1	
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	United States of America, ) Criminal Action ) No. 21-cr-303
4	Plaintiff, )
5	) SENTENCING HEARING vs. ) BY VIDEO
6	Michael Joseph Rusyn, ) Washington, DC ) January 11, 2022
7	Defendant. ) Time: 2:00 p.m.
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING HELD BEFORE
10	THE HONORABLE JUDGE AMY BERMAN JACKSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	<del></del>
12	APPEARANCES
13	For Plaintiff: Michael Romano  James Pearce
14	U.S. Department of Justice 1331 F Street, NW
15	Washington, DC 20004 Email: Michael.romano@usdoj.gov
16	For Defendant: Andrea Bergman Assistant Federal Public Defender
17	22 South Clinton Avenue
18	Station Plaza 4, Fourth Floor Trenton, NJ 08609
19	Email: Andrea_bergman@fd.org
20	Court Reporter: Janice E. Dickman, RMR, CRR, CRC
21	Official Court Reporter United States Courthouse, Room 6523
22	333 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001
23	202-354-3267
24	
25	

```
1
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, this afternoon,
2
       this is scheduled as a video sentencing proceeding. We have in
 3
       front of us criminal case No. 21-303-1, the United States of
       America V. Michael Joseph Rusyn.
 4
 5
                 Will the probation officer please identify herself
 6
       for the record?
 7
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
       Jessica Reichler on behalf of the United States Probation
 8
 9
       Office.
10
                 THE COURT: Good afternoon.
11
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Counsel for the government,
12
       please identify yourself and your colleague for the record.
13
                 MR. ROMANO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael
14
       Romano on behalf of the United States. I'm joined today by
15
       James Pearce.
16
                 THE COURT: Good afternoon.
17
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Counsel for the defendant,
18
       please identify yourself for the record.
19
                 MS. BERGMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Andrea
20
       Bergman, Assistant Federal Public Defender, appearing on behalf
21
       of Mr. Rusyn.
22
                 THE COURT: Good afternoon.
23
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Will the defendant state his
24
       name for the record and verify that he is able to see and hear
25
       the judge, the probation officer and the attorneys.
```

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm

Michael Joseph Rusyn. And, yes, I can.

THE COURT: All right. Now, I want to say that we're here this afternoon for Mr. Rusyn's sentencing. I understand that members of the public and the press may be listening in on our public line, which they have an absolute right to do and you're welcome to attend and report on what transpires in court

But I do want to remind you that just as if the courtroom were open, the recording or dissemination of a recording of these

proceedings would be a violation of our court rules.

proceedings, just as you would be if the courtroom were open.

Second thing I want to talk about before we move forward is to ask you, Ms. Bergman, whether you've consulted with the defendant about whether he wishes to proceed by video conference this afternoon?

MS. BERGMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I have consulted with Mr. Rusyn about that and we are prepared to go forward by video.

THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Rusyn, do you agree with that? You understand you have a constitutional right to be in the courtroom, in person, at a critical stage in your case, and this is one of those. And do you agree to participate by video this afternoon?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. I understand and I do agree.

THE COURT: All right. And I find, pursuant to the CARES Act, and given your written waiver and the standing order of this Court calling for remote proceedings, particularly now in order to protect the health and safety of you, and also the court personnel and the lawyers involved, that these are all specific reasons why the sentencing in this case can't be further delayed without serious harm to the interest of justice.

I just want to start by saying that I really appreciate the quick work and responsiveness on the part of the parties and the probation office in answering a question that I posed for the first time this morning. I have, as you are probably aware, a number of these sentencings going on at the same time and in another case the government took the position, for the first time, it had been arguing that I could put someone on probation after incarceration, even though I can't put someone on supervised release after incarceration. And since it sensed some resistance on my part to that concept, it offered up a short period of intermittent incarceration, but it proposed up to 14 days for that.

I think everybody agrees and everyone knows that if the defendant is placed on probation under 18 U.S. Code § 3563, the Court has the discretion to impose intermittent confinement or confinement in a community correctional facility as a condition of probation, that's not really an issue. But I was

interested in how you interpret the notion of an interval under that provision, the intermittent confinement provision, and what you thought of the 14 days.

I very much appreciated the detail and the thoughtfulness that went into the letter from the federal public defender that was turned around on an incredibly short period of time. But I think at this point it's fair to say that the defense doesn't dispute that I have the authority to do that. What your dispute is, whether that would be the appropriate thing to do under the circumstances.

Is that a fair compressed summary of your letter, Ms. Bergman?

MS. BERGMAN: I think that I should probably clarify that. I think that if you interpret the statute faithfully, that you have to give the operative word "intermittent" its due. And that if the intent is to do a 14-day consecutively-served period of days, that that is not intermittent. And that when we look to the purpose of that special condition of probation, with Congress's intent being to, one, make it the least restrictive on the defendant and provide for the Court's other concerns, which might be whether or not the defendant was able to keep his appointments or meet other family obligations and that kind of thing, that it might become more fact-specific what that length of -- or, interval might be, when you look at the statute and the purpose of the statute.

And, so, I would suggest, in Mr. Rusyn's case, that 14 days -- because he would lose his employment -- that that would not be an appropriate reading of the statute or an appropriate interval because it's not, in fact, intermittent and it would do violence, I think, to the spirit of the statute.

I also think that it would appear to be an end run around 3551's command that the Court has separate options, in the disjunctive, either to impose periods of incarceration or impose probation, and that --

"intermittent" has to mean something. I guess what I was really trying to figure out, whether -- what the upper boundary was of an interval, presuming that the Court gave a sentence that appropriately had intervals in this situation. And I don't want to get ahead of myself here or suggest that's what I'm planning to do.

But, there are sentences where a sentence of incarceration of 30 days, 60 days, 90 days can be appropriate for individuals who are also working, or for other reasons you wouldn't want to give up the option of other forms of supervision or to remove them from the community entirely for that period of time. But I had never seen an intermittent sentence for anything other than weekends.

So, it was the length of the 14 days that struck me,

but I absolutely take your point about the fact that if you just make it 14 in a lump, doesn't sound very intermittent.

MS. BERGMAN: Right.

THE COURT: Mr. Pearce, I think you're here for this issue. Is there anything you want to add about this before I go forward?

MR. PEARCE: Certainly. Thank you, Your Honor. The word "intermittent," of course, does not appear in 3563(b)(10). As Your Honor quoted, it talks about nights, weekends and other intervals of time. And so then the question really becomes what does "other intervals of time" mean? And I think Your Honor laid out where at least a handful of district courts interpreting this provision have said, kind of, that you could not have more than 60 days, 90 days, 30 days, even, as one consecutive lump.

But, one of those courts, the *Mize* court, the decision, I think, out of the District of Kansas, quoted the legislative history, which I think is useful here. And, specifically, what 3563 -- at the time it was enacted it was (b) (11), now it's (b) (10) -- sets out are both the opportunity for the courts to impose intermittent confinement, what I think the legislative history referred to as split intervals, as well as a brief period of time, and the Senate report suggests up to a week or two.

And so in our reading of that, you either can do

intermittent or you can do a brief period of time. We certainly recognize that consistent with what the cases have held -- frankly, we think once you get above 14 days, that's not a brief interval of time or a brief period of time. But we've do believe, consistent with the legislative history and the statute's history, that 14 days is permissible under 3563(b)(10).

THE COURT: All right. The other issue that we're facing is that while we can have an academic conversation about this, no matter which way it comes out you have to deal with the practical realities of what would be available in the district in which the defendant is going to be sentenced. And even if there were facilities that were prepared to accept probationers under the kinds of sentences that are being discussed, whether those exist now and whether those options are either compromised or limited or eliminated entirely due to the presence of the coronavirus in the community and in the facility at large.

So there's a lot to think about legally and practically in terms of what we can do with sentencing. I think it's important to think about all this in connection with this series of misdemeanors. The Court is probably doing more misdemeanor sentencing than it's ever done before in this building in -- at least in this volume. So, it's useful to know what some of these options are. But then it still may

turn out that they're not options.

So what I think is more important to do is to go

forward now and discuss what we ordinarily would discuss, which

is the sentencing factors. And so I would like to get into the

substance of the sentencing directly.

First, I would say, for the record, that I received the final revised presentence report, and it was filed on December 8th. Ms. Bergman, have both and you Mr. Rusyn had an opportunity read the presentence report?

MS. BERGMAN: Yes, Your Honor, we have. We did identify one correction to be made at paragraph 35 with respect to what sentence was actually imposed in that prior matter for Mr. Rusyn. In an email received from the probation department yesterday, I understand that the probation department is in agreement that the correction should be made. I don't know if that was yet communicated to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. I did note that you had that objection. And with that correction, then, do you have any objections to the presentence report at this point?

MS. BERGMAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And I don't believe the government has any factual or legal objections to the presentence report either.

MR. ROMANO: We do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So with that correction, I'm going

\_\_\_

to accept the presentence report as undisputed.

I've also received additional materials concerning the defendant, including the government's memorandum in aid of sentencing and a video and some photographs from January 6th; the defendant's memorandum in aid of sentencing; his academic records that reflected struggles with learning issues as a young man; a letter from his great aunt who told me a great deal about his character, in particular, his role in supporting his elderly grandmother; a letter from a fellow volunteer firefighter; a letter from another parent, one of his daughter's best friends, who have witnessed the defendant's love of and commitment to his daughters.

A letter from a parent who witnessed interest in his daughters' little league activities, and ultimately recruited him to be a coach himself, who talks about his maturity and composure; another parent interested in sharing softball coaching duties, and; the defendant's father, who was worried that maybe he had a conflict of interest. But he's a person who knows the defendant quite well and he had valuable things to say. He wrote about not only Mr. Rusyn's extraordinary efforts caring for his grandmother, but the way he stepped up to help raise his younger brothers when his mother passed away.

There were also supplemental submissions from the defense regarding information regarding his new employment and recent injury sustained during heroic efforts to fight a fire

and saved one of the members -- one of his subordinates. I also received a letter from counsel that dealt with the prior assault conviction, which we've now addressed through the probation report.

I would note -- and I wasn't going to say anything about this in connection with today's letter, given the turnaround -- our local rules actually require docketed submissions and not letters to the Court. So if you have other cases, just keep that in mind.

Finally, I received a letter from the defendant himself. And I read and very much appreciated all of that.

In a criminal case, as I said at the time you pled guilty, there's a statute that tells me the things I'm supposed to think about when I sentence someone, it's 18 U.S. Code § 3553. It list a number of factors that we're supposed to think about, and one of the things it tells me you're supposed to think about is what the sentencing guidelines would recommend in your case. But the parties have all agreed that given the plea to the misdemeanor charge of parading, demonstrating, or picketing in a Capitol building, in violation of 40 U.S. Code § 5104(e)(2)(G), that is the type of misdemeanor to which the guidelines do not apply, and so we don't have to talk about them or calculate them or think about them. However, what we do know is that for this offense Congress has said that the maximum sentence that could be

imposed would be up to six months.

Would the government like an opportunity to speak regarding the appropriate sentence in this case?

MR. ROMANO: We would, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Romano.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you. So, Your Honor, I don't -I'll begin by noting that we've argued in this case, as we've
argued in other cases arising out of the riot on January 6,
that the scope of the riot and the presence of numerous people
who participated in it, whether they committed conduct that was
charged by misdemeanors or felonies, enabled the riot to
persist for the length of time that it did, enabled the
violence that took place during that day, and contributed to a
criminal offense of historic proportions.

We treat the riot very seriously, and the defense does as well. The defense acknowledges that the size of the riot made the riot more dangerous, made this a significant criminal offense. There are several areas where we and the defense disagree. I want to highlight those.

I actually want to begin, though, by addressing the defendant's points about his own personal history in relation to his family, his children, and his care of his grandmother.

These absolutely are to his credit, Your Honor. His commitment to his children, his commitment to be an active parent, to work hard at getting education, provide a good

education to his children, they're all to his credit, they're worthy of consideration. There's one point that I thought was especially important for me to highlight in the defendant's memorandum, that his -- that speaks well of him. He wrote of having been ashamed of participating in the events of January 6th. He noted that he believed his daughters had lost faith in him. One of his daughters told him she has difficulty trusting him after the events of January 6. I'm sure that was tremendously difficult for the defendant to hear. I'm sure it was difficult for him to engage with.

But, it's important that he's having conversations like this with his children and others. It's important that he's working, as he's demonstrated through Ms. Bergman's arguments, to better himself, to work with a therapist, to care for his grandmother, to find gainful employment. Again, it also sounds like he is separating himself from people in groups that encouraged the sort of conspiratorial thinking and the behavior that led to the crimes on January 6. And this is what we would hope any person coming before the Court for sentencing would do.

But, I think the Court is well aware that not all defendants in January 6 matters are doing this. There are certainly some that are becoming more entrenched, there are some that are refusing to engage. There may be an ecosystem that will allow people to continue to buy into conspiracy

theories. The work the defendant is doing to separate himself is noteworthy and I think deserves our acknowledgment.

The area we largely disagree with the defense is our interpretation of the defendant's conduct that day. And reading the defendant's memorandum, I was struck by some things that when I put them next to each other, did not appear to make sense to me. On the one hand, the defendant acknowledged that the riot was serious. He wrote in his letter to the court that, "After my first few footsteps, I had a terrible feeling about this and I should have known that nothing good could happen." In his original sentencing memorandum he wrote that he was ashamed of himself in the immediate aftermath of the events of January 6th.

But, reading both the original and the supplemental sentencing memorandum, in my view, Your Honor, fails to answer the question of why? Why he had that terrible feeling, why he was ashamed of himself immediately. And, of course, all of us here virtually today for this hearing know that the conduct was wrong and understand that it was wrong and criminal. But to read the defendant's sentencing memorandum, it sounds like he was oblivious to what was going on around him.

He claims that he didn't see how the building's doors were opened, that he was forced inside the Capitol building, that he didn't see the group of people inside the statuary hall connector, just outside of the house chamber, pushing against

the police line. So, based on what he describes of his conduct, it's not clear how or why he came to the understanding of the seriousness of what he did.

Now, it's the government's view that his statements about not seeing these things and not understanding these things are not credible and that the Court shouldn't credit those statements. The defendant claims he didn't see how the door on the east side of the Capitol building leading into the rotunda was breached. And, in a way, that statement could be read as true because the door was opened from the inside. But he was at the doors and close enough to the front of the crowd to be able to see them.

Exhibits 2 and 3, which we submitted with our sentencing memorandum, show that he was using his phone to film these doors for a full ten minutes before other rioters at the front of the crowd tried to break through them. Other videos that we highlighted for the Court show clashes between other rioters and police officers right there at the door.

So, for the length of time that rioters were trying to break into the Capitol, he was there. Breaking in wasn't a fast process either, as we identified in our sentencing memorandum; it was four minutes from the time the rioters first broke parts of the glass, when somebody inside the building got those doors open. So, if the defendant was standing in the crowd recording those doors and watching for a period of 14

minutes, and hearing and watching as other rioters clashed with police, he, of course, would have understood the violent nature of this event before he ever stepped foot inside the building. It would have been inescapable, it boggles the mind, Your Honor, to think that he wouldn't have known what was going on around him.

I want to highlight one piece of evidence that we didn't submit, and this was something that came to our attention after we filed our original sentencing memorandum and which I informed Ms. Bergman about. There were a handful of videos recovered from the defendant's phone that initially did not appear to be videos, it was sent after. We dug a little deeper and we found that these files that appeared to be nothing were actually videos. I informed Ms. Bergman about this and her legal assistant as soon as we found out.

There is a video -- if the Court would find it useful, I would be happy to share my screen and show it -- and it is from the defendant's cell phone of that door that shows the spiderweb fractures in the window as other rioters were trying to break in.

So, again, it makes no sense that he didn't know that this was happening. And I think, even without consideration of that video, the Court can tell this based on the totality of the circumstances and the other exhibits that we've submitted.

So, now we move to the defendant's point that he

claims he was forced into the Capitol against his will. And if there was any risk of him being trampled by the crowd, it was only because he put himself at the front of the crowd and remained there for 14 minutes while other people were trying to break into the building.

The claim doesn't make sense, Your Honor. And as the Court can see from the videos we submitted from the U.S.

Capitol police security footage taken from inside the building, when the defendant got in he certainly didn't act like a person who was forced inside. He didn't take any time to collect his bearings, he didn't take any time to process what had just happened to him. He didn't look around in confusion and try to make sense of where he was. He and Deborah Lee, who he was with, continued forward.

Next, the defendant and Ms. Lee moved through the rotunda to the statuary hall connector. That's the room beyond the statuary hall that has a number of statues of people from different states that leads up to the House of Representatives chamber. Now, there again, he would have been in a position to see and hear what was going on. The defense and the government agree that he was a few rows of people back from the front of the crowd. But, in our view, he was not so far back that his view would have been obstructed.

The defense and I disagree about whether or not he would have heard one of the people at the front of that crowd

yell the phrase, "Tell Speaker Pelosi we're coming for that bitch." The video shows that she said this at around the time that Mr. Rusyn arrived in the statuary hall connector. And it was not, at that time, so crowded that there was a mass of people and wall to wall, but it's possible that he didn't hear.

Nonetheless, even if he didn't hear that, he would have heard people call police officers traitors, he would have heard people swear at police officers, he would have heard people demand to be let past the police line.

You can tell he heard and was generally aware of what was going on because the video makes abundantly clear that he at one point stood at the front of the crowd and joined in a "We want Trump" chant. And, again, he can be picked up in other pieces of video, not very far from the back of the crowd, in a position to see and hear what was going on.

Next, after he pressed through that group, he was part of a crowd that reached the house antechamber. And there, as anywhere else, there's no indication that Mr. Rusyn was violent. But there were people in that antechamber who were calling to have the window leading into the House chamber smashed in. The photo that we submitted that has people on the other side, the video shows people in defense of the representatives in the House chamber having barricaded that door, holding guns on the other side of the window and on the side of the chamber where Mr. Rusyn was. There were people who

were calling for parts of body armor or crowbars to smash in the window. That is audible on the video taken by

Mr. Sullivan, another defendant in one of these rioting cases.

And at times Mr. Sullivan was standing right next to Mr. Rusyn.

Again, it makes no sense to think that he didn't understand what the crowd was trying to do.

There's also another moment that, again, appears on a video that I didn't share with the Court for the same reasons.

And if it would be useful, I would be happy to share it now.

But, otherwise, I'll just proffer it is, again, from the defendant's phone. This is from the rotunda. It's from a period of time after which it's difficult to see, from the rotunda security footage, where he went.

And there is a video of the defendant filming a third attempt by other rioters to get through a police line. There, those police officers stood in front of a door that led from the rotunda to a set of stairs. I believe, but I'm not certain, that those stairs led down from the rotunda into the area where police officers were staging to defend the tunnel at the lower west terrace, that I'm sure the Court is familiar with through other cases. And for over a period of several minutes there were rioters yelling at those police officers, pushing against those police officers. And the defendant, again, did not push police officers himself, but stood right there at the front of the crowd and filmed other rioters doing

that.

Then, we submit that Deborah Lee's statements after the defendant and she left the Capitol were revealed. I know in his sentencing memorandum he distances himself from statements that Ms. Lee made and says he did not agree with them, but that day the statements that we quoted came right after he and she had left the Capitol, right after a period of time when their conduct within the Capitol was largely identical, where it is fair to infer that there was a unity of purpose that day, even if he came to a point later where he didn't agree with her.

All of this evidence taken in conjunction shows that he was a willing participant. And so, this speaks to a point about the nature and circumstances of the offense, but also the history and characteristics of the defendant. It speaks to the nature and circumstances of the offense because it shows that the defendant's conduct was more serious than that of a number of other people who were in the building that day. It shows that he lent his presence to groups of people, several times, who were trying to penetrate police lines, even if he didn't engage in physical violence himself. And it speaks to the history and circumstances of this particular defendant in thinking about acceptance of responsibility and accountability.

The defendant absolutely has accepted responsibility by pleading guilty. He's acknowledged the factual nature of

what he did and he is doing the work to repair the relationships damaged by his participation in January 6th, but it doesn't appear that he is acknowledging the gravity of his actions or a full understanding of what he would have seen and known.

It is unlikely, Your Honor, that he went into the Capitol completely oblivious to what was going on around him but, nonetheless, immediately came to an understanding that it was problematic. It's much more likely, and we think the evidence shows, that he shared a common goal with other rioters and he wanted to be part of the goal that they were trying to achieve, even if he was not willing to use violence to achieve it. And it was after leaving and after thinking back on the things that he had seen and had done and had known that he realized how wrongful and problematic his conduct and other people's conduct were. That explanation, we submit, makes much more sense.

Lastly, I want to talk about the issue of sentencing disparities. The defense raises a number of cases that they view as comparable, the government does not. I'm happy to speak to specific cases, if it would be helpful to the Court. But I think there are two general points that I take away from the defendant's discussion of comparable cases.

One is that it seems that the defense has a view that the thing that is an aggravating factor in misdemeanor cases is

bragging about the riot on social media or spreading lies about the election. To be clear, that is an aggravating factor, the government has argued it is an aggravating factor in a number of cases, but it is not the only aggravating factor. So the government submits that it is incorrect to look at the defendant's conduct and look at the conduct of somebody who is more a loudmouth and say the conduct of somebody who was more a loudmouth is categorically worse.

The defendant did not participate in the kind of disinformation or bragging on social media that other rioters did. That is clear. But, his conduct in the Capitol, lending his support to efforts to breach police lines, watching as other people breached police lines, and be a part of that numerous times and trying to record those interactions is problematic in a way that other defendants' conduct is not.

And I think I rolled up both of the points that I was going to make about comparable cases into one, so if it would be helpful to the Court to hear the government discuss any particular cases that the defense cited, I would be happy to do so. But, otherwise, I would rest my argument there and, again, ask Your Honor that the Court impose a sentence of 45 days of straight time, which the government submits is warranted given the nature of the conduct in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'm not sure, I think when you have to compare these cases, the need to avoid

unwarranted sentencing disparities, you have to look at these cases writ large. What are the cases that are generally moving in the direction of probation? What are the ones that are generally moving in the direction of incarceration? And there's going to be outliers on both sides, there's going to be individual factors that we can't tell just from the sentence, what it was that moved a particular judge to go one way or the other.

There's going to be multiple sentences that any judge in the courthouse might have handled differently in that particular sentence than the judge assigned, either a harsher sentence or a lighter sentence. So, really, you have to see what the picture is as a whole. And I'm happy to have people point out particular sentences to me, but I think it's important, really, to focus more on what this defendant did and what this defendant deserves under all of the sentencing factors.

And, so, with that, Ms. Bergman, I would like to hear from you on the defendant's behalf. And one of the things you do mention frequently is the impact a sentence would have on his job. So, you said that with some certainty at various points, so I would like to know more about that. But, also, if I end up crafting something that has him at home but home confinement, I want to know, before you're finished, what his schedule is in terms of when he goes to work in the morning,

and the same thing with the fire station.

MS. BERGMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. First, you know, we've submitted comprehensive briefing. I'm not going to belabor most of the points that I've set forth in the papers that have been submitted to the Court, which I know Your Honor has gone over very carefully.

I will say that I think that, with due respect to Mr. Romano, he overstates the point that I was attempting to make for Mr. Rusyn with respect to the nature and circumstances of the offense and his particular remorse or realization very soon after coming out of the Capitol about how serious his participation in the riot was. I don't think I ever suggested that Mr. Rusyn was oblivious to what was going on around him before he went into the building.

I do think it was extremely chaotic, that a lot of people were using their cell phones over their heads to capture video that they didn't necessarily even see, but only later, looking at their own video, were able to see. I'm not suggesting in this particular case or pointing to a particular piece of video in Mr. Rusyn's case, I'm just saying that he would acknowledge, before he went into the building, that he shouldn't have been there and that it was wrong to go in.

It is equally true that, given the chaos of the situation and having seen other people be trampled on that staircase, that he held that fear before going in. I think

that that's what he was trying to convey to the FBI, when he was initially interviewed by them. But, he has always said, from the beginning, that if that was truly the only concern, that he would have been able to find his way out of the building before going further, and that he acknowledges the wrongdoing at every moment that he stayed in the building.

The real point that I was hoping to make for the Court is because these sentences require such an individualized evaluation, not just the individual's conduct in the building, but all of the 3553(a) factors, that we have someone who had been at the Capitol a couple months prior and really appreciated the historical significance of the city and the building. I think I mentioned he brought souvenirs home for his kids on that particular occasion. And that it is perhaps why, very shortly after coming out of the building, that he was really overwhelmed by this sense of remorse, notwithstanding his participation.

But an individualized assessment, I think, has to take into consideration not just what the person's acts were, or assume that an opportunity to observe something is the same or as culpable as someone who was engaging in the kind of conduct. So, for instance, of pushing through the police line or, you know, holding a makeshift weapon, you know, those kinds of things. So that was really the only point that I was trying to make with respect to distinguishing the offense conduct for

Mr. Rusyn.

I really want to speak about the distinguishing personal history and characteristics that I think ultimately are important for this Court to pay attention to, especially as it pertains to disparity in sentencing.

I agree that just the sheer number of these cases right now, that we are starting to see what appear to be inconsistencies, different judges are viewing facts in different ways and that it is hard to make one-to-one comparisons with cases. But, you know, the 3553(a) says that the Court has to consider disparity in sentencing, and the way to do that is learned.

I look at what appear to be similarly situated defendants, whether it's offense conduct or some other factor. And that, you know, my second letter to the Court was really about whether a probationary sentence was necessary because when you look at some of the factual underpinnings of the cases where some individuals got probation, that it's hard to distinguish Mr. Rusyn's from those cases, and that there would be a disparity in sentencing if Mr. Rusyn were not to get probation.

And, you know, conversely, that if the Court were to determine that the offense conduct in the building warranted some more severe imposition of sentence than a probationary sentence, that there is basis here for a warranted disparity at

sentencing, and that those factors, particularly with respect to Mr. Rusyn's devotion to the community, his long history of community service -- I detailed, you know, just coincidentally, this fire that happened on December 12th in Olyphant, Pennsylvania, where Mr. Rusyn was seriously injured in his capacity as a volunteer firefighter, that those kinds of factors that are personal to Mr. Rusyn would outweigh, in comparison to the nature and circumstances of the offense conduct, would, you know, I think, provide a basis for this Court to determine that there's a warranted disparity in sentencing Mr. Rusyn to probation.

And there are other, of course, factors that I presented to the Court; the issue of his employment, the issue of his taking care of his grandmother, who would otherwise be in a nursing home if it were not for his decision to move from his father's house to her home to care for her. And, you know, being, of course, the Court is well aware of what his commitments are to his children.

So, I want, then, to answer this Court's specific questions about his schedule. As I understand it, the current schedule is 7 a.m. to 3 p.m., there is some overtime. I honestly don't know the answer to the question of whether or not that overtime is a schedule that he gets, you know, initially, at the beginning of the week, or if it's a more ad hoc thing, on a day-to-day basis. But it's my understanding

that his standard hours are Monday through Friday from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m., or 7:30 to 3:30, if I'm correct.

And with respect to the children, I believe that he sees them on weekends and one day during the week, as I understand it, although I don't know that that is necessarily a schedule that is set in stone. I think that he would be able to work with the probation department, if he were placed on probation, to set a schedule that was appropriate, especially if the Court accedes to the request to give him 30 days of house arrest, which is the incremental penalty that I have suggested is the more appropriate one, given the particular offense conduct and, you know, perhaps Mr. Rusyn's history of misdemeanor convictions, which might differentiate himself, if I'm candid with the court, to some of these other cases.

But, with that home confinement provision, that would allow him out for purposes of work, that he would be able to work with the probation department to set a set schedule for him to see his children, as well. I don't know if that answers the Court's particular question.

THE COURT: No, I think that's helpful. Is there anything else you wanted to say before I turn to Mr. Rusyn himself?

MS. BERGMAN: I'll just make one last comment about the social media piece of it, because I think it goes not just to the disparity in sentencing, but also to the acceptance of

responsibility. And that's something the government has sort of hammered hard on, about questioning the sincerity of his acceptance of responsibility. And I think that it is pretty good corroborating evidence that he felt very remorseful in the immediate aftermath of the events of January 6th because he did completely disassociate himself from others that he knew, like Ms. Lee, and also completely shut down any activity on his own social media. And that was the only point that I wished to make with respect to that.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rusyn, this is your opportunity, if there's anything you would like to say to me that I should consider before I impose sentence in your case.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, I would like to start by saying I'm sorry. And I apologize and I would like to take this time to express my remorse on this terrible situation. This was not my intentions, but understanding the wrong that I have done, along with the impact that it has on me, but more importantly, my family, my friends, my loved ones. I'm full of regrets and I'm full of shame.

Moving on into the future, I plan to continue to live with my grandmother and being my grandmother's caretaker and provider for all of her needs. I call my daughters every morning to make sure they are up and getting ready for school, along with making the bus on time, making sure that they were doing their homework and studies, making sure they understand

the work to help pick up their grades. Spending as much time as I can with them as possible. Within the few days to come, signing Mikaila and Nadia, my daughters, up for softball and taking on the role of being head coach. This year will be quite the challenge, as they will be in different leagues; high school and youth. Be a provider, making sure they have everything they need, along with transportation, practices, games, pitching and batting lessons through a private instructor.

I plan to further my education for my career with the union pipe fitters, welders program. I have worked very hard to be where I am today. I went through five years of school, apprenticeship, to become a journeyman and I want to continue to climb the ladder to be, some day, a foreman, a general foreman, a superintendent, and be able to run work, along with helping out my community and giving back any way possible. And I have enrolled in counseling classes, which I find help very much, and will continue with counseling.

Thank you for this opportunity, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Rusyn.

I've heard a lot and it's hard to harmonize all of it because the personal qualities point in one direction and the events of the day point in another. And I want to take a few moments to leave the bench and put everything together in my

mind before I tell you what your sentence is going to be. I'm going to ask everybody to just stay connected so we don't lose this well-attended Zoom proceeding that we have right now, where we haven't lost anyone, frozen anyone yet. And I will probably be back in about ten minutes. So thank you very much.

(Recess.)

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, recalling criminal case No. 21-303-01, the *United States of America v. Michael Joseph Rusyn*. The probation officer is Officer Reichler.

Counsel for the government are Mr. Romano and Mr. Pearce.

Counsel for the defendant is Ms. Bergman.

THE COURT: Okay. I couldn't see her before. I wanted to make sure she was here before I went forward.

All right. As I said earlier, there's a statute that tells me what I'm supposed to think about when I sentence someone. It list a number of factors and I'm going to go through each one of them.

The first thing I'm supposed to think about is the nature and circumstances of the offense. What happened? What did you do? On January 6, 2021, you left your home in Pennsylvania to attend the rally for the former President of the United States. There's nothing wrong with that.

Afterwards, you walked to the east side of the U.S. Capitol building. The U.S. Capitol was closed to the public while, in accordance with the Constitution, a joint session of Congress

was convened to certify the vote of the Electoral College in the 2020 presidential election. Vice President Mike Pence, a Republican, was present and presiding, as the Constitution required him to do.

You were in the first waive of people to approach the building and attempt to gain entry through the east rotunda doors, which were unquestionably closed. People began breaking windows to gain entry. You saw this. You didn't walk away. You suggested that you were going along with the crowd, but you had choices. And you could see from the very start that the line had been crossed and it wasn't about listening to speeches anymore.

Officers were unable to disperse the large crowd and ultimately one of the rioters forced the doors open as others engaged in combat with police on the outside and chemical spray was deployed. You were there for the entire seven minutes it took for this to happen. Apparently you were waiting to get in. There is no other explanation.

Eventually people forced the door open. There were officers just inside trying to keep the demonstrators out, and officers outside doing the same thing. The woman traveling with you got inside the partially opened doors first and turned around to take your hand so you could step over the threshold as well.

At approximately 2:27 p.m., according to the

government, you two were among the first 30 to 40 people to enter the building. An officer was knocked to the ground at that very spot just seconds earlier and was still lying there when you walked in. And you didn't just simply step in and then step out either. As the government said, you didn't seem surprised to be there or confused or try to get out. You walked through the rotunda, through the statuary hall and into the small connector leading to the main entrance to the House of Representatives chamber itself. This is exactly where the certification proceeding was taking place.

While you were not one of the members of the group pushing through the connector, shouting threats to the speaker that they were coming for her, you were right up front. You joined in the chants of "We want Trump" and you and Ms. Lee were directly in front of the officers trying to hold the group back. No one is pushing you. No one is making you go anywhere.

There is plenty of video of your literally strolling through the building arm-in-arm with Ms. Lee. It was striking to me how calm you were, notwithstanding your statements that this was all something that was offensive to you.

The members of the unruly group swelled to the point where the police line got overwhelmed and the crowd surged forward into the anteroom immediately outside the chamber door.

Officers were telling everyone to get back. You were in the

middle of this. You're walking forward yourself, you're not pulling back. You don't bail out down a side hallway, you're not listening to the officers.

Police and congressmen of both parties are trying to barricade the door from the other side as members of the crowd urged others to use various means to break it down. This is all to the refrain of "Stop the Steal."

The police were eventually able to get the crowd to leave the immediate area with smoke canisters, but you didn't leave the building then either. You and Ms. Lee wandered into the hallway, back through the rotunda, filming with your cameras. And you're still there at about 3 p.m. And when you get outside, Ms. Lee crows about it, "We F'ing did it. It's our house," while you preserve her remarks in the video you're recording.

In sum, on that day the U.S. Capitol police officers, federal law enforcement officers, doing their job, surrounding the building, were overcome. You were one of the many individuals who made their way illegally into the building and past the officers who were attempting to keep the crowd away from the building. You were one of the individuals who entered the closed building and the certification process was interrupted as members of Congress and the Vice President himself had to struggle to hold the crowd back themselves or were forced to hide.

That was the point of the trip, to disrupt the process. You can say you were only one man and only a minor participant, but it took the force of a crowd, a large number of people to overcome the police, to breach the building. And it couldn't have been accomplished without the power of numbers and without people like you. And the building had to be cleared of the people who had not gone through security before Congress could resume. So the mere fact of remaining inside put the democratic process, the constitutional proceedings that were underway at risk.

One of the recent submissions said something to the effect about being there for 11 minutes. But I think the statement of facts agree that you were there for an hour. And when we talk about disparities, most of the people that I've put on probation at this point were generally people who walked in and walked right out.

It is true, though, and it is also an aspect of the nature and circumstances of this offense that you weren't a person circulating violent rhetoric or whipping up enthusiasm about an attack on Washington beforehand, and you didn't do anything personally destructive once inside. You didn't arm yourself to come here, you didn't dress for war. You didn't break anything, you didn't hurt anyone. And the sentence also should reflect that, too. Although, people who did those things aren't generally getting probation.

However, while you report now that you were horrified then, you didn't say or do anything to demonstrate that you were chastened or shocked by the news reports afterwards, when one can see the defilement and destruction that was left behind and could learn what happened to so many law enforcement officers, and some of the other rioters, as well.

You were interviewed on February 24th, after you'd had more than a month to think about it, and couldn't quite bring yourself to tell the truth. You denied traveling with another person, despite your obvious chumminess on the video. You insisted that what you were doing was disarming other people and turning their weapons over to the police and getting wounded in the process. And maybe you did discourage others or removed weapons from others by turning things over to the police.

You insisted you were swept inside by the force of the crowd; it was not conscious, it was not voluntary, you were just trying to keep yourself from getting trampled. And,
Mr. Rusyn, I just don't think that's what the evidence shows.

Even the sentencing memo was still trying to advance that narrative, that it was, quote, in part, close quote, true. That would not begin to justify the amount of time you spent inside, or where you headed once you got there. Your lack of candor, even after the benefit of time, is a troubling fact.

So I want to make a few things clear. You're

standing before me and a sanction is warranted, in my view, but not for exercising your First Amendment rights. You're not here today because you supported the former President.

Millions of people voted for him and didn't heed his call to descend on the nation's capital. You pled guilty to breaking the law. And you didn't get swept away and it wasn't anybody else's fault. You walked in on your own two feet, filming it for posterity.

You were convicted because you were a participant in an effort to disrupt and undo the electoral process, to interrupt the certification of an election, to subvert democracy -- which is based on the will of the people -- and replace it with the will of the mob. You may very well have sincerely believed at the time the misinformation you'd been receiving from your news sources of choice that the election had been unfair and tainted. But by that time, even the Republican election officials in the challenged states had said, over and over again, and more than 60 judges across the country had found -- including judges appointed by both parties and even some appointed by the President himself -- had said over and over again that there's no evidence behind the claims.

Now, you've told me you've sworn off politics, but that isn't the point. I want to assure you that you did and you still do have an absolute right to support whoever you want to support, to rally for whoever you want to rally, and to vote

for whoever you want to vote for. Acceptance of responsibility in this courthouse does not require you to renounce your allegiance to any candidate or any party, but it does include the notion of accepting the fact that you went too far, that forcing your way into the closed building and trying to force your way into the House chamber itself is not being a tourist, it's not being a part of history, and it doesn't honor that history that you said you were so impressed with when you were at the Capitol before. It's not a political activity. It was an illegal action motivated by an illegal purpose.

The nature and circumstances of the offense aren't the only thing I'm supposed to think about. I'm also supposed to think about the history and characteristics of the defendant. And I have received considerable information that you are a decent and hard-working person, who does a great deal for your family and for your community. You are a volunteer firefighter. You understand exactly what it means to put your own self in danger to serve the public. It requires bravery and it requires character. You've been involved since you were a teenager, and now you've risen to the chief's position, training and managing others, and you risked your own life just the other day to safe a colleague.

You provide much needed assistance so that your elderly grandmother can live in her home and doesn't have to be in a nursing home. You live with her, you cook for her, and

you take her to medical appointments. There aren't many people who would step up in such a committed fashion. You are a devoted father, notwithstanding the strained relationship with the mother of your two daughters.

You struggled academically as a boy and still struggle with that self image. But I want to tell you that the various forms of construction work you've been trained to do are complicated, that take years, as you said, to learn, and not everybody is up to that task either. And firefighting, that's difficult, it requires a knowledge of science and engineering, it requires judgment, it requires management skills and split-second decision making. It's proof that whether a person has a particular sort of learning skills that are suited to a classroom or not, that's not the measure of whether they're smart or not. You are obviously an intelligent and capable person. And I have to take all of that into consideration.

But I have to tell you, it gave me pause because it also points to the conclusion that you, the chief of a firefighting unit, a public safety supervisor, yourself knew exactly what role the officers were performing that day and knew exactly why it was wrong to interfere with them. And that really bothers me. It makes your failure to respect their line more troubling than that of other people.

Also, your history and characteristics include a few

prior criminal convictions; not terribly serious, but this isn't your first brush with the law. When you were 23 you were convicted of being in a building where you weren't supposed to be, recklessly endangering someone else. And it actually continued into your 30s; harassment, violating court orders, issues where the disputes with your ex-wife got out of hand. Blame can't all be laid at one person's feet, but there were some anger issues on your side; an assault, DUI, apparently arising out a bar fight. Again, you've reached the age where you need to know better. And the important role you play in guiding your daughters surely taught you to exercise better judgment than you did on January 6th.

I'm also supposed to impose a sentence that's sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to accomplish a number of purposes set out in the statute. I have to think about the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense.

I'm also supposed to think about a sentence that deters not just you, but other people from doing criminal conduct in the future. I'm supposed to protect the public from further crimes that you might commit and to provide you with the best environment for vocational or educational training or medical care or other treatment. And I'm supposed to think about what your lawyer talked a lot about, avoid unwarranted

disparities, differences among sentences imposed with defendants who had similar records who had been found guilty of doing similar things.

The guidelines are supposed to help with that, but they are of no utility here. Ensuring that this sentence fairly reflects where you fall on the spectrum of individuals arrested in connection with this offense has largely been accomplished by the offer of a misdemeanor plea, which reduced your exposure substantially.

But I also have the benefit of the other information of cases across this court arising out of January 6th. And the majority of the people who have been sentenced so far have also been sentenced to misdemeanors. But I agree with the significant number of judges on this court who have insisted that probation isn't the default option. It doesn't really recognize the seriousness of the offense, it doesn't fulfil the legitimate statutory goals of deterrence and punishment.

You're a father. You've had to teach your daughters lessons. And I think you can understand why the judges in this building have been reluctant to let this searing event in our history pass without real consequences. It's why it's been difficult for me to decide what to do with you.

I also agree with the government that this case doesn't really fall within the very small category of individuals who have received probation, at least from me,

either because of such a brief involvement in the offense or unique postconviction steps that have been taken to acknowledge the wrongfulness of their conduct.

The government recommended 45 days. And while the circumstances it laid out in detail could have supported even more in my view, the -- and in the probation officer's view, I'm not going to consider more than what the government is asking for.

But at the end of the day, as Ms. Bergman mentioned, every defendant who stands before me is an individual and I have to fashion each sentence on an individual basis. And so I've wrestled a great deal with your case. I was fully prepared to impose a short sentence — and I can tell you, it was fully warranted — but I do need to weigh what would be gained in terms of punishment and deterrence against what would be lost — the impact on your efforts to obtain and sustain employment, to serve the public, to care for others. If we weren't dealing with COVID right now, you might be a good candidate for intermittent incarceration, weekends in jail. But, COVID is a real risk, even with — if I tried to sentence you to a community correctional facility.

So I've decided that the lessons that need to be taught can be taught in other ways. But, I want to tell you that if you violate any of the conditions of your probation, I will not hesitate to impose a sanction. There's not going to

be another conversation on this subject.

Therefore, in an exercise of my discretion, after consideration of all the statutory factors, the sentence to be imposed is as follows:

It's the judgment of the Court that you're hereby sentenced to serve a 24-month term of probation. I understand that you're now employed and, in lieu of a period of incarceration, I find it appropriate to order you to pay a fine in the amount of \$2,000, to be paid out on a schedule to be determined by the probation office. You are required to pay a \$10 special assessment. It's immediately due and payable to the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia. If you change your address, within 30 days you have to let the clerk know where you reside until such time as the financial obligation is paid in full.

Pursuant to your plea agreement, you're also ordered to pay \$500 towards the more than \$1.5 million worth of damage that the Capitol sustained that day. I will waive, with respect to both the fine and the restitution, any interest and penalties.

After this hearing -- I believe this is correct -that the probation officer will provide you with instructions
about when and where to report. I will transfer your
supervision to the district in which you live, but I will
retain jurisdiction over this case. I will want to be the one

who is informed if you have any difficulties with the law or with these conditions under my supervision.

While under supervision shall you not possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon, you shall not use or possess an illegal controlled substance, and you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. You must also abide by the conditions of supervision adopted by the U.S. probation office, as well as the following special conditions:

First of all, you are to maintain employment. Second of all, as a condition of your probation you must abide by a curfew for the first 60 days of home detention. During the daytime you may attend work, firefighting duties, your daughters' activities, religious services, medical and therapeutic appointments, and care for your grandmother. But you will be restricted to your residence for the first 60 days, to be monitored by the form of location monitoring designed by the probation office in its discretion at — in the evening, and on the weekends in the evening, on a schedule to be determined by the probation office once they have obtained the verification of your employment and the hours when you have these activities.

Second of all, you must pay the \$500 and the \$2,000 fine, it will be a condition of your probation, at a rate to be determined by the U.S. probation office. You must provide that office with any requested truthful financial information until

such time as the amount has been paid in full. And the probation office may share that information with the U.S. attorney's office.

You must participate in any drug testing, including random drug testing, to determine if you've used a prohibited substance, including marijuana. You must not attempt to obstruct or tamper with the testing methods.

You must participate in and complete an alcohol or substance abuse assessment at the direction of the U.S. probation office and participate in any substance abuse treatment that is indicated at the direction and under the supervision of the probation office.

You must also participate in and complete a mental health assessment at the direction of the probation office and participate in any treatment that's indicated at the direction of and under the supervision of the probation office, which may include continuing with the treatment that you've already begun with your current therapist. You must execute any releases in order to enable the probation office to monitor compliance with this condition.

Probation office shall release the presentence investigation report to any treatment agencies, and they must return it upon the defendant's completion or termination of treatment.

Mr. Rusyn, you have a right to appeal the sentence

imposed by this Court if the period of imprisonment was longer than the statutory maximum or the sentence departed upward from the guidelines — which are not applicable in this case. If you choose to appeal, you must file any appeal within 14 days after the Court enters judgment. And if you are unable to afford the cost of appeal, you may request permission from the Court to file an appeal without cost to you.

Mr. Romano, I believe that there's a motion that needs to be made with respect to dismissing some of the counts.

MR. ROMANO: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. The government moves to dismiss the balance of the charges in this case, which I believe are Counts 1, 2, and 3.

THE COURT: All right. Your motion will be granted.

Ms. Bergman, is there anything else I need to take up on behalf of the defendant at this time?

MS. BERGMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rusyn, as I said, I have a tremendous amount of respect for the things that you've done right and the way you've lived your life in the community and what you're doing for your grandmother. And I want you to keep those ideals in mind as you move forward, and hopefully we won't be discussing violations of conditions in the future and you will continue to be a productive citizen.

It looks like the probation officer -- was there anything you need to say? I was going to, I think, have the

```
1
       two of you stay on so that you can give him instructions about
2
       where and when to report. Is he supposed to contact you after
       this proceeding?
 3
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: That works, Your Honor.
 4
                                                                  I'11
 5
       speak to him for a moment, after.
 6
                 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I'm going to step
 7
       out then and the case will -- Court will stand down and we'll
 8
       close the public line and then the two of you can speak about
 9
       moving forward.
10
                 All right. Thank you very much.
11
                 MR. ROMANO: Your Honor?
12
                 THE COURT: Yes? I'm sorry, Mr. Romano?
13
                 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
14
                 MR. ROMANO: I'm sorry, there was one brief matter.
       Is there an order from the Court on releasing the video
15
16
       exhibits we submitted for sentencing? I know sometimes those
17
       are ordered to be made public following usual proceedings.
18
                 THE COURT: If a motion was made to release them, I
19
       would certainly grant them. I think that would be appropriate,
20
       since it was part of what was shown to me to make my decision.
21
                 Does anybody have any objection to that?
22
                 MS. BERGMAN: No, Your Honor.
23
                 THE COURT: All right, then.
24
                 MR. ROMANO: And the government would certainly have
       no objection to their release.
25
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: All right. Then I would publish them the
2
       same way the others have been published, through the office of
 3
       the U.S. Attorney's office.
 4
                 MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
                 THE COURT: Thank you, everybody.
 6
                 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you again, Your Honor.
7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
2	
3	I, JANICE DICKMAN, do hereby certify that the above and
4	foregoing constitutes a true and accurate transcript of my
5	stenographic notes and is a full, true and complete transcript
6	of the proceedings to the best of my ability.
7	Dated this 25th day of January, 2022
8	
9	
10	
11	Janice E. Dickman, CRR, CMR, CCR Official Court Reporter
12	Room 6523 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
13	Washington, D.C. 20001
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
25	