STATE OF NEW MEXICO
COUNTY OF SANTA FE
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

In the Matter of a Citizen Petition to Convene a Grand Jury Under Article II, Section 14 of the Constitution of New Mexico	No. _____ (assigned by the Clerk)

PETITION TO CONVENE A GRAND JURY

The undersigned registered voters of Santa Fe County, New Mexico, petition the First Judicial District Court to order a grand jury convened in Santa Fe County, or to submit the matters set out below to a grand jury already convened in the county, to inquire into the violations of law described in this petition.

Person filing this petition

Name: _____

Mailing address for court notices: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

1. Authority

1.1. Article II, Section 14 of the Constitution of New Mexico provides that "a grand jury shall be ordered to convene by such judge upon the filing of a petition therefor signed by not less than the greater of two hundred registered voters or two percent of the registered voters of the county."

1.2. Rule 5-302.3 NMRA, as amended by Supreme Court Order No. S-1-RCR-2023-00023, effective December 31, 2023, requires the district court to make "both a factual determination that a citizen petition to convene a grand jury meets the procedural requirements of Article II, Section 14 and a legal determination that the petition seeks a legitimate inquiry into alleged criminal conduct or malfeasance proscribed by state law." Rule 5-302.3(B) NMRA (determinations required). When the petition meets both, "the court shall convene a grand jury," or submit the matter to one already convened, and "shall direct the grand jury to make inquiry into all potential violations of law described in the petition that the judge determines are proper subjects of grand jury investigation." Rule 5-302.3(F) NMRA (convening the grand jury).

1.3. The petition "must identify with reasonable specificity the alleged criminal conduct or unlawful malfeasance to be investigated," and the court determines "whether the petition seeks to investigate conduct that lies within the permissible scope of grand jury inquiry." Rule 5-302.3(B)(2) NMRA (legal determination); see *Pino v. Rich*, 1994-NMSC-105, ¶ 3, 118 N.M. 426, 882 P.2d 17. "A district court judge must determine the legality of a petition to convene a grand jury by deciding whether the petition on its face delimit[s] an area of inquiry that colorably lies within the permissible scope of grand jury inquiry." *Convisser v. Ecoversity*, 2013-NMSC-039, ¶ 11 (quoting *Pino*, 1994-NMSC-105, ¶ 3). The petition "need not name persons specifically, because grand juries investigate crimes or acts of malfeasance, not people." *District Court of the Second Judicial District v. McKenna*, 1994-NMSC-102, ¶ 11, 118 N.M. 402, 881 P.2d 1387. The judge "is not to inquire into the motives behind the filing of the petition." *McKenna*, 1994-NMSC-102.

1.4. This petition meets that test. It does not ask a grand jury to review a charging decision or any other lawful official act. It describes acts that New Mexico law makes crimes when done for the purposes alleged: giving a thing of value to a witness to keep her from testifying or reporting, and hiding evidence to prevent a prosecution. It identifies specific conduct of two kinds. The first is the giving of a thing of value to a witness: the transfer of Ghislaine Maxwell, a convicted sex offender serving a twenty-year sentence, from a low-security prison to a minimum-security prison camp that Bureau of Prisons policy

closed to her absent a waiver, in the week after the Deputy Attorney General of the United States personally questioned her for about nine hours and while she was under subpoena to testify before Congress. The second is the hiding of evidence: the withholding, from New Mexico's reopened criminal investigation of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch in Santa Fe County, of the federal investigative records of those crimes, which the United States Department of Justice holds. The redacted files the Department has released to the public refer to the ranch more than 13,000 times. The petition asks the grand jury to inquire whether that conduct violated Section 30-24-3(A)(1) or (A)(3) or Section 30-22-5 NMSA 1978, or was a conspiracy to do so under Section 30-28-2 NMSA 1978. If the conduct occurred as alleged, it would warrant a true bill of indictment. The petition identifies the official whose conduct it describes, because the acts were his; whether any person is indicted is for the grand jury. Because a target is identifiable in this petition, Rule 5-302.3(C) to (E) NMRA (notice to target and intervention) provides for written notice to him and an opportunity to intervene before the court rules on the petition.

2. Subject matter of the inquiry

The subject matter of the inquiry is the conduct of Todd Blanche, Deputy Attorney General of the United States from March 6, 2025, Acting Attorney General from April 2, 2026, and Attorney General of the United States since August 10, 2026, and of any person who combined or acted with him, in two acts. The first is giving, or causing to be given, a thing of value to Ghislaine Maxwell by her transfer on or about August 1, 2025 from Federal Correctional Institution Tallahassee, a low-security prison, to Federal Prison Camp Bryan, a minimum-security camp, when she was a witness under subpoena in a proceeding of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, a person likely to become a witness in New Mexico's criminal investigation of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch in Santa Fe County, which New Mexico opened in 2019 and stood down at federal request, and in any proceeding arising from it, and a person holding information relating to the commission of felonies at the ranch. The second is hiding from the New Mexico Department of Justice, from February 13, 2026 to the present, the records of the federal investigation of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch.

3. Areas of inquiry

3.1. The questioning of Ghislaine Maxwell by Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche in Tallahassee, Florida on July 24 and 25, 2025, including who arranged and attended it and what she said about Zorro Ranch and New Mexico. What was offered or discussed in that questioning concerning her custody, her place of confinement, clemency or her testimony.

3.2. The transfer of Maxwell from Federal Correctional Institution Tallahassee to Federal Prison Camp Bryan, Texas, which the Bureau of Prisons confirmed on August 1, 2025, including who requested, recommended, approved and carried it out, and every communication about it among the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, the Office of the Attorney General, the Bureau of Prisons and any other person. The waiver of the Bureau's sex offender public safety factor that the transfer required, who granted it and on what stated ground.

3.3. Whether Maxwell is a witness, or a person likely to become a witness, in New Mexico's criminal investigation of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch and in any proceeding arising from it, including what she knows of conduct at the ranch and of the persons who took part in it.

3.4. Whether the transfer, or anything else of value, was given or offered to Maxwell for the purpose of inducing her to testify falsely or to abstain from testifying to any fact in any judicial, administrative, legislative or other official cause or proceeding, including the proceeding of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform under its subpoena of July 23, 2025 and New Mexico's investigation and any proceeding arising from it, or with intent to keep her from truthfully reporting to the New Mexico Department of Justice or any other agency responsible for enforcing criminal laws information relating to felonies committed at Zorro Ranch. What the officials who requested and approved the transfer knew of that subpoena and of her lawyer's letter of July 29, 2025. Whether she has since abstained from testifying, including by declining to answer the committee's questions on February 9, 2026. Whether anything of

value has been given, continued or offered to Maxwell since New Mexico reopened its investigation in February 2026.

3.5. Each request the New Mexico Department of Justice made to the United States Department of Justice for the records of the federal investigation of Zorro Ranch from February 13, 2026 to the present; who received each request; who decided how to answer it; the reasons recorded for each decision; and the basis for the statement of the United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Mexico that it "neither collected nor retained any investigative materials," including what that office collected, retained or sent elsewhere.

3.6. The location, custody and contents of the records withheld, including the file New Mexico transmitted to federal prosecutors in September 2019, the records of the federal investigation that refer to Zorro Ranch, the records of the Maxwell prosecution that refer to New Mexico, and any record of a search, or of a decision not to search, of the ranch by federal law enforcement.

3.7. Whether the records were withheld with intent to prevent the apprehension, prosecution or conviction of any person for a crime committed at Zorro Ranch, and the identity of each person whose apprehension, prosecution or conviction the withholding served to prevent.

3.8. Whether the reasons stated for withholding the records, including protective orders entered in the Southern District of New York and the privacy of victims, were the reasons for the decision, and whether redaction or a protective order in New Mexico could have met them under the procedures in 28 C.F.R. Sections 16.21 to 16.29. Whether the Department asked, or could have asked, a federal court to permit disclosure of grand jury matters to New Mexico officials under Rule 6(e)(3)(E)(iv) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which allows disclosure at the government's request to an appropriate state official for the purpose of enforcing state criminal law.

3.9. The identity of each person who combined with Todd Blanche, or with whom he combined, in either act described in paragraph 2.

4. Violations of New Mexico law

The grand jury is asked to inquire into whether the person described in paragraph 2, and any person who combined or acted with him, committed the following offenses under the laws of New Mexico, directly or as an accessory who "procures, counsels, aids or abets in its commission." Section 30-1-13 NMSA 1978.

Count 1. Bribery of a witness, Section 30-24-3(A)(1) and (A)(3) NMSA 1978: knowingly "giving or offering to give anything of value to any witness or to any person likely to become a witness in any judicial, administrative, legislative or other official cause or proceeding to testify falsely or to abstain from testifying to any fact in such cause or proceeding," Subsection A(1), or "giving or offering to give anything of value to any person with the intent to keep the person from truthfully reporting to a law enforcement officer or any agency of government that is responsible for enforcing criminal laws information relating to the commission or possible commission of a felony offense," Subsection A(3), namely the transfer of Ghislaine Maxwell to a minimum-security prison camp, a third degree felony under Subsection C.

Count 2. Tampering with evidence, Section 30-22-5(A) NMSA 1978: "destroying, changing, hiding, placing or fabricating any physical evidence with intent to prevent the apprehension, prosecution or conviction of any person or to throw suspicion of the commission of a crime upon another," namely hiding from the New Mexico Department of Justice, with intent to prevent the apprehension, prosecution or conviction of persons who committed crimes at Zorro Ranch, the records of the federal investigation of those crimes: the unredacted record from the Department's release that New Mexico requested on February 13, 2026; the investigative records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of the United States Attorney's Offices for the Southern District of New York and the District of New Mexico that refer to Zorro Ranch; and any record of a search, or of a decision not to search, of the ranch by federal law enforcement. The acts of hiding alleged are the responses and refusals described in paragraph 5.7, including the response of the United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Mexico dated June

30, 2026 and the refusals of the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York on July 14 and July 31, 2026; the categorical policy of refusal described in paragraph 5.8; and any statement that concealed the existence, location or custody of the records. Where the highest crime for which tampering is committed is a capital, first degree or second degree felony, tampering is a third degree felony under Subsection B(1). The record New Mexico requested on February 13, 2026, as New Mexico describes it, alleges the burial of two victims near the ranch, paragraph 5.5, and murder in the first degree is a capital felony, Section 30-2-1(A) NMSA 1978, which may be prosecuted at any time, Section 30-1-8(I) NMSA 1978. The crimes alleged at Zorro Ranch also include the sexual abuse of children. Under Section 30-9-11 NMSA 1978, as in effect when each act was committed, criminal sexual penetration of a child under thirteen is a first degree felony, and criminal sexual penetration of an older minor is a second degree felony in the circumstances the statute then specified. The level of the underlying crime must be found beyond a reasonable doubt. *State v. Radosevich*, 2018-NMSC-028, ¶¶ 2, 29. That level, and whether the records were hidden, by concealing their existence, location or custody or by refusing access to them, are subjects of the inquiry.

Count 3. Conspiracy, Section 30-28-2(A) NMSA 1978: "knowingly combining with another for the purpose of committing a felony within or without this state," namely either felony described above, a fourth degree felony under Subsection B(3) where the highest crime conspired to be committed is a third degree or fourth degree felony.

5. General allegations

The allegations below rest on the complaint the State of New Mexico filed on August 5, 2026 in *State of New Mexico v. United States Department of Justice and Todd Blanche*, No. 1:26-cv-02762 (D.D.C.) (the "New Mexico Complaint"); on the transcripts and recordings of the interview of Ghislaine Maxwell that the United States Department of Justice released on August 22, 2025; on statements of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and of Todd Blanche; and on the record of *United States v. Maxwell*, No. 20-cr-330 (S.D.N.Y.). Allegations made on information and belief say so.

5.1. Zorro Ranch is a property in Santa Fe County, outside Santa Fe. Jeffrey Epstein bought it in 1993 and visited New Mexico repeatedly until his death in 2019. "Zorro Ranch was one of the locations where Epstein's victims were taken." New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 2, 19-20.

5.2. Ghislaine Maxwell was indicted in the Southern District of New York in 2020, and in a superseding indictment in 2021, for conspiring with Epstein to recruit and groom girls for sexual abuse between 1994 and 2004, and her indictment "included alleged overt acts of grooming and abuse in New Mexico." New Mexico Complaint ¶ 39. At her trial, Annie Farmer testified that in 1996, when she was sixteen, Maxwell gave her a massage at the ranch while she was undressed, and a witness identified as "Jane" testified that as a teenager she traveled with Epstein and Maxwell to New Mexico. Maxwell was convicted on December 29, 2021 of sex trafficking of a minor and related counts and was sentenced on June 28, 2022 to twenty years in prison. *United States v. Maxwell*, No. 20-cr-330 (S.D.N.Y.).

5.3. In February 2019 the New Mexico Attorney General opened a criminal investigation of Zorro Ranch. "During a subsequent telephone call on July 23, 2019, USDOJ told NMDOJ to stand down from its investigation into Epstein's potential criminal activity in New Mexico," and agreed in exchange to "pass along any information [USDOJ] may have gathered about state crimes that were committed in [NMDOJ's] jurisdiction." On September 17, 2019 New Mexico transmitted its investigative file to the United States Department of Justice. "But federal law enforcement failed to ever search Zorro Ranch." New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 24-30.

5.4. Under the Epstein Files Transparency Act, the Department released about 3.5 million pages of its Epstein and Maxwell investigative records, with redactions, on a rolling basis through January 30, 2026. The released files "include over 13,000 references to Zorro Ranch and 5,000 references to New Mexico." New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 23, 38 and Ex. 7.

5.5. On February 13, 2026 the Chief of Criminal Affairs of the New Mexico Department of Justice wrote to Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche requesting immediate production of the full, unredacted copy of a document in the release, which, as New Mexico describes it, "alleges the burial of two female victims in the land surrounding Zorro Ranch," and related records. On February 19, 2026 Attorney General Raúl Torrez announced that New Mexico had reopened its criminal investigation of Zorro Ranch, and on March 9, 2026 New Mexico conducted the first law enforcement search of the ranch. New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 44, 47; New Mexico Department of Justice, Statement Regarding Zorro Ranch, Feb. 19, 2026.

5.6. New Mexico asked again for the records on March 13, 2026, in a letter from Attorney General Torrez to Attorney General Pam Bondi; on May 3, 2026, in a formal request under 28 C.F.R. Sections 16.21 to 16.29 to the United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Mexico and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and on May 29, June 4, June 30 and July 14, 2026, in letters to Blanche, by then Acting Attorney General, and to his Associate Deputy Attorney General. The June 30 and July 14 letters said New Mexico would treat the request as denied if it had no access by July 31, 2026. New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 48-71.

5.7. The United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Mexico answered in a letter dated June 30, 2026 and received July 14, 2026 that it "neither collected nor retained any investigative materials," and that its file "consist[ed] mostly of transmittal materials [to SDNY] and materials collected from the public domain," and enclosed thirty-one pages: follow-up questions for victim interviews, a newspaper article, a former governor's press release, the 2019 correspondence between the two departments, redacted internal emails and redacted Virgin Islands corporate records. On July 14, 2026 the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York said it "would not provide any materials in response to NMDOJ's Touhy request," and on July 31, 2026 it repeated that the Epstein Files Transparency Act and the protective orders precluded production. New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 72-76.

5.8. On August 5, 2026 the State of New Mexico sued the Department and Blanche, in his official capacity as Acting Attorney General, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The complaint alleges that "USDOJ and Acting Attorney General Blanche are refusing to facilitate the investigation of state law crimes" and that "USDOJ adopted an authoritative and categorical policy or practice to refuse to share investigative information." New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 6, 139. Announcing the suit that day, Torrez said: "Todd Blanche today with a stroke of a pen could grant us the access that he claimed," and "Instead they have decided to stonewall, to obstruct and to frankly conceal for whatever reason." Associated Press, Aug. 5, 2026. The Department answered that the Epstein Files Transparency Act does not require, and the protective orders entered in the Southern District of New York do not permit, disclosure of victim-identifying information "carte blanche," and that it "remains available to assist New Mexico's investigation consistent with the law and binding court orders." ABC News, Aug. 5, 2026.

5.9. Blanche took office as Deputy Attorney General on March 6, 2025, became Acting Attorney General on April 2, 2026, was confirmed by the Senate as Attorney General on August 8, 2026 by a vote of 50 to 49, and took the oath of that office on August 10, 2026. Every request described in paragraphs 5.5 and 5.6 was made while he held one of those offices, and the first and the last four were addressed to him.

5.10. On July 24 and 25, 2025 Blanche, as Deputy Attorney General, personally questioned Maxwell in Tallahassee, Florida, for about nine hours over two days, under an agreement that her statements would not be used against her. He told her: "By you meeting with us today, we're really just meeting, I'm not promising to do anything." The Department released the transcripts and recordings on August 22, 2025. Maxwell was then confined at Federal Correctional Institution Tallahassee, a low-security prison.

5.11. On August 1, 2025 the Federal Bureau of Prisons confirmed that Maxwell had been moved to Federal Prison Camp Bryan, in Bryan, Texas, a minimum-security camp. Bureau of Prisons Program Statement 5100.08 assigns a sex offender public safety factor that keeps an inmate at low security or above unless the factor is waived, and a waiver must be approved by the administrator of the Bureau's

Designation and Sentence Computation Center. A retired Bureau official, Paul Gibson, said: "I've never seen them waive a sex offense public safety factor for a transfer to a minimum-security camp." Reason, Aug. 6, 2025.

5.12. On December 21, 2025, asked on NBC's Meet the Press about the transfer, Blanche said the Bureau of Prisons made the decision because "[s]he was suffering numerous and numerous threats against her life," and said of the Bureau's decisions: "every decision that they make lands on my desk to the extent it needs to." On June 16, 2026 the ranking members of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform reported that, during their staff's visit to the camp, Bureau leadership would not answer questions about Maxwell's treatment, and described their investigation as one into "Attorney General Blanche's role in ensuring Ms. Maxwell remains comfortable and quiet."

5.13. On July 23, 2025, the day before Blanche began questioning Maxwell, the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform subpoenaed her to sit for a deposition at Federal Correctional Institution Tallahassee on August 11, 2025. On July 29, 2025 her lawyer wrote to the committee that unless several conditions were met she would invoke her Fifth Amendment privilege at the deposition. The conditions included a grant of immunity and a deposition held somewhere other than Federal Correctional Institution Tallahassee. On August 1, 2025, the day the Bureau of Prisons confirmed her transfer, the committee wrote to her that it was "unwilling to grant you congressional immunity pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 6005 at this time" and agreed to delay the deposition. Letters of Chairman James Comer to Ghislaine Maxwell, July 23 and Aug. 1, 2025. On February 9, 2026 Maxwell, appearing by video before the committee, invoked the Fifth Amendment and refused to answer the committee's questions. Her lawyer said she was "prepared to speak fully and honestly if granted clemency by President Trump." NPR, Feb. 10, 2026.

5.14. On information and belief, Maxwell is a witness, and a person likely to become a witness, in New Mexico's criminal investigation of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch and in any proceeding arising from it, and she holds information relating to the commission of felonies at the ranch. Her own indictment charged overt acts in New Mexico, trial testimony placed her at the ranch with a sixteen-year-old, and she "visited Zorro Ranch repeatedly in the years Epstein owned the property." New Mexico Complaint ¶ 21. When the transfer was made she was also under subpoena as a witness in a proceeding of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Paragraphs 5.1, 5.2 and 5.13. New Mexico's investigation was then stood down at the request of the United States Department of Justice, which had agreed to pass along what it learned of state crimes. Paragraph 5.3. The New Mexico Department of Justice remained an agency of government responsible for enforcing criminal laws, and only New Mexico can prosecute state crimes committed at the ranch. Section 30-24-3(A)(3) NMSA 1978 reaches a thing of value given with intent to keep a person from reporting to such an agency, whether or not an investigation is open, and since 1987 Section 30-24-3 has not required that a cause or proceeding be pending or about to be brought. Laws 1987, ch. 227, § 1.

5.15. On information and belief, the transfer was a thing of value given to Maxwell, by or at the direction of Blanche or with his approval, for the purpose of inducing her to abstain from testifying to facts, or to testify falsely, in official proceedings concerning Epstein's crimes, including the committee's and New Mexico's, and with intent to keep her from truthfully reporting to the New Mexico Department of Justice what she knows of felonies committed at Zorro Ranch. That belief rests on these facts. When the transfer was made she was under the committee's subpoena. The transfer followed the nine-hour interview by a week, and it moved her out of Federal Correctional Institution Tallahassee three days after her lawyer listed a deposition somewhere other than that prison among her conditions. It required a waiver that a retired Bureau official had never seen granted for a camp transfer. Blanche conducted the interview himself and has said that the Bureau's decisions land on his desk. Six months after the transfer Maxwell refused to answer the committee's questions, and her lawyer said she was prepared to speak if the President granted her clemency. The petition also sets out that Blanche told her he was not promising

anything and that her lawyer's letter of July 29, 2025 said she would invoke her privilege unless her conditions were met. Paragraphs 5.10 and 5.13. Neither answers the question. A thing of value can be given without a spoken promise, and a witness who has set conditions on whether she will testify can be given something to settle which way she goes. Whether the transfer was given for the purpose alleged, and by whom, is what this petition asks a grand jury of Santa Fe County to determine.

5.16. On information and belief, the records described in paragraphs 5.3 to 5.7 are physical evidence of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch, and withholding them from the New Mexico Department of Justice hid that evidence with intent to prevent the apprehension, prosecution or conviction of persons who committed or concealed those crimes. That belief rests on these facts. The first record New Mexico asked for alleges the burial of two victims near the ranch. Paragraph 5.5. The Department holds the records and has shown it can release them, by publishing about 3.5 million pages of them with redactions. New Mexico asked at least ten times over five months, by letter, by telephone, by formal request and by requests for meetings, New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 47-71; Associated Press, Aug. 5, 2026, and received only the thirty-one pages and the refusals described in paragraph 5.7. The Department's regulations allow its law enforcement agencies to disclose information to state law enforcement without any demand, 28 C.F.R. § 16.21(c), and provide that, where no listed bar applies, the Deputy or Associate Attorney General will authorize disclosure in response to a demand unless disclosure is unwarranted, 28 C.F.R. § 16.26(c). Blanche, who was Deputy Attorney General when New Mexico first asked, later told the Senate that the Department was "continuing to work with" New Mexico and would "help [NMDOJ] get the information it needs," and he has confirmed that the Department "is not proceeding with any Epstein-related prosecutions at this time." New Mexico Complaint ¶¶ 41, 77. New Mexico alleges that the Department adopted "an authoritative and categorical policy or practice" of refusal, and the State's chief prosecutor has called the refusal concealment. Whether the records were hidden with that intent, and by whom, is what this petition asks a grand jury of Santa Fe County to determine.

5.17. On information and belief, Blanche did not act alone. The transfer required action by officials of the Bureau of Prisons, and the withholding required decisions by the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Mexico, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department's leadership. Who combined with whom, and for what purpose, is a subject of the inquiry. Paragraph 3.9.

6. Jurisdiction and venue

6.1. New Mexico has territorial jurisdiction over a crime committed outside the state that has a detrimental effect within New Mexico. "[I]f a crime has a detrimental effect in a state, that state has territorial jurisdiction to prosecute the perpetrator notwithstanding that the acts were committed entirely within another state." *State v. Allen*, 2014-NMCA-111, ¶ 16, 336 P.3d 1007, citing *Strassheim v. Daily*, 221 U.S. 280, 285 (1911). No statute is required for New Mexico to exercise that jurisdiction. *Allen*, ¶ 18.

6.2. The conduct alleged in this petition has its detrimental effect in New Mexico: on the New Mexico Department of Justice's criminal investigation of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch, which that department conducts from its office at 408 Galisteo Street in Santa Fe; on that department's receipt of information about those crimes from a witness who holds it; and on the prosecution of those crimes, which lies in this court. Paragraphs 5.5 to 5.8 and 5.13 to 5.16.

6.3. Section 30-1-14 NMSA 1978 provides that "[a]ll trials of crime shall be had in the county in which they were committed," and that "[i]n the event elements of the crime were committed in different counties, the trial may be had in any county in which a material element of the crime was committed." A person may be charged in the place where the harm the statute is meant to prevent results. *State v. Lefthand*, 2015-NMCA-117. Most of the acts alleged took place outside New Mexico, and each was directed at this county. Under Count 1, the agency the witness was to be kept from reporting to is the New Mexico Department of Justice in Santa Fe, and the official cause or proceeding includes New Mexico's investigation of crimes committed at Zorro Ranch and any prosecution of them in this court, so the testimony and information a witness is induced to withhold are owed in this county. The evidence hidden

in Count 2 is evidence of crimes committed in Santa Fe County, sought by an agency in Santa Fe County for a prosecution in this court, and the prosecution the hiding was intended to prevent would be brought here. The harm each statute is meant to prevent therefore results in Santa Fe County, and for the same reason each offense is within New Mexico's territorial jurisdiction, as is a conspiracy formed elsewhere to commit a felony with that effect. Paragraph 6.1. A grand jury may not be convened "to investigate criminal conduct alleged to have occurred in another jurisdiction." *Cook v. Smith*, 1992-NMSC-041. The conduct alleged here is not of that kind. It is conduct aimed at a New Mexico investigation and a New Mexico prosecution, and the oath of a Santa Fe County grand jury covers "all public offenses against the people of this state, committed or triable within this county." Section 31-6-6(A)(1) NMSA 1978. Whether geographical jurisdiction exists is part of the court's determination on this petition. *Pino v. Rich*, 1994-NMSC-105.

6.4. The conduct is alleged as the personal acts of the official who performed or directed them. A federal officer charged under state law may claim immunity under the Supremacy Clause. *In re Neagle*, 135 U.S. 1 (1890). In the Tenth Circuit an officer is not immune unless, in performing an act he was authorized to do under federal law, he "had an objectively reasonable and well-founded basis to believe that his actions were necessary to fulfill his duties." *Wyoming v. Livingston*, 443 F.3d 1211 (10th Cir. 2006). Federal law does not authorize giving a congressional witness a thing of value to influence her testimony or keep her away. It makes that a crime. 18 U.S.C. § 201(b)(3). No federal law authorizes an officer to hide evidence of state crimes from a state prosecutor with intent to prevent their prosecution, and the Department's own regulations provide for disclosure to state law enforcement. 28 C.F.R. §§ 16.21(c), 16.26(c). Once immunity is raised, the State must offer evidence that raises a genuine factual issue, and the federal court resolves it on evidence. *Livingston*, 443 F.3d 1211; 28 U.S.C. § 1455(b)(5). Immunity is a defense to a prosecution, decided on the facts of the act charged. This petition asks for the inquiry that would find those facts.

7. Further inquiry

The grand jury may further inquire into other violations of New Mexico law, by these or other persons, that arise as part of the same investigation.

8. Request

The person filing this petition requests that the court verify that this petition bears the signatures of not less than the greater of two hundred registered voters or two percent of the registered voters of Santa Fe County, and that it identifies with reasonable specificity the alleged criminal conduct to be investigated, and, upon those determinations, order a grand jury convened in Santa Fe County, or submit these matters to a grand jury already convened in the county, and direct it to inquire into each violation of law described in this petition that the court determines is a proper subject of grand jury investigation, as provided by Article II, Section 14 of the Constitution of New Mexico and Rule 5-302.3 NMRA.

Signature of person filing: _____ Date: _____

The signature pages that follow are part of this petition. Print as many copies as needed.

PETITION TO CONVENE A GRAND JURY, SANTA FE COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

Article II, Section 14 of the Constitution of New Mexico

We, the undersigned registered voters of Santa Fe County, New Mexico, petition the First Judicial District Court to order a grand jury convened in Santa Fe County to inquire whether Todd Blanche, as Deputy Attorney General, Acting Attorney General and Attorney General of the United States, and any person acting with him, gave Ghislaine Maxwell, a witness under congressional subpoena and a likely witness in New Mexico's investigation of crimes at Zorro Ranch in Santa Fe County, a thing of value by her transfer to a minimum-security prison camp in the week after he questioned her, to keep her from testifying or from reporting those crimes to New Mexico, and hid evidence of those crimes by withholding the federal investigative records from that investigation, and whether that conduct was bribery of a witness under Section 30-24-3 NMSA 1978 or tampering with evidence under Section 30-22-5 NMSA 1978, or a conspiracy to commit either under Section 30-28-2 NMSA 1978, as set out in the petition to which this page is attached.

Signature page _____ of _____. Do not separate this page from the petition.

Person filing: Name _____

Notice to signers: This page is filed with the First Judicial District Court and becomes part of the court file, which the public can read unless the court orders it sealed. Sign only if you are a registered voter of Santa Fe County. Sign once. Print your name as it appears on your voter registration and write the residence address at which you are registered to vote, so the County Clerk can verify your registration.

No.	Printed name	Signature	Residence address as registered (street, city, ZIP)	Date
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				

Circulator statement: I witnessed each signature on this page.

Circulator name _____ Signature _____ Date _____