AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

House Calendar No. __

119TH CONGRESS
2d Session
} HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES {
REPORT
119–__

IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO REPRESENTATIVE JIMMY GOMEZ

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS



November 23, 2026.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
XX–XXX
WASHINGTON : 2026

ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS ON NOVEMBER 19, 2026

119TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO REPRESENTATIVE JIMMY GOMEZ

November 23, 2026

Mr. GUEST from the Committee on Ethics, submitted the following

REPORT

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

MICHAEL GUEST, Mississippi
Chairman
ANDREW R. GARBARINO, New York
ASHLEY HINSON, Iowa
NATHANIEL MORAN, Texas
BRAD KNOTT, North Carolina

MARK DESAULNIER, California
Ranking Member
DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina
GLENN F. IVEY, Maryland
SYLVIA R. GARCIA, Texas
SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia

REPORT STAFF

THOMAS A. RUST, *Chief Counsel / Staff Director*
BRITTNEY PESCATORE, *Director of Investigations*
JORDAN DOWNS, *Chief of Staff to the Chairman*
DAVID ARROJO, *Counsel to the Ranking Member*

RAY RHATICAN, *Counsel*
PEYTON WILMER, *Senior Investigative Clerk*

Michael Guest, Mississippi
Chairman
Mark DeSaulnier, California
Ranking Member

Andrew R. Garbarino, New York
Ashley Hinson, Iowa
Nathaniel Moran, Texas
Brad Knott, North Carolina

Deborah K. Ross, North Carolina
Glenn F. Ivey, Maryland
Sylvia R. Garcia, Texas
Suhas Subramanyam, Virginia

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

U.S. House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Thomas A. Rust
Staff Director and Chief Counsel

Jordan Downs
Chief of Staff to the Chairman

David Arrojo
Counsel to the Ranking Member

1015 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515–6328
Telephone: (202) 225–7103
https://Ethics.House.gov

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

November 23, 2026

The Honorable Kevin F. McCumber
Clerk, House of Representatives
H-154, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. McCumber:

Pursuant to clauses 3(a)(2) and 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, we herewith transmit the attached report, "In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Jimmy Gomez."

Sincerely,

Michael Guest
Chairman

Mark DeSaulnier
Ranking Member

C O N T E N T S

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY 2

III. RELEVANT LAWS, RULES, AND OTHER APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF CONDUCT 3

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND 4

V. FINDINGS 14

VI. CONCLUSION 18

VII. STATEMENT UNDER HOUSE RULE XIII CLAUSE 3(C) 19

APPENDIX A: EXHIBITS TO THE COMMITTEE REPORT

119TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO REPRESENTATIVE JIMMY GOMEZ

NOVEMBER 23, 2026

Mr. GUEST, from the Committee on Ethics, submitted the following

R E P O R T

In accordance with House Rule XI, clauses 3(a)(2) and 3(b), the Committee on Ethics (Committee) hereby submits the following Report to the House of Representatives:

I. INTRODUCTION

The Committee reviewed allegations that Representative Jimmy Gomez engaged in sexual misconduct in violation of the Code of Official Conduct (the Code) or any other applicable standard of conduct, including engaging in inappropriate sexual contact with a House staffer in violation of clause 18(b) of the Code. As discussed further below, the Committee found that there is substantial evidence that Representative Gomez engaged in sexual misconduct in violation of the Code of Official Conduct, including making unwelcome sexual advances and sexual contact toward a House staffer.

In April 2026, the Committee learned of public reporting that Representative Gomez was seen "making out" in public with a House staffer at a party attended by other Members of Congress and House staff. As part of its commitment to preserving the integrity of the House and protecting the safety of House employees, the Committee formally requested that Representative Gomez disclose whether he "ever engaged in a romantic or sexual relationship or made sexual contact with a congressional staffer." Representative Gomez disclosed interactions with two women. With one of them, he described "one sole occasion" of "consensual kissing."

The Committee contacted this woman, whose recollection differed sharply from that of Representative Gomez. She informed the Committee that while she was a House staffer, Representative Gomez made unwanted sexual advances toward her on two occasions, including an incident in which he made sexual contact with her, as defined by the District of Columbia Code,[1] in public without her consent and another in which he was "forceful" with her in his congressional office. Representative Gomez later admitted to making "sexual contact" with her but insisted this encounter was consensual.

[1] D.C. Code § 22-3001(9).

As set forth below, the Committee found the former House staffer to be credible and determined that Representative Gomez violated House Rules by making an unwelcome sexual advance toward a House staffer. Representative Gomez failed in his obligation to behave in a manner that reflects creditably on the House, and his conduct was exacerbated by his failure to appreciate the inherent power imbalance between House Members and House staff.

Representative Gomez's conduct caused this House staffer significant and ongoing distress and contributed to her decision to leave House employment altogether. Representative Gomez's conduct also reflects a broader environment of sexual misconduct and toxic working conditions in some Capitol Hill offices which the Committee is determined to address. The Committee expresses its gratitude to each of the several witnesses in this matter who spoke with the Committee formally and informally and assisted the Committee in its mission to make House employment a place of dignity and respect for all House staff. The Committee encourages anyone with information related to sexual misconduct to speak with the Committee and its staff confidentially and reiterates its commitment to treating all allegations seriously.

The Committee has determined to publish this Report as part of its ongoing efforts to thoroughly investigate allegations of unwanted sexual advances and to make public its findings of credible misconduct, as it has found with respect to Representative Gomez.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 20, 2026, the Committee released a public statement emphasizing that the Committee is dedicated to maintaining a congressional workplace free from sexual misconduct and ensuring that any individuals responsible for misconduct are held responsible for their behavior, and that "[t]here should be zero tolerance for sexual misconduct, harassment, or discrimination in the halls of Congress, or in any employment setting."[2] On April 23, 2026, following public reporting that Representative Gomez was seen publicly kissing a congressional staffer in 2023,[3] the Committee informed Representative Gomez that it had opened this investigation under Committee Rule 18(a), and requested narrative responses to questions inquiring into any instances of romantic or sexual relationships with congressional staff and any instances of Representative Gomez being accused of making unwanted sexual advances toward a congressional staffer.[4]

On May 6, 2026, Representative Gomez disclosed, through counsel, "a past consensual, sexual relationship with a senior employee in the personal office of a more senior Member of Congress," in addition to "one sole occasion" of "consensual kissing with a senior employee of

[2] *See* Comm. on Ethics, Statement of the Committee on Ethics Regarding Sexual Misconduct and Workplace Rights (Apr. 20, 2026) (hereinafter April 20, 2026 Committee Statement), https://ethics.house.gov/press-releases/statement-of-the-committee-on-ethics-regarding-sexual-misconduct-and-workplace-rights/.
[3] Steven Nelson, *Rep. Jimmy Gomez–member of Eric Swalwell's 'Cool Kids Clique–accused of kissing much younger staffer*, NEW YORK POST (Apr. 18, 2026) (hereinafter April 18, 2026 New York Post Article), https://nypost.com/2026/04/18/us-news/rep-jimmy-gomez-friend-of-of-eric-swalwell-accused-of-kissing-staffer/.
[4] Letter from Committee on Ethics Chairman Michael Guest and Ranking Member Mark DeSaulnier to Representative Jimmy Gomez (Apr. 23, 2026) (hereinafter April 23 Committee Letter).

another, more senior Member's office."[5] Committee staff requested, and received, the identities of these two women through counsel. Counsel requested strict confidentiality for the contents of Representative Gomez's disclosures. Committee staff agreed to treat this information confidentially but noted that staff could not guarantee confidentiality should the witnesses indicate sexual misconduct took place.

At the direction of the Chairman and the Ranking Member, Committee staff (who are trained in trauma-informed interviewing) reached out to relevant witnesses to determine whether Representative Gomez violated federal law, House rules, or other applicable laws or standards of conduct. As explained in the Committee's April 20th statement, the Committee prioritizes witness confidentiality and safety, and thus "the Committee's practice has been to release only the information that is necessary to hold Members accountable for misconduct and address public reporting that impacts the integrity of the House."[6] The Committee reviewed relevant documents and spoke to 10 witnesses, including Representative Gomez. On November 19, 2026, the Committee voted to adopt this Report with respect to Representative Gomez.

III. RELEVANT LAWS, RULES, AND OTHER APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

A. House Rules and Additional Standards of Conduct

House Rule XXIII (the Code of Official Conduct), clause 18(a) prohibits Members from "engag[ing] in a sexual relationship with any employee of the House who works under the supervision of the Member" and clause 18(b) prohibits a Member from "engag[ing] in unwelcome sexual advances or conduct towards . . . [an] employee of the House."

House Rule XXIII, clause 1 states, "[a] Member . . . of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House." House Rule XXIII, clause 2 states that Members "shall adhere to the spirit and the letter of the Rules of the House." The Committee has noted that "[c]lause 1 is a purposely subjective standard designed to 'have a deterrent effect against improper conduct,' and provide 'the ability to deal with any given act or accumulation of acts which, in the judgment of the [C]ommittee, are severe enough to reflect discredit on the Congress.'"[7] The provision serves "as a safeguard for the House as a whole."[8]

The Code of Ethics for Government Service sets forth standards of conduct for all government employees. Paragraph 2 of that Code provides that those in government service should "[u]phold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion."

---

[5] April 23 Committee Letter.
[6] April 20, 2026 Committee Statement.
[7] Comm. on Ethics, *In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Matt Gaetz*, H. Rept. 116-479, 116th Cong. 2d Sess. 9 (2020).
[8] Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, *Inquiry Into the Operation of the Bank of the Sergeant-At-Arms of the House of Representatives*, H. Rept. 102-452, 102nd Cong. 2d Sess. 22 (1992).

B. District of Columbia Law

The District of Columbia's Anti-Sexual Abuse Act of 1994 (ASAA) groups sex offenses into four categories.[9] The first category of these offenses includes misdemeanor sexual abuse, in addition to four degrees of felony sexual abuse.[10] The distinguishing characteristic of these offenses, which are referred to more commonly as sexual assaults, is the commission of a sexual act or contact against a person's will or without their consent.[11]

Felony sexual abuse, in varying degrees, requires an element of force or impairment.[12] Misdemeanor sexual abuse, under D.C. Code § 22-3006, occurs where a defendant "engages in a sexual act or sexual contact with another person and who should have knowledge or reason to know that the act was committed without that other person's permission." To prove misdemeanor sexual abuse, "the government need only establish that the defendant knew or should have known that the complainant did not give 'permission' to the sexual act or contact at issue."[13]

A sexual act includes "penetration, however slight, of the anus or vulva by a hand or finger," with an intent to "arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person."[14] Sexual contact includes touching, "either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person," with an intent to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person.[15]

District of Columbia courts construe "permission" in this context to be synonymous with "consent."[16] "Consent" is defined to mean "words or overt actions indicating a freely given agreement to the sexual act or contact in question," with the caveat that "[l]ack of verbal or physical resistance or submission by the victim, resulting from the use of force, threats, or coercion by the defendant shall not constitute consent."[17]

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Representative Gomez has represented the 34th District of California since 2017. On April 18, 2026, following the resignation of former Representative Eric Swalwell, public reporting alleged that Representative Gomez "was spotted surreptitiously kissing a much younger

[9] *Davis v. U.S.*, 873 A.2d 1101, 1103 (D.C. 2005) (citing D.C. Code §§ 22–3001 *et seq*.).
[10] *Davis*, 873 A.2d at 1103-04 (citing D.C. Code §§ 22–3002 to 22–3006 and explaining that the remaining categories address "particular situations and relationships" affecting the victim's ability to give consent, such as sexual interactions with children or medical patients); *see also Augustin v. United States*, 240 A.3d 816, 820 (D.C. 2020).
[11] *Davis*, 873 A.2d at 1104.
[12] *See* D.C. Code §§ 22-3006-08.
[13] *Davis*, 873 A.2d at 1104 (citing D.C. Code § 22–3006); *see also Mungo v. U.S.*, 772 A.2d 240, 244-45 (D.C. 2001).
[14] D.C. Code § 22-3001(8).
[15] D.C. Code § 22-3001(9).
[16] *Davis*, 873 A.2d at 1104, n3 (citing Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged 1683 (1993) and the Council of the District of Columbia, Report of the Committee on the Judiciary, Bill 10–87, the 'Anti–Sexual Abuse Act of 1994,' at 4 (noting the ASAA "was not intended to criminalize consensual sexual activity between adults.")).
[17] *Davis*, 873 A.2d at 1104 (citing D.C. Code § 22–3001(4)).

congressional aide in the summer of 2023."[18] The reporting alleged that Representative Gomez was seen kissing a staffer employed in another congressional office at a party hosted by then-Representative Eric Swalwell," and that this staffer was "two decades younger than Gomez." The article cited a witness who stated "[t]hey were down the street a little bit. But it wasn't that discreet." The article cited a second source, who "recalled that 'someone pointed it out and it took me a second to recognize who it was.'" The article stated that a spokesperson said the accounts were "not true" and this encounter "didn't happen." The publication noted the interaction appeared to be consensual.[19]

On April 23, 2026, the Committee informed Representative Gomez that it was aware of allegations that he "may have engaged in an inappropriate relationship with a congressional staffer, in violation of House Rules, laws, or other standards of conduct," and informed him that the Committee had opened an investigation into these allegations under Committee Rule 18(a). The Committee requested that Representative Gomez inform the Committee whether, beginning in 2018: he ever engaged in a romantic or sexual relationship or made sexual contact with a congressional staffer; whether any such staffer was employed by his congressional office or by a committee on which he has served; and whether he has ever been accused, formally or informally, of making unwanted sexual advances toward a congressional staffer. The Committee requested a response in writing, under oath or affirmation.[20]

On May 6, 2026, Representative Gomez responded, through counsel, in a certified statement to the Committee, that he "has had no romantic or sexual relationship and has made no sexual contact with anyone employed by his Congressional office or any committee on which he has served."[21] Representative Gomez's response added that the Congressman "knows of no instance in which he has been accused, formally or informally, of making unwanted advances." Representative Gomez disclosed "a past consensual, sexual relationship with a senior employee in the personal office of a more senior Member of Congress," and, in addition, "on one sole occasion, the Congressman engaged in consensual kissing with a senior employee of another, more senior Member's office." The letter stated, "[t]hese associations occurred over two years ago and were consensual, reciprocal, and involved no unwanted advances."[22]

Counsel to Representative Gomez later communicated the identities of the two women to Committee staff. The Committee contacted both women. Both spoke to the Committee informally and declined to voluntarily sit for a transcribed interview.

[18] April 18, 2026 New York Post Article.
[19] June 3, 2026 New York Post Article (also stating that Representative Gomez was a client of this woman's political startup; Federal Election Commission records reflect payments from Representative Gomez's campaign to the startup beginning July 2025, two years after the alleged public encounter.).
[20] April 23 Committee Letter.
[21] Letter from Representative Jimmy Gomez to Committee on Ethics Chairman Michael Guest and Ranking Member Mark DeSaulnier (May 7, 2026) (hereinafter Representative Gomez Response Letter).
[22] Representative Gomez Response Letter.

Witness 2, the woman with whom Representative Gomez disclosed "a past consensual, sexual relationship with a senior employee in the personal office of a more senior Member of Congress," denied to the Committee that she had ever had a nonconsensual sexual encounter with Representative Gomez. Representative Gomez informed the Committee that his sexual relationship with Witness 2 ended in July 2022,[23] and he denied that he kissed Witness 2, or any person, at the party described in the *New York Post*'s reporting, although he stated that he and Witness 2 were both in attendance.[24]

Witness 1, the woman with whom Representative Gomez disclosed "one sole occasion" of "consensual kissing," informed the Committee that she had more than one physical encounter with Representative Gomez and she did not consider them consensual. The Committee issued a subpoena for her testimony.[25]

Witness 1 worked in the House for several years, before departing in 2025. She never worked directly for Representative Gomez or for any committee on which he served. At all times relevant herein, except where otherwise stated, she was in her mid-twenties and worked for a House leadership office. Witness 1 stated that there was "a huge Member services component" to her work, and explained that in that office, "your constituents are the Members of Congress. And so we are very Member-facing, which meant that we served in the best interest of the Members of Congress[.]"[26] Witness 1 testified that she first met Representative Gomez in the fall of 2018, while she was employed in the personal office of a Member of Congress, but at that time they interacted very little.[27]

1. February 2024 Birthday Party

Witness 1 testified that her first meaningful interaction with Representative Gomez was on February 29, 2024, during a birthday party held by another Member of Congress at a bar near Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. At the time, the Member for whom the party was held was dating Witness 3. Witness 1 and Witness 3 were acquaintances. All four of these individuals informed the Committee that Representative Gomez and Witness 1 spent a good portion of the night seeking to "chaperone" or to keep an eye on the other Member and Witness 3, as they had just begun dating and it was not something they had sought to publicly disclose.[28] Witness 1 and Representative Gomez testified that this was their first time speaking with each other.[29]

---

[23] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[24] *Id*.
[25] The Committee did not lightly reach the determination to issue a testimonial subpoena to a potential victim of sexual assault. Committee staff engaged in extensive discussion with counsel to Witness 1, and based on those conversations, determined not only that Witness 1's testimony was critical to the Committee's obligations to the House, but also that issuing the subpoena to Witness 1 would not cause unreasonable hardship to her.
[26] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[27] *Id*.
[28] *Id*.; 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez; 18(a) Interview of Member 1; 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[29] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1; 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.

Witness 1 testified that she and Representative Gomez joined the new couple on a pair of couches outside the bar,[30] and that she observed that Witness 3 was becoming intoxicated.[31] Witness 1 stated that as it was getting later in the evening and the visible affection between the other Member and Witness 3 was growing, she suggested "[w]e either go home, or we go somewhere else," with fewer Members of Congress and staff around.[32] Around that time, she and Representative Gomez exchanged phone numbers.[33] The Committee reviewed contemporaneous text messages between Witness 1 and Representative Gomez showing that Witness 1 texted her name to Representative Gomez around 11:00 p.m. that evening as a way to share her number, to which Representative Gomez immediately replied, "What should we do with them," and "Let's help them keep it on the DL," in reference to the other Member and Witness 3.[34] About half an hour later, while talking with another man during the birthday party who she testified was hitting on her, Witness 1 texted Representative Gomez, "Save me."[35] Four minutes later, Representative Gomez responded, "Just saw this let's go."[36]

The four of them – Witness 1, Witness 3, Representative Gomez, and the other Member – decided to go to a different location. Representative Gomez was the designated driver and drove the group to Rocket Bar in Chinatown.[37] Representative Gomez recalled driving the group to another bar, although he believed the bar was in Dupont Circle.[38] He stated that he "wasn't really drinking because I was driving,"[39] and that Witness 1 did not seem intoxicated.[40]

Witness 1 testified that she "had a lot to drink," and Representative Gomez told her "something along the lines, like, 'I've noticed you for years'; [] 'It's hard to miss you'; [] 'I've seen you walk around the halls[.]'"[41] She testified that she responded, "'[w]hen will it stop becoming about my looks and about my work and, like, who I am as a person,' something like that. And he said, 'Well, usually when a woman turns 40 is when they get respect.'"[42]

Representative Gomez testified that, at the bar, he and Witness 1 were together, separate from the other Member and Witness 3.[43] He testified that Witness 1 made a reference to women who "liked to be tossed around," in response to which he asked Witness 1, "do you like to be tossed around? And I can't remember what happened next, but we were flirting."[44] He stated that

[30] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[31] *Id*.
[32] *Id*.
[33] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1; 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[34] Exhibit 1.
[35] *Id*.
[36] *Id*.
[37] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1; 18(a) Interview of Member 1; 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[38] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[39] *Id*.
[40] *Id*.
[41] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[42] *Id*.
[43] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[44] *Id*.

he and Witness 1 were "kind of leaning in on each other, touching a little bit," but did not kiss inside the bar.[45]

Witness 3 and the other Member both recalled that Representative Gomez and Witness 1 spent time together at the bar, away from the rest of the group.[46] The other Member stated that Witness 1 and Representative Gomez were talking, but he "wasn't really paying attention to them."[47] Witness 3 specifically recalled that Representative Gomez and Witness 1 sat together further down the bar from her and the other Member.[48] Witness 3 stated that her view of Witness 1 was blocked by Representative Gomez, but "I knew he was talking to her."[49] She stated that they were "very, very close," and she assumed they were kissing.[50]

Witness 1 testified that she and Representative Gomez sat on barstools facing each other, and Representative Gomez "sort of like starts to caress my legs. . . . And so he started to touch my legs, and, at some point, he put his hand down my skirt and then put his fingers inside of me."[51]

Witness 1 described this incident as "nonconsensual whatsoever. It was not -- I don't think that there was even any conversation leading up to that."[52] She testified that she was not sure how long this lasted, but remembered "feeling very uncomfortable and, like, just mortified that that had just happened. And I didn't know what to do." She stated that she "probably flinched," and although she probably did not remove his hand herself, she "was shocked by it."[53] She testified that "the way I reacted initially was just to turn and to, like, make sure like no one had seen that," and she believed that she saw a member of Representative Gomez's congressional staff looking at them.[54] Witness 1 stated that "I don't know why that was my instinct," to look around to make sure nobody had seen, but that "what I remember doing is just being in total shock and, like I said, I kind of just was really embarrassed by it. I didn't know how to react."[55] Witness 1 testified that "pretty immediately after, like, right away probably, I ran to the bathroom. And I, like, started to cry."[56]

At 11:56 p.m., Representative Gomez texted Witness 1 that a member of his staff was there, and she responded, "Well, at least you're not hiding anything."[57] Witness 1 testified that this exchange occurred while she was in the bathroom and indicated that she believes she was referring

---

[45] *Id*.
[46] 18(a) Interview of Member 1; 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[47] 18(a) Interview of Member 1.
[48] 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[49] *Id*.
[50] *Id*.
[51] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1; Witness 1 clarified that Representative Gomez put his hand "under the skirt and the tights and under my underwear." *Id*.
[52] *Id.*
[53] *Id*.
[54] *Id*.
[55] *Id*.
[56] *Id*.
[57] Exhibit 2.

to the other Member and Witness 3,[58] and that she "probably just wanted to play off what had just happened," and return to discussing the new couple.[59] Representative Gomez responded, "Not yet." Witness 1 testified, "I think that once he sent that, I like just wanted to, like, leave immediately."[60] Witness 1 testified that after receiving Representative Gomez's message that he was "not yet" hiding anything, she grabbed her purse and went outside to the street, and that she was not "feeling well."[61]

Representative Gomez also testified that he saw his staffer while inside the bar; according to his version of events, he was the one who went to the restroom then, which he said he did "to see if it was [his staffer], because it was in the distance."[62] He stated that he came back from the bathroom and told Witness 1, "hey, I can't be in here with you because I think my staffer saw," so Witness 1 agreed to go outside with him.[63] Outside, he stated that he recalled discussing "how long it was taking [Witness 3] and [the other Member] to do anything."[64]

Witness 1 stated that she went outside, followed by the rest of the group, and she "was just kind of, like, wandering in front of Rocket Bar."[65] Witness 1 testified that Representative Gomez then pushed her against a wall and kissed her, and "at that point, I kissed him back because I just wanted to go home and I just, like, wanted it to end."[66] She explained that she "felt that he was coming on pretty strong to me. And so I think that I just, like, wanted it to just end and just give him what he wanted, and then – so that we can go home."[67]

Representative Gomez, who originally disclosed only "consensual kissing" with Witness 1, recalled in his testimony that he made sexual contact with her, but only once they were outside the bar. Representative Gomez stated that, "I can't remember how we started making out, but we started making out in the cutout of a storefront."[68] He testified "it was getting -- how do you say it? -- hot, I guess. And I did have sexual contact" with Witness 1:[69]

> She -- as we were making out, I had my hand on her stomach, and I put my hand down the top of her skirt. I asked before. I said, yes? And she said yes. And then as we were making out, stimulated her

[58] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[59] *Id*.
[60] *Id*.
[61] *Id*.
[62] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez; Committee staff contacted this staffer, who denied seeing Representative Gomez and Witness 1 at the bar. Consistent with this, Representative Gomez testified that he asked this staffer whether she had seen him at Rocket Bar, and the staffer told him no. *Id.*
[63] *Id*.
[64] *Id*.
[65] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[66] *Id*.
[67] *Id*.
[68] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[69] *Id*.

> for I can't remember how long, did not penetrate her, and she did not say no, she did not push me away.[70]

Representative Gomez added, "I can't remember exactly what I said."[71] He could not recall or estimate how long this interaction lasted.[72] He stated that Witness 1 "was touching me as we were making out, but not in my private [area],"[73] and she gave no indication that she was uncomfortable with this interaction.[74] He stated that he was not concerned that others would see him because it was dark.[75]

Then, he stated that "she gave me her number or we exchanged numbers, and I can't remember at what point that occurred."[76] Witness 1 testified that, at some point in the evening, Representative Gomez "switched to Signal messages, and I don't remember anything that we texted about. He had put it on to, like, 5-second disappearing messages."[77] Witness 1 produced a screenshot indicating that Representative Gomez set messages to quickly disappear, but she did not remember what they discussed.[78]

Witness 3 recalled leaving the bar to go outside, stating, "we were just hanging out in front for a little bit."[79] Outside, she stated "[Witness 1] was smoking, Jimmy was laughing and just talking to us," and eventually the group split up again.[80] She stated, "I remember Jimmy, once again, his back, he has a big back, I couldn't see [Witness 1], but I assumed they were extremely close."[81] She stated that she did not see them kiss or get physical, "I never saw them kissing. It's just I'm assuming that in their closeness they were."[82] She stated that Witness 1 "looked very carefree when she was smoking,"[83] and that Representative Gomez seemed "friendly. He was joking, laughing. I think he was smoking with her, yeah."[84] Witness 3 stated that she did not see anything that evening with Witness 1 that concerned her.[85]

The other Member stated that he did not see Representative Gomez kiss or be intimate with anyone at the bar or outside,[86] but recalled "I speculated about it, but I didn't know whether it

---

[70] *Id*.
[71] *Id*.
[72] *Id*.
[73] *Id*.
[74] *Id*.
[75] *Id*.
[76] *Id*. Text messages reviewed by the Committee indicate that they had already exchanged numbers during the birthday party.
[77] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[78] *Id*.; Exhibit 3.
[79] 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[80] *Id*.
[81] *Id*.
[82] *Id*.
[83] *Id*.
[84] *Id*.
[85] *Id*.
[86] 18(a) Interview of Member 1.

happened or not and I didn't see anything."[87] The other Member elaborated only that this was based on "a gut feeling" and "intuition," "[b]ut I didn't see anything, so I wouldn't know personally."[88]

There was some conflicting testimony about how Witness 1 and Witness 3 got home, but all of those present agreed that Representative Gomez and Witness 1 did not go home together. Witness 1 testified that she and Witness 3 left together, and that they likely took an Uber.[89] She stated that by this time she and Witness 3 were very intoxicated;[90] Witness 3 denied that she was intoxicated.[91]

Witness 1 testified that she does not know if Witness 3 or the other Member directly witnessed her interaction with Representative Gomez, but she stated that she "had conversations with [Witness 3] afterwards where I was pretty clear with her that I -- it was not welcome, and it was not consensual, and I did not like him."[92] She recalled that Witness 3 "tried to make it seem like I liked him or tried to make it seem like it was a thing," but that "I had explained to her that it wasn't."[93]

Witness 3 recalled that once they left, Witness 1 told her that Representative Gomez "fingered" her, and recalled that Witness 1 was "disgusted" by it:

> she's, like, I was being a good wing woman. And I'm, like, what do you mean? And she was just, like, yeah, he touched me. And she was kind of disgusted by it, but at the same time, she was, like, so, you know, I was being a good wing woman. And I'm, like, what did he do? And she's, like, he touched me. She's, like, he fingered me. And I was, like, oh, my gosh! And she's just, like, yeah, but, you know -- she was just, like, normal about it. And I'm, like, I never asked you to do that. And she's, like, yeah, it's whatever. It doesn't matter. Like, she made -- these weren't her exact words, but she was, like, whatever.[94]

Witness 3 stated that Witness 1 did not seem upset by this,[95] and that she never perceived Witness 1 to be in danger.[96]

---

[87] *Id*.
[88] *Id*.
[89] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[90] *Id*.
[91] 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[92] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[93] *Id*.
[94] 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[95] *Id*.
[96] *Id*.

Representative Gomez testified that he drove everyone home.[97] Representative Gomez testified that he and Witness 1 exchanged text messages, and "I asked if she had Signal," and they "continued the conversation," and Witness 1 "talked about how drunk [Witness 3] was," and that is all he remembers from the evening's conversation.[98] Representative Gomez separately recalled, "we texted that night. We messaged each other almost -- I can't remember, but it wasn't -- it wasn't short. It didn't feel short."[99]

Asked why he originally disclosed only a single instance of consensual kissing with Witness 1, with whom he later described having "sexual contact,"[100] Representative Gomez testified "I thought I would have an opportunity to give more detail here."[101] However, when Representative Gomez made his initial disclosure through counsel, his letter stated "[t]he Congressman also hopes that, with this sworn response, the Committee can consider the matter closed[.]"[102]

2. July 2024 Incident in Representative Gomez' Office

Witness 1 also described a second incident with Representative Gomez. She testified that during an evening vote series in the House in July 2024, she was at a happy hour nearby on Capitol Hill.[103] She stated that she texted Representative Gomez, "[s]omething like, 'I'm on the Hill,'" or "are you on the Hill," although she does not remember why she texted him, and he invited her to his office.[104] When she got there, they were alone and had a brief conversation.[105] Representative Gomez recalled that Witness 1 came to his office in the spring of 2024, and as they sat together, Witness 1 discussed her dating life, and asked him, "why do you like me?," and they discussed men who were interested in her.[106] He stated that Witness 1 told him "I don't want to do anything here. And I said, okay," and the conversation ended.[107]

Witness 1 did not characterize the interaction as flirtatious and instead described it as a brief and "pretty normal conversation."[108] She stated that the conversation ended after Representative Gomez made a comment about a reporter on the television, "saying that she was so hot and that he texts her all the time."[109] Witness 1 stated that she became uncomfortable and

[97] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[98] *Id*.
[99] *Id*.
[100] *Id*.
[101] *Id*.
[102] Representative Gomez Response Letter.
[103] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[104] *Id*.
[105] *Id*.
[106] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[107] *Id*.
[108] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[109] *Id*.

told him that she was going to leave.[110] Witness 1 testified that she stood up and walked to the door, and they said goodbye to each other.[111] Witness 1 testified:

> And I opened the door, and he grabbed my arm and he, like, grabbed my body and, like, pushed it into his and started caressing my back and, like, put his hand on my face and, like, tried to kiss me. And, at that point, I said, no. Like, I have to go. Like, I need to leave. And then I pushed him off of me and -- or I was trying to push off of him, and he wouldn't let go. And, at some point I, like, succeeded in pushing him off of me, and then I just ran out.[112]

She testified that Representative Gomez was "[p]retty forceful" during this encounter, that it was not consensual, and that there was no ambiguity that she did not consent to this advance.[113] She stated that she left his office and has only interacted with him very casually since then.[114] Witness 3 informed the Committee that Witness 1 "did mention to me later that she had to go to his office one day, and he had asked to kiss her, and she said, no."[115]

Representative Gomez testified, "I walked her to the door, gave her a beso, a kiss on the cheek, a hug, and she left," and that Witness 1 reacted "fine."[116] He stated that he did not try to kiss her on the lips and, "[b]esides the hug," did not put his hands on her.[117] He informed the Committee that there was no indication that Witness 1 was uncomfortable with this interaction, and she did not resist him in any way.[118] He testified that he did not try to prevent her from leaving the office.[119]

After this second encounter, Witness 1 did not recall interacting with him again until the Democratic National Convention, when she and Representative Gomez briefly saw each other and texted about an after party. Representative Gomez similarly recalled the texts about an after party but did not recall any specifics. Witness 1 stated that they did not interact at the after party.[120] They also both recalled running into each other and briefly chatting at an event in 2025.

---

[110] *Id*.
[111] *Id*.
[112] *Id*.
[113] *Id*.
[114] *Id*.
[115] 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[116] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[117] *Id*.
[118] *Id*.
[119] *Id*.
[120] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.

V. FINDINGS

Representative Gomez's interactions with Witness 1 constitute sexual misconduct in violation of House Rules and merit consideration by the full House. Specifically, Representative Gomez violated clauses 1 and 18(b) of the Code of Official Conduct by making unwelcome sexual advances and engaging in unwelcome sexual conduct towards a House staffer and disregarding the power imbalance inherent in his relationship with House staffers. The Committee also notes that Representative Gomez's behavior towards Witness 1 could constitute criminal misdemeanor sexual abuse (more commonly referred to as sexual assault).

Clause 18(b) of the Code prohibits a Member from "engag[ing] in unwelcome sexual advances or conduct towards . . . [an] employee of the House," including staff who are not employed by the Member's office or a committee on which the Member serves.[121] The Committee has noted that this provision prohibits all "'unwanted sexual advances or conduct,' even when not rising to the level of sexual harassment, precisely because of the power dynamics at play."[122]

Even prior to the adoption of clause 18 in the Code, the Committee has made clear that unwelcome sexual advances do not reflect creditably upon the House. For example, where a Member was alleged to have made unwanted advances towards a Peace Corps volunteer during an official congressional trip to Zaire in the 1980s, including forcing her to kiss him and trying to persuade her to have sex with him, the Committee found that these actions were contrary to clause 1 of the Code and stated that it "clearly disapproves" of this conduct.[123] In that matter, over 35 years ago, the Committee noted that the adoption of its Report "place[d] other Members on notice" that additional action may be pursued against Members who engage in similar conduct.[124] The Committee noted that the conduct at issue occurred in a setting "which cannot be deemed wholly separate and apart from [the Member's] status as a Member of Congress," and that the congressman and the volunteer had no "prior personal or private social relationship."[125] While the setting and context of the encounters between Representative Gomez and Witness 1 had more of a personal and social component, they nonetheless cannot be divorced from Representative Gomez's status as a Member.

In more recent matters, the Committee has consistently highlighted the pressure that a Member's status can create in a sexual or romantic situation with someone who is required to interact with that Member as part of their employment. In a 2018 Report, the Committee warned Members that although they are "free to pursue romantic and intimate relationships outside of the House, there is an inherent power imbalance when Members romantically pursue individuals who

[121] Comm. on Ethics, *In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Chuck Edwards*, H. Rept. 119-756, 119th Cong. 2d Sess. 12, 18 (2026) (hereinafter *Edwards*).
[122] *Id*. at 18.
[123] *Id*. at 14 (citing Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, *In the Matter of Representative Gus Savage*, H. Rept. 101-397, 101st Cong. 2d Sess. 1, 14 (1990) (hereinafter *Savage*).
[124] *Id.* (citing *Savage* at 2).
[125] *Savage* at 2.

are required to interact with Members as part of their professional responsibilities.''[126] Service as an elected official involves power imbalances that Members must be careful not to exploit.[127]

Witness 1 was not Representative Gomez's employee. She did not work in his congressional office or for a committee on which he served. She worked for a leadership office where, from her point of view, Members were the "constituents."[128] The reality of that power dynamic is further evidenced by Witness 1's testimony that she did not want Representative Gomez "to feel upset in any way," that she was concerned that any incident would be construed as "the woman's fault," and she was "afraid that I was going to get in trouble at work[.]"[129] Even if Representative Gomez believed that his actions were wholly consensual, his failure to appreciate the reality of this power dynamic and thus the untenable position he put a young congressional staffer in, is inconsistent with the standards required of a Member of Congress.

Representative Gomez's conduct at various junctures suggests he knew that what he was doing was wrong. He has sought to characterize his actions as "personal mistakes outside my marriage," which impacted "those I care about the most," and for which "I am deeply sorry to my wife for the pain and embarrassment that I have brought into our lives."[130] The Committee is much more concerned by the impact Representative Gomez's conduct had on Witness 1, who testified that Representative Gomez's conduct contributed to her decision to leave work on the Hill.[131] Most notably, Representative Gomez dismissively disclosed to the Committee "one sole occasion" of "consensual kissing" Witness 1, months before admitting in his testimony that he made "sexual contact" with her on one occasion, and gave her a "beso" on another.

Despite Representative Gomez's characterizations of these incidents as isolated and private, for Witness 1 they were anything but. Instead, Representative Gomez's conduct caused a traumatic and ongoing chain of interactions for Witness 1 which, combined with a broader culture of sexual misconduct on the Hill, drove her from government service. The experience was exacerbated over the last year when Representative Gomez's sexual activity became the subject of national reporting and Witness 1 found herself as a key witness in a congressional ethics investigation.

The Committee determined that Witness 1's testimony was clear and was supported by evidence that she contemporaneously complained of his conduct to Witness 3. Although Representative Gomez has not admitted to the account as Witness 1 described it, the Committee found her sufficiently credible in her assertions that his conduct toward her was unwelcome.

The Committee also determined that Representative Gomez knew or had reason to know that Witness 1 did not consent to his sexual conduct on the evening of February 29, 2024. As

---

[126] Comm. on Ethics, *In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Ruben Kihuen* H. Rept. 115-1041, 115th Cong. 2d Sess. 6 (2018) (hereinafter *Kihuen*).
[127] *Edwards* at 16 (citing *Kihuen* at 6).
[128] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.
[129] *Id*.
[130] Dareh Gregorian and Kyle Stewart, *House ethics panel says it's investigating Rep. Jimmy Gomez over allegation of 'sexual misconduct,'* NBC NEWS (Aug. 17, 2026), https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/house-ethics-panel-says-s-investigating-rep-jimmy-gomez-alleged-sexual-rcna592984.
[131] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.

discussed above, Representative Gomez testified that the encounter was consensual. However, his account is not reconcilable with Witness 1's testimony, which the Committee determined was sufficiently credible. While Witness 3's testimony did not precisely match that of Witness 1, it was closer to Witness 1's account than Representative Gomez's account; for example, Witness 3 testified that it appeared to her that Representative Gomez and Witness 1 likely kissed both inside and outside the bar.[132] Even more notable was Representative Gomez's own testimony that he was concerned that one of his staffers may have seen something between him and Witness 1 while they were still in the bar, and that he felt compelled to ask the staffer a few days later if she saw him at the bar.[133]

Although Witness 3 stated that Witness 1 "was just, like, normal" about Representative Gomez's sexual contact, that perceived demeanor is not necessarily inconsistent with Witness 1 having recently endured a traumatic, nonconsensual episode.[134] Courts and many others have recognized that victims of sexual assault may respond to the assault in a manner that others might find confusing.[135] Witness 1 repeatedly testified that she did not know how to respond to the situation.

Even taking Representative Gomez's testimony at face value – that Witness 1 was flirting with him at the bar and that he perceived her openness to sexual activity based on a reference to her own sexual interests – his actions were aggressive and inappropriate. Representative Gomez and Witness 1 formally met for the first time that night, he was married, they were in public, his colleague was present, and he and Witness 1 shared a workplace. Even putting aside that Representative Gomez was a Member of Congress and the unique concerns that raises, a reasonable person would not have concluded under these circumstances that Representative Gomez had consent to make sexual contact Witness 1 in a bar. Accordingly, Representative Gomez's conduct violated clause 18(b) and clause 1 of the Code.

Although clause 18(b) does not define "unwelcome sexual advances," this standard is broader than, and encompasses behavior that may fall short of implicating, other standards, such as sexual harassment in employment or sexual assault in the criminal context. In another recent matter involving allegations of sexual misconduct, pertaining to a Member's conduct toward staff under his supervision, the Committee cited as unprofessional conduct, *inter alia*, a Member's comments to his female staffers that they looked "pretty" and "breathtaking," comments he made about their weight, and his purchase of lavish gifts including jewelry, even where the Member and the subjects of this conduct described their relationship as "close," but the conduct "made the

[132] 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[133] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez.
[134] 18(a) Interview of Witness 3.
[135] *See e.g., Hughes v. United States*, 150 A.3d 289, 306 (D.C. 2016); *see also* U.S. Dep't of Justice, *Framework for Prosecutors to Strengthen Our National Response to Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Involving Adult Victims* (May 20, 2024) at 4 (citing Deborah Tuerkheimer, *Victim, Reconstructed: Sex Crimes Experts and the New Rape Paradigm*, 2024 U. ILL. L. REV. 55, 67 (2024)) ("[T]here is no typical demeanor for a sexual assault or domestic violence victim when they are recounting their assaults. A victim may . . . have a flat affect or appear emotionally detached, express anger, display stoicism, or even laugh nervously or act in a manner we perceive as inappropriate. Such conduct is consistent with trauma[.]").

women feel uncomfortable."[136] The Committee made its findings that these actions were inappropriate even in the absence of allegations of physical touch.[137] Notably, the Committee explained that a Member's subjective interpretation of an event is not the only controlling factor in determining whether his conduct toward staff is appropriate.[138]

The Committee determined that the factual record contains sufficient evidence that Representative Gomez's sexual conduct toward Witness 1 was not welcome. His testimony that "she did not say no, she did not push me away," does not come close to establishing her consent to the sexual contact. Although Representative Gomez testified that "I asked before. I said, yes? And she said yes," the Committee found Witness 1's testimony that she did not give her consent, verbally or otherwise, and that she was "shocked" by his behavior, to be more credible. The Committee found the verbal exchange described by Representative Gomez to be improbable, and also considered that, in this instance, Representative Gomez's recollection reached a level of specificity that was absent from much of his other recollections from that evening.

Notably, in assessing Representative Gomez's conduct under clause 18(b), the Committee considered how it may implicate relevant local laws relating to sexual assault. In Washington, D.C., where the relevant conduct occurred, misdemeanor sexual abuse occurs where a defendant "engages in a sexual act or sexual contact with another person and who should have knowledge or reason to know that the act was committed without that other person's permission."[139] Sexual contact includes touching, "either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person," with an intent to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person.[140] There are thus two essential elements to misdemeanor sexual abuse: (1) that the defendant made a "sexual act" or "sexual contact;" and (2) that he knew or should have known that he did not have permission to make that contact.[141] "Consent" is defined in the District of Columbia to mean "words or overt actions indicating a freely given agreement to the sexual act or contact in question," and a "[l]ack of verbal or physical resistance or submission by the victim, resulting from the use of force, threats, or coercion by the defendant shall not constitute consent."[142]

---

[136] *Edwards* at 3-4.
[137] *Id.*
[138] *Savage* at 3-4.
[138] *Edwards* at 3-4 ("Although Representative Edwards testified that he did not treat these two young women he directly hired differently than the rest of the staff, most of the current and former staffers that the Committee spoke with felt that Staffer 1 and Staffer 2 were in fact treated differently" and "While many witnesses, including the two staffers themselves, also characterized the relationship as 'close,' several felt that it was far from professional.").
[139] D.C. Code § 22-3006. Felony sexual abuse occurs where a defendant engages in sexual contact with another person by placing that person in reasonable fear (other than reasonable fear that any person will be subjected to death, bodily injury, or kidnapping), or where the defendant knows or has reason to know that the victim is incapable of declining the sexual contact or incapable of communicating unwillingness to engage in the sexual contact. D.C. Code § 22-3005. The Committee did not determine that Representative Gomez's conduct was likely to implicate felony sexual assault laws.
[140] D.C. Code § 22-3001(9).
[141] *Harkins v. U.S.*, 810 A.2d 895, 900 (D.C. 2002).
[142] *Davis,* 873 A.2d at 1104 (citing D.C. Code § 22–3001(4)).

There is no question that Representative Gomez made sexual contact with Witness 1 at Rocket Bar,[143] when he put his hand underneath Witness 1's skirt and "stimulate[d] her."[144] As discussed above, the Committee also found that Representative Gomez knew or had reason to know that his contact was not welcome. There is also evidence that he knew or had reason to know his repeated advance towards Witness 1 in his congressional office was inappropriate and unwelcome. Accordingly, Representative Gomez's conduct towards Witness 1 could implicate D.C. laws related to criminal sexual assault, including misdemeanor sexual abuse.

In the 101st Congress, from 1989 to 1990, the Committee released two reports relating to allegations of sexual misconduct by Members. In one, the Committee noted its "disapprov[al]" of the conduct of a Member who engaged in unwelcome sexual touching, but determined no further action was necessary because he wrote an apology letter to his victim.[145] In another, a Member was found to have "initiat[ed] uninvited physical contact" and made "inappropriate sexual comments" to female staffers, but the Committee noted that he said "he considered his conduct as flirtatious," not harassing, and determined "recommending a sanction to the House is unnecessary," instead directing the Member to "apologize" to his victims.[146] Here, Representative Gomez has emphasized the harm he caused to his own family, but not to Witness 1. In any event, this is not 1990, and an apology would not suffice.

During the Committee's consideration of this matter, Representative Gomez lost his bid for re-election to the House. In this circumstance, the Committee has observed that although there is not enough time for it to pursue an adequate House sanction, it remains essential that the Committee adopt and publish its Report so that the House is aware of Representative Gomez's misconduct and so that the House may determine, in its judgment, whether to sanction Representative Gomez.[147]

VI. CONCLUSION

Representative Gomez's unwanted sexual advances toward Witness 1 violated clause 18(b) and clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct. In addition to the direct and immediate impacts borne by Witness 1, Representative Gomez's conduct made House employment more toxic and

[143] Although Representative Gomez believed this incident took place someplace in Dupont Circle, all other witnesses agreed it took place at Rocket Bar. Representative Gomez' description of the bar is consistent with Rocket Bar.
[144] 18(a) Interview of Representative Gomez; *See Harkins,* 810 A.2d at 900 (to be found guilty of misdemeanor sexual abuse by way of "sexual contact," the government must prove the specific intent to "abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person.").
[145] *Savage* at 14.
[146] Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, *In the Matter of Representative Jim Bates*, H. Rept. 101-293, 101st Cong. 1st Sess. 14 (1989).
[147] *See* Comm. on Ethics, *In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative George Santos*, H. Rept. 118-274, 118th Cong. 2d Sess. 3 (2023); *see also* Comm. on Standards of Official Conduct, *In the Matter of Representative Barbara Rose-Collins*, H. Rept. 104-876, 104th Cong. 2d Sess. 4 (1997).

less safe. Throughout her interview, Witness 1 repeatedly referenced a toxic and predatory culture on the Hill that she experienced. She stated:

> I think it's something that's definitely happened to me a lot on the Hill where, like, people get[] handsy; they touch me or, like -- you know, and so my reaction is just to always sort of, like, back off, like, make sure no one saw that because then I don't want anybody else to think that's okay.[148]

This is not acceptable.

The Committee takes allegations of sexual misconduct by Members seriously. There must be zero tolerance for unwanted sexual advances toward House staff. The Committee is tasked with investigating alleged misconduct and, where appropriate, holding Members accountable for conduct that does not reflect creditably on the House or puts other Members and staff in danger. Having determined that Representative Gomez made unwanted sexual advances toward a House staffer, the Committee adopted this Report to hold Representative Gomez accountable and to serve as a warning to the entire House community that this conduct will not be tolerated.

The Committee reiterates its commitment to investigating allegations and providing accountability to those who face sexual misconduct from Members and their staff. Here, the House lost Witness 1 as a competent and able staffer because of Representative Gomez's misconduct and because of a broader culture of disrespect and toxic sexual behavior toward staff that permeates life on the Hill and is long overdue for correction.

The Committee sincerely hopes that anyone with information related to sexual misconduct by Members of Congress or their staff will come forward and share their experiences with the Committee. The Committee is committed to providing a safe and respectful place where wrongdoing can be reported and duly examined and addressed while maintaining the confidentiality of all whistleblowers and witnesses.

The Committee hereby adopts this Report in the Matter of Representative Jimmy Gomez. The Constitution charges the House with policing the behavior of its own Members, and the House should take whatever action it deems appropriate in light of the Committee's findings.

VII. STATEMENT UNDER HOUSE RULE XIII CLAUSE 3(c)

The Committee made no special oversight findings in this Report. No budget statement is submitted. No funding is authorized by any measure in this Report.

[148] 18(a) Deposition of Witness 1.