



Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
1200 Seventeenth Street, NW | Washington, DC 20036 | tel 202.663.8000 | fax 202.663.8007

William M. Sullivan, Jr.
Tel: +1.202.663.8027
wsullivan@pillsburylaw.com

December 17, 2025

Tom Rust, Esq.
Chief Counsel and Staff Director
Committee on Ethics
1015 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
tom.rust@mail.house.gov

**Re: Referral Report in Review No. 25-5681 – Response on Behalf of
Rep. Nancy R. Mace**

Mr. Rust:

I write on behalf of the Honorable Nancy R. Mace (“Rep. Mace” or the “Congresswoman”) in response to the Office of Congressional Conduct’s (“OCC”) Referral Report in Review No. 25-5681 (the “Referral Report”). As explained below, the Referral Report is fundamentally flawed in several significant respects. The Referral Report’s narrative appears to incorporate unverified assertions and materials that may have originated from, or been influenced by, Rep. Mace’s former fiancé, Brendan Patrick Bryant. The OCC was informed of Bryant’s relationship with the Congresswoman and his documented history of abusive and retaliatory conduct toward her. Counsel repeatedly raised these credibility concerns and requested transparency regarding the sources of information the OCC relied upon and which the OCC never provided. This lack of lucidity deprived the Congresswoman of any meaningful opportunity to assess or respond to the information underlying those assertions. Accordingly, we submit the following information to aid the Committee’s assessment of the Referral Report’s accuracy and foundation.

Based on the information reflected in the Referral Report, many of the claims concerning Rep. Mace’s lodging expenses and reimbursement practices appear to derive—directly or indirectly—from records or narratives connected to her former fiancé, Patrick Bryant. Rep. Mace’s engagement to Bryant ended in late 2023 after his conduct toward her escalated to a level that made termination of the relationship necessary for her safety and wellbeing. The dissolution of that relationship resulted in

significant personal and legal conflict and created circumstances in which Bryant had both motive and opportunity to disseminate misleading and materially false information concerning the Congresswoman. That motive is further underscored by the fact that Rep. Mace previously reported Bryant's conduct to law enforcement, and it is her understanding that he is currently under investigation in connection with that referral, providing an additional incentive for him to advance retaliatory and misleading narratives.

The period following the end of the engagement was marked by a substantial escalation in retaliatory conduct by Bryant. In early 2025, attorneys acting on Bryant's behalf intentionally initiated a contrived pre-litigation proceeding in South Carolina—*GLT2, LLC v. Jane Doe*—structured to obtain discovery concerning the Congresswoman while deliberately concealing her identity from the court. In that matter, Bryant's counsel issued illegitimate subpoenas and conducted an unauthorized deposition, the transcript of which was subsequently leaked to the media in a manner evidently intended to inflict reputational harm upon the Congresswoman. After Rep. Mace intervened through counsel and opposed these actions, the court promptly sanctioned Bryant for abusing the judicial process. The willingness to employ such improper legal mechanisms and to improperly manipulate civil litigation procedure underscores the extent to which Bryant has sought to advance adverse, false, and harmful accounts concerning the Congresswoman.

In light of this pattern of conduct, counsel informed OCC staff that Patrick Bryant was engaged in an ongoing campaign to discredit and injure the Congresswoman through false narratives and misuse of legal process, and that any information originating from them would raise serious credibility concerns. Counsel emphasized that the involvement of either individual in the referral process would be directly relevant to assessing the reliability of the allegations in addition to being potentially exculpatory. Accordingly, counsel formally requested that the OCC disclose whether Bryant or his known associates had provided documents, testimony, or other information in connection with the inquiry, and requested the production of any such materials. Despite that request, the OCC declined to provide counsel with any information related to his involvement in the investigation. The absence of candor and clarity on this point, particularly where the individuals in question have a documented history of willful misconduct toward the Congresswoman, is itself troubling and further undermines confidence in the Referral Report's foundation.

Several indicators within the Referral Report suggest that Bryant's false narratives and spurious characterizations influenced the OCC's analysis. Certain expense figures, payment descriptions, and alleged discrepancies closely mirror claims Bryant began advancing after the end of the relationship and are inconsistent with the Congresswoman's fundamental understanding of her obligations during the period at issue. These patterns cannot be reconciled with the broader financial realities of the arrangement between the parties and therefore raise significant concerns about the provenance of the information the OCC relied upon.

Those concerns are heightened by Bryant's role during the period covered by the OCC's investigation. During that time, Bryant exercised exclusive control over the couple's shared financial arrangements, including the District of Columbia residence at the center of the referral. He maintained the financial accounts, controlled the flow of funds, and generated and retained the documentation relating to the property's operating expenses. Staff preparing the Congresswoman's reimbursement submissions relied entirely on cost information supplied by Bryant and his accountant. As a result, Bryant maintained primary responsibility for the financial information on which the reimbursement submissions were based. Because Rep. Mace did not have access to these records, and because the financial arrangement placed Bryant in the position of sole custodian of the underlying data, he is now uniquely able to manipulate or mischaracterize that information in ways the Congresswoman cannot readily refute. In view of Bryant's documented pattern of retaliatory conduct, assertions or records originating from him are inherently suspect. This concern is underscored by the nature of the documents specifically cited in the referral, including those identified in footnote 19 of the Referral Report. The mortgage statements, bank account records, and spreadsheets referenced by the OCC in footnote 19 were maintained exclusively by Bryant or individuals working under his direction and were not accessible to the Congresswoman following the dissolution of the relationship. Any reliance on documents originating from Bryant or those aligned with him raises significant bias and credibility concerns derived from his documented history of retaliation, abuse of legal process, and willful dissemination of misleading information.

The Referral Report's reliance on material and information originating from Patrick Bryant is therefore deeply problematic. Bryant's personal motives, documented misuse of legal process, and demonstrated willingness to advance distorted or incomplete narratives about the Congresswoman raise substantial concerns about the accuracy and fairness of any claims premised upon or aligned with his accounts. Assertions in the referral that mirror Bryant's characterizations, particularly where they cannot be independently verified or diverge from the Congresswoman's own recollections and records, rest on a foundation too compromised to warrant confidence.

These concerns are further informed by the limited reflection in the referral of the context and information the Congresswoman provided during the inquiry. Rep. Mace undertook a good-faith effort to cooperate with the OCC, including conducting a thorough document search and offering detailed explanations regarding her reimbursement practices. Despite these efforts, the referral appears to rely heavily on unverified materials originating from individuals with personal or adversarial motives, while leaving unanswered whether those individuals contributed to the information underlying the OCC's analysis. The reliance on materials not subject to independent corroboration or critical review, together with the absence of clarity regarding their provenance, raises additional questions about the completeness and legitimacy of the factual record supporting the referral.

December 17, 2025

Page 4

For these reasons, we respectfully submit that the Referral Report's reliance on materials or narratives originating from Bryant—particularly in the absence of clarity from the OCC regarding his or his associates' involvement—raises substantial concerns about the reliability and weight of several of its conclusions. Rep. Mace is confident that the Committee will carefully evaluate the origins and credibility of the information at issue and will recognize the significant deficiencies that undermine the Referral Report's persuasive value. The Congresswoman appreciates the Committee's attention to these matters and remains available to provide any additional information that may assist in its review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "William M. Sullivan, Jr." The signature is written in a cursive style.

William Sullivan, Jr.

Partner

cc.

The Hon. Nancy R. Mace
Brian E. Finch, Esq.
Johnna Purcell, Esq.