_	
1	BEFORE THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	. Case Number 21-cr-201 Plaintiff, .
5	vs.
6	ZACHARY HAYES MARTIN, .
7	MICHAEL AARON QUICK, . STEPHEN BRIAN QUICK, .
8	KARI KELLEY, . March 17, 2022 . 11:09 a.m.
9	Defendants
10	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE DABNEY L. FRIEDRICH
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12	APPEARANCES:
13	For the United States: JACK KORBA, AUSA
14	United States Attorney's Office 601 D Street Northwest Washington, D.C. 20579
15	For Defendants Martin,
16	M. Quick, and S. Quick: JOSEPH PASSANISE, ESQ. Wampler & Passanise
17	2974 East Battlefield Road Springfield, Missouri 65804
18	
19	Federal Public Defender's Office
20	625 Indiana Avenue Northwest Washington, D.C. 20004
21	Official Court Reporter: SARA A. WICK, RPR, CRR
22	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
23	333 Constitution Avenue Northwest Room 4704-B
24	Washington, D.C. 20001 202-354-3284
25	Proceedings recorded by stenotype shorthand. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (All participants present via video conference.) 3 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, we are in Criminal Action 21-201, the United States of America versus Zachary 4 5 Martin, Michael Quick, Stephen Quick, and Kari Kelley. 6 If I can have the parties identify themselves for the 7 record, beginning with the United States. 8 MR. KORBA: Good morning, Your Honor. Jack Korba on 9 behalf of the United States, standing in for AUSA Brenda 10 Johnson. 11 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Korba. 12 MS. JACOB: Good morning, Your Honor. Maria Jacob 13 appearing on behalf of Ms. Kelley, who is present via video. 14 THE COURT: Good morning to you both. 15 MR. PASSANISE: Joseph Passanise, counsel for Zach 16 Martin and Stephen and Michael Quick. 17 THE COURT: All right. Good morning, all. You are 18 all there in the same room? 19 MR. PASSANISE: We are, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: And I see we have a probation officer on 21 the line as well? 22 PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning. 23 Aidee Gavito as to all defendants in this case for Probation. 24 THE COURT: Thank you, all. 25 So this is -- the pleas in this case were to a petty

offense, a class B misdemeanor. So I don't need to make a CARES 1 2 Act finding in order to do the sentencing by video. Even so, I 3 do want to make sure with respect to each defendant that they do 4 want to appear by video conference rather than wait to do the 5 sentencing in person in the courtroom. 6 So let me start with -- I think the first defendant in this 7 case is Mr. Martin. Is it your desire to appear for sentencing 8 by video rather than do this in the future in the courtroom? 9 Yes, Your Honor. DEFENDANT MARTIN: 10 THE COURT: All right. You understand you have the 11 right to be sentenced in the courtroom? 12 DEFENDANT MARTIN: Yes, I do. 13 THE COURT: All right. How about Michael Quick? 14 you also understand that? 15 DEFENDANT M. QUICK: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And Stephen Quick? 17 DEFENDANT S. QUICK: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: And Ms. Kelley? 19 DEFENDANT KELLEY: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. I'm also going to ask all four 21 defendants in order again whether you've had adequate time to 22 review the presentence reports and recommendations in this case 23 and had an opportunity to correct any errors in the report, 24 along with your attorney.

Mr. Martin, is that the case? You have had a chance to

25

```
1
      review the PSR and recommendation and make any objections?
 2
                DEFENDANT MARTIN: Yes, I have, Your Honor.
 3
                THE COURT: All right. Mr. Michael Quick?
 4
                DEFENDANT M. QUICK: Yes, I have, Your Honor.
 5
                THE COURT: All right. Stephen Quick?
 6
                DEFENDANT S. QUICK: Yes, Your Honor.
7
                THE COURT: And Ms. Kelley?
 8
                DEFENDANT KELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
 9
                           Sorry, Ms. Kelley. I didn't hear you.
                THE COURT:
                DEFENDANT KELLEY: Yes, Your Honor.
10
11
                THE COURT: All right. And then I will ask
12
      Mr. Passanise, if you can just confirm, I know there are some
13
      unresolved objections we will address in just a minute.
14
      aside from those that are noted in the addendums to the
15
      presentence report, are there any remaining factual inaccuracies
16
      or objections that the Court needs to address, Mr. Passanise?
17
                MR. PASSANISE: No, Your Honor.
18
                           Okay. And Ms. Jacob?
                THE COURT:
19
                MS. JACOB: No, Your Honor.
20
                THE COURT: Okay. Let me just go through for
21
      Mr. Martin and Mr. Quick, both Quicks, the PSRs, I see there are
22
      some unresolved objections.
23
           Before I do that, Ms. Jacob, let me just confirm with you,
24
      there are none for Ms. Kelley; correct?
25
                MS. JACOB: Correct, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Passanise -- sorry. I'm going to say your name incorrectly probably all day -- with respect to Mr. Martin, the first objection that you raised has been resolved by Probation. There's this objection that you have made for all three defendants with regard to the information that I believe relates to the January 6 events as a whole, is that correct, the offense conduct listed in paragraphs 14 to 20 of the PSR? That's what you're objecting to?

MR. PASSANISE: Yes, Your Honor. I will waive the purpose of my objections. I was -- my context was that I understand that the government was bringing those paragraphs in to set the stage for the background, while that behavior was not directly related to my three clients. So I will waive the objection, and we can address anything in allocution.

THE COURT: All right. And I was inclined to overrule the objection anyway. I'm not relying on that to sentence these defendants. It just provides helpful context. Obviously, they were a part of a large mob, and to that extent, I think it's relevant and necessary context. But I'm not, and nor do I think the government is attempting to hold them accountable for assault and property damage of others other than to say they were a part of a large mob that made the officers' jobs more difficult that day.

With respect to Mister -- it's hard to keep all these PSRs correct. Let me start with Michael Quick. So you had the same

objection which you're withdrawing here, but then you also have this objection with regard to Michael Quick, paragraph 64.

And I'm just wondering, for the probation officer, why not include this additional job information if this is, in fact, true? I guess if you say that he's been employed, but it appears that there's an additional job he's done. Is there any objection from Probation's standpoint to include this information, or is there a question as to whether it's accurate?

PROBATION OFFICER: There is no objection, Your Honor.

We -- yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Unless you have reason to think it's not true, I think it's appropriate to add that.

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. We can make --

THE COURT: Okay. You can make that --

PROBATION OFFICER: We can make that --

THE COURT: Okay. And then with regard to paragraph 68, Mr. Passanise, is this an issue really? It's pretty --

MR. PASSANISE: No, Your Honor. I was just trying to give accurate information to Probation.

THE COURT: All right. That one to me did not seem to be that material, but if you think otherwise, let me know.

MR. PASSANISE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With regard to Stephen Quick, however, there is this objection to the criminal history which I want to make sure I understand. Is your objection that this incident

never occurred or that he was never charged?

MR. PASSANISE: Never charged, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm -- if he's not objecting to the incident and suggesting this is a different Stephen Quick, I'm inclined to credit what's in here. The records do reflect that he was charged. If I'm remembering correctly, he wasn't convicted but just charged; is that right?

MR. PASSANISE: He had a friend that was charged with it, Your Honor. He wasn't charged with it. But I understand -- I think in the scheme of things, it was just trying to put context to it.

THE COURT: Well, again, if you're telling me that he didn't -- this incident never occurred, then I would be inclined to strike it from the report, but if it did occur -- at least according to the sheriff's office records, there is some indication that he was released and ordered to pay a fine.

Given that that's the official records, I'm inclined to leave it in here. Of course, the guidelines don't apply here, but it is, I think, relevant to his criminal history. So I'm not going to ask Probation to remove that.

All right. Have we covered everything in terms of the PSRs such that counsel for any defendant has no objection to me accepting the presentence reports as my findings of fact under Rule 32? Mr. Passanise?

MR. PASSANISE: Correct.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. PASSANISE: That's correct, Your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know why, sometimes the microphone's not quite picking you up sometimes.

And Ms. Jacob?

MS. JACOB: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So again, I will accept the PSRs as my findings of fact under Rule 32.

Under 1B1.9 of the guidelines, the guidelines don't apply because it's a petty offense. So I will apply the 3553(a) factors in deciding the appropriate sentence.

Let me start with Mr. Korba. Mr. Korba, I know that you're standing in for the AUSA here. So I appreciate that you may not be as intimately familiar with this case as she might have been, but you can see, she filed lengthy sentencing memoranda in this case. I don't know to what extent you're familiar -- I don't think I've had you in any of my cases, but you're familiar with the sentences I've imposed in similar cases.

But I certainly appreciate that the government is trying hard to be consistent in these cases and making consistent sentencing recommendations. The judges, too, are trying to be hard in -- I mean trying to do their best to impose consistent sentences in like cases.

And if you've reviewed the sentences I've imposed in cases like the instant one where there's no evidence of preplanning

that I'm aware of or the government's brought to my attention, there's no evidence of any assault, any, for that matter, encounters with law enforcement, any evidence of property disruption, or really any aggravating factors that I see -- I know there's some social media postings, and I know that a couple of the defendants appeared to sort of minimize their conduct a bit in interviews with law enforcement. But as I read those interviews, they did admit the offense, and whether they went in the window or the door is not that material here, given that they've basically accepted responsibility. I'm not inclined to view that as such an aggravating factor that I would impose something other than a probationary sentence.

And just so the government understands where I'm coming from -- I haven't had you, again, in these cases. But I really feel that for deterrence purposes and rehabilitation purposes, a sentence of -- that imposes a period of supervision by the Court is more important than a very short amount of time in prison.

And I do -- I've reviewed Judge Lamberth's opinion. I disagree with his reading of those statutes, and I've explained it at length in other cases. For now, I will just simply say that I disagree with his reading of the language in this relevant statute, the same or different offense language. I don't read it the same way he does.

And I do think that for Congress to abandon the basic rule that applies in every other instance of the Court being able to

impose either probation or a sentence of imprisonment with supervised release, I think it would have spoken more clearly.

So I disagree with his ruling, and I don't think I can do both. And given that I can't do both, I'm inclined to impose in these sorts of cases where there are not aggravating circumstances a sentence of probation.

So again, I recognize where the government's coming from. I've just had enough of these cases now, probably ten or so, where I've rejected calls for short terms of imprisonment and instead imposed longer terms of probation because I think supervision better furthers the goals of sentencing in these cases where there are not aggravating factors.

Mr. Korba, I gave you all of that context so that you know where I'm coming from. And I've reviewed the government's sentencing memorandum at length. So not to totally preempt you, but it's -- you've lost that battle in other cases. So right now, we're really looking at what are the appropriate conditions for each of these defendants.

MR. KORBA: Thank you, Your Honor, and I do appreciate Your Honor realizing I'm standing in. However, I have read and digested all of the materials, as well as other cases in which Your Honor, I believe, has sentenced similarly situated defendants, as well as other judges. So if Your Honor has any particular questions, I'm more than happy to attempt to answer them.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me, I saw that the government, you know, drew distinctions from -- with regard to the various defendants here. And I know that some of that stems from conduct while on pretrial release, I would guess some of it from the minimization of conduct and statements to law enforcement.

But help me understand how you're drawing these distinctions, and are they ones that really warrant either a longer term of probation for some defendants or, I think, greater conditions certainly with respect to some defendants. So I'm interested in your perspective on that.

MR. KORBA: Yes, Your Honor, I do have some points on these particular defendants. Does Your Honor have a preference which defendant I start with?

THE COURT: No, it doesn't matter.

MR. KORBA: So I will start with defendant Kari Kelley, Your Honor.

So I did read the defense sentencing memo as well, and I think one of the aggravating factors the government would point to in Ms. Kelley's situation is, number 1, she was the first of her group to enter the Capitol through the broken window and in the sentencing memo still does appear to try to minimize the behavior enticing or encouraging her co-defendants to come into the building with her.

Her explanation is just simply not plausible, in the government's view, as she claims that she lost her co-defendants

in the masses and was trying to reunite with them. Your Honor, it just defies logic that someone would try to enter a broken window in the U.S. Capitol, engage and enter the eye of the storm essentially in order to try to reunite with your lost group members. A much more plausible explanation is to distance yourself from that crowd and try to reunite with your companions away from where the large crowd is. So I just don't think that explanation is reasonable and true, quite frankly.

And so just comparing that with the sentencing memorandum filed on behalf of her co-defendants, that explanation is inherently inconsistent with her co-defendants as well, who indicate that their rendezvous point was supposed to be one of the monuments, which clearly Ms. Kelley didn't go to, the rendezvous point, according to the other co-defendants. She went to, like I said, the eye of the storm and tried to motion her co-defendants in.

So I do believe that act of encouragement does sever her apart from the other co-defendants in this particular situation such that I understand Your Honor's ruling and view of Judge Lamberth's opinion and Your Honor's restrictions here with regard to sentencing, but I would argue that at least some period of home confinement or home detention is warranted.

Your Honor, I would just point out as well, while the defense does make a point and the government is sympathetic to the defendant's health concerns that were outlined, however,

it's just frankly perplexing and worrisome that knowing she has a compromised health immune system she would enter a defined building with hoards of other people in close proximity. It just, I think, speaks to the defendant's poor judgment as well.

And Your Honor, that is further exacerbated by, I think, what is already spelled out in the government's memorandum by the defendant testing positive for illicit substances while on pretrial release in this case, which is quite concerning to the government.

So I understand the defendant has offered a generic apology letter, but to set her apart from, for instance, her co-defendant Stephen Quick, the government doesn't see any true example of -- examples of true specific introspection about the day of that event, just really more of a generic apology, but still attempts to try to minimize her behavior and justify her actions in enticing her other co-defendants to enter.

So based upon those reasons, Your Honor, the government does believe that Ms. Kelley stands apart and should be sentenced to at least some period of home confinement.

THE COURT: Okay. Maybe it makes sense, Ms. Jacob, to have -- unless you have more to add, Mr. Korba, about

Ms. Kelley, maybe it makes sense to hear from you, Ms. Jacob, in response to what Mr. Korba has said.

But anything aside from the evidence clearly showing

Ms. Kelley entering the Capitol first, is there anything more

than that that distinguishes her in terms of the offense itself, the way in which it was completed?

I mean, she walked around like the other three; right? She didn't do -- she didn't engage with law enforcement. She didn't do any property damage. She didn't prepare for the offense.

You have no evidence that she came to D.C. intending to go in the Capitol?

MR. KORBA: That's correct, Your Honor. The only factual evidence to distinguish them is the act of encouraging the other three to come into the building with her.

THE COURT: Okay. And in terms of conditions of probation, aside from the government thinking that the Court should impose a period of home detention or home confinement in terms of -- one condition I'm considering for several defendants is a mental health assessment and treatment, if necessary, in Ms. Kelley's case substance abuse treatment and testing.

I know the government has also suggested community service, which I think -- I think that was a part of your recommendation.

Am I right about that?

MR. KORBA: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I have imposed it in a number of cases.

I'm always concerned, though, I want the priority to be a job

and treatment where needed and don't ever want the community

service to get in the way of those two things. But that's your

position, I should impose community service.

What about a fine with regard to Ms. Kelley? It does seem like she does not have the ability to pay a fine.

MR. KORBA: I think given the fact that there's an agreement on restitution, Your Honor, I don't think a fine is necessary.

But I would agree with Your Honor about the substance abuse assessment and treatment if deemed necessary. I did read in the latest filed pretrial report that I believe her probation in her other matter is terminated. So I think initial substance abuse treatment in this case would be appropriate given the lack of pretrial compliance.

THE COURT: And Mr. Korba, I'm wondering whether you agree with me, and I want to hear from Ms. Jacob, too, but it does seem like Ms. Kelley had a really critical period in which she was really struggling and appears from her performance in the other case in Alabama that she successfully completed all of that Court's requirements, which is a good sign, I think, for her compliance on probation with this Court.

Do you disagree with that?

MR. KORBA: No, Your Honor, I would agree with the Court's assessment. Given her compliance on the last period since her noncompliance in this case, it would bode well.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Jacob, let me hear first from you. I do have some concerns with Ms. Kelley's, you know, lack of full candor in her interview with the FBI. I know

that you suggested that might be misconstrued by them, but, you know, there are a number of different ways that she seemed to attempt to minimize her conduct, one being a suggestion that the FBI deactivated her Facebook account. That doesn't seem credible to me, nor does that she didn't enter first.

As I said, she did accept responsibility for at least the elements of the offense, and she seems to have admitted what she did. And so I'm crediting that, but it is a little troubling that she wasn't fully forthcoming with them, and the evidence conflicts with the statements that the FBI said she gave to them.

MS. JACOB: Yes, Your Honor. So I will focus first on addressing the Court's concerns about that.

I actually inquired to the government whether or not there was an audio recording of that interview, because after talking to Ms. Kelley it just seemed like something was off about the context. And thankfully, the government did provide that audio recording after I filed my sentencing memorandum.

And so now after listening to that audio recording, I do see the context, and I do think that Ms. Kelley, you know, since that interview, from the time of that interview until now, she's realized even -- she's realized kind of the gravity of what happened on that date even more.

But I do think that the summary, the written report the government relied on to say that she wasn't forthcoming or

minimized her conduct is taken a little out of context.

THE COURT: Wait. I don't want the public to hear about the tape.

MS. JACOB: Right. And I will explain that, Your
Honor. I just want to say that's me as her counsel saying that.
That's not Ms. Kelley saying it. I just want to make that
clear, because the --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

THE COURT: -- I want your best argument.

MS. JACOB: So the context was that she never -- Your Honor, she did discuss losing the group. That was a lot of the interview, that basically she lost them for several hours. She did not mean to -- or I should say, I did not mean to suggest in my memorandum that she only found them, was only reunited at the steps, you know, at the entrance of the Capitol building. No, she was reunited with them on the grounds, and they were -- what Ms. Kelley explained to the FBI is that they were all, the group was all amongst a large, large crowd moving towards the entrance together.

And so when she -- she explained to the FBI that when she was on -- when she, you know, was closer to the entrance, she definitely wanted to -- she did want to reunite with them, but that was not said in response to why did you go in the building. So she never said to the FBI, oh, they were in the building first, and that's why I followed. No. I mean, it was -- the

conversation didn't go like that. Instead, she said --

THE COURT: Okay. What about the deactivating of the Facebook account? Does she admit that she did that?

MS. JACOB: In the audio recording, no, Your Honor, but that wasn't really -- it wasn't really discussed in detail. And I don't have anything particularly helpful to offer the Court except for the fact that, you know, regardless of whether the FBI did it or she did it, that's one of her mitigating points, is that she really was not -- you know, she distanced herself from January 6 and the events. She didn't send people messages. She didn't get on other platforms, social media platforms and express some of the views that some of the other Capitol defendants have been expressing. I do think that's actually a mitigating factor.

THE COURT: Okay. And I know she had a really rough period of time with her own diagnosis and losing her dad and being a single mom, and there were a lot of demands on her, I think at one point even taking care of her own mom; is that right?

MS. JACOB: That's right, Your Honor. And I think that that's -- that's what all culminated to a certain point during her pretrial release, and that all led to the drug use, which she had never been a drug user. I mean, that was a completely isolated time period for her. Losing her father, I mean, her father was everything to her. He took care of her and

her son, you know. She relied on him. He raised her primarily, along with her stepmother. And so losing him a few years ago was absolutely devastating to her. On top of that, Your Honor, she had a diagnosis of cancer and endometriosis.

Dealing with all of that while raising a son, while being a primary care-giver of her 11-year-old son while working what can be sometimes a very busy job put a lot of stress on Ms. Kelley. And I think that, you know, that's what led to her arrest in her prior offense and that's what led to her drug use. It was very short lived, and she spent five days in jail for that, and she snapped out of her feelings of, you know -- she kind of lost sort of motivation to continue at some point. She's overcome that, and she has -- what's unique about Ms. Kelley and why I think that a lengthier period of supervision is actually not necessary is that she's already gone through a strict condition. She did Narcotics Anonymous classes every day for -- I want to say it was a few months. And she tested negative -- ever since September, she's been testing negative.

So she's done everything that's asked of her in that case, and she successfully completed supervision. So she's already shown that she's overcome that period of her life and that she's stable. And so I think that goes in her favor. I don't think a lengthy period of supervision is necessary or a period of home detention. I don't think she's shown that she is any further danger to the community, you know. She's not a danger to the

community. She's shown that she's distanced herself entirely from her conduct.

Your Honor, she is remorseful for what happened. The government, you know -- I know that the government pointed out concerns that she was sort of minimizing her conduct. But, you know, I didn't get that when I listened to the audio recording. I think that she was explaining -- she was answering the questions honestly, and she sat down with the FBI. And I know that it was after her plea agreement and so was a part of her plea agreement, but if she had not been remorseful, she wouldn't have done that. And she answered all their questions.

And she wrote a sincere letter to the Court. I disagree with the government that it's a generic letter. I think it took her a long time to write, and I think it had a lot of sincere words. And, you know, she's going to address the Court today as well.

I don't see -- I don't see the -- you know, the government is trying to paint her as being not remorseful. And besides, you know, her interview, I just don't -- I just don't see how from her interview until now she hasn't been remorseful. She's accepted responsibility. She's pled guilty. She's been compliant with Pretrial. She hasn't gone on social media to express any different views.

And Your Honor, I just -- I think that the likelihood of recidivism in this case is just extremely low, given what I've

just explained.

THE COURT: Ms. Jacob, let me hear from you on the conditions. I'm inclined to agree with you on home detention. I'm not inclined to agree with you on the length of probation. I think it's in her interest to be on probation. And as you know, if she's complying with probation in the beginning, the amount of contact she's going to need to have with them will be reduced over time if she's performing well.

So my real concern with her is this, even if aberrant, nonetheless worrisome period with the abuse of alcohol and drugs, and there is some family history there. So I would like you to talk about the conditions that Probation is recommending as conditions of release, namely the substance abuse treatment and testing.

I take it you don't disagree with that?

MS. JACOB: Your Honor, I don't disagree with that, although, you know, I would note that I think that, you know, she has already been through that. But I think she would agree with the Court that, of course, if the Court thinks that that's appropriate, then she's more than willing to do so.

I guess I would just suggest that -- I think she's -- the NA classes, I think, she's been attending by Zoom. And so if that can be the treatment rather than her having --

THE COURT: I think that's something she works through with Probation, but my understanding is that they're -- correct

me if I'm wrong, Probation, but that they want to make this easy.

And tell me what she's envisioning in terms of employment.

How is she able to -- I know she has a part-time job now. Is

that something that she's hoping to ramp up and become more

full-time? What are her plans in that regard?

MS. JACOB: Your Honor, the way that Ms. Kelley described her job to me was that sometimes it can be part-time and sometimes it can be really busy and be full-time. It's just as an insurance adjuster, I think it depends on what natural disasters and calamities are occurring. And so sometimes it's slow, but sometimes it's really busy. So I think that's just entirely dependent on circumstances, but as far as I know, that is her plan, to continue with her current employment.

THE COURT: But given her negative monthly income, is she living off of inheritance? How is she staying afloat?

MS. JACOB: Your Honor, she -- I guess the negative monthly income, she had to kind of average it out, because some months -- the months that are busy she'll make more, and the months that are slow, you know, it will be a big hit to her income. And so --

THE COURT: Even so, that's problematic over the long run. So what is her cushion, if any? Does she have one?

MS. JACOB: Your Honor, I don't know the answer to the Court's question in that regard. Perhaps I can turn to --

Ms. Kelley can address that in her statement to the Court, but I'm not sure if she has an additional cushion.

THE COURT: Because that's an obvious stressor with a child and paying the bills. It does give me concern that the pressure she felt before that led to this conduct could still be there if she can't pay her bills.

MS. JACOB: Right. I understand that, Your Honor.

And after -- I've had conversations with Ms. Kelley, and the way that she explained it to me is that she's able to make it work.

Obviously, it's tight, but she's been able to make it work being an insurance adjuster, and she really does rely on kind of those busy months to make her overall yearly income work.

THE COURT: Okay. So I misspoke. It's a negative total net worth but not a negative monthly income. Okay. No, it is a negative monthly cash flow.

All right. Is there anything, Mr. Korba, just with respect to Ms. Kelley you would like to add?

MR. KORBA: No, Your Honor. I think Your Honor has covered it all.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Given that we focused first on Ms. Kelley, Ms. Kelley, I didn't intend for you to start first, but given that we've been talking about you, I think if you would like to make a statement, now would be a good time to do so. You don't have to, but this is your opportunity to address me before I impose sentence if you would like to do

so.

DEFENDANT KELLEY: I do want to say that I am truly sorry, and I have been carrying the weight on my shoulders this past year on what has took place. And I've felt so much guilt this past year on what I did that I really have been putting myself into a position to where there's not enough weight that anybody else can put on my shoulders but myself, because I really have felt so remorseful and so, you know, sorry for what I've done that I can't express it enough.

So that's why I have distanced myself and I have cut myself off from the outside world and media, because I don't want to be a part of it. I just -- I don't know.

THE COURT: Ms. Kelley, you've been through a lot in the last few years, and for those reasons, I'm inclined to impose as a condition a mental health assessment and treatment as needed. Is that something you're receptive to? It seems like you're carrying a big burden, and there's financial concerns, and all of that could be helpful.

DEFENDANT KELLEY: I am receptive to it. However, I do have a 401(k) that I am able to fall back on financially. So I am able to take care of my son. It has been a heavy burden, but that's what's made me stronger. And I am happy. I am a whole person. And I am willing to take responsibility for what I've done and carry that load. And that's why I said that I am truly remorseful, because I have carried that load from day 1

after I realized that what I had done was wrong. 1 2 I don't feel like I'm mentally incapable or that --3 THE COURT: I'm not suggesting that at all. It's just 4 it's a lot when you have this many major life events come all at 5 once. 6 DEFENDANT KELLEY: It is. THE COURT: Sometimes some support is useful just in 7 8 getting through a rocky period. 9 DEFENDANT KELLEY: And I'm actually handling that on With talking with family and talking with neutral 10 11 parties, I am actually addressing that on my own. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I appreciate your 13 remarks, and I do believe that you're genuinely remorseful. 14 I'm kind of inclined, so Ms. Kelley and Ms. Jacob, you 15 don't have to sit through the rest of the sentencing hearing, to 16 go ahead and sentence Ms. Kelley, and then move on to the Quicks 17 and Mr. Martin. 18 Any objection to doing that? Mr. Korba? 19 MR. KORBA: Not from the government, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Ms. Jacob? 21 MS. JACOB: No, Your Honor, no objection. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Kelley, I didn't mean to cut 23 you off. Is there anything else you would like to say before I 24 sentence you? 25 DEFENDANT KELLEY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, I do want to say that -- one moment.

I have, as I've noted already -- the 3553(a) factors apply here; the guidelines do not. And I have considered all those factors even if I don't list them all here. I'm familiar with them, and I have considered them.

Looking first at the nature and circumstances of the offense -- and what I'm about to say with regard to that applies to all four defendants. Although none of these defendants engaged in any acts of violence or property damage on January 6 of 2021, they were a part of a large mob that disrupted the peaceful transfer of power. They knew they had no right to be in the Capitol that day, and their mere presence, as I've noted, did make it more difficult for those Capitol police officers and other law enforcement officers to do their jobs defending the Capitol and those inside the building.

I recognize there's no evidence that any of these defendants went to D.C. or even to the Mall that day, on January 6, with an intent on entering the Capitol, but even if they didn't appreciate the significance of their actions on that day, still, this is a serious offense that undermines the rule of law.

And so looking first at the nature and circumstances of the offense, it's a serious one, and as other judges have said, probation is not to be expected in all of these cases for that

reason.

1.3

Looking at the next -- another factor that will apply to all of these defendants, and that is, the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, as I've said already to Mr. Korba, I'm looking at this case in the context of all the other sentences I've imposed in similar cases, and I've also, in imposing this sentence and other sentences, looked at what other judges on our court have done.

Though I recognize the government is asking for a sentence of imprisonment and/or home detention, home confinement in this case, I don't think that's necessary. I think a sentence of probation will best fulfill the goals of the Sentencing Reform Act, and I do find this case more analogous to cases like Schwemmer, Harrison, and Wangler than I do some of the other cases like Dillon, who I sentenced to home detention, again for all the reasons I've stated, the lack of aggravating factors in this case.

So for that reason, with respect to all these defendants, I am considering imposing a sentence of probation with conditions.

With respect to Ms. Kelley, I will not impose a fine, because I don't think she has the ability to pay a fine. I also will not order community service, because I do think that she has a lot on her plate right now, and I do want her to focus on increasing her employment to address her financial burden.

And also, I will impose a more extensive period of

supervision of three years and substance abuse treatment and testing, as well as I will order a mental health assessment. I understand Ms. Kelley thinks she doesn't need it, and that may well be true, but I think it's prudent, given the way in which she acted, you know, with kind of an aberrant episode of drug and alcohol use, and given the family history, I think it's important to see if there is a need for more support in that regard, not because I think that she can't handle it on her own. I just think she might need more tools to do so through these stressful periods. So I will impose that as well.

So let me go ahead and I will read the formal sentence, and before I impose it, I will give both parties an opportunity to object.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and in consideration of the provisions of Title 18 United States Code Section 3553, it is the judgment of the Court that you, Kari Kelley, are sentenced to a term of 36 months, three years, probation. And I note this is consistent with the probation officer's recommendation in this case. And that is on Count 4.

In addition, you are ordered to pay a special assessment of \$10.

I will authorize supervision of this case to be transferred to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Alabama, but I will retain jurisdiction.

While on supervision, you will abide by the following

mandatory conditions, as well as the standard conditions of supervision which Probation will review with you after this sentencing. The mandatory conditions include not committing another federal, state, or local crime, not unlawfully possessing a controlled substance, refraining from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, submitting to a drug test within 15 days of placement on supervision and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by Probation. You also must make restitution — that is a part of the plea agreement in this case — of \$500, and that's payable to the Clerk of Court for the U.S. District Court. The victim is the Architect of the Capitol, and the amount is \$500.

You must also provide the probation officer access to any requested financial information and authorize the release of that financial information and not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer.

Again, I will impose substance abuse treatment. Probation will supervise your participation. That is, treatment and testing, as well as a mental health assessment and treatment, if necessary.

I think I've said already I will not impose a fine.

I will advise you, Ms. Kelley, to the extent you have not already validly waived your right to appeal, you do have the right to appeal. To do so, you must file any appeal within 14

days after the Court enters judgment, and if you're unable to afford the cost of appeal, you may request permission from the Court to file an appeal without cost to you.

Before I impose the sentence, let me ask counsel and also Probation if there are any objections to the sentence that I've said that I will impose.

Mr. Korba?

MR. KORBA: Not from the government, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Jacob?

MS. JACOB: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Gavito?

PROBATION OFFICER: No objections, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So that is the sentence of the court. I will impose that sentence.

And Ms. Kelley, I wish you the best. I hope not to see you, but I will ask for a periodic -- generally, I only see you if there's a problem. But I will ask for a periodic status report, Ms. Gavito, in one year on how Ms. Kelley is performing on probation, and if necessary, I will order a future one after that. But I want to hear that, Ms. Kelley, you've completed the conditions and you're doing well.

And if there are issues, Ms. Kelley, if things are too burdensome, reach out to your counsel, talk to Probation.

That's the most important thing. And let's have a hearing, if need be. I can make modifications of conditions. But I do want

to see a commitment from you that you are doing what you can to 1 2 help yourself. All right? 3 DEFENDANT KELLEY: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, Ms. Gavito? 4 PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, for clarification 5 6 purposes, was there a motion from the government to dismiss the 7 remaining counts as to Ms. Kelley? 8 MR. KORBA: I'm sorry. Yes. The government would 9 move to dismiss the remaining counts other than Count 4. 10 THE COURT: I will grant that motion. Thank you. 11 All right. So I will excuse Ms. Jacob and Ms. Kelley and 12 move on to Mr. Martin and the Quick brothers. 13 MS. JACOB: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Sorry, folks. I didn't intend to start 15 with defendant 4, but it just made sense to do that. 16 All right. So Mr. Korba, let's go through Mr. Martin and 17 the Ouick brothers. 18 MR. KORBA: Yes, Your Honor. I will start my allocution with Mr. Martin. 19 I completely understand the Court's position on the 20 21 government's request for incarceration and also the Court's 22 rationale for leaning in the direction of probation without home 23 confinement. I'm going to try to focus on a few factors that we 24 believe is relevant as to Mr. Martin, why the government would 25 still ask for at least a period of home detention.

Number 1, defendant Martin does appear to have the most serious criminal history out of all four of the defendants.

While the government would acknowledge that some of the convictions are dated, I do believe that one of the convictions appears --

THE COURT: Sorry. Aren't they all more than ten years old?

MR. KORBA: Yes. I was just going to point out that it does appear that he was under supervision at least until 2015 on one case. So that was within the last ten years of the Capitol offense. So that was the only thing I was going to point out with regard to the criminal history.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KORBA: Your Honor, with regard to the factors of the case, I do believe some of the items that would stand Mr. Martin apart from his other co-defendants is he did seemingly delete a Facebook video in the days after the riot.

And I do -- from the government's perspective and, it seems, from the defense memo, he did that in order to avoid detection. It appears his reasons were out of fear about his presence at the Capitol and out of fear that people were going to report him. So I do believe that's an aggravating factor with regard to him attempting to avoid detection with regard to his presence in the Capitol.

Your Honor, I would also submit that it appears Mr. Martin

did not demonstrate real genuine remorse with regard to his interview at least to the FBI or law enforcement following the plea agreement. He appears to maintain an irrational belief, from the government's perspective, that the only wrong thing he did was enter through a window as opposed to enter through a door, which of course is completely false because one does not have to enter a broken window or break something in order to commit a trespass-related offense or even a felony-related offense.

THE COURT: Clearly not, Mr. Korba, but tell me where you're getting that. That was lost on me a little bit. Is this the 302?

MR. KORBA: I believe that is in the government's sentencing memo.

THE COURT: But I didn't quite track. This is based on his interview with the FBI?

MR. KORBA: That is my understanding, Your Honor. I'm again relying on prior counsel. But that is my understanding, that it came from the interview with law enforcement.

THE COURT: Yeah. And another thing -- I don't mean to get ahead of ourselves, but with respect to, I think, one or both Quick brothers, there's still this notion coming out through Probation that they had -- it wasn't clear to them that they couldn't enter because so many people were going in and police were fist bumping some of the January 6 rioters, for lack

of a better word. So if you can speak to that. I don't know if that's a part of Mr. Martin's mind-set as well.

MR. KORBA: Absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: But they took a plea in this case, and that does trouble me.

MR. KORBA: I completely agree with Your Honor. I believe it is inconsistent with accepting responsibility to somehow portray that day to believe that they were entitled to be there or they weren't trespassing. I think that just kind of flies a little bit in the face of accepting true responsibility for their actions. So I would agree that that is another factor that should weigh against them and against just a straight probationary sentence without home detention.

Your Honor, obviously, even in their own statements, their explanations belie the facts that they passed through broken glass, police in riot gear. There's absolutely no rational person who would believe that they were entitled to be in the Capitol that day, the government would submit.

Lastly, Your Honor, I know this is already pointed out in the government's sentencing memorandum, but it does appear that Mr. Martin has been missing a couple of his check-ins. I think the latest report actually had a missed check-in the week of March 5th.

THE COURT: A total of five.

MR. KORBA: Right. So the government is certainly

concerned about that. It does appear to -- it does create some concerns about his ability to take serious probation and comply with all the terms of probation and appreciate the consequences of his actions.

So for those reasons, the government does believe that a period of home detention at the very least in addition to the lengthy period of probation the government is asking for is appropriate in Mr. Martin's case.

THE COURT: All right. Do you want to go ahead and move on to the Quick brothers?

MR. KORBA: Sure, Your Honor. Absolutely. Thank you.

So with regard to Michael Quick, who I will start with first, Your Honor, I would just reiterate some of the same arguments that the Court pointed out that I made regarding the idea that he didn't know he was trespassing. Again, I just think that is completely contrary to, I believe, his interview, which is cited in the government's memo on page 12. Just prior to those statements, he acknowledges that he passed by broken glass and police in riot gear. And entering through a window, I just don't know how anyone in their reasonable mind would believe that they were okay and lawfully allowed to be at the U.S. Capitol at that point in time.

So again, I do see that, the government sees that as a complete minimization of their actions -- his actions and not taking full responsibility.

I would just note, Your Honor, that again they claim they didn't see any violence or any destruction, but as his brother points out, Mr. Stephen Quick, he admits that they engaged in the "fight for Trump" chants by the crowd. So I don't really find that explanation plausible either.

And again, with regard to Mr. Quick, he is another one of the defendants that the government does not believe is really indicating true remorse. It appears, based upon some of his statements, I believe, in his interview, that he only appears to be sorry that he lost faith with the press after he posted positive things about his experience while participating in the Capitol riot.

So for that reason, the government would submit that a period of home detention is appropriate as well as a lengthy period of probation in Mr. Michael Quick's case.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, Mr. Korba?

MR. KORBA: Not with regard to Mr. Michael Quick.

Just lastly, I can speak to Mr. Stephen Quick.

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. KORBA: The government personally does see

Mr. Stephen Quick in a little bit of a different situation with

regard to at least his statements to law enforcement and his

expression of remorse. It does appear that he fully

acknowledges that he knew bad things were on the horizon and

that things were going left and things were feeling strange. It

didn't feel right, I believe, were his own words.

In some respect, that cuts against him because he still went in the Capitol after realizing all these things. But at least Mr. Stephen Quick was truthful enough and had the candor to acknowledge that he knew something was afoot, something bad was afoot, and that he was not entitled to be in the building. He doesn't make any comments to suggest that he believes he was entitled to be in the building that day.

Mr. Stephen Quick did -- does stand apart, I believe, again from his co-defendants in that he immediately in his law enforcement interview expressed disappointment in himself and acknowledged that he was really engaging in mob-like mentality, which I believe that he -- by expressing that view was remorseful about. So he does not, like his co-defendants, appear to make light of his behavior.

I note his criminal history is also completely devoid of any criminal convictions whatsoever, and he does appear to be in consistent compliance with Pretrial.

So from the government's perspective, he should receive, out of all four of the defendants, some credit for that, perhaps the most lenient sentence out of all four. However, the government would still ask for a lengthy period of probation.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Korba.

Mr. Passanise, I do want to credit all three defendants for accepting responsibility, at least the elements of the offense,

at the time of the plea, but I am concerned with the tension between that and the comments of at least two to Probation. So I would like you to address that. I also am crediting their willingness to be interviewed by the House Select Committee.

I just -- obviously, they all showed an incredible lack of judgment on January 6, but help me understand why I should look at this as an in-the-moment lapse of judgment rather than something that needs more, you know, punishment or deterrence in terms of the future. I'm not contemplating a year probation for any of them. I'm looking at two to three with conditions, so just to kind of preview where I am.

Tell me why I should go to the lighter rather than the heavier end and your position on home detention.

MR. PASSANISE: Yes, Your Honor. My comments collectively with these three, because they were all together that day, first of all, to address the government's concern and the Court's concern about genuine remorse, in particular, the Quick brothers, they were interviewed prior to counsel, prior to being charged, like within days of January the 6th. And not that it's an excuse or a mitigator. I don't think the gravity of their inappropriate behavior had fully set in at that time.

As the Court already has indicated, they had no preplanned intent to go into the Capitol. They got sucked into the craziness, so to speak, of the atmosphere. Their behavior was inappropriate. There is no excuse. They have accepted

responsibility. They fully cooperated with the FBI, gave access to their social media. The government has done, as you've seen in filing their suggestions, gone to great lengths as to identifying the worst of the worst here for all three individuals what they did as far as social media.

The context of the interviews with the Quicks as well as with the Martins was full candor, full honesty, answering the questions. And even in regards to Mr. Martin, same thing.

THE COURT: Sorry to interrupt. But Mr. Passanise, what about the remarks to Probation which came post-plea? It did make me concerned about whether they should have pled. I thought that a couple of them said they didn't think they were doing anything wrong to be inside the Capitol. Am I remembering that incorrectly? It's the post-plea remarks to Probation that concern me.

MR. PASSANISE: Your Honor, I was on each of the calls with Probation, and to my knowledge, they didn't make any other statements. But --

THE COURT: This is Probation summarizing the law enforcement comments? Ms. Gavito, can you speak to that?

PROBATION OFFICER: I'm looking to see who said that,
Your Honor, with regard to the three defendants. I'm looking
for that in the presentence report as to both Mr. Quicks --

THE COURT: It appears Michael Quick, paragraph 21.

Oh, I see. So this is quoting the complaint, which

presumably --

MR. PASSANISE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. I thought this was in an interview with Probation. But was there not also a separate interview? No, you just agreed to the conduct described in the Statement of Offense. So I was reading those statements as their interview with Probation. So these are pre-plea statements.

MR. PASSANISE: Correct, Your Honor, in the 302. And the timing of both the Quicks as well as Martin's 302s was -- if you remember, it was a part of the plea agreement that those interviews and access to social media were taken place prior to the Court's acceptance of the plea.

Obviously, the one concern is, and I agree with the government in indicating that Mr. Martin deleted his social media. I think it was just shame and remorse. I understand the appearance of it, but when he was interviewed by the FBI, he gave the government access to his phone and his social media. And I also believe the government had access to the Facebook to see if there was any inappropriate posts or angry posts or anything. And to my knowledge, that was not there.

As you've already indicated, all three of them not only cooperated with the FBI on the social media, they accepted responsibility, and then all three sat for questioning with the House legislative committee to further cooperate and give

insight for their report.

So I do take issue a little bit with the government's characterization that it wasn't true remorse by all three. This has been a situation where all three have been embarrassed here in our community. They've been humbled by this process.

They've lost family and friends because of their behavior and their actions that day on January the 6th.

This was -- all three of them -- if you're interested, all three of them wished had they thought back -- as the Court has alluded, this was such a short window, about 12 to 15 minutes. And there was no confrontation, no disrespect, no property destruction, no violence. They voluntarily left, and they've tried to right the wrong since day 1.

So I don't know if you want me to address anything else specifically, Your Honor. I know you know a lot more, as you've done many sentencings on these.

THE COURT: Well, no, I appreciate your comments, and I've reviewed the presentence reports carefully and appreciate a lot of what you're saying here in terms of impact of this on their personal lives and their hard work and their jobs, and their -- to the extent they have any criminal record, they are fairly dated.

With respect to Mr. Martin and also Mr. Michael Quick, I do, in light of paragraph 53 and 63 of Mr. Martin's PSR, like with Ms. Kelley, I'm inclined to require a mental health

assessment. And I'm not suggesting that any have major mental health issues, but I think they've all had struggles that could benefit from at least an assessment. The same for Michael Quick in light of paragraphs 58 through 59. So I will include those conditions on theirs.

But I do credit their cooperation with law enforcement and the House Select Committee and do think even though their remorse was a little slow in coming, perhaps, it does seem genuine to the Court. So I am crediting that.

But let me give Mister -- let me start with Mr. Martin, unless there's anything you want to add, Mr. Korba, to what Mr. Passanise said. I'm going to hear from each defendant to the extent they want to address the Court. Is there anything else you would like to add?

MR. KORBA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So I will start with you,
Mr. Martin. As you've heard me say to Ms. Kelley, this is your
opportunity to address the Court. You don't have to, but if
there's anything you would like to say to me before I impose
sentence, I welcome it.

DEFENDANT MARTIN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

I just -- it's just been -- it's just been really hard, and I can't believe that I made the decision to do what I did that day. I just want you to know that I am truly sorry. It is just totally embarrassing to be here right now. I just -- I just

appreciate your compassion and, you know, just -- I mean, I don't know what else to say. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Martin, I just have a question. I know a lot of the January 6 defendants in that moment, I think -- I think that your sentencing materials, I think you were one of those who felt like there were irregularities in the election and there should be delay, it was either you and/or the Quicks, and you were -- you felt you were there to show support on what you viewed as a wrong, and at the moment, in that moment, so many January 6 rioters, for lack of a better word, felt that what they were doing was fully justified.

Looking at this now where you sit, do you see how erroneous that view was?

DEFENDANT MARTIN: Yes, I do; yes, Your Honor, I definitely do.

THE COURT: All right. Because it did take a little while. I mean, I think even in those post -- those initial statements to law enforcement are not quite what I would like to see in terms of appreciating the severity of the conduct.

Can you help me understand what was going through your mind at that point?

DEFENDANT MARTIN: It was like a perfect example of curiosity killed the cat. I was just -- I didn't know -- it was just wild and crazy, and I just wasn't thinking straight, you know, when that happened.

MR. PASSANISE: You've had a chance to reflect. 1 2 DEFENDANT MARTIN: I've had a chance to reflect on it, 3 and I'm just super remorseful. I wish I had never gone to the I wish we would have left immediately. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me move on to 6 Michael Quick, if he would like to make a statement. 7 DEFENDANT M. QUICK: Yes, Your Honor. 8 As far as remorse, yes, I think we've all experienced a 9 great deal of remorse. My statements to the FBI, they were in 10 context of at the time. It was not how I was feeling 11 afterwards. It was after we had gone that we realized the 12 gravity of the situation. We've all been through a lot. 13 That's really all I can say about that. Deeply 14 regrettable. No intentions to go to the Capitol, and if that's 15 a moment we could take back, we would not have went. 16 THE COURT: All right. Stephen Quick, would you like 17 to make a statement? 18 DEFENDANT S. QUICK: Yes. I'm just really embarrassed 19 with our actions. It was totally out of character for us, 20 and --21 MR. PASSANISE: Sorry. DEFENDANT S. QUICK: -- I am sorry. That's about all 22 23 I can say. Thank you. 24 THE COURT: All right. Anything more from you, 25 Mr. Korba?

MR. KORBA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: As I said previously, I won't review the nature and circumstances of this offense, which I view is very serious as I explained in sentencing Ms. Kelley for the same acts.

Given that these defendants did not plan to go inside the Capitol that day ahead of time, it seemed to be a spur of the moment decision that showed incredibly poor judgment. They did follow Ms. Kelley into the Capitol. I think the evidence shows that. They didn't commit any property damage or any assaults, had no exchanges with law enforcement officers, didn't enter any private areas, did cooperate with law enforcement on at least two occasions, shared evidence with the FBI, cooperated with the House investigative committee. All of that reflects favorably on them.

I don't view the deactivation of the social media account in the same way as I view evidence destruction. I think a lot of people who posted things that they later regretted took that down, and I don't know that that's destroying evidence in the same way that some other Capitol defendants did destroy literally photographs and physical evidence. So I view this as different.

They were inside a short period of time. It was, obviously, a reckless decision. Based on Mr. Martin's prior record, which though dated is more extensive, and his

deactivation of the Facebook account, based on those facts, I am going to impose a longer term of probation in his case of three years. I'm also going to impose for both Quick brothers a period of two years' probation.

I will impose for Mr. Martin and Mr. Michael Quick a mental health assessment and treatment as needed. And I think all can afford to pay a fine. So I will impose a \$1,000 fine in addition to the restitution that's ordered. And I will also impose community service, to complete 60 hours in a year.

So I will read the sentence with respect to all three and give counsel an opportunity to object and Probation as well before I impose sentence.

So pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and in consideration of the provisions of Title 18 United States Code Section 3553, it is the judgment of the Court that you, Zachary Hayes Martin, also known as Zach Martin, are hereby sentenced to a term of 36 months, three years, of probation on Count 4. And with respect to Michael Quick, you are sentenced to a term of 24 months, or two years, of probation on Count 4. And with respect to Stephen Quick, you are sentenced to a term of 24 months, two years, of probation on Count 4.

In addition, all three are ordered to pay a special assessment of \$10.

The Court will authorize supervision to be transferred to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri,

1.3

but the Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter and will order that a status report be filed with respect to all three defendants within one year.

While on supervised release, you shall abide by the following mandatory conditions, as well as the standard conditions of supervision which Probation will explain to you. The mandatory conditions include not committing another federal, state, or local crime, not unlawfully possessing a controlled substance, not possessing a firearm, refraining from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, submitting to a drug test within 15 days of placement on supervision, and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by Probation.

You're also ordered to make restitution consistent with the plea agreement in the amount of \$500, and that is to the Clerk of Court, made payable to the Architect of the Capitol.

You must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information and authorize the release of any financial information. The Probation Office may share that with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

I'm also imposing a fine in the amount of \$1,000 with respect to each defendant.

And I'm imposing a condition of community service, again 60 hours, to be completed within one year.

And with respect to Mr. Martin and Mr. Michael Quick, I am ordering a mental health assessment and treatment as needed.

And to the extent that you have not validly waived your right to appeal through the plea agreement, you do have the right to appeal, and if you choose to appeal, you must file any appeal within 14 days after the Court enters judgment. And if you're unable to afford the cost of appeal, you may request permission from the Court to file an appeal with no cost to you.

Before I impose this sentence, Mr. Korba, do you have any objections?

MR. KORBA: No objections, Your Honor. We just move to dismiss the remaining counts.

THE COURT: Okay. And I will grant that motion to dismiss the remaining counts.

Mr. Passanise, do you have any objections to the sentence imposed? I'm sorry. I couldn't hear that.

MR. PASSANISE: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Ms. Gavito, any problems with the sentences imposed?

PROBATION OFFICER: No problems, Your Honor. The Court has ordered the transfer of supervision to the Western District of Missouri as to all defendants in this case -- as to these three defendants in the case, and the Western District had a request, if the Court will consider a special condition that each defendant shall submit his or her person and any property, house, residence, office, vehicle, papers, computer, other electronic communication or data storage devices or media and

effects to a search conducted by a U.S. Probation officer at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner based upon reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of release. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation. The defendants shall warn any other resident that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition.

They asked for this condition --

THE COURT: I saw that condition suggested with regard to, I believe, Michael Quick, maybe Stephen Quick as well, but it wasn't with Mr. Martin. I'm interested in the government's position on this.

My inclination is not to impose that condition. It's not one we typically impose in this court. And obviously, if there's a lack of compliance or concerns about any of these defendants, I could always consider modifying conditions in the future.

But what is the government's position on that?

MR. KORBA: I agree with the Court. I'm not familiar with that condition being regularly imposed. If Probation feels it's necessary, they can ask for an amendment.

THE COURT: Ms. Gavito, given this isn't a standard condition in our court, I'm not inclined to impose that. Is that something that you think is required in order for them to accept supervision?

PROBATION OFFICER: We have been in communication with the supervisor in the Western District of Missouri, and they have expressed that in order for them to take -- to take supervision as to these three defendants, they will require that condition.

THE COURT: Why is that not included in all of these defendants' sentencing recommendations by Probation? The Martin one did not have that in there.

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, Mr. Martin's recommendation, I prepared the recommendation as to that, and I had not -- I had already disclosed the recommendation prior to receiving notification from the Western District of Missouri.

THE COURT: If I refuse to impose this and they don't accept supervision, then what happens?

PROBATION OFFICER: I'm not sure what will happen,
Your Honor. I'll come back and --

THE COURT: I'm not going to impose it. Again, I will reconsider, if necessary, but I don't feel that given that our district does not typically do that and given the facts and circumstances of this case and these defendants, I don't think it's necessary, but I will revisit it if necessary.

Mr. Passanise, do you have a view? Would you rather the Court just simply impose it now to ensure that they can be supervised in the Western District of Missouri? Is it your desire that that condition be in here so that we're not,

perhaps, back in another hearing to address this issue? 1 2 MR. PASSANISE: I want to agree with the government, 3 Your Honor. They spoke very eloquently on this condition. don't know that it's going to be a problem. I have not seen 4 5 some of this language that they want in this case in other 6 cases. I realize that it's standard language, but I don't think 7 it's going to prevent them from supervision. 8 THE COURT: Yeah, okay. I'm inclined to hold the line 9 here, Ms. Gavito. I can envision a case where that would be 10 appropriate. I just don't see this as one such case and that 11 the degree of supervision that's required would need that. 12 But again, if Probation feels strongly about this and wants 13 to request that the Court modify the conditions, I will consider 14 that. 15 PROBATION OFFICER: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: So anything else aside from that issue? 17 Nothing more, Ms. Gavito? 18 PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor. 19 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, I just want to make 20 sure of one thing. The mental health assessment only applies to 21 Mr. Zachary Martin and Mr. Michael Quick; is that correct? 22 THE COURT: That's correct, and it's the assessment 23 and treatment as necessary. 24 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: All right. So that is the sentence I will

```
1
      impose.
 2
           Like I said with Ms. Kelley, folks, I hope not to see you
 3
      all. I wish you the best.
           And Ms. Gavito, you let me know if there's a need to
 4
 5
      revisit this.
 6
                PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
 7
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you all. Thank you,
      Mr. Korba, for standing in. We appreciate it.
 8
 9
                MR. KORBA: Absolutely, Your Honor. Any time.
10
                MR. PASSANISE: Judge, please give my best to Judge
11
      Leon if you see him.
12
                 THE COURT: All right. Will do.
13
                MR. PASSANISE: Thank you.
            (Proceedings adjourned at 12:31 p.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER I, Sara A. Wick, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Please Note: This hearing occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic and is, therefore, subject to the technological limitations of court reporting remotely. /s/ Sara A. Wick June 1, 2022 SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE