



DIANA DIZOGLIO
AUDITOR

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

AUDITOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH

ONE ASHBURTON PLACE, ROOM 1819
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

TEL (617) 727-6200
FAX (617) 727-5891

October 15, 2025

VIA E-MAIL

The Honorable Andrea Joy Campbell
Office of Attorney General Andrea Joy Campbell
One Ashburton Place, 20th Floor
Boston, MA 02108

Dear Attorney General Campbell:

I write regarding my office's engagement with the Office of the Attorney General in connection with our current performance audit of the Massachusetts General Court.

As previously disclosed to the Office of Attorney General, the scope of our audit is state contracting and procurement procedures, the use of taxpayer-funded nondisclosure agreements, and a review of the balance forward line item - including a review of all relevant financial receipts and information during fiscal years 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 (July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2024). Although this has been the scope of our audit since my office engaged the General Court on January 3, 2025, my office most recently re-articulated the scope of our audit in a September 24, 2025 letter to the General Court to clarify any supposed uncertainty on the part of the General Court regarding our audit's scope. In connection with the afore-mentioned scope of our audit, my office requested the following records from the General Court:

1. The official budgets for the House and Senate for Fiscal Years 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024.
2. Copies of official audits of the House and Senate for Fiscal Years 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024.
3. A listing of all transactions related to the House's and Senate's balance forward line item for Fiscal Years 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024.
4. A listing of all monetary settlement agreements entered into by the House and Senate with any current or former employees or members of the House and Senate during Fiscal Years 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024.

To date, my office's request for the above-referenced records remains outstanding and unfulfilled.

Since January 9, 2025, my office has been engaged with your office to enforce our statutory authority to audit the General Court under G.L. c. 11 § 12. We have presented your office with a legal issue that is not only ripe for litigation, but for which litigation is the only means of resolution given the General Court's refusal to comply with our audit. The legal issue is the General Court's refusal to comply with our request for records that are related to the scope of our audit. We are seeking to litigate this discrete issue, not any hypothetical questions that may or may not present themselves in the future.

The scope of our audit and the related records request do not conflict with any constitutional principles of our Commonwealth. Neither violates or otherwise endangers the General Court's freedoms under Mass. Const. Pt. I art. 21 or the separation of powers doctrine under Mass. Const. Pt. I art. 30. We are auditing the General Court's administrative functions, not its legislative functions. Our review of budgetary, financial, and contractual records does not constitute an exercise of the General Court's legislative powers by my office in violation of Mass. Const. Pt. I art. 30. Moreover, the relief that my office is seeking is for a court to order the General Court to take an administrative action – producing the requested budgetary, financial, and contractual records – not a legislative action. Accordingly, any concerns with respect to Mass. Const. Pt. I arts. 21 and 30 are moot.

My office has communicated the above to your office repeatedly over the past nine months. Yet, you maintain that you are unable to take any action because we have allegedly not answered your questions regarding the scope of our audit, our proposed legal claim against the General Court, the relief we are seeking in court, and constitutional concerns. This is clearly inaccurate and I disagree. However, if you genuinely believe that I or my office are somehow preventing or obstructing you from carrying out your statutory duty to enforce the law, I call on you to sue me and/or my office. Sue me to have a court resolve these matters if you really require additional answers – other than the answers already provided to you by my office – that you allegedly need to enforce the law.

Your office's recent September 18, 2025 correspondence stated, "It is plain that the OSA has a political dispute with the Legislature." I disagree. My office has a legal dispute with the General Court that requires adjudication in court. Conversely, you have abdicated your responsibility as our Attorney General to enforce the law due to your political allegiances to Beacon Hill, against the people of this Commonwealth.

However, because it is apparent to me that you believe there is a political dispute between our respective offices, it is incumbent upon you to allow us to hire our own attorneys to pursue litigation immediately. We have a clear, legitimate legal dispute for which adjudication in court is appropriate. So, sue me, sue the General Court, or immediately authorize our office to move forward with litigation without you. To do anything less is obstruction of justice on the part of the Attorney General's Office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Diana DiZoglio". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Diana DiZoglio
Auditor of the Commonwealth