

---

**From:** Kathy Ruemmler [REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 17, 2014 8:04 PM  
**To:** jeffrey E.  
**Subject:** Fwd: letter from Sauber to WP

Letter from Dach's lawyer.

----- Forwarded message -----

From:="Schultz, Eric" [REDACTED]<mailto:[REDACTED]>>  
Date: Oct 16, 2014 6:18 PM  
Subject: letter from Sauber to WP  
To: "Kathy Ruemmler" [REDACTED]>  
Cc: =br>

◆=AO Re: My client Jonathan Dach

Dear Carol:

◆=AO I want to raise with you and your colleagues, to whom I ask=that you circulate this letter, a serious question about the continued use=of Jonathan Dach's name in the follow-up articles that the Washington Post intends to pu=lish.

◆=AO You repeatedly told us that your initial article on this su=ject was not really about Jonathan Dach—it was a story about what =ou saw as pressure exerted on DHS investigators and what you perceived as disparate treatment of Secret Service personnel =versus White House staff or volunteers. In fact, it would seem that M=. Dach's actual activities in Cartagena were nearly irrelevant to =our story.

Now that the initial story is out, with the not unexpected buzz it generate=, I would ask that you from this point forward refrain from using Mr. Dach=E2◆◆s name. He has served his purposes for your reporting◆=94repeating his name in connection with these allegations only deepens the wounds he has already suffered.

If the Post insists, for no reason we can ascertain, to include the name, i= seems the very least the paper should do is to include, whenever his name=is used, reference to his continued denials and to the fact that his=signature, to say nothing of his name, does not appear on the hotel register.

Let me give you an example of how your continued emphasis on whether or not he acted inappropriately in Cartagena has gone unnecessarily over the line of propriety. On your MSNBC appearance last Friday you said;<=>

"And the [hotel] made clear to investigators that there was no way a woman could just write a number down for a room in the president's hotel=where there was a lot of high security."

This statement presents two problems: It is first and foremost highly misleading. As you know the erroneous h=tel log was dated around 12:01 AM on the morning of April 4th.=C2♦ And as you know, the President did not arrive in Cartagena until April 13<=up>th, almost 10 days later. On the night of April =rd and the morning of April 4th, it wasn't the president's hotel -- it was just a hotel. Your choice of words, whether accidental or purposeful, would leave any viewer with an impression you may have sought, but which was clearly wrong.<=>

♦=A0 More to the point, there is no reason to keep harping on Mr= Dach's behavior and whether you think he really had a woman in his room. The thesis that Mr. Dach misbehaved is irrelevant and it continues the unfairness we have presented to you for several months now.

♦=A0 We would ask that you not name him any further, or at the very least if you feel compelled to name him please include the denials and an accurate recitation of the evidence presented to the White House at the time the early decisions were made.=/u>

On another note we also point out that Leslie Dach was not a registered lobbyist during his tenure at Walmart. <=u>

Eric Schultz

w 202/456-4674 <tel:202%2F456-4674>

c 202/503-5929 <tel:202%2F503-5929>

eschultz@who.eop.gov <mailto:eschultz@who.eop.gov> <=u>