



OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT
1700 G STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20552 (202) 414-3800
Office of General Counsel

February 7, 2007

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Chief Docket Clerk
Attn: Honorable William B. Moran
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Administrative Law Judges
Franklin Court Building
1099 14th Street, N.W., Suite 350 West
Washington, D.C. 20005

Re In the Matter of Franklin D. Raines, et al., Notice Number 2006-1

Dear Judge Moran:

Enclosed for filing in the above referenced matter is an original and one copy of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight's Motion for Referral to the Director and proposed order.

Please date stamp the copy and return it with our messenger.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David A. Felt
Deputy General Counsel

Enclosure

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

Notice Number 2006-1

In The Matter Of:)

FRANKLIN D. RAINES)

J. TIMOTHY HOWARD)


LEANNE G. SPENCER)

MOTION FOR REFERRAL TO THE DIRECTOR

NOW COMES, the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight ("OFHEO") on this 7th day of February, 2007, and moves this Court to refer to the Director for his determination both the letter dated December 18, 2006, by Kevin M. Downey, counsel for Respondent Franklin D. Raines, and the letter dated January 12, 2007, by David S. Krakoff, counsel for Leanne G. Spencer, by which these Respondents have sought the Director's recusal. To date, the Director has not made any determination as to these requests for recusal. The letters are attached to this request for the convenience of this Court.

For the foregoing reasons, OFHEO requests that this Court enter OFHEO's proposed order, herewith submitted to this Court.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David A. Felt". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

David A. Felt
Deputy General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise
Oversight
1700 G. Street, NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20552
202-414-3750

Dated: February 7, 2007

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

Notice Number 2006-1

In The Matter Of:)
)
)
FRANKLIN D. RAINES)
)
)
J. TIMOTHY HOWARD)
)
)
LEANNE G. SPENCER)
)
)
_____)

ORDER OF REFERRAL

Now, this _____ day of February, 2007, upon consideration of the letter dated December 18, 2006, by Kevin M. Downey, counsel for Respondent Franklin D. Raines; the letter dated January 12, 2007, by David S. Krakoff, counsel for Leanne G. Spencer; the Motion to Docket Ex Parte Letter From Respondent Raines, filed by the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight ("OFHEO") on or about January 23, 2007; the Motion for Referral to the Director, filed February 7, 2007; and it appearing for good cause and the orderly prosecution of the pending action;

IT IS ORDERED that such letters immediately shall be referred to the Director for determination on the merits of the Respondents' requests for recusal and in accordance with the requirements of applicable law and regulations.

Honorable William B. Moran
Presiding Officer


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 7th day of February, 2007, I caused to be served by hand delivery and by e-mail true and correct copies of OFHEO's Motion for Referral to the Director and proposed Order on:

Mr. Kevin M. Downey, Esq.
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth St., NW
Washington, DC 20005
kdowney@wc.com
Counsel for Respondent Franklin D. Raines

Mr. Steven M. Salky, Esq.
ZUCKERMAN SPAEDER LLP
1800 M Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036
ssalky@zuckerman.com
Counsel for Respondent J. Timothy Howard

Mr. David S. Krakoff, Esq.
MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
1909 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1101
dkrakoff@mayerbrownrowe.com
Counsel for Respondent Leanne G. Spencer




Rocco N. Covino

EXHIBIT 1

LAW OFFICES
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005-5901
(202) 434-5000
FAX (202) 434-5029

KEVIN M. DOWNEY
(202) 434-5460
kdowney@wc.com



December 18, 2006

By Hand Delivery

Honorable James Lockhart
Office of Federal Housing
Enterprise Oversight
1700 G Street, NW
Washington D.C. 20552

Re: Notice of Charges Against Franklin D. Raines

Dear Director Lockhart:

This law firm represents Frank Raines in connection with litigation matters arising out of Fannie Mae's accounting restatement.

I have received and reviewed the Notice of Charges that your agency filed against Mr. Raines this afternoon. The allegations leveled against Mr. Raines in that Notice are false. We look forward to refuting them in a fair and impartial forum. Two actions on your agency's part will be necessary to ensure that Mr. Raines receives due process in connection with this matter.

First, please remove yourself immediately and completely from any further regulatory action affecting Mr. Raines. The long record in this matter demonstrates that you are a fatally biased regulator and that you are determined to use the Notice of Charges and the hearing in this matter to advance your agenda of having the Congress enact legislation concerning Fannie Mae that you endorse.

Since May of this year, you have stated – publicly, repeatedly, without qualification, and without affording any due process to Mr. Raines – that Mr. Raines and others at Fannie Mae “manipulated accounting;” engaged in “mismanagement,” “fraud,” and “earnings manipulation;” and that Mr. Raines obtained compensation from Fannie Mae “fraudulently.”

Your motive for stating such conclusions is obvious: you seek to advance the argument that particular forms of legislation concerning Fannie Mae are necessary. Thus, your conclusions regarding Mr. Raines's conduct have been leveled, amongst other places, in speeches with such explicit titles as "The Current GSE Regulatory Environment and the Need for Reform" (arguing that portfolio limits are necessary because "unconstrained growth focusing on earnings per share" is harmful to Fannie Mae). Whatever your view may be as to the appropriateness of legislation, you are not entitled to advance such views by formulating legal conclusions regarding Mr. Raines's personal conduct and stating them publicly in advance of any due process afforded to Mr. Raines to dispute them.

Your conduct is especially troubling because the conclusions that you have repeatedly asserted stand in contrast to the findings of the independent review conducted by former Senator Warren Rudman, which found that Mr. Raines did not know that any of the Company's accounting practices departed from Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). The contrast between Senator Rudman's conclusions and yours are striking both for their content and for the manner in which they were reached and presented. Senator Rudman reported his conclusions after a seventeen-month, \$65 million dollar investigation. You began stating your conclusions of fact and law within three and one-half weeks of being nominated to serve as the Director of OFHEO. The Rudman review consisted of the review of many more millions of pages of documents and the interviews of scores more witnesses than your agency's examination. On the critical substantive issue of whether Mr. Raines knew of any effort to alter earnings numbers to affect compensation at Fannie Mae, Senator Rudman's report noted actual witness recollection that "Raines insisted that the Company should book everything that needed to be booked." See Rudman Report, at 49. Your Notice of Charges ignores this and other critical facts and, without citation to any actual evidence, but with highly inflammatory rhetoric, accuses Mr. Raines of orchestrating fraud and earnings manipulation.

Equally notable is the reaction of other regulators to accounting restatements in similar circumstances. A recent count of public companies that have restated earnings because of errors in the application of the accounting standard at issue here totals 117 companies. But no company (or corporate officer) – other than those regulated by your agency – has faced the spate of public accusations of misconduct that you have relentlessly leveled. This is so even though many of the other restatements appear to have resulted from exactly the same purported misinterpretations of accounting standards. Of course, none of those

other companies is in the midst of the same political discussion as the companies that you regulate.

You have now started a proceeding which is designed to determine whether the assertions that you have made publicly are in fact true. As you know, the proceeding that you have initiated makes you, rather than an objective third party, the ultimate decision maker with regard to the very conclusions that you have stated publicly over several months. The Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the statute that created OFHEO, your agency's own regulations, and fundamental notions of fairness obviously preclude you from doing so. Please advise promptly whether you will agree to our request to stand down.

To cleanse the taint of prejudgments that has infected OFHEO, there is a simple step your agency can take which will permit the parties to get to the merits and resolve this matter promptly. As you well know, 12 U.S.C. § 4632 permits you to enter a temporary order effecting the remedies sought in your Notice of Charges. Mr. Raines and the other Respondents can then challenge such an order in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which can adjudicate the merits of the order. We will agree to an appropriate stipulation waiving any procedural impediment and permit you to proceed in this manner. We could then have this matter adjudicated promptly in federal court, a forum that does not suffer from questions of prejudice, bias, or politics.

Second, we request that you cause your agency to produce expeditiously and without any designation of confidentiality documents (i) compiled during your agency's investigation of Fannie Mae's accounting restatement and (ii) that relate to your agency's oversight of Fannie Mae during Mr. Raines's tenure as Chief Executive Officer.

The agency is already under Court order to produce such documents to us. (As you know, we caused a subpoena to issue to your agency for such documents in other litigation almost six months ago. Your agency refused to comply. The Court then compelled your agency to do so and has noted the possibility of sanctions against your agency if it engages in further shenanigans). Your agency began to produce such documents to us just last week, but it has designated every single document produced as "confidential," preventing any public discussion of such materials by anyone but you – and it is now apparent that you have distorted and obscured the content of such documents in your public statements and actions.

A review of a small number of documents produced to date reveals direct and disturbing contrasts between the underlying investigative documents

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
Honorable James Lockhart
December 18, 2006
Page 4

and the rhetorical assertions of your Special Examination Reports. If you do not consent to remove the confidentiality designations today, we will take action to compel the removal of the Confidential designations, at which time we will describe, with as much particularity as permissible, contrasts between your public assertions and the actual testimony of witnesses and content of documents known to your agency when it filed the Notice of Charges.

We are eager to disprove your allegations. If you are also interested in fairness, you will let the federal courts resolve this matter and make public documents long kept secret so that the process, which has been conducted to date under the impermissible influence of a legislative agenda, can be conducted fairly. We wish to expedite adjudication of the merits, and our suggestions will achieve that end. If you wish to continue to use Mr. Raines as a prop in the interests of your own political agenda, you will not consent and will continue to proceed as you have to date.

We await a response.

Very truly yours,




Kevin M. Downey

EXHIBIT 2



MAYER
BROWN
ROWE
& MAW

January 12, 2007

Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101

Main Tel (202) 263-3000
Main Fax (202) 263-3300
www.mayerbrownrowe.com

David S. Krakoff
Direct Tel (202) 263-3370
Direct Fax (202) 263-5370
dkrakoff@mayerbrownrowe.com

James B. Lockhart III
Director
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight
1700 G Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20552

Re: *In re Raines et al.*, OFHEO Notice No. 2006-1

Dear Mr. Lockhart:

I am counsel for Leanne Spencer. As you know, she previously served as the Controller and as a Senior Vice President of Fannie Mae. I respectfully request that you recuse yourself from any further participation in *In re Raines et al.*, OFHEO Notice No. 2006-1. OFHEO's enforcement procedures appoint you, as Director of the agency, to be the final arbiter of the charges that OFHEO filed against Ms. Spencer, Franklin D. Raines, and J. Timothy Howard. 12 U.S.C. § 4633(b) ("the Director shall render the decision"); *see also* 12 C.F.R. § 1780.5(b)(7) (stating that "only the Director shall have the power to ... make a final determination of the merits of the proceeding").

It is clear from your own statements and those of your predecessors, as well as from the reports issued by OFHEO on September 17, 2004, and May 23, 2006, that you and the agency have already decided that Ms. Spencer is liable for the claims brought in this matter. As delineated below, you have articulated unbridled hostility toward the respondents. Your statements are based solely on a one-sided investigation by OFHEO whose outcome was predetermined without affording the respondents any opportunity to be heard. That is not due process. Indeed, OFHEO's conclusions are premised on a full scale distortion of the witnesses and documents. The Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development even found evidence that the OFHEO examination was "altered and made to appear much more egregious and significant." Report of the Office of the Inspector General, U.S. Dep't of Housing & Urban Dev't, Investigation No. SID-04-0034-1, at 84 (Oct. 5, 2004) (hereinafter "OIG Report") (Exhibit 1). When the respondents are permitted a fair adjudication, they will undoubtedly prevail. However, as long as you continue to serve as both prosecutor and adjudicator, it will be impossible for Ms. Spencer to receive a fair resolution of the Notice of Charges.

The Supreme Court of the United States has stated repeatedly, a "fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process. This applies to administrative agencies which adjudicate as well as to courts." *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. 35, 46 (1975) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). An adjudicator who has formed an opinion regarding the merits of the case

Berlin Brussels Charlotte Chicago Cologne Frankfurt Hong Kong Houston London Los Angeles New York Palo Alto Paris Washington, D.C.
Independent Mexico City Correspondent: Jauregui, Navarrete y Nader S.C.

Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP operates in combination with our associated English limited liability partnership in the offices listed above.

James B. Lockhart III

January 12, 2007

Page 2

before it is tried cannot provide a fair trial. *See, e.g., Cinderella Career & Finishing Schs., Inc. v. FTC*, 425 F.2d 583 (D.C. Cir. 1970); *Texaco, Inc. v. FTC*, 336 F.2d 739 (D.C. Cir. 1964), *vacated and remanded on other grounds*, 381 U.S. 754 (1965). Accordingly, whenever “a disinterested observer may conclude that (the agency) has in some measure adjudged the facts as well as the law of a particular case in advance of hearing it,” the agency is disqualified from participating in the case. *Cinderella*, 425 F.2d at 591 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

On July 17, 2003, OFHEO commenced a Special Examination of Fannie Mae, one of only two Government Sponsored Enterprises regulated by the Agency. As you know, Ms. Spencer fully cooperated with the Special Examination, providing testimony on three separate occasions. On September 17, 2004, OFHEO issued a preliminary report on the findings of examination. Report of Findings to Date, Special Examination of Fannie Mae (Sept. 17, 2004) (Exhibit 2). The 198-page report concluded, inter alia, “that the accounting used by Fannie Mae for amortizing purchase premiums and discounts on securities and loans as well as amortizing other deferred charges is not in accordance with GAAP” (*id.* at ii); that “management intentionally developed accounting policies and selected and applied accounting methods to inappropriately reduce earnings volatility and to provide themselves with inordinate flexibility in determining the amount of income and expense recognized in any accounting period” (*id.*); and that “Fannie Mae implemented SFAS 133 in a manner that placed minimizing earnings volatility and maintaining simplicity of operations above compliance with GAAP” (*id.* at v).

OFHEO continued its examination, culminating in a final report on May 23, 2006. Report on the Special Examination of Fannie Mae (May 23, 2006) (Exhibit 3). The report accuses Fannie Mae and the three respondents of manipulating earnings “in order to generate unjustified levels of compensation for themselves and other executives” (*id.* at 4); engaging in “a wide variety of unsafe and unsound practices” (*id.*); and “failing to establish a sound internal control system” (*id.* at 9), through the violation of at least eight different accounting standards. As Acting Director of OFHEO, you announced in a press release: “As the OFHEO report shows, the image of Fannie Mae as one of the lowest-risk and ‘best in class’ institutions was a façade. In fact, it was just the opposite. They promoted unconstrained growth while undermining proper internal controls by under investing in systems, risk management and staff. Our examination found an environment where the ends justified the means. There was a systematic effort by senior management to manipulate accounting, reap financial rewards, and prevent the rest of the world from knowing about it.” OFHEO Press Release, *OFHEO, SEC Reach Settlement With Fannie Mae; Penalty Imposed* (May 23, 2006) (Exhibit 4). In another press release issued the same day, you stated that “Fannie Mae’s executives were precisely managing earnings to the one-hundredth of a penny.” OFHEO Press Release, *OFHEO Report: Fannie Mae Façade* (May 23, 2006) (Exhibit 5). Their conduct, you alleged, “resulted in an estimated \$10.6 billion of losses, well over a billion dollars in expenses to fix the problems, and ill-gotten bonuses in the hundreds of millions of dollars.” *Id.*

On the same day the report issued, OFHEO entered into an agreement with Fannie Mae in which the entity agreed to pay \$400 million to OFHEO and the Securities and Exchange Commission to

James B. Lockhart III

January 12, 2007

Page 3

resolve the allegations. You commented: "The penalty and settlements represent a major step in correcting a dangerous course that had been followed by one of the largest financial institutions in the world. Unprincipled corporate behavior and inadequate controls will simply not be tolerated." OFHEO Press Release, *OFHEO, SEC Reach Settlement With Fannie Mae; Penalty Imposed* (May 23, 2006) (Exhibit 4). On December 18, 2006, OFHEO issued the Notice of Charges against Mr. Raines, Mr. Howard and Ms. Spencer, which includes 101 different claims and seeks significant penalties from the respondents. Notice of Charges, OFHEO Notice No. 2006-1 (Exhibit 6).

OFHEO's Rules of Practice and Procedure permit you to hand-pick an administrative law judge or "any other person" to hear evidence and make a recommendation to you on liability, restitution, and penalties of the respondents. 12 C.F.R. §§ 1780.3(h), 1780.5. Even after appointing such person, you may, "at any time during the pendency of a proceeding, perform, direct the performance of, or waive performance of any act that could be done or ordered by the presiding officer." *Id.* § 1780.4. Moreover, you retain the exclusive power "to grant any motion to dismiss the proceeding or make a final determination of the merits of the proceeding." *Id.* § 1780.5(b)(7). It is our view that a fair assessment of the evidence will demonstrate that the respondents are not liable for any of the claims in the Notice of Charges. However, under OFHEO procedure, you are free to reject a recommendation of the presiding officer in favor of the respondents. *Id.* §§ 1780.53-.55. Based upon your unqualified statements, it is clear that you would do just that.

Your statements to the press throughout the course of OFHEO's investigation of Fannie Mae and its former officers demonstrate unequivocally that you have already determined that Ms. Spencer, Mr. Raines, and Mr. Howard are liable for all claims against them. For example, even before OFHEO issued the Notice of Charges, you told the press that these individuals "grossly mismanaged" Fannie Mae, "underspent dramatically on systems, internal controls, risk management—all the basic building blocks of a good corporation," and went "beyond mismanagement to manipulating earnings." David S. Hilzenrath, *Fannie Mae Final Tally: \$6.3 Billion Overstated*, Washington Post (Dec. 7, 2006) (Exhibit 7).

Moreover, you testified before Congress that "[b]y encouraging rapid growth, unconstrained by proper internal controls, risk management and other systems," these individuals "did serious harm to Fannie Mae while enriching themselves through earnings manipulation." Statement of James B. Lockhart III on OFHEO's Report on the Special Examination of Fannie Mae Before the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, U.S. House of Representatives (June 6, 2006) (Exhibit 8). You told Congress that the actions of these former Fannie Mae executives "were flat-out wrong, or, to use the proper regulatory phrase, they were managing Fannie Mae in an 'unsafe and unsound' manner. Senior management manipulated accounting; reaped maximum, undeserved bonuses; and prevented the rest of the world from knowing about it. They co-opted their internal auditors and other managers. They stonewalled OFHEO." *Id.*

James B. Lockhart III

January 12, 2007

Page 4

You further stated that “[i]n 1998, management *should* have recognized significant losses from the amortization of premiums and the impairment of guaranty-fee buy-ups, but much of the actual loss was deferred so that management could meet bonus targets, as well as the expectations of analysts.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). Among other things, you concluded that “senior management did not make adequate investments in accounting systems and staffing,” which helped them “to hide improper actions that smoothed earnings; that they implemented FAS 115 and 133 in a manner that “did not comport with GAAP”; that they “went to extraordinary lengths to avoid recording GAAP required impairment losses”; and that they used “cookie-jar reserves, income shifting transactions and inappropriate debt repurchases.” *Id.*

In a speech you delivered to the American Enterprise Institute on September 13, 2006, you announced OFHEO’s intention to sue the respondents, declaring: “I think we need to send a very strong message. We sent a strong message with the \$400 million fine against Fannie Mae, but I think we also need to send a message about the mismanagement and—as the SEC says it—fraud committed by the former management.” Transcript of Remarks of Jim Lockhart to the American Enterprise Institute (Sept. 13, 2006) (Exhibit 9). Indeed, it appears that you anticipated overstepping the bounds of your lawful authority in your zeal to prosecute these individuals. You declared that OFHEO “will try to use our powers to the utmost,” noting: “In some cases we may end up being sued by Fannie and Freddie if we try to use some powers that we think we could possibly have. But we’ll try to do the best we can because that’s our job.” *Id.*

In a press release accompanying the Notice of Charges you filed against Ms. Spencer, Mr. Raines, and Mr. Howard, you did not mince words. On behalf of the agency, you characterized the charges not as allegations that you would fairly evaluate, but rather as facts you had already determined to be true. You stated: “The Notice of Charges details the harm to Fannie Mae resulting from the conduct of these individuals from 1998 to 2004. The 101 charges reveal how the individuals improperly manipulated the earnings to maximize their bonuses, while knowingly neglecting accounting systems and internal controls, misapplying over twenty accounting principles and misleading the regulator and the public. The Notice explains how they submitted six years of misleading and inaccurate accounting statements and inaccurate capital reports that enabled them to grow Fannie Mae in an unsafe and unsound manner. The misconduct cost the Enterprise and shareholders many billions of dollars and damaged the public trust.” OFHEO Press Release, *OFHEO Files Notice of Charges Against Former Fannie Mae Executives Franklin Raines, Timothy Howard and Leanne Spencer* (Dec. 18, 2006) (Exhibit 10).

Similarly, in a subsequent press conference, you declared that OFHEO “believed as an agency that these three individuals, separately and together, did serious harm to the company. There is a long list of charges that show they allowed this company to grow out of control.” See Eric Dash, *Fannie Mae Ex-Officers Sued By U.S.*, New York Times (Dec. 19, 2006) (Exhibit 11); see also, e.g., David S. Hilzenrath, *Fannie Mae Ex-Officials Are Sued For Disputed Pay*, Washington Post (Dec. 19, 2006) (Exhibit 12). You told reporters that Mr. Raines, Mr. Howard, and Ms. Spencer “knowingly” neglected “accounting systems and internal controls, misapplying over 20 accounting principles and misleading the regulator and the public.” James Tyson, *Fannie Mae Regulator Sues Raines, Former Executives*, Bloomberg.com (Dec. 18, 2006) (Exhibit 13). You

James B. Lockhart III

January 12, 2007

Page 5

further stated: "This activity was so unsafe and unsound that we have to take this action. We have no choice, really. We have to send a message to the management ..., both present and previous, that this kind of activity cannot be allowed." Damien Paletta, *OFHEO Files Notice of Charges vs. Ex-Fannie Executives*, Dow Jones Newswires (Dec. 18, 2006) (Exhibit 14).

These comments illustrate precisely the sort of bias that compels your recusal from participation in this case. Federal law requires you to recuse yourself from "any proceeding in which [your] impartiality might reasonably be questioned." 28 U.S.C. § 455(a). Your public condemnations of Ms. Spencer, Mr. Raines, and Mr. Howard, which have been widely reported in every national newspaper, would cause any reasonable observer to question your impartiality. Indeed, the Washington Post has already noted that "after the evidence has been heard, it is the accuser who will render judgment." David S. Hilzenrath, *Players Oddly Aligned in New Fannie Mae Case*, Washington Post (Dec. 20, 2006) (Exhibit 15); see also *id.* (noting that "[t]he playing field is inhospitable"). The New York Times has observed that OFHEO "seems intent on sending a message to Capitol Hill, where legislation is to be debated that would give the office greater authority." Eric Dash, *Fannie Mae Ex-Officers Sued By U.S.*, Washington Post (Dec. 19, 2006) (Exhibit 11). As one commentator explained, "OFHEO basically may be trying to send a signal that they are going to be really tough under their jurisdiction. They traditionally have not had the clout compared to other regulators for banks. And by bringing this action, they may want to send the fear of God to these executives." *Id.* (quoting Prof. Henry T. Hu, University of Texas Law School).

Moreover, your agency's bitter and repeated criticisms of the respondents are premised on a perversion of the testimony and documents obtained in the Special Examination, where there was an institutional initiative to distort the evidence in order to marginalize Fannie Mae and damage the Respondents. Indeed, as early as April 2004, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development ("OIG") launched an investigation at the request of Senator Christopher S. Bond into possible criminal misconduct stemming from improper leaks of confidential information by former Director Armando Falcon, based on OFHEO's selective release to the press of "the results and partial recommendations of a confidential regulatory examination of Fannie Mae." OIG Report at 2 (Exhibit 1). While the U.S. Attorney's Office ultimately declined to prosecute Director Falcon "in favor of administrative remedies," *id.* at 92, the OIG Report well documents OFHEO's overwhelming institutional bias. For example, one member of OFHEO's examination staff reported to the OIG that OFHEO staff members were instructed "that it's our job, meaning all employees of OFHEO, to make the Director look good." *Id.* at 9. Employees were told that "the Enterprises should fear OFHEO when we come onto the premises and that our relationship is inherently acrimonious and adversarial." *Id.* According to this witness, OFHEO's Special Examination of Fannie Mae "was focused on finding a way to bring into question the propriety of Fannie Mae's approach," and thus examination results and conclusions "were then altered and made to appear much more significant and egregious." *Id.* at 84. The "ultimate objective on the part of the Director and the Deputy Director" was to force Fannie Mae "to recognize an increased level of impairment" and to "find a way to conclude that Fannie has misapplied the financial accounting standards." *Id.* at 85.

James B. Lockhart III

January 12, 2007

Page 6

Another OFHEO employee told OIG that the agency's Special Examination was driven by the goal of "finding problems at Fannie Mae," and that employees were "rewarded for finding things versus saying that everything is okay." *Id.* at 80. OFHEO's former Chief Examiner, Scott Calhoun, testified that "the attitude prevailing at OFHEO was one in which efforts would be made to find things wrong at Fannie Mae, then take strong enforcement action; 'when we find them, we'll hammer you hard.'" *Id.* at 82. Managers who "did not conform to this new approach" were "marginalized" by senior management. *Id.* at 82-83. OFHEO's former Deputy Director, Stephen Blumenthal, acknowledged lecturing staff "about how public announcements by government officials could negatively impact the stock of Fannie Mae and could serve as a means for making the regulated entity ... 'submit to the will' of the regulator." *Id.* at 11.

Under these circumstances, your dual role as prosecutor and adjudicator casts inescapable doubt on your impartiality. As the Supreme Court has held, the Constitution does not permit a judge who has "in effect bec[ome] part of the prosecution and assumed an adversary position" to adjudicate a case. *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. at 53; *see also, e.g., Wildberger v. Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees*, 86 F.3d 1188, 1190, 1195 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (holding that a disciplinary procedure in which the same individual "initiated the investigation, determined probable cause, and served as the final adjudicator" violated constitutional due process). In light of OFHEO's politically motivated investigation and prosecution of Ms. Spencer, Mr. Raines, and Mr. Howard, in which you personally have played a crucial role, you must remove yourself from any further involvement in this case.


The Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution requires that "an administrative hearing 'must be attended, not only with every element of fairness but with the very appearance of complete fairness.'" *Cinderella*, 425 F.2d at 591 (quoting *Amos Treat & Co. v. SEC*, 306 F.2d 260, 267 (1962)). Your statements are prima facie evidence that you have "adjudged the facts as well as the law ... in advance of hearing [*In re Raines et al.*]." *Id.* You cannot back off your public statements now. Decision-makers are without "license to make speeches [or statements] which give the appearance that the case has been prejudged." *Id.* As long as you continue to participate in this case, Ms. Spencer will be denied her fundamental constitutional right to due process.

This letter is presented to you to permit you a fair opportunity to recuse yourself now. Because this matter will be irrevocably tainted by any further involvement from you – including appointment of a presiding officer pursuant to 12 C.F.R. § 1780.3(h) – you must act on this issue now. Your recusal cannot await completion of a hearing on the Notice of Charges. If you deny

James B. Lockhart III
January 12, 2007
Page 7

our request or take any further action in this matter without responding, we will petition the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for a writ of mandamus removing you and OFHEO from the adjudication of this matter. See 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a). Whatever your action, please make this letter part of the administrative record of *In re Raines, et al.*, OFHEO Notice No. 2006-1.

Very truly yours,



David S. Krakoff

cc: Kevin M. Downey
Counsel for Franklin D. Raines

Steven M. Salky
Counsel for J. Timothy Howard

Alfred M. Pollard
General Counsel for OFHEO