Mar-a-Lago Raid: Kash Patel Talks Search Warrants, Law Enforcement, Magistrate Judge Reinhart

Kash's Corner

Kash Patel and Jan Jekielek

In this episode of Kash's Corner, Kash Patel dives into the Mar-a-Lago raid and the many unanswered questions surrounding it.

"Nothing these guys do is inadvertent. Everything they do is intentional, including this intentional raid on President Trump's home," argues Kash Patel.

We discuss what Kash Patel sees as the failure to apply blind justice as well as the government's abandonment of due process and its selective application of the law.

"Jurisdiction is supposed to be blind," says Kash Patel. "They are selectively applying federal jurisdiction by going to a magistrate judge that they know hates President Trump as much as they do, and applying their political bias to what's supposed to be an apolitical investigation."

Does this constitute a modern-day Watergate?

"It's the same individuals that ran Russiagate. It's the same individuals that said Hunter Biden's laptop was Russian disinformation. It's the same individuals that falsified FISA warrants. These people are running this investigation? When is it going to be enough?"

* Click the “Save” button below the video to access it later on “My List.”

Below is a rush transcript of this Kash’s Corner episode from Aug 12, 2022. This transcript may not be in its final form and may be updated.

Kash Patel:
Hey, everybody. Welcome back to Kash’s Corner with myself and Jan Jekielek. I think this episode is going to be a heater.

Jan Jekielek:
Well Kash I’ve been hoping for quite a while, quite a number of episodes now, to do something other than basically looking at former President Trump.

Mr. Patel:
Not today.

Mr. Jekielek:
I think the whole episode is going to have to be about this recent raid on Mar-a-Lago and all the fascinating commentary that’s come out there, the conjecture, and also some realities that we know, frankly. But I’m going to start here, one of my favorite essayists out there these days is actually Matt Taibbi-

Mr. Patel:
He’s brilliant.

Mr. Jekielek:
And he… Really. And he wrote something like this. He said, “We may be looking at simultaneously the dumbest and most inadvertently destructive political gambit in the recent history of this country.” And his caveat is unless there’s something quote unquote, “Pulverizing.” Right. What are your thoughts?

Mr. Patel:
Matt’s one of the few reporters out there with journalistic integrity. I’ve spoken to Matt in the past and I don’t think we politically align on much of anything, but he cares about the truth. And I said, “That’s great. If you write about that, I’m happy to talk to you.” And I think that headline is largely accurate. I might adjust one thing when he gives him a little bit too much credit, in my opinion, by saying, “Inadvertently.” Nothing these guys do is inadvertent. Everything they do is intentional. Including this intentional raid on President Trump’s home. The former president of the United States’ house just got raided. For what? Some giant criminal conspiracy, some fraud to steal money from Americans and take it for himself, some high level operation where he was defrauding Americans?

No, none of that. Some of that might have made sense. But apparently it was for, at best, possibly holding classified information. We'll get to why that is not even legally possible to hold against President Trump or this other myth created by the DNC and Hillary Clinton campaign mafia, that he somehow is not able to take documents out of the White House as a president. It's bogus on its face, that's why I say it's intentional, and Matt's right, when they say they better have something pulverizing. And he wasn't the only one.

Mr. Jekielek:
There's been a lot of, let's say, folks with quite a bit of antipathy towards President Trump that have voiced basically exactly what you just said. That's kind of a common thread. So what do you think they have? And it pertains to the National Archives, that's kind of hard to even fathom.

Mr. Patel:
I don't know what they have. I'm with everybody else in the American public, in the world, that I don't have an inside access to anything. I've not seen the search warrants. I don't don't know what specifically they did or they collected down there outside of media reporting. They say they got boxes of stuff. I saw that Eric Trump gave an interview this week on TV, where he said, "They cracked the safe, but there was nothing in it." And if that's true, what are they doing cracking a safe? And by the way, you need a separate search warrant to crack a safe. Did they have that? I don't know? Lots of good questions. You don't go down to Mar-a-Lago and have a safe cracking expert, because that's what it takes, you need a specialist to come down there. It's not like, "Oh, Hey, by the way, call the guy he's down the street." They brought them.

They knew what they were doing. Who is in charge of this case, the U.S. Attorney's office in DC, main justice? Where's it being run out of, is the main question. We know FBI Washington field office is running it, but we also know how corrupt the Washington field office is. The agents in charge of the Washington field office are the same guys that entrapped people for the Whitmer prosecution, and those individuals were acquitted or a hung jury. It's the same individuals that ran Russiagate. It's the same individuals that said Hunter Biden's laptop was Russian disinformation. It's the same individuals that falsified FISA warrants to unlawfully go up on presidential candidate, then Trump. These people are running this investigation? When is it going to be enough?

Mr. Jekielek:
We have some, let's say, level of confidence that we know at least what types of warrants were issued.

Mr. Patel:
Yeah. So we have these things called docket entries. So this magistrate judge in question, and we'll get to him in a minute, but we have to caveat this, we believe it to be the case, but it might not be. But based on our analysis, there's three docket entries on this magistrate judge's order sheet, which is basically an electronic version of what this judge did recently. And three specific warrants relate in a timely fashion to the raid on Mar-a-Lago. We're not a hundred percent sure because we haven't seen the warrant, but in my prosecutorial experience, in my experience as a federal public defender, I believe these two relate to them and there's three specific ones. One, there was a warrant approved by this magistrate for what we call a records hold, basically an

electronic storage data hold. So some company, cell phone or otherwise, was given a warrant to say, "Hold these records."

Two, there was this thing that we called pen, trap and trace. What that means is basically it's a search warrant that allows… If you picture in the old times, when we had phones hanging on walls in houses, in offices with the cords, you basically are enabled to say what number called and when, and who was on the other end, that's a pen trap and trace. And if there's a modern version of it, obviously everybody has cell phones now. So similar, but that's how it works. And the last warrant, if it's the one that applies to Mar-a-Lago was the warrant to physically search the premises. So those are the three warrants that we believe, but aren't a hundred percent sure, are relevant to our discussion with this magistrate judge.

Mr. Jekielek:
And this judge is an MJ or magistrate justice. What does that mean, exactly? What is the significance of that?

Mr. Patel:
Okay, so they're basically like a quasi-federal judge. Magistrate judges are not appointed by the president of the United States, nor do they go through a Senate confirmation hearing. Magistrate judges are selected by the federal district court judges of their district. So in this case, the Southern District of Florida, the judge, the Article 3, presidentially-appointed, Senate-confirmed, judges gather around and select who should be the magistrate judge. And there's a number of them. And basically the magistrate judges do the initial appearances, the pretrial motions in some instances. They do the preliminary work for the district court judge. And every ruling or decision made by magistrate can be appealed to the district court judge because they have the final say at the trial level, in the case. So this is a magistrate judge who was selected by the bench of Article 3 judges down in the Southern District of Florida, so his authorities are limited in that he can do preliminary rulings and all of his work can be reviewed by the actual judge presiding over the case.

Mr. Jekielek:
So let's talk a little bit more about the judge in question and Hans Mahncke, of course, who's our regular contributor and is on Truth Over News, the EpochTV show. This is what he noted. He says, "How's it possible that in a country of 330 million people, the guy who approved the Trump warrant is the same guy who donated to Obama, represented Epstein's gang, circled the wagons for Lois Lerner, presided over Trump versus Clinton, had to recuse himself from Trump versus Clinton.

Mr. Patel:
And issued that statement on the internet some time ago. Let's read that.

Mr. Jekielek:
Absolutely, yes. And as well, he said, "Thank you, Robert Reich for saying what many of us feel, 'John Lewis is the conscience of America.' Donald Trump doesn't have the moral stature to kiss John Lewis' feet." So he's not exactly impartial here or appears to be that way.

Mr. Patel:
No, and here's the thing… We'll get to the judge in the second. My initial problem is as a former federal prosecutor is with the prosecutors in this case, and the FBI agents in this case, they know that they're not stupid. Jurisdiction is supposed to be blind. They are selectively applying federal jurisdiction by going to a magistrate judge that they know hates President Trump, as much as they do and applying their political bias to what's supposed to be an apolitical investigation. They know this judge is in the bag for them. They know he hates Trump. They know he said, what you just read. They know he represented Epstein's pilot and others before rising to the bench. They know he's an Obama donor. They know he loves Hillary Clinton. They selectively go to him on purpose because they know he's in on it. And they expect America to now believe that we don't have a two-tier system of justice.

This is what we were talking about last week when we had Devin Nunes on the show and he explained thoroughly why there is a two-tier system of justice. And anyone that thought there wasn't before better think there is one now, because that's what's happening. Do you think that they allow John Durham to select his magistrate judge and select the jurisdiction he was going into? If he's not allowed to do it as special counsel, why are these FBI agents and these assistant United States attorneys allowed to do it when they're prosecuting, quote unquote, "President Trump." It's an outrage. It's an extreme violation to due process. And so I keep saying that some of the best work I ever did was when I was a national security prosecutor and federal public defender, but where are the public defenders in America? Where is the liberal left who care about due process and blind justice now? Where's the ACLU?

Mr. Jekielek:
The real question that all the media should be asking, which they're not is, if this is a national records thing, how is it that we're having this kind of NTVA? This really, really harsh type of raid happening when you look at presidents, similar types of situations are typically dealt with amicably with a call to the lawyers or something like this, right?

Mr. Patel:
Yeah. And it just goes to show you the state of affairs of law enforcement. I think this week as we speak, President Trump is going before the New York State Attorney General for a deposition. This is another political animal in law enforcement who literally has been on TV and campaigned on the fact that Donald Trump was an illegitimate president. That's her words. And she said, "If she was elected, she was going to go get him." That's not how you run law enforcement. That's not how you select apolitical law enforcement officers. It's what happens in banana republics. It's what's happened in third world countries. But it's on full display in New York and all the way down to Mar-a-Lago, with the failure of due process and the destruction of our constitution. Returning to this magistrate judge, you forgot one thing Jan, this magistrate judge Reinhardt was initially given the Trump RICO case.

The civil case that was brought by President Trump against Clinton world and Rod Rosenstein, and the list goes on. That was filed some months ago. He recused himself from that case after making a few initial rulings, why did he do that? If he recused himself from that case involving President Trump and the Russiagate hoax and President Trump's attempt to correct civilly, the wrongs that were done to him, how can he authorize a search warrant against President Trump

for a possible criminal investigation? Why is he not recused from this case? It's outrageous. Any judge worth his salt and who said, "I am sworn to be an apolitical neutral arbiter of the law", would've recused himself and said, "This case is not for me. I've done all these things against President Trump publicly. I've donated to his opponents. I've represented some people who hated President Trump, and now I'm on the bench swearing out a search warrant against this person."

That's the point of recusal. And it's not like there's no one else to hear the case. There's 24 other people that could hear this case. So it's just outrageous for him to say, "No, I can do this in a detached and neutral manner", And now look at what you have. And the Department of Justice is equally as in on it as is the FBI as is this judge. They could have taken away this entire narrative and removed it by going to some random judge who has nothing to do with anything and saying, "Well, this is the first time we approached him and we laid it out and he gave a search warrant." They would be on so much better footing. The outcry from the American public in the world would be… There wouldn't be any on this issue. There'd still would probably be a large outcry on the Mar-a-Lago raid, but now they've just given more ammunition to the people who've said, there's a two-tier system of justice. And these questions… And people are out there demanding that Merrick Garland do this and do that and explain what happened.

They're never going to do it. That's just hyperbole. They're not going to come before Congress and do it. Now I do hope that my friend, Kevin McCarthy comes out and is a man of his word. He said yesterday, or the day before that Merrick Garland, and I'm paraphrasing, but we should have put it up his quote, "Merrick Garland better preserve all records at the DOJ and prepare to be investigated come November." I hope that's true because that's the only way we're going to get to the bottom of this. They are not going to volunteer any information, and some officers of the court and officers in the Department of Justice and FBI may need to be impeached, based on not just egregious conduct, but everything from Russiagate to Jan 6th on down now we find ourselves at Mar-a-Lago with the judge presiding over the case who thinks Donald Trump doesn't deserve to even kiss the feet of a man who was a political figure. If that's not bias in the law, I really don't know what is.

Mr. Jekielek:
How are you so sure that Judge Reinhardt was selected by these people to do this specifically? And also you mentioned, I think you said, "He's in on it", just want you to clarify-

Mr. Patel:
Sure.

Mr. Jekielek:
What you mean by that?

Mr. Patel:
So the way blind justice works is there's rotating magistrate judges on duty, and you're supposed to go… If a case comes up and it pops, you're like, "I'm going. Who's the mag? Who we… Who's mag?" Magistrate judge. "Who's on duty? 'Oh He… Judge X, Judge Y.' Got it. Check." Go to chambers. And I've done this. Sign out the warrant and be like, "Judge, this is what we

want to do." Usually they have no familiarity with the case. These folks know when these magistrate judges are on duty, they select it. And there's also the very real possibility that they made up some fiction that said, "Oh, this judge has been hearing our case for some time, we're going to go back to them."

Those facts need to come out. And if they wanted to do it the right way, they could have just chosen another judge. There's like 25 magistrate judges in the Southern District of Florida, literally. Any other one, pick any other one. No, they pick the one randomly who has the most bias and the most reasons to recuse themself from this matter? That's not a mistake. That is the intentional destruction of due process by this Department of Justice and this career clown show at the FBI.

Mr. Jekielek:
We haven't confirmed this, but apparently there were counterintelligence officers kind of on site, and there might be a sort classification of what actually happened during the raid. Is that a possibility? Like that we might not even know?

Mr. Patel:
I mean, it's always a possibility. And remember there's differences between a criminal investigation and a CI investigation. CI investigations are not criminal by definition. They are run to collect intelligence, usually against our foreign adversaries or people working with our foreign adversaries. So I don't know if there were people in the CI world on the ground there, but that would be unusual, but not surprising given the way they've carried out this investigation. And criminal, yeah sure, they've said supposedly it's been reported publicly this is for the possible criminal prosecution of Donald Trump for holding classified information, which we'll get into, but doesn't make any sense under the facts. And the other sort of procedural one is the whole National Archives sending records down there and we'll get to that too.

Mr. Jekielek:
Well… No, exactly. So let's talk about the National Archives because in June, you're on record, I think we may have even talked about it on the show that you became a representative for President Trump-

Mr. Patel:
Yeah.

Mr. Jekielek:
At the National Archives. Now so I have to ask… And actually at the time you basically said, "I'm going to go in there and I'm going to get everything and I'm going to work on basically making sure the stuff that was supposed to be declassified gets declassified." What happened with that, and could there be a connection with this? Again, it seems bizarre that the National Archives is the issue around which such a raid was conducted.

Mr. Patel:
Look President Trump made no bones about it, he was one of the most transparent presidents in American history and he wanted the documents. I wanted the documents out. We want the

documents out for the American public to read. The documents of the FBI, of the DOJ, of other departments and agencies who were in on the fraudulent Russiagate conspiracy, who were in on the fraudulent corruption in the Hillary Clinton email investigation and the like. And so President Trump… This is winding back the clock. In October of 2020 when he was still president issued an order declassifying, and we could put it up, but paraphrasing here, everything related to rush gate and everything related to the Hillary Clinton email investigation. That's a wide swath of records, Government records. That's a presidential order, and for our audience, I think they know this, but that's all the president has to do.

He's the Commander in Chief, he has a unilateral authority to classify and declassified documents by just saying so, and that's what he did. Fast forward to the end of his term, I don't remember the exact date, but it was sometime in December, January, the President was reviewing documents that he thought were worth the public seeing, and he declassified… And I've said this previously. Whole sets of documents then, sitting the White House. Saying, "I mean the American public should get these. Get these out." Then what happened was there were some bureaucratic gymnastics at the end of the administration where these documents were sent to the National Archives for some reason, and never disclosed to the American public. So fast forward a few months after that, and what happens is these documents still aren't out. And it's kind of outrageous that in order to declassify by the Commander in Chief, when he was president, was not followed because some bureaucrats got in the way.

So they're sitting at the National Archives, the President names me his representative at the National Archives, along with another individual, to try to get these documents out. And I did… You're right, we should cite this interview I gave. I did engage with the National Archives immediately. And I said, "I have an active security clearance. I'll come down there and look at it if it's a classification issue, why aren't these documents out? Why is the American public not have access to the documents that have been declassified?" And I didn't get a good answer. All I got was another bureaucratic runaround. "Oh, we have some. We don't have all. We don't know where the rest of them are. Something went back to DOJ." How do you… "You guys are the National Archives, the holders of the presidential records and documents, and you don't have a control on it and you're not letting me in."

So we're still dealing with that. I know a lot of people have criticized me for saying, "Why aren't you already in there and putting this stuff out?" But I wish it were that easy. I wish people in government would abide by the chain of command in the rule of law, but they clearly do not as evidenced by this raid on Donald Trump's home in Mar-a-Lago, as evidenced by Russiagate, as evidenced by the Hillary Clinton email investigation, January 6th, Ukraine, impeachment one, impeachment two, Mueller investigation, and so on. So that is why people have completely lost faith in our agencies and departments. If our records custodian can't do the simple thing of turning over the documents to the American people that they should rightfully have then our entire government apparatus is in great danger and it's being questioned by the American public and the world, and rightly so. And I'm going to keep fighting at the archives.

You're right. The timing is interesting that now all of a sudden there's a National Archives issue related to this raid at Mar-a-Lago. And if it was related to that, why didn't they just do what we normally do in those situations and call and say, "Hey, we think you have X. We want to review

it. Can you return it?" Search warrant… You could have just issued a subpoena. Do you need 30 armed swatted-up FBI agents to go in there, maybe with counter-intel agents for nine hours? "What were you guys doing? What were you guys looking for? What was being hidden?" And then we'll get to the reasons as to why even if they went in under the whole classified thing or under the National Archives thing, why it doesn't hold water. Because the political goal is to make Donald Trump never run again under those two scenarios, but it's factually and legally impossible.

Mr. Jekielek:
Well so let's jump into this. So of course the famed or infamous, depending who you are, lawyer Marc Elias made a comment on Twitter, basically saying, "Media are overlooking this provision", and he's pointing to [inaudible 00:20:41] provision that he's saying that, "This might preclude Trump from ever running again."

Mr. Patel:
Yeah. So Marc Elias, a crook, who John Durham has outlined in his joint venture a criminal conspiracy in the prosecutions he has ongoing into Russiagate. Marc Elias was the head of the DNC apparatus that manufactured and paid for the Steele dossier, which allowed the FBI to unlawfully go in and hijack the FISA court and the law enforcement process to unlawfully surveil a presidential candidate, and eventually president. That all started and stopped with Marc Elias as the head of the DNC and Hillary Clinton apparatus. This same guy now comes out and says, "Oh, look at this statute. Everyone's missing it." Well, he's smart enough to know that most people don't know constitutional law to that depth that very few in America do, and they'll just believe the headline because they've bought and sold this headline through, by laundering this nonsense through the likes of Fusion GPS.

But it's pretty simple. The quote unquote, "Statute", that he has put forth, doesn't apply to the Office of the President. There's only two things that govern the president, the constitution and constitutional amendments. Federal statute does not supersede those two things. And I'm summarizing here, but it says, "If you take documents, you can't hold public office. If you took them as an office or officer of the United States government", the president does not fit into that definition by the Constitution's own phraseology. He knows that, but now the fake news mafia is coming out with their headlines. And this is what I was talking about, this is why one of the points is defeated. Even if the FBI gets to their end of the rainbow and gets what they want, doesn't apply to the President on the National Archives issue. But that's the narrative they want.

The Jan 6th committee is running out of time and they ran out of facts a long time ago, and they've been lying since they were stood up. And we've talked about in depth on this show why. So the next one, and we've said this, it's rinse repeat, rinse repeat, right. Russiagate was the first one, then we have Ukraine impeachment, Bountygate, impeachment two, Mueller, Jan 6th, now we have the whole raid, the Mar-a-Lago raid, or will come up with a better name for it going forward. And now they want to put this front and center, all for the one singular purpose of making sure President Trump never runs again. And you know what, there's been a lot of folks out there on the liberal left who have said, "You may have just handed President Trump the presidency in 2024." It may not be the most appropriate analogy, but I think it applies.

This is the modern day version of Watergate, except the only difference is it wasn't political operatives breaking in to their opponent's headquarters, it was the FBI and DOJ busting in to the home of their political opponents. And if the facts play out the way we think then a lot of people are going to be held accountable, just like they were rightfully so for the violations along Watergate at the highest levels of government. And I think that people will criticize that analogy, but I can't think of a better way to encapsulate it for the American public because that's one they can all relate to, and it was egregious then. It was gross violation of the law by the highest levels of the Department of Justice, the FBI and the White House.

Mr. Jekielek:
Let's talk about this issue of classification because that in itself is also a question, isn't it? Is this classification issue actually even a possible issue?

Mr. Patel:
No, and we just went over why. But give a quick summary, the president is the final arbiter of classification authority, unilaterally. He can classify and declassify anything they want, like that. And he did. He put out a statement in writing back then, on multiple occasions at the White House, declassified whole sets of documents. So if it's a classification issue, go back and do your homework. How could it be a classification issue if these are the documents in question we're already declassified? And furthermore he's a former president of the United States who always maintains a security clearance. President Obama still has one. President Bush still has one. President Clinton still has one. A lot of these guys continuously as former presidents, and I believe rightfully so, access classified information because they used to be the Commander in Chief and they do consulting work and people talk to him and seek advice.

Why wouldn't the same rules apply for President Trump, former President Trump? That's why I think this entire raid is an extension of how Russiagate was handled, and this is another example of why Chris Wray has failed to hold anyone accountable at the FBI. I mean, just rewind to last week, Chris Wray, before the United States Senate, answering questions on whistle blowers and their safety as it relates to Russiagate, on why corrupt FBI agents were promoted instead of demoted, and his response was, "I have to catch a flight." He literally took the private, government jet to cut out of Congress early so he could fly to his vacation home in the Adirondack Mountains than stand to be scrutinized by the United States Senate. This is the person running the FBI. He has been out to lunch since day one, and he's destroying America's faith in a premiere law enforcement institution.

And we haven't even talked about Merrick Garland in the Department of Justice who had to have known and authorized this raid. And people are asking a right question Jan, "Did the White House know? How can the White House not know? How can you go and raid your predecessor's home and not give someone at the White House, a heads up? The White House Council at the bare minimum." Those questions aren't being really answered by the White House. They're saying, "Oh, we didn't know anything." But America has a right to question it because they've lied so many times about what they did know and didn't know. Case in point, Joe Biden said, "I don't know anything about my son, Hunter Biden's dealings overseas." And then we find on Hunter Biden's laptop, a recording where Joe Biden says, "You're in the clear my son." So we can't believe them, nor should we believe them. And journalists should be in an uproar as to the

invasion of the Office of the Presidency and the structure and method in which the Department of Justice and the FBI have operated for political gain and political vengeance.

Mr. Jekielek:
This has been described by a number of people as banana republic type stuff, or Third World type stuff. What are your thoughts?

Mr. Patel:
Those are terms we throw around because they used to be a good basis of comparison. It's scary now that we have become that basis. And I've said the same thing on many interviews on TV, and even on our show in the past that the American judicial system has been superior because it did not reflect those of other countries where you have a dictator or you have tyrannical rule, like in Russia, or the Chinese Communist Party, where they suppress due process, and they execute political convictions through their intelligence, law enforcement apparatus. And what we've just outlined, we're just talking about the rate on Mar-a-Lago. But what have we been outlining for the last few years from Russiagate to Bountygate, to Jan 6th and on is a continuous destruction of our law enforcement apparatus because our leaders at the highest levels have chosen to politicize it. I think the way we prosecuted terrorists in Africa, in East Africa is-

Mr. Jekielek:
Okay.

Mr. Patel:
Far superior to the way we are prosecuting criminals currently by this Department of Justice, a hundred percent. They did it apolitically for the first time in their history as the nation, they brought national security prosecutions and convicted everybody while maintaining due process. We don't have due process anymore here.

Mr. Jekielek:
It appears that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is actually kind of fundraising off of this raid, what about the emails, right? And what about the emails? I mean, clearly there were classified. Classified information in those emails-

Mr. Patel:
Yeah.

Mr. Jekielek:
And then we have former-

Mr. Patel:
Well, let tell-

Mr. Jekielek:
FBI Director Cuomo, right? Just-

Mr. Patel:
Yeah. Let me talk about Clinton first, and then I definitely want to… I'm glad you brought these two up.

Mr. Jekielek:
Okay.

Mr. Patel:
So Hillary Clinton email scandal, just for our reminder of our audience, it's not a question that she as Secretary of State unlawfully handled classified information and sent it out on unclassified servers, James Comey has said that and the department has proven that she did it on multiple occasions. How did the FBI treat her in her investigation? They allowed the agents to be invited to Hillary Clinton's office and have biased counsel representing Hillary Clinton who worked on matters that would've conflicted them out of her representation in a cordial setting at a place of mutual convenience to discuss the matter within Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Compared to how they handled this with President… A president, Trump. Completely different. Two standards of justice.

And Hillary actually violated the law, and now she's out there fundraising for what? Maybe her next run in 2024. I hope she does it because she's the only one insane enough to do it, and it would be great to run against her. But now she's saying, "But her email…" She's advertising the felony that she actually committed and the media failed to cover and still fails the cover to this day. Now she's making money off of it. She's making money off of being a criminal and getting away with it. And then I'm glad you brought up James Comey. James Comey, I read every one of the Comey memos when I was head of the Russiagate investigation. And I said, "This contains classified information." It was six or seven memos, I can't remember off the top of my head. He released those memos to people in the public and he said, "Oh, I released it to a friend and a journalist." And then he hid behind attorney client privilege, because one of them happened to be a lawyer, which is a total farce.

He released, the former director of the FBI, released classified information and publicly stated it was in the hopes of spawning a special counsel to investigate Donald Trump. And that special counsel would just happen to be his friend Mueller. So he gets a pass, James Comey as a former director of the FBI for breaking the law, for releasing classified information unlawfully, gets a pass. Isn't it the epitome of a two-tier system of justice when a former FBI director and a former secretary of state who broke the law for classification are now attempting to say that Donald Trump should be held accountable for not doing the very same thing they did, but politically they can get there because the FBI will conjure it up, and this DOJ will prosecute it falsely? That is the two tier system of justice on display, and that is why I say many third world countries currently have a better system of justice than America does right now because our faith in these institutions has been destroyed by a select few people who have hijacked law enforcement for political gain.

Mr. Jekielek:
So you don't think there are any goods to be found here?

Mr. Patel:
I don't think so. And I don't what's in the vastness of Mar-a-Lago, but based on the information that's publicly available, if they're going down this quote unquote, "Classification track", or this, "National Archives track", we've discussed in detail why those are bogus claims. Completely bogus. And without merit. And if that turns out to be the case, which I think it will, then guys like Matt Taibbi and Andrew Cuomo are going to be shown to be actually right in this instance, and so many others. I know they're not the only two, but it's an interesting couple of people that we've highlighted or our audience to see because they're not dumb. They're not making these statements blindly. These guys know how the system of government works.

Mr. Jekielek:
So Kash, one of our regular contributors, Marc Ruskin, 27 year FBI veteran, former federal prosecutor, actually was an undercover agent for years with the FBI, this is what he describes, what he saw. He said, "The disregard for traditional norms and apparent lack of concern with the appearance of impropriety is indicative of an abandonment of even a veneer of independence and objectivity."

Mr. Patel:
That's a brilliant quote, and it leads me to the following point, when I was a federal prosecutor I was constantly told, "If we ever bring a prosecution related to a political target, we don't bring it around an election cycle." That has been the mandate at the Department of Justice for as long as I can remember. It's consistently been touted as a mandate for the reason why the Hunter Biden criminal probe has not reached an indictment because we're inside of 90 days to the midterm election. Apparently that mandate has been thrown out by this Attorney General, which only validates what that former FBI agent said. The selective application of not just the law, but of partisan hacks who have risen through the ranks to run the FBI and DOJ and discard, at a whim when it's convenient to them, tradition and how these things are supposed to be run.

What happened to not bringing… And we know this from the Hillary Clinton email investigation too. Not bringing or announcing charges around an election cycle. That's also been thrown at John Durham a lot because they don't want him to bring more indictments this summer, it's too close to an election. But it's okay to prosecute President Trump possibly and raid his home inside 90 days, there is no equal application of the law anymore. It's gone. We can earn it back, I agree. I don't want to leave our audience thinking it's all gone forever. We can earn it back. And the change has to start with constitutional, congressional oversight with committees that take on matters such as the FBI and DOJ, and judiciary, and OGR, and Intel. And then we have to re-certify the confidence in our intelligence apparatus to make sure we're taking on our adversaries and not political opponents.

So it can happen. I know as a lead investigator for Russiagate, what we did was righteous work and it's proven to have stood the test of time. And I think it's going to take a similar kind of investigation like that, that Devin Nunes has outlined last week, a Writ Large investigation of DOJ and everything else to bring that to light and to bring that to bear. And Congress is going to have a heavy job come the midterms to hold these people accountable, every single one of them. And it's going to be a multi-year process. It won't happen like that, or just because November changes the gavels.

Mr. Jekielek:
What would be the first thing that should happen to start the process you're describing?

Mr. Patel:
So you always start an investigation appropriately by collecting documents and at the parallel track lining up witnesses. It's what we did in Russiagate. It's what you do as a public defender. It's what you do as a prosecutor. Collect information, collect information, collect information. Documents are your best source of information. Videotape testimony, or videotape, is another very good version of information, recorded conversations. You subpoena all of that. You subpoena everything from this Department of Justice and FBI leadership and everyone involved. And then you subpoena the individuals and you haul them before the American public in an open hearing and ask the tough questions. "Why have you politicized the Department of Justice? What authorized you to do this raid? Why did you do it so close to an election cycle, when you said the mandate at the DOJ was never to do that? Why are these corrupt FBI agents allowed to flourish who violated the law and their oaths of office during Russiagate during the Whitmer prosecution and so forth to only go on to more prominent roles running these investigations?"

You put these people on notice in front of America to see so that the American public can have their accountability belief factor restored, and Congress is where it starts. And I know Congress isn't the most popular of places most times, but this is a chance for them to regain the trust that of the American public, and I think that's how you start it.

Mr. Jekielek:
Well Kash, I think this is the perfect time to finish up and it's time for a shout out.

Mr. Patel:
Thanks everybody for tuning in to this week's episode of Kash's Corner. And our shout out this week goes through Robert A. Simon. Thanks so much for your kind comments on our wall. Thank you everybody who joined us live chat last week and every week on Kash's Corner, and we look forward to seeing you next week on Kash's Corner.

Follow EpochTV on social media:

Twitter: https://twitter.com/EpochTVus
Rumble: https://rumble.com/c/EpochTV
Truth Social: https://truthsocial.com/@EpochTV

Gettr: https://gettr.com/user/epochtv
Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/EpochTVus
Gab: https://gab.com/EpochTV
Telegram: https://t.me/EpochTV