



One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

February 25, 2026

Mr. Shou Zi Chew
Chief Executive Officer
TikTok
5800 Bristol Parkway
Culver City, CA 90230

Dear Mr. Chew:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Tim Cook
Chief Executive Officer
Apple
One Apple Park Way
Cupertino, CA 95014

Dear Mr. Cook:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

February 25, 2026

Mr. Steve Huffman
Chief Executive Officer
Reddit
303 2nd St.
San Francisco, CA 94107

Dear Mr. Huffman:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Andy Jassy
President & Chief Executive Officer
Amazon
410 Terry Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98109

Dear Mr. Jassy:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Elon Musk
Executive Chairman and CTO
X, Inc.
865 FM 1209, Building 2
Bastrop, TX 78602

Dear Mr. Musk:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Satya Nadella
Chief Executive Officer
Microsoft
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052

Dear Mr. Nadella:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Sundar Pichai
Chief Executive Officer
Google
1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
Mountain View, CA 94043

Dear Mr. Pichai:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Humam Sakhnini
Chief Executive Officer
Discord
444 De Haro Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94107

Dear Mr. Sakhnini:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Evan Spiegel
Chief Executive Officer
Snap, Inc.
3000 31st Street
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Dear Mr. Spiegel:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability



**One Hundred Nineteenth Congress
Committee on Homeland Security
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515**

February 25, 2026

Mr. Mark Zuckerberg
Chief Executive Officer
Meta Platforms
1 Meta Way
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dear Mr. Zuckerberg:

We write to request information on your company's policies and activities related to administrative subpoenas and summonses issued by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In the past year, DHS has issued numerous administrative subpoenas or summonses to social media companies, seeking data about users who have criticized or monitored DHS's immigration enforcement activities.¹ These subpoenas and summonses have targeted individuals based on First Amendment protected activities. Considering the sensitive information social media companies maintain about their users, it is imperative that social media companies protect their users' privacy and free speech rights and do not share user information with DHS in the absence of compelling legal justification. As we conduct oversight of DHS's use of its existing administrative subpoena and summons authorities and consider potential statutory changes, we request that your company provide the Committee on Homeland Security with necessary information on DHS's requests to your company.

DHS has justified its expansive use of administrative subpoenas and summonses by citing its legal authorities to request documents and records in furtherance of certain immigration and customs investigations.² DHS's use of these authorities has gone far beyond their narrow purposes. While Federal law grants DHS the authority to issue administrative subpoenas to assist its enforcement

¹ Sheera Frankel & Mike Isaac, *Homeland Security Wants Social Media Sites to Expose Anti-ICE Accounts*, N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/13/technology/dhs-anti-ice-social-media.html>.

² See, e.g., *Doe v. DHS*, 3:25-mc-80286, ECF 1-3 (ND Cal. Sept. 18, 2025), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/71386144/1/3/j-doe-v-united-states-department-of-homeland-security/>.

of the Immigration and Nationality Act³ and to issue summonses as part of customs investigations,⁴ DHS's current use of these authorities appears to exceed congressional intent and threatens the First Amendment rights of U.S. citizens. DHS's frequent withdrawals of these requests once challenged in court demonstrate that even DHS recognizes the weak legal basis for their subpoenas and summonses.⁵ Unfortunately, DHS has a history of abusing these authorities, with the DHS Office of Inspector General finding in 2017 that U.S. Customs and Border Protection had engaged in inconsistent and improper use of its summons authority.⁶ Over the past year, DHS's inappropriate use of its administrative subpoena and summons authorities has become a serious threat to the First Amendment and privacy rights of Americans.

In order to assist our oversight of DHS's use of administrative subpoenas and summonses, please respond to the following inquiries by March 20, 2026:

1. How many administrative subpoenas or summonses has your company received from DHS since January 20, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by the statutory authority cited in the subpoena or summons and the type of information requested.
2. How many DHS administrative subpoenas or summonses did you respond to with the requested information? In how many cases did you decline to provide the requested information?
3. What is your policy regarding notifying users when DHS has issued a subpoena or summons for their data?
4. In how many cases did you notify the user of the administrative subpoena or summons?

Sincerely,



Bennie G. Thompson
Ranking Member
Committee on Homeland Security

³ 8 U.S.C. § 1225(d).

⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1509.

⁵ See Ashley Belanger, *DHS keeps trying and failing to unmask anonymous ICE critics online*, ARS TECHNICA (Jan. 23, 2026), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2026/01/instagram-ice-critic-wins-fight-to-stay-anonymous-as-dhs-backs-down/>.

⁶ DHS Office of Inspector General, *Management Alert - CBP's Use of Examination and Summons Authority Under 19 U.S.C. § 1509* (Nov. 16, 2017), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2017-11/OIG-18-18-Nov17.pdf>.



J. Luis Correa
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Border Security
and Enforcement



Shri Thanedar
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight,
Investigations, and Accountability

cc: The Honorable Andrew R. Garbarino, Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Michael Guest, Chairman
Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement

The Honorable Josh Brecheen, Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Accountability