

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6216

(202) 225-6906
judiciary.house.gov

June 30, 2025

Philip Dormitzer, M.D., Ph.D.
Former Vice President and Chief Scientific Officer of RNA and Viral Vaccines
Pfizer, Inc.
c/o Ms. Susan E. Brune
Brune Law P.C.
450 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Dr. Dormitzer:

On May 15, 2025, the Committee requested your voluntary cooperation with our oversight into whether Pfizer “sat on the positive results of clinical trials” of its COVID-19 vaccine so as to influence the 2020 presidential election.¹ We asked that you produce four categories of documents and that you appear for a voluntary transcribed interview with the Committee.² To date, you have failed to voluntarily comply with our requests. Therefore, the Committee must resort to compulsory process to obtain your testimony and the requested documents.

On May 29, 2025, your attorney, Susan Brune, informed the Committee that you declined our request for testimony.³ With respect to the documents requested by the Committee, Ms. Brune artificially narrowed the scope of our requests and stated that you possess “no document” that would be responsive to this limited scope.⁴ Ms. Brune did not address any of the four specific categories of documents requested by the Committee.⁵ Instead, she wrote that “Pfizer’s

¹ Letter from Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, to Dr. Philip Dormitzer, Former Global Head of Vaccines Research and Development, Pfizer, Inc., at 1 (May 15, 2025) [hereinafter “May 15 Letter”].

² *Id.*

³ Letter from Susan E. Brune, Brune Law P.C., to Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary (May 29, 2025). During a phone call with the Committee on May 28, 2025, Ms. Brune, refused to engage with us regarding how and when you might respond to our requests, and instead stated that she would provide a written response the following day. Phone Call Between Comm. Staff, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, and Ms. Susan Brune, Counsel for Dr. Philip Dormitzer (May 28, 2025, 2:30 p.m.). During a phone call with the Committee on June 5, 2025, Ms. Brune again declined to make Dr. Dormitzer available for a transcribed interview. Phone Call Between Comm. Staff, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, and Ms. Susan Brune, Counsel for Dr. Philip Dormitzer (June 5, 2025, 11:00 a.m.).

⁴ Letter from Susan E. Brune, *supra* note 3.

⁵ *Id.*

representatives are or will be in communication . . . to provide whatever details you might request.”⁶

As noted in our May 15 letter, the Committee received information that “[o]n three occasions between November 13-19, 2024, [you] spoke with a senior legal executive at GSK” and provided information that “the three most senior people in Pfizer R&D were involved with a decision to deliberately slow down clinical testing so that it would not be complete prior to the results of the presidential election that year.”⁷ GSK further informed the Committee that you were “clear that this was not a situation of delaying disclosure of completed results but was a situation of slowing down results before disclosure became necessary.”⁸ Notably, Ms. Brune’s response to the Committee did not dispute GSK’s principal assertions, including that you told a senior legal executive at GSK that Pfizer deliberately slowed down clinical testing so it would not be complete prior to the presidential election.⁹

Based on the information we have obtained to date, the Committee believes your testimony is critical for our oversight. Ms. Brune’s response offered no reason why you cannot comply with our request for testimony and provided no explanation for your refusal to do so. In addition, Ms. Brune’s response did not address any of the four categories of documents specifically sought by the Committee. Although Ms. Brune suggested that the Committee could obtain further “details” from Pfizer, the Committee’s request to Pfizer is separate and unique from the Committee’s request to you. To the extent that Pfizer has provided information to the Committee, it does not relieve you from your obligation to comply with the subpoenas the Committee is issuing today.¹⁰

Pursuant to Rule X of the House of Representatives, the Committee has jurisdiction to conduct oversight of matters concerning civil liberties and “administrative practice and procedures” as well as federal criminal law to inform potential legislative reforms.¹¹ As we explained in our May 15 letter, the allegation that senior Pfizer executives conspired to withhold public health information so as to influence the 2020 presidential election implicates substantial federal interests and requires additional inquiry, which will in turn inform potential legislative

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Letter from Reginald J. Brown, Kirkland & Ellis LLP, to Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judic., (Apr. 16, 2025).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ See Letter from Susan E. Brune, *supra* note 3.

¹⁰ See *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187–88 (1957) (All citizens have an “unremitting obligation to respond to subpoenas, to respect the dignity of the Congress and its committees and to testify *fully* with respect to matters within the province of proper investigation.” (emphasis added)); *Anson v. Weinstein*, No. 2:17-cv-8360-GW/KS, 2019 WL 6655259, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2019) (A party is “not absolved of [its] own obligation to produce the responsive materials regardless of whether other parties may also produce similar or even identical documents.”); *Alutiiq Int’l Sols., LLC v. OIC Marianas Ins. Corp.*, 305 F.R.D. 618, 626 (D. Nev. 2015) (“[D]ocuments already produced by another party” do not absolve another party “of its own production obligation.”); *Lawson v. Fla. Dep’t of Corr.*, No. 4:18-cv-437-MW/CAS, 2019 WL 13199691, at *1 (N.D. Fla. Sept. 3, 2019) (“Belief that another party already has the information in question is not a substantial justification for [failing] to disclose that information.”).

¹¹ Rules of the House of Representatives R. X.

Dr. Philip Dormitzer

June 30, 2025

Page 3

reforms.¹² These reforms may include, among other things, modifying federal administrative procedure law to deem an Emergency Use Authorization a ‘major rule’ under the Administrative Procedure Act and require additional public transparency in the vaccine testing and approval process, imposing criminal penalties for withholding or delaying public health information with the intent to influence a federal election, or enhancing criminal penalties for making false or misleading statements to a federal entity regarding public health matters.

Accordingly, please find enclosed a subpoena compelling your attendance at a deposition at 10:00 a.m. on July 22, 2025 and a subpoena for the requested materials to be produced to the Committee by July 18, 2025.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Jim Jordan
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member

Enclosures

¹² May 15 Letter, *supra* note 1, at 2.