and personal privacy is an honored and sacred right, my parents’ civil liberties were denied and trampled upon by an overzealous prosecutor and investigator. And the courts were complicit. They simply turned a blind eye to this. How can we let that happen? How can we stand for this? A nation that has no respect for its own laws isn’t a nation at all. It has simply descended into an elitist clubhouse whereby only those who are friends with the mighty and powerful, or those who are not the target of these mighty and powerful, get fair treatment. The rest of us are left to hope and pray that we get a fair shake or a fair chance. This is **NOT** justice for **ALL**.

On top of all of this, my mom was charged with **FIVE** counts of bank fraud despite the fact that she was not on a single bank loan. In fact, when FBI Special Agent Steve Ryskoski was asked to identify my mom’s first act in furtherance of the conspiracy he could not do it. When pressed to specifically identify the first act that she did in furtherance of the conspiracy, Agent Ryskoski testified that “there were times where she had to continue to make payments on all of these loans[,]” referring to her making payments on the loans. He admitted this was not illegal but simply showed that she was aware of the loans. He then said there were more acts “later,” but he could not confirm whether any of these purported acts preceded 2012. Agent Ryskoski eventually conceded he could point to no act. How can someone be responsible for bank fraud when they are not on a single loan and the agent investigating cannot identify one single act she did to further or participate in the crime?

Again, if the court of law is able to facilitate a trial where an honest and ethical presentation of the facts is conducted, and if that process results in the conviction of my parents, then that is an outcome I can accept and understand. I won't be happy, but I respect this country, the Court and our laws. But this process that we have been forced to endure has not been one of honesty and integrity. We were not even provided with an evidentiary hearing where the numbers that the government alleged as to the size and scope of the tax and bank "fraud" were forced to be proven and defended. This means that my parents were sentenced under federal sentencing guidelines that are determined by the size and monetary value of a fraud that was never forced to be proven. The government gave a number and the court simply accepted it. Then, using the improperly high Guidelines Range associated with the incorrect loss amount, the court sentenced my mom to 84 months and my dad to 144 months. That is a combined 228 months, that is 19 years! All of this was based on false loss numbers and the government was **NEVER forced to prove those numbers!** Even now, the government has never once been forced to actually prove the validity of these loss numbers despite the fact that those numbers are responsible for taking 19 years of time away from my family.

How can this happen? How could this happen here in America? Again, I am not asking you to believe me, I am only asking you to take the next step and ask for proof. Every single word within this letter can be proven and substantiated.

I want help. I need help. My younger siblings need your help. I look into the eyes of a 10 year old girl who only wants to have her mother back and I have no good answers. I don't have the power to get those answers, but I know you do. Please use your power to help the powerless. Use your influence to let truth and justice prevail. I am not asking you to change the outcome, only to level the scale so that once again justice can be blind, the rule of law be upheld and that we can return to the values of Liberty and Justice FOR ALL.

As I close this letter, I want you to realize that I never, never in a million years, thought this would be my life. But what this has taught me is that it could so easily be any of us. If the agents and the prosecutors can be so flippant with the truth, then this could be any of us. The moment you become a target, the moment you become the ire of someone influential, then you can easily become the product of this nightmare. When we have people in power who are willing to go to such great lengths to hide and deceive and avoid the plain evaluation of **ALL THE FACTS**, then we have no justice, we have no fairness and we have no rule of law.

I am a 25-year-old, single girl who has put my entire life on hold to try and help hold my family together. I am trying. I am trying so hard. But I can't fight this fight alone. I have only been doing this for a mere 5 months and already I am so tired. I need help with this fight. I need someone who has your influence and your ability to bring light to these matters. We cannot allow injustice to become an infection within our system because that infection will spread. If this stands then none of us are safe. Please, please, please help me. Help me expose what has occurred and help my family get a fair moment before the court. Again, I am not looking for a free pass, only a fair shake.

Thank you so much for giving this letter your time and attention. I pray that you are moved or at least provoked into curiosity. If so, please contact me and allow me to provide you with the proof of my assertions. You can call me at [PHONE NUMBER/redacted] or email at [EMAIL/redacted]. Thank you again. And I appreciate your hard work and your service to our country.

Sincerely Seeking,

Savannah Faith Chrisley