

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

August 15, 2024

Ronald L. Rowe, Jr.
Acting Director
United States Secret Service
245 Murray Lane SW - Building T-5
Washington, D.C. 20223

Matt White
Vault Supervisor, Forensics Services Division
United States Secret Service
245 Murray Lane SW - Building T-5
Washington, D.C. 20223

Dear Acting Director Rowe,

I am writing to express serious concern regarding the handling of a cocaine discovery within the White House on July 2, 2023.¹ Recent revelations suggest a troubling pattern of misconduct and possible cover-up involving former Director Kimberly Cheatle and the United States Secret Service. This issue comes at a time when the Secret Service is already under scrutiny following its failure to protect former President Donald Trump during an assassination attempt on July 13, 2024.

In recent years, there have been multiple instances where illegal drugs were discovered on White House grounds, with whistleblowers reporting that these incidents were routinely handled by discreetly disposing of the substances without formal reporting.² The discovery of cocaine on July 2, 2023, deviated from this unusual and non-standard practice because it was found by a Uniformed Division officer—a member of the Secret Service committed to transparency and accountability, unlike other personnel who had previously managed such situations with less visibility.³

¹ Susan Crabtree, *Former Secret Service Chief Wanted To Destroy Cocaine Evidence*, REALCLEAR POLITICS (Aug. 5, 2024), https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2024/08/05/former_secret_service_chief_wanted_to_dest_roy_cocaine_evidence_151392.html

² *Id.*

³ *Id.*

This officer's adherence to proper protocol triggered a series of alarming events. Former Director Cheatle, who had close ties with the Biden family from her role on Vice President Biden's protective detail, appeared to prioritize avoiding public scrutiny over maintaining investigative integrity, particularly in light of Hunter Biden's well-documented struggles with drug addiction. This shift from objective professionalism to a politically motivated response underscores a troubling trend within the Secret Service, where political considerations now seem to overshadow its core mission of impartial security and justice.

Matt White, the vault supervisor of the Forensics Service Division of the Secret Service, reportedly received a phone call from Cheatle or her representative to destroy the cocaine evidence.⁴ This directive was met with resistance from White and his superior, Glenn Dennis.⁵ The resistance to destroy the evidence, combined with Richard Macauley, the Acting Chief of the Uniformed Division, being passed over for the permanent position of Uniformed Division Chief despite his notable service—including being named Uniformed Division Officer of the Year in 2018—raises concerns of possible retaliation. Many within the agency view Macauley's non-selection as a repercussion for supporting those who opposed Cheatle's directive to destroy the evidence.

The investigation was abruptly closed less than two weeks after the discovery, citing a "lack of physical evidence" despite the presence of DNA material.⁶ Reports from within the Secret Service indicate that the FBI laboratory found DNA on the cocaine packaging that yielded a "partial hit," indicating a possible DNA match to a known individual with ties to the White House.⁷ This premature closure, without conducting further searches or interviews, raises significant concerns about the investigation's integrity.

The American people deserve a thorough and transparent account of these events. Accordingly, I demand a detailed response to the following questions by September 5, 2024:

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Press Release, *Official Statement on the Investigation of a Substance Found in the White House*, UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE (Jul. 13, 2023), <https://www.secretservice.gov/newsroom/releases/2023/07/official-statement-investigation-substance-found-white-house/>.

⁷ *Supra* note 1.

1. Please list all instances of illegal drugs or other contraband found on White House grounds since 2021.
 - a. How many of those resulted in the identification of a suspect?
 - b. How long in each instance did it take to identify the suspect?
 - c. Were any subsequent charges brought? If so, what were they?
2. What specific actions did the Secret Service take immediately following the discovery of the cocaine? Provide a precise timeline of all actions, decisions, and communications that pertain to the discovery and subsequent investigation.
3. On what grounds did the Secret Service decide not to pursue additional searches or interviews despite the presence of DNA evidence? Provide specific justifications for closing the investigation.
4. What does “partial DNA hit” mean or indicate in simple terms? Explain when that term is used and what it signifies, especially in comparison to a full DNA hit.
 - a. Did it reveal family members of the person who was in contact with the cocaine?
 - b. Was a specific individual or group of individuals identified?
 - c. If so, was this identified population located in the DC area?
5. Who authorized the decision to destroy the cocaine evidence, and what was the rationale behind this directive? Provide names and positions of all involved.
6. Why was the Uniformed Division officer, who was initially assigned to investigate the cocaine incident, removed from the case? Reports suggest that he was taken off the investigation after expressing a desire to follow a specific crime-scene investigative protocol, which led to disagreements with his supervisors, including Cheadle and Acting Secret Service Director Ron Rowe.⁸

⁸ *Supra* note 1.

Detail the reasons given for his removal and how these disagreements influenced the decision.

7. Why was Richard Macauley passed over for the permanent position of Uniformed Division Chief despite his tenure as Acting Chief and his recognition as Uniformed Division Officer of the Year? Considering the timing of this decision coinciding with the Uniformed Division's resistance to destroying the cocaine evidence, how do you justify this move in light of allegations that it was retaliation for Macauley's support of those opposing Cheatle's directives?
8. Was there any internal or external pressure to limit or suppress the investigation into the cocaine's origin? Specify any directives or communications aimed at reducing the scope of the investigation.
9. What specific steps were taken to preserve the chain of custody for the cocaine? Were there any breaches or irregularities in this process?
10. Was any evidence related to the cocaine incident intentionally destroyed or tampered with? Provide details of any evidence that was altered, lost, or hidden.
11. Who was responsible for making the final decision to close the investigation?
 - a. Was anyone in the Biden family and their immediate staff aware of the discovery of cocaine?
 - b. Did any of them speak to you, Director Cheatle, or Secret Service personnel about this incident?
 - c. Were you aware of this incident and did you participate in the decision-making process?
12. What actions were taken to follow up on the DNA evidence found on the cocaine packaging? Were these actions consistent with standard investigative practices?
13. Have any Secret Service employees reported concerns or misconduct related to this investigation? If so, what were these concerns and how were they addressed?

14. What measures are being implemented to prevent similar issues in the future?
Detail any changes to procedures or policies to ensure transparency and accountability.

The integrity of, and the public trust in, the United States Secret Service are on the shakiest ground in perhaps 60 years. We must uncover the full truth and ensure accountability to restore confidence in our institutions. Your prompt and thorough response is crucial to upholding the standards of impartiality and trust that our democracy depends on.

Sincerely,



Ted Cruz
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on the Constitution
U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary



Darrell Issa
Chairman, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet
U.S. House Committee on the Judiciary