1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
2	FOR THE DISTRICT (	OF COLUMBIA	
3	United States of America, )	Criminal Action No. 1:21-cr-00388-RC-1	
4	Plaintiff, )	Sentencing (via Zoom)	
5	vs. )	<u> </u>	
6	Vic Williams,	Washington, D.C. February 7, 2022	
7	Defendant. )		
8	Transcript of Sentence	inα (via Zoom)	
9	Held Before  The Honorable Rudolph Contreras (via Zoom)		
10	<del>_</del>	United States District Judge	
11		N C F C	
12		A P P E A R A N C E S  For the Government: Laura E. Hill (via Zoom) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 175 N Street, NE Room 9.1811	
13	(via Zoom) DEPARTMENT		
14		n, D.C. 20002	
15	=	Chip Lewis CHIP B. LEWIS LLC 1207 South Shepherd Drive Houston, Texas 77019	
16	1207 South		
17	Also Present (via Zoom):		
18		Aidee Gavito, U.S. Probation Officer	
19	Stenographic Official Court Report		
20	(via Zoom) Nancy J. N		
21	Certified	Certified Realtime Reporter 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest	
22	Washington	Washington, D.C. 20001 202-354-3118	
23	202 304 3.	<del></del>	
24			
25			

## PROCEEDINGS

(REPORTER'S NOTE: This hearing was held during the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and is subject to the limitations of technology associated with the use of technology, including but not limited to telephone and video signal interference, static, signal interruptions, and other restrictions and limitations associated with remote court reporting via telephone, speakerphone, and/or videoconferencing.)

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Judge, this is Criminal Action 21-388, United States v. Vic Williams.

For the United States, I have Laura E. Hill. For
Vic Williams, I have Chip Lewis. The probation officer today
is Aidee Gavito for Crystal Lustig, and our court reporter
today, again, is Nancy Meyer.

All parties are present.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody. Are we ready to get started?

MS. HILL: Good afternoon.

MR. LEWIS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's start with the colloquy for the -- under the CARES Act for the videoconferencing. The Chief Judge in this district has authorized the use of videoconferencing for sentencings because they cannot be conducted in person without seriously jeopardizing public health and safety. We're prepared to proceed today by videoconferencing if the defendant consents.

Do the parties believe that proceeding today via

```
1
       videoconference rather than waiting until a hearing can be held
2
       in person is in the interests of justice? Mr. Lewis?
 3
                 MR. LEWIS: We do, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: Okay. If you could just make a short
 4
 5
       record as to why it makes sense to go forward today by video
 6
       rather than waiting until we can do it in person when -- who
 7
       knows when.
 8
                 MR. LEWIS: Your Honor, I would take that entreaty
 9
       as -- as to who knows when as a very good reason. Mr. Williams
10
       is very eager to move forward with his life and put this very
11
      poor decision behind him.
12
                 THE COURT: All right. Does -- Ms. Hill, do you have
13
       a contrary view of things?
14
                 MS. HILL: No, Your Honor. We agree with the
15
       defendant.
16
                 THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Williams, I gather
17
       that you're comfortable with the videoconferencing equipment
18
      made available to you?
19
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
20
                 THE COURT: And after having consulted with your
21
       counsel, you agree to participate in today's sentencing hearing
22
      using videoconferencing rather than being physically present in
23
       the courtroom?
24
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
25
                 THE COURT: All right. The Court finds that the use
```

of the VTC is necessary because it is not practical to appear in person. Proceeding by VTC today is justified because the interests of justice will be harmed without a prompt hearing. And the defendant, after consultation with counsel, has consented to proceeding in this fashion.

I normally ask a question as well about whether the parties can talk in private, if necessary, but I'll state for the record that from what I see on the videoconferencing, counsel and defendant are sitting right next to each other so they can clearly discuss something in private, if necessary.

All right. All right. Mr. Williams and defense counsel, have you reviewed the presentence report as revised following the defense and the government's submissions?

MR. LEWIS: We have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any additional objections?

MR. LEWIS: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32(i)(3)(A), the Court will accept the presentence report as its findings of fact on issues not in dispute.

Defendant has pleaded guilty to a Class B misdemeanor to which the sentencing guidelines do not apply. Therefore, I will assess and determine the proper sentence in this case by reference to and in consideration of all the relevant factors pursuant to the sentencing statute found at 18 U.S.C. 3553(a).

Defendant has pled guilty to Count 4, parading, demonstrating, or picketing, in a Capitol Building, in violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G). Defendant has no criminal history. The maximum term of imprisonment for this offense is six months, and the maximum fine is \$5,000.

Would the government like to address the Court regarding sentencing, Ms. Hill?

MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor.

The events of January 6th are -- are unprecedented. A mob attacked the Capitol, causing a delay in the certification of the Electoral College votes; countless injuries, including to law enforcement officers; and about \$1.5 million in property damage.

This broader context of January 6th is important. The riot would not have been successful without its numbers, but I will focus today on Mr. Williams' actions on January 6th and the reason the government is requesting a sentence of 14 days of incarceration, followed by 3 years of probation, 60 hours of community service, and \$500 in restitution.

On January 3rd, leading up to his trip to
Washington, D.C., Mr. Williams posted to Facebook, quote, don't
be fooled that you are not at war and take lightly just what is
at stake. I am going to D.C. tomorrow to voice my concern. If
we do not win this battle, we may need more than our voice to
keep our freedom, close quote. By posting "we may need more

than our voice," Williams acknowledged that violence may be needed and that he may participate in that violence. Also, he posted this message on a public forum; so he's sharing his view that violence may be needed with others on social media.

On January 4th, Williams flew to Washington, D.C., where he met up with a friend. And on January 5th, Williams appeared to have gone to an event with a crowd of President Trump supporters. After attending the event, Williams posted to Facebook about a part of the crowd that, quote, looks like they just rappelled from a helicopter. Williams said of this group, they are pissed and now they realize our freedom is being attacked, and they're ready to fight as they were trained by the same government now trying to steal their freedom. He further states they did not come for violence, but if pushed, violence will ensue and the violence will take it by force.

On January 6th, Williams attended President Trump's

"Stop the Steal" rally. He then walked to the Capitol with his

friend. While he was en route to the Capitol, his friend

received a video showing smoke and violence at the Capitol. In

the video posted to Facebook, Williams described what he saw in

the video as, quote, smoke flying everywhere. They were

fighting them. They were putting smoke on them. Everything.

Trying to get them out of there, close quote.

Instead of deterring Williams, he marched forward to the grounds. To get to the building itself, Williams was required

to climb a wall and scaffolding, and then he entered the building through the Senate wing door and remained inside for about a minute and a half.

After the riot on January 6th -- so the evening of

January 6th -- and on January 7th, Williams posted to Facebook

that he was intending to return to the Capitol on January 7th,

the day after the Capitol riot. He posted, "See you patriots

tomorrow at the Capitol" and "Go stand at the Capitol and be

counted." So not only was he intending to return to the

Capitol, but he was encouraging others on social media to

attend as well.

About a month after that, in February of 2021, Williams was interviewed by the FBI. During that interview, he lied to the FBI. He unequivocally stated that he did not enter the Capitol Building. Williams also appears to have deleted several social media posts about his participation in the events on January 6th. While I don't know the specifics of why Mr. Williams deleted these posts, here's what I do know.

On January 17th, Williams told a third party that his friend received a visit from the FBI. He told that third party, quote, he says I'm next, close quote. Meaning, he would soon receive a visit from the FBI himself. On March 25th, the FBI sent Facebook a preservation letter; on April 20th, a search warrant. Some of the social media posts related to January 6th that the FBI received from tipsters were then not

recovered in the Facebook search warrant return. That includes the 17-minute Facebook live photo -- post -- excuse me -- a photo from the Capitol with the caption, I said I wasn't going in, but then I couldn't help myself, and a selfie in front of the Capitol.

So in thinking of the nature and circumstances of the offense, four aggravating factors affected the government's sentencing recommendation. First, that Williams saw smoke and violence, yet he continued moving forward toward the Capitol and, ultimately, joined the mob that entered the Capitol Building.

Second, his social media posts. He posted on January 3rd and 5th about potential violence on January 6th. He posted on January 6th about his actions on the 6th, and then on the 6th and 7th, he talked about returning to the Capitol on the 7th.

Third, that Williams lied to the FBI. He told the FBI that he was not in the building on January 6th, but he, clearly, was.

Fourth, that he seemingly deleted Facebook posts discussing his involvement in the Capitol riot.

While Williams has no criminal history, he's also shown little remorse for his actions on January 6th. Williams alleges in his sentencing memorandum that he was caught up in the moment and now regrets his decision. But his actions here

speak louder than his words, and his actions contradict his statement of remorse. Williams' actions before and on January 6th show that he acted deliberately. He posted again to social media on January 3rd about using more than his voice. On January 5th, he talked about individuals being prepared for violence. On the 6th, before walking onto Capitol Grounds, he saw smoke and violence at the Capitol. He heard explosions, yet he continued marching forward. He climbed a wall, he climbed scaffolding, ultimately, to enter the building.

And Williams' actions after the riot show his lack of remorse. He posted about returning to the Capitol on the 7th, and he encouraged others to return with him. And over a month after the riot, he lied to the FBI about entering the Capitol. Then he, seemingly, deleted Facebook posts.

So to ensure specific deterrence here, incarceration is warranted.

The last thing I'd like to address is the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities. In the defendant's sentencing memorandum, they point to the case of Sean Cordon as being similar to Mr. Williams' case, but there are major distinctions with Williams' case and Cordon's case. Cordon saw violence before entering, but he was already on Capitol Grounds when he saw that violence. Also, there's no evidence that Cordon posted anything to social media about January 6th, unlike Mr. Williams. Cordon did not talk about violence prior

to January 6th or advocate that anyone return to the Capitol after January 6th.

Also, when interviewed by the FBI, Cordon told the truth. He immediately told the FBI that he had entered the building. And, finally, he was immediately remorseful about his actions. At the time of his arrest and, to my knowledge, the first time he spoke with the FBI, Cordon told the FBI that he knew what he did was wrong. So all of that is contrary to Mr. Williams' case.

Instead, the government would point the Court to the cases that the government outlines in its sentencing memorandum, and I'd be happy to answer questions about those.

But, in conclusion, Williams recognized the possibility for violence on January 6th, and then he saw with his own eyes smoke and violence on the 6th, yet he continued to move forward to join the mob on Capitol Grounds. After the riot, he encouraged others to return with him the next day, and then he explicitly lied to the FBI and, seemingly, deleted Facebook posts related to January 6th.

And so for these reasons, the government recommends a sentence of 14 days in custody, followed by 3 years of probation, and 60 hours of community service.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

As His Honor is acutely aware, we have focused in our papers on the measure of this man. I chose to do so after reviewing -- if not dozens -- hundreds of similar folks and the outcomes of their cases.

Having learned about this Court and the very hard-working nature of this Court, I have no doubt the Court has looked at the contrast of cases, given this Court's track record of making sure there are not disparate sentences with similarly situated fact patterns and defendants. Therefore, I have slated the one case.

But most tellingly, Your Honor, in this regard, my choice to focus on the measure of the man was an easy choice, having gotten to know Mr. Williams. As -- the Court may not be familiar with this, but Ms. Hill and I entered along this course early on about my desire to see Mr. Williams be considered for a diverted sentence in this case, given his remarkable background and what the government has conceded was on the spectrum of the most benign facts of those charged with similar offenses. And I'll emphasize that. The most benign facts.

The Court knows what the spectrum of the hundreds of the defendants in this case looks like, and I have no doubt the Court recognizes where Mr. Williams falls on this spectrum.

Therefore, unless the Court asks me to further contrast the

circumstances factually of his conduct, I will choose to focus on the man with my brief remaining remarks.

As a prosecutor and a defense lawyer going on close to 30 years, Your Honor, I have seen, heard, and done everything possible in the name of the defense of our Constitution. Both as a prosecutor and a defense attorney, I have worked very, very hard to make sure all those constitutional freedoms, all the guarantees that our forefathers shed their blood for, remain sacrosanct.

While I could probably not be further left on the political spectrum -- in fact, I started a grassroots effort to abolish the 22nd Amendment in favor of President Obama -- I have come to know Vic Williams not for his political viewpoints, I've come to know him as a man. And I will tell this Court, without hesitation, as I have defended and prosecuted the most reprehensible of criminals throughout my career, Vic Williams is the furthest thing from a criminal I've ever seen.

His respect for the law, his loyalty, his dedication, and service to not only his country, but those worldwide, as the Court is aware from our sentencing memorandum, is breathtakingly refreshing.

I do not have to agree with the politics of a man to recognize the measure of that man. And there's an old saying that has stood the test of time, Your Honor, and it's because

it could be no more apropos, and that is through our deeds we are known. We're not talking about the deeds of January 4th through 7th. We're talking about almost 50 years on this earth.

And I know the Court has studied our papers and has a very good hold on the measure of this man, what he's done in life, what he's overcome, and his dedication to the fellow man and others. It was remarkable when I read the letters. Like the Court, I've read thousands of letters of support, but rarely have I ever encountered such a quality of letter in the actual substantive comments these folks had to make about this man and his life's work.

THE COURT: If there's a silver lining here, it's that he doesn't have to wait until he's in a casket to hear those things about himself.

MR. LEWIS: That is -- that is very true. We often don't get to hear those things about ourselves. Unfortunately, Mr. Williams' sole lack of good judgment that he's displayed for 50 years has -- has led us to this point where you do hear these things. The last place he wanted to hear it, sitting in front of an honorable jurist seated in the District of Columbia.

As I have gained respect for Vic Williams as a man, I also do not quarrel with his principles. And while I invite the Court to actually watch the entire narration that

```
Mr. Williams posted on his social media, I will highlight even Ms. Hill's words. And there were three words that were very telling: Voice your concerns. It's voice your concerns, narrate -- it's really what he was doing throughout the video. If you watch it, Your Honor, he's narrating what he's seeing and what's going on. You can hear in his voice, you can see in his eyes a sense of disbelief, a bit of awe. I don't think many of the folks like Vic Williams who went to D.C. as a peaceful demonstrator could ever have imagined what was going to unfold because of some very, very reprehensible folks who had much different motives than Vic Williams.
```

And I've enjoined working with Ms. Hill. She's a -- her integrity, her honesty. She's a very good lawyer, but we all understand the DOJ's position here is one of an unfortunate cookie-cutter mechanism. It is very difficult -- and I am very thankful that we have Your Honor to hear this -- in that the cookie-cutter and mixing everybody into this crowd of wrongdoers doesn't fit Vic Williams.

Vic has waited for this day to address His Honor. And without further ado, I'm going to close here and let him do so because I think his words are much more important than mine.

He has --

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you -- before you turn it over --

MR. LEWIS: Yes, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: -- just -- I want to focus in on two 2 issues, and one --3 MR. LEWIS: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: -- is the apparent deletion of the 4 5 electronic evidence, and two is the deception to the FBI during 6 that first interview. Do you have anything to add on those 7 issues? MR. LEWIS: I will defer to Mr. Williams. I would 8 9 add this, Your Honor: Relative to the FBI, the exact quote 10 from discovery is that he said he went to the door and he 11 stopped short. He will address that directly with Your Honor, 12 because that's what I asked him, quite frankly. As -- as a 13 former prosecutor in making an argument such that Ms. Hill 14 made, I would have asked that very question. Well, why didn't 15 you just tell the FBI from the jump? And I will let him 16 address that. 17 As far as the deletion of his Facebook posts, I have 18 the -- I don't know if it's the pleasure, privilege, or what it 19 is, but I have a handful of other January 6th defendants. And 20 in talking to all of them, I have seen a common thread. And I 21 said the privilege or the good luck. All of these folks are 22 charged with similar offenses. There's no violence with any of 23 the defendants that chose to hire me. 24 However, I have seen a common thread that runs through

them of realizing very soon after the events, the despicable

25

events of January 6th, that there was -- and how do I say this in PG terms? There was one of those, oh, shucks moments. This is a lot bigger and a lot more serious than I thought it was.

And in that panic, without consulting counsel, without really thinking it through, many folks decided it would be better not to have any of their discussions about that event online.

I won't speak for Mr. Williams since he's right here and he's very capable of addressing the Court, but I have seen that run through the tenor of several of my own personal clients; the decision that, uh-oh, I've participated in something that's gotten way out of hand. I don't want anything to do with it. I'm going to get rid of any of the chats or my posts or my comments.

And I will close as follows: Over my almost three decades immersed in the criminal justice system,

Your Honor, I've gotten to know a lot of people. And as I said a few minutes ago, I've represented -- I have defended some of the most reprehensible criminals. Vic Williams is about as far from that as I have ever in my life encountered. I've spent a lot of time with him over the last several months. I have met family. I have heard from a number of friends, coworkers, and folks.

And as I see the Court, I know the Court has heard plenty of these cases, has many more on its docket. And while I do not struggle with the Department of Justice's method of

prosecution here, it's an unprecedented behemoth of a task, but this case and this man really cries for a unique set of circumstances, not the broader context that the government wants to paint some folks into, but the specific context of not only his actions --

And one thing I would be remiss if I did not talk about very quickly from a factual standpoint. In that minute and few seconds that Mr. Williams was actually in the Capitol taking a photo, as he goes to leave, without any violence, without incurring any violence, without seeing anything, there is a lady who had gotten knocked down or fallen down. He took the time to help her up. That's the measure of the man that he is.

This isn't a violent man who went to D.C. to further any despicable agendas. He went as a supporter of this country, of the freedoms that we so covet and we so treasure, to see what was going on. And as -- as I referenced, the proof is in the pudding. If you listen to the video that Ms. Hill described, he -- he sounds almost like a lay journalist narrating the events, and the words he used are very important. Voice my concerns. Stand and be counted. Narrating the events.

Therefore, I'm going to defer to the Court. We will answer any questions. I will let Mr. Williams answer the direct questions His Honor has posed, but I respectfully request this Court to fashion an appropriate sentence. And I would submit given this man and the 49 years of his conduct,

```
1
       impeccable, that this Court can fashion a sentence somewhere
2
       between time served and a very benign probation as I referenced
 3
       in our pleadings.
 4
              Mr. Williams does not at all struggle with the
 5
       court-ordered restitution. He is by nature, as the Court
 6
       knows, a community servant. So additional community service is
 7
       in his blood. It's not something the Court has to order, but
 8
       he will gladly discharge anything this Court finds appropriate.
 9
              I thank the Court for the patience. It has been an
10
       absolute pleasure practicing in front of you, and I look
11
       forward to the opportunity someday down the road when we get
12
       on the other side of this to practicing in front of you in
13
       person.
14
              Thank you, Your Honor, and I will now turn to
15
       Mr. Williams.
16
                 THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Williams.
17
                 THE DEFENDANT: If I can use my notes, Your Honor.
18
       Should I answer the questions, first?
19
                 MR. LEWIS: Please.
20
                 THE COURT: If you could -- Mr. Williams, if you
21
       could get a little closer to the microphone because it's a
22
       little bit low.
23
                 THE DEFENDANT: Is that better?
24
                 THE COURT: That is better. Thank you.
25
                 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Yes. Before I kind of go on
```

my notes, I'll answer -- the two questions, sir, the -- what was the first one? About the -- the videos.

MR. LEWIS: The videos. The deletion of the videos.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, there's a couple different stories to that. One of them is my -- my wife, who just, obviously, practiced her whole life more sense than me, immediately on the 6th -- I think on the 6th, and maybe into the 7th -- she was deleting them. And, in fact, on my video when you see me in the deal, you know, she's calling me. "What are you doing? You know, are you at the Capitol?"

"I'm, you know, on the steps." She's just -- and I laugh. And so she deleted some out of just -- she's seen what's going on. We're not seeing --

I know because I've seen the videos since of a lot of crazy stuff that went on, but just the side I went in, we didn't see the violence and, you know, the things that were going on there. So she deleted some of those. Later, yes, sir, exactly right, as Mr. Lewis said, just deleted them out of oh my, you know. Some of it was just talking by then.

But as far as the FBI, they came to my house, I think, in February to pay me a visit. My wife and I invited them in.

I'll just -- I have that part here. We answered truthfully to the questions they asked because they were there almost two hours. It was a very pleasant visit, honestly. They were very respectful. We were respectful. I -- I was honest as far

as telling them I had not heard of Oath Keepers, Proud Boys,

Q some -- a Q movement or group. I had never heard of them in

my life until the 6th.

On the 6th, I did hear of them. Actually, the 5th I heard of one group, and on the 6th I heard of the other two. One of them was just because -- at the Capitol there was a bunch of green smoke, and I'd asked somebody next to me, "What's the green smoke all about?" And in a brief ten minutes, they explained the Q thing. I was -- all that part was new to me.

But when they came back for the arrest -- I think that was May 20th. When they came back for the arrest, I was asked -- oh, and I was asked -- I'm sorry. Excuse me. I was asked if I entered the building when they visited in February. And -- and, I mean, I was scared to death. By the time I answered all those questions, I thought, you know, do I deny this one? Do I not tell them? Do I ask for an attorney? Can I -- what do I do?

I did not want to lie to the FBI, but I sure didn't want to admit to going in the building. I was scared to death. And so I only told them I went to the door. I was misleading, of course, a hundred percent. I -- I was. But I will say when they came back -- they arrested me -- I apologized to Agent Fields. They were -- I know I've heard stories about some of these arrests, but they were very, very courteous,

```
1
       professional, and they were -- the whole time they were.
2
       even allowed my wife to grab extra clothes for me to appear
 3
       before the judge. And I apologized to them for lying to them.
       I had -- there was a lady -- and I can't remember her name --
 4
 5
       and there was Agent Fields.
              And I told them everything. They asked for my phone.
 6
 7
       gave it to them immediately. I told them where my videos were.
 8
                 MR. LEWIS: Passwords.
 9
                 THE DEFENDANT: Passwords on the phone. Everything I
10
       could, I gave to them. And, I mean, in fact, at one point of
11
       talking, they reminded me I had the right to an attorney, but I
12
       had told them everything already except for -- the only thing I
13
       had not been honest with them about was going into the
14
       building.
15
              And so on those two questions, that's where I am, sir.
16
                 MR. LEWIS: Do you have anything else you want to
17
       tell the Court?
18
                 THE DEFENDANT: If I go on, is that all right?
19
                 MR. LEWIS: Sure.
20
                 THE DEFENDANT: Up until that point, you know, I've
21
       always had a great deal of respect for authority. I've never
22
       condoned any kind of violence, any behavior. To the contrary.
23
       My daughters can attest to this. They've had endless speeches
24
       about respecting authority, from elementary school.
25
              Like many others on the 6th, I was confused. There was
```

curiosity. There was a lot of emotions going on. I had every intention to go to a peaceful rally, hear what was going on, even do some sightseeing with my friend at the nation's capital, and then return home. I didn't. I swear I did not have any prior intention to go to the Capitol Building to be a part of any type of riot, violence, or anything else.

I've spent much of my life in service to people. I've worked hard my entire life. I've always been active in church, the community, along with communities around the different parts of the world. I've lived a very fulfilling life. I don't want this one careless act to overshadow decades of service and work, and I do apologize for it. If I could take back the things at the Capitol that day, you know, I, obviously, promise that I would, but that's not possible. So all I can do is apologize to the Court now.

Another person I talked to is -- I had just got a new job at the time of the arrest, very -- the CEO is a NASA engineer. They were all very, very high up in NASA as engineers, and they had invented some very new technology in the field I work in, very sophisticated. They hired me to come on and help them. When I got arrested on May 20th, on May 21st -- because I was going to start June 1st -- I called them all, had a meeting, and I told them the situation. I apologized. I gave them the opportunity -- because some of these had their own money involved in this to make this company

go forward. And I gave them the opportunity to let me go, get rid of me, not hire me. I was just sick. I didn't want to do that to the company, knowing my name was going to be in this.

They kept me on. I'm a hard worker and they knew that.

I -- they kept me on without health benefits. They made me contract. But even then, they gave me enough that I could go get my own insurance, take care of myself. They just wanted to keep me as a contract employee. And I've always been very appreciative of that -- of them for that.

I also appreciate the Court for allowing me to travel for work because I've been able to travel freely. Staying employed, keeping my family afloat, you know, and doing what we need to do, I appreciate it.

All I can do now is apologize to the Court, and I can say that if I -- if I -- if an officer would have just snapped at me, yelled at me, anything, told me to leave, I would have, but that doesn't take the fact that common sense that's ruled me my whole life should not have jumped in and used it to just leave anyway, you know. I went to the rally. It was enough.

Unfortunately, like I keep saying, I can't take that back. I regret it. I apologize to my wife and kids. That was another reason for taking some of the posts down. My kids are both professionals, have their degrees, very good jobs, and they've had to suffer because of my actions. Just, you know, comments and that and some pressure from that.

I've apologized to the FBI agents. Many of the TSA agents, who -- they're already shorthanded, you know -- have to be tied up when I fly. The pretrial service employees I've apologized to. And, again, I apologize to the Court today for all the hours they've had to spend on my case and dealing with this.

Lastly, just in conclusion, my wife and I, we recently moved to our final -- hopefully, our final house. It's the last home. And I -- hopefully, it's our last home. It's in a small, quiet community. We hope to be able to put it behind us, retire one day, enjoy our grandchildren, teach them golf, baseball, and continue the life of service that we've always had.

Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate it.

THE COURT: As I reviewed your background and all the work you've done in Africa and elsewhere, literally the most letters I've ever gotten from any -- maybe any defendant ever, everyone is saying you're the greatest thing since sliced bread. The one piece of the puzzle that didn't make sense to me is did I read that you're estranged from your mother?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. Yes.

THE COURT: Yes? That --

(Indiscernible simultaneous cross-talk.)

THE COURT: You're just a little bit younger than me, that -- you know, every year may be her last. That may be

25 1 something you want to work on. 2 THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All those people think you're great. You've got to make an effort. 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: All right. That has nothing to do with 7 this case, but I -- that was the one piece of the puzzle that 8 just jumped out at me. I couldn't figure that one out. 9 good luck on that. Those -- family's always complicated, but 10 you've got to make an effort as people get older. 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. So we'll start out with the 12 13 financial issues, which is the \$500 for the restitution to be 14 paid to the Clerk to be forwarded to the Architect of the 15 Capitol. That's -- everyone's in agreement on that. 16 The maximum fine is \$5,000. Although probation 17 indicated that he has an ability to pay, noting ownership of 18 several rental properties, I believe only a modest fine is in 19 order to help compensate the government for a portion of its 20 supervision of defendant for the past year and the upcoming 21 year. So I'm going to impose a fine of \$1500. 22 The Court is to impose a sentence sufficient but not

greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set forth in

the subsection, and I'm to consider the nature and

circumstances of the offense and the history and

23

24

25

characteristics of the defendant, impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, and provides just punishment for the offense.

Of course, the offense is serious. A number of my colleagues have spoken eloquently about this. Defendant took part in a mob riot that took place at the Capitol on

January 6th, 2021. Many of the rioters engaged in violence and some destroyed property. I have watched numerous videos of rioters engaging in hand-to-hand combat with police officials. It was not a peaceful event. More than a hundred law enforcement officers were injured on that day; moreover, the Capitol sustained almost \$1.5 million in property damage.

Many of the rioters intended to block the certification of the votes for President Joe Biden, and although the rioters failed to block that certification, they delayed it for several hours. The security breach forced lawmakers to hide inside the House gallery until they could be evacuated to undisclosed locations. In short, the rioters' actions threatened the peaceful transfer of power, a direct attack on our nation's democracy.

With that said, no evidence has been presented that shows defendant assaulting law enforcement or destroying property. After entering the Capitol Building through an entrance at which law enforcement had been overwhelmed a short time beforehand, defendant entered the Capitol Building for

less than two minutes. Although he entered the building through an open door, he scaled the wall and scaffolding to access a higher level of the grounds to get to that door.

The riot was successful in delaying the certification, in large part, because of the larger number of participants, which simply overwhelmed the outnumbered law enforcement officers present. Regardless of his intentions, because defendant contributed to these numbers, he must be held accountable for his actions and the results to which his actions contributed.

The defendant also appears to have deleted some electronic evidence on his social media accounts and, most concerning, lied to the FBI during his first interview. But to his credit, he pleaded guilty at an early juncture and cooperated with the investigation in other respects.

Otherwise, defendant has no criminal history. He's a 49-year-old man with a college degree. He served in the United States Navy Reserves for several months before a severe injury resulted in a medical discharge. He appears to have been gainfully employed for the majority of his adult life, earning a good salary for several years in the oil and gas industry.

However, defendant's upbringing was not ideal. His parents divorced when he was about 7. His father, who abused drugs and alcohol during that time, did not play much of a role

in his life subsequently, either emotionally or financially.

His mother supported him on his -- on her modest wages. When

she remarried to a man with which defendant did not bond, they

both regularly disciplined him using corporal punishment.

On the brighter side, Mr. Williams has been married for 27 years, has 2 adult daughters, 1 grandchild, and another one on the way. He, thus, appears to have a strong family support system in place.

One thing that stands out about the defendant are his charitable activities. He founded a nonprofit organization called the Green Foundation that has engaged in charitable work in several countries, most notably building wells for fresh water and subsidizing education in Kenya. Mr. Williams provides most of the funding for this endeavor. He also owns a craft coffee company with proceeds used to provide high-quality coffee to members of the armed forces. The Court received and read an unusually large number of letters in support of the defendant.

The Court is to impose a sentence that affords adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protects the public from further crimes of the defendant. The events of January 6th involved a rather unprecedented confluence of events spurred by then-President Trump and a number of his prominent allies who bear much of the responsibility of what occurred on that day.

Since his arrest, defendant seems to have done well

while on release status. The Court is confident that given his prior lack of criminal history and a lack of violent past,

Mr. Williams is unlikely to reoffend. He will not be emotionally swept up in irrational actions and will not be a risk to the public.

With respect to general deterrence, the Court does not believe that incarceration is necessary to deter other nonviolent protesters from crossing the line into lawbreaking. The defendant's ordeal through the criminal justice system, fines, restitution, community service, and probation with some level of confinement, should serve as an adequate deterrent to those who can be deterred.

The Court is to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. Nothing has been brought to my attention in this respect.

The Court is to consider the kinds of sentences available. Given the nature of the crime and the defendant's lack of criminal history, the Court is considering a period of probation that contains restrictions and imposes home confinement for a short period of time with some leeway given for the out-of-town travel that his job sometimes requires. Even if the Court were inclined to consider a short term of incarceration, it would not be prudent to impose one given the COVID pandemic.

The Court is to impose a sentence that takes into consideration the kinds of sentence and the sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines, but the Court is cognizant that the guidelines don't apply here. And no pertinent policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission have been brought to my attention.

The Court is to impose a sentence that avoids unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct. The problem with this case is that there are a number of judges deciding literally hundreds of cases. So one could probably point to any single case to support their argument. But the government has provided a chart that lists a number of January 6th defendant sentencings. There's not enough granular information in that chart to make apt comparisons. However, the list does make it clear that the government has recommended noncustodial home confinement probation sentences in a number of these cases. And the Court finds it hard to distinguish this case from those.

We already dealt with the restitution of \$500 for the Architect of the Capitol.

I will now indicate the sentence to be imposed, but counsel will have one opportunity to make any legal objection before the sentence is actually imposed.

Mr. Lewis, do you have any objections to any of the factors I'm considering?

MR. LEWIS: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Hill?

MS. HILL: No, none, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It is the judgment of the Court that you, Vic Williams, are hereby sentenced to serve a 12-month term of probation on Count 4. This term of probation shall include a 2-month term of home confinement, location monitoring with flexibility to allow out-of-town work travel with preapproval from the probation office.

You're further ordered to pay a special assessment of \$10, as per statute, and a fine of \$1500 as to Count 4. You are ordered to make the restitution to the Architect of the Capitol in the amount of \$500. And these financial obligations in the aggregate are to be paid at a rate of \$170 per month. The special assessment and fine are payable to the Clerk of the Court. Within 30 days of any change of address, you shall notify the Clerk of the Court of the change until such time as financial obligations are paid in full.

While on supervision, you shall not use or possess an illegal controlled substance; and you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended based on the Court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse.

You shall also abide by the general conditions of supervision adopted by the U.S. Probation Office, which will be set forth in the judgment and commitment order, as well as the following special conditions: As I indicated, the location monitoring to monitor the home confinement, which will either be radiofrequency or GPS, depending on what the probation office there uses, and will last for the amount -- the period of time for the home confinement.

There's also, because of the financial requirements, a

There's also, because of the financial requirements, a financial information disclosure requirement that you need to provide probation with financial information; but if you pay everything up-front, that may be unnecessary.

And then community service. You must complete 60 hours of community service within 6 months, which, as Mr. Lewis indicated, is in your nature anyway.

Counsel, any reason other than those previously stated and argued why the sentence should not be imposed as just stated?

MR. LEWIS: None, Your Honor.

MS. HILL: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The sentence is as stated.

I gather, Ms. Hill, that there's a -- he pleaded to Count 4 of the information. So Counts 1, 2, and 3 need to be dismissed; is that right?

MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor. I so move.

THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry, Judge. We couldn't hear your last sentence.

THE COURT: I'll go ahead and dismiss those: Counts 1, 2, and 3.

All right. Mr. Williams, you were convicted by a plea of guilty. You can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow involuntary or if there's some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that was not waived by your guilty plea, although I note that your guilty plea did have a pretty substantial waiver of appellate rights and collateral attack rights. But if you're inclined to appeal, discuss it with your very able counsel.

You may also have a statutory right to appeal under certain circumstances, and you can consult with your counsel about those as well. If you decide to appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. That means without the payment of costs. And if you request and qualify, the Clerk of the Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf, although I note that you're represented by very able counsel who can assist you in that process.

But, most importantly, with very few exceptions, any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the entry of the judgment. It's going to take a couple days to get that judgment entered on the docket, and then it's 14 days after

```
1
       that.
2
              Probation has asked me that I transfer jurisdiction of
       the supervision to the Eastern District of Arkansas. Does --
 3
 4
       Mr. Lewis, do you have any objection to that?
 5
                 MR. LEWIS: None whatsoever, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Hill?
 6
 7
                 MS. HILL: No objection, Your Honor.
 8
                 THE COURT: Okay. As soon as probation gives me the
 9
       paperwork for that transfer, I'll go ahead and enter that on
10
       the docket as well.
11
              Anything else we need to cover today, Mr. Lewis?
12
                 MR. LEWIS: No, Your Honor.
13
                 THE COURT: Ms. Hill?
14
                 MS. HILL: Not from the government, Your Honor.
15
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Williams, good luck to
16
       you, sir. I hope you continue the good works you've done in
17
       the past and that this is just a blip in an otherwise
       commendable life.
18
19
                 THE DEFENDANT: I appreciate it, Your Honor.
20
                 THE COURT: All right. Good luck. You're excused.
21
                 (Proceedings were concluded at 2:48 p.m.)
22
23
24
25
```

## CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER I, Nancy J. Meyer, Registered Diplomate Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and accurate transcript of my stenograph notes and is a full, true, and complete transcript of the proceedings to the best of my ability. Dated this 3rd day of April, 2022. /s/ Nancy J. Meyer Nancy J. Meyer Official Court Reporter Registered Diplomate Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter 333 Constitution Avenue Northwest Washington, D.C. 20001