1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
2	
3	United States of America,) Criminal Action) No. 1:21-cr-00461-RCL
4	Plaintiff,)
5) <u>Sentencing</u> (via Zoom) vs.
6	Devlyn Thompson,) Washington, D.C.) December 20, 2021
7	Defendant.) Time: 2:00 p.m.
8	·
9	Transcript of <u>Sentencing</u> (via Zoom) Held Before
10	The Honorable Royce C. Lamberth (via Zoom) United States Senior District Judge
11	
12	<u>APPEARANCES</u>
13	For the Government: Tejpal S. Chawla (via Zoom) UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
14	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 555 Fourth Street, Northwest Washington, D.C. 20001
15	
16	For the Defendant: Elizabeth Kelley (via Zoom) ELIZABETH KELLEY, LPA, INC. 2525 East 29th Avenue, Suite 10-B #225
17	Spokane, Washington 99223
18	Also Present (via Zoom): Jessica Reichler, Probation Officer
19	
20	Stenographic Official Court Reporter: (via Zoom) Nancy J. Meyer
21	Registered Diplomate Reporter
22	Certified Realtime Reporter 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest
23	Washington, D.C. 20001 202-354-3118
24	
25	

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (REPORTER'S NOTE: This hearing was held during the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and is subject to the 3 limitations of technology associated with the use of technology, including but not limited to telephone and video 4 signal interference, static, signal interruptions, and other restrictions and limitations associated with remote court 5 reporting via telephone, speakerphone, and/or videoconferencing.) 6 7 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, we're on the record for Criminal Case 21-461, United States of America v. 8 9 Devlyn Thompson. 10 Counsel, please identify yourselves for the record, 11 starting with the government. 12 MR. CHAWLA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's Tejpal 13 Chawla for the United States. I can see everybody and I can 14 hear everyone clearly, although there's a little muffling or 15 reverb that I'm hearing. 16 MS. KELLEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Elizabeth 17 Kelley representing the defendant, Devlyn Thompson. 18 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jessica Reichler on behalf of the United States Probation 19 20 Office. THE COURT: Okay. 21 22 MS. KELLEY: Your Honor, we can't hear you. 23 MS. LE VERGNE: Am I supposed to introduce myself? 24 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Thompson is sitting there 25 beside you, Ms. Kelley?

1 MS. KELLEY: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MS. KELLEY: And also the defendant's mother is on the screen, Michelle Le Vergne. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. First of all, Counsel, both of you 6 agree, I take it, with the final presentence report which sets 7 the guidelines and custody of 46 to 57 months, supervised release at 1 to 3 years. The guideline fine range is 20,000 to 8 9 200,000, restitution of 200, and special assessment of a 10 hundred dollars. The total offense category of 23 and criminal 11 history at I. I take it that's all set forth in the presentence 12 13 That's all without objection; am I correct? 14 MR. CHAWLA: Yes, Your Honor. 15 MS. KELLEY: That is correct, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay. With those -- I make those my 17 findings then. So with those findings then, I'll hear the 18 government's allocution first as to the appropriate sentence in 19 the case, and then I'll hear from the defendant after that. 20 The government may proceed. 21 MR. CHAWLA: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 The events of January 6th were an attack on our 23 democracy, our civil institutions, law enforcement officers 24 who were protecting the Capitol, and the elected 25 representatives of chamber, as well as the hundreds of men and

women in our local community who work at the Capitol who were just doing their job.

The rioters on January 6th were told a lie, a lie that they wanted to believe against all evidence to the contrary. They reveled in their success as their riot was succeeding. You can see it and hear it in their chants, their exuberance, their reaction in the hundreds of videos they posted online, and other social media accounts.

And, of course, the mob used that lie to justify the violence of lawlessness. They used it to justify their obstruction of the constitutional succession and, of course, to attack our democracy and the police who they professed to love.

In truth, whatever love they professed to have was outweighed by their desire for control. It's not unlike a domestic abuser who assaults their loved one while professing they love their victim. The violence of January 6th is not about the rioters purported -- what they purported to love. It was about control and power through group force.

And that brings us to Devlyn Thompson, who was someone who went to rally after rally that promoted the lie. He came to the Ellipse to watch another rally, then decided to come to the Capitol. In so doing, he crossed police lines, engaged with police verbally, climbed up this part of the West Terrace area on the Capitol, and then participated in some of the most violent activity against law enforcement that happened that

day.

And I'm referencing specifically the battle for the entrance to the Capitol, the lower West Terrace tunnel, where several dozen brave Metropolitan Police Department and U.S. Capitol officers were among hundreds of rioters in intense hand-to-hand combat for over two hours in a dimly lit tunnel amidst blinding tear gas and chemical spray.

With limited backup or relief, these officers endured attack after attack with all matter of weapons. They held the line with remarkable restraint. The courage and valor and humanity of these officers to protect our nation shines bright in stark relief to the ugliness of the mob who wished to destroy it.

Devlyn Thompson committed numerous acts of violence in the 13 minutes that he was in the tunnel, and, thereafter, he observed up close and personal the attack on other law enforcement officers at that same tunnel entrance for hours afterwards.

In terms of presentation, Your Honor, I'm just going to address some of the sentencing -- I know the Court has reviewed the sentencing materials and knows the video pretty well, but I want to focus on a few key areas because I think it's important to look at these as it relates to the defendant's stated information in their mental health expert report. We do believe there are problems and inconsistencies with that

report.

Let me just first say, the government doesn't take serious issue with the fact that Mr. Thompson suffers from a mild form of autism; that is, he has the highest functioning category and lowest impaired level of a person on the ASD, or autism spectrum disorder, Level 1. We do have issues with the extent of that suggestion and what that means in the report's analysis, and we do have serious issue with the Vineland brief study report, which was based on an hour-long interview with the defendant's mother.

First, the report itself has problems with -- the expert was limited in what they looked at. They only interviewed the defendant and their [sic] mother and looked at some of the paperwork the defendant signed related to his statement of offense. There was no review of any medical paperwork or written history; no review of the copious video material in this case, including the government exhibits that we're showing today; no discussion or reach-out to the government or agencies to find out what Mr. Thompson spoke to us about; no discussion with defendant's former girlfriend of more than three years who he lived with -- that's the PSR paragraph 54 -- or interview with the brother of the defendant -- and the mother now claim would have otherwise kept him out of trouble.

And obviously the Court, I know, is aware that numerous studies indicate there's a possibility for malingering when

cases are -- forensic interviews occur after a case -- criminal case has been brought. In particular, I want to focus in on the Vineland brief study information. It's a little unclear about whether it was historical or current, but more to the point, it's inconsistent with what the government itself viewed as the evidence when it spoke to Mr. Thompson, as well as the videotape evidence we're about to show you.

And so what I'd like to do is go through a little bit of the -- just momentarily point out some of the issues related to the second part of the study, which is the ADOS 2. That is the gold standard the defense is indicating. We don't have a problem with that. But there were statements made by the defendant that are not accurate. I don't to mean say the defendant's willfully lying, but the information conveyed to the expert is not accurate.

For example, on page 30 of that report, Mr. Thompson is quoted as saying he was there at the Capitol to attend a speech and, quote, I was told to stay behind the line. I never tried to go past the line. As you'll hear in the videotape evidence, that is inaccurate. He says, quote, I was not trying to hit him — that being the officer, Sergeant W.B. In the debrief he told us he was trying to strike the hand of the officer who was holding the pepper spray, not just the canister, but the hand itself.

Third, he said, quote, I wanted to go into the tunnel to

see what was happening, close quote. As I think we'll present in the evidence, that's incorrect. And, lastly, he says, quote, they never told me to leave. That's also incorrect.

And we'll show that through the videotape evidence.

I would also point out, specifically, Mr. Thompson was found under the ADOS 2 study to be in the autism spectrum disorder category because he had 10 points out of a possible -- with the minimum of 8. If he had 8, he would not have had the diagnosis. Two of the points of the 10 were awarded because of what she referred to as unusual eye contact; there was inability to focus and talk [sic] to people in the eye, including her, the examiner.

As I think you'll see in the video, Mr. Thompson had no problem on January 6th directly talking to people, using gestures, looking at them directly in the eye, and stating very vile things to people while staring at them in the face.

And with that, let's just go to the evidence that we're talking about. Mr. Thompson showed up on January 6th. He was politically motivated. Still is. That's not a crime, but the fact that he was motivated by believing the big lie and attending the Capitol -- you can hear in his voice, which we're about to play for the Court, what he actually intended to do when he got there. He may have been there for a speech. I don't doubt that, but that quickly morphed into "I want to get into the Capitol."

```
1
              And what I would like to play to the Court is Exhibit 2,
2
       which we've already provided to the Court, which is body-worn
 3
       camera from the frontline before Mr. Thompson comes up to the
       tunnel area, before that frontline area is breached.
 4
 5
       Mr. Thompson has already crossed onto the restricted Capitol
       grounds, crossed signs that say you cannot enter, you're not
 6
 7
       supposed to be there. And you're going to see interaction.
 8
              And I'm going to state, if the Court has problems with
 9
       the audio, please let me know, but I'll stop at a point and
10
       just clarify what I hear Mr. Thompson saying. And you'll see
11
       Mr. Thompson wearing a green Seattle Seahawks jersey.
12
                 (The video recording was played.)
13
                 MR. CHAWLA: Can the Court see the video? I want to
14
       make sure --
15
                 THE COURT: I can see the video. I'm not hearing the
16
       audio.
17
                 MR. CHAWLA: Okay. I'm going to continue playing.
18
       This is at 12 seconds. And this is Government's Exhibit No. 2.
19
                 (The video recording was played.)
20
                 THE COURT: Now I can hear audio.
21
                 MR. CHAWLA: Do you hear that, sir?
22
                 THE COURT: Yes.
23
                 (The video recording was played.)
24
                 MR. CHAWLA: That's Mr. Thompson in the green hat
25
       there, and he says, "Where's your boy at?" And I'll continue
```

playing. You'll hear his voice.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: I'm going to pause here to point out, you can see Mr. Thompson talking to other people, talking about what he thinks the police are about to do, showing eye contact to the law enforcement. He's pointing at things, using gestures, which the experts suggest he didn't really do very easily or had difficulty doing. You're going to see him talking to other people. He's also going to be told to calm down in a moment, and you're going to see other persons in the crowd trying to calm him down and his reaction to it.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: He says to the officer, "Do you want to fight? Let's fight. One on one. Let's go." And you see another individual, who was wearing a gas mask, trying to calm down Mr. Thompson. But, again, eye contact with both the officers and the other person who's tried to calm him down.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: I'd also note you can see Mr. Thompson had his hand there on a phone. You'll see later on he makes phone calls, including to his brother and to his mother. He talked to his brother before he goes in the tunnel. He talked to his mother after he goes in the tunnel. Several conversations, but the fact that he had communication and ability to communicate with other people is apparent. He's

also checking his phone.

And I'm going to play this last bit because I do think it's relevant to the point that he made to the expert, which we believe is incorrect.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: He says, "What is there left if we can't talk to representatives? What is there left?"

Mr. Thompson indicated he was there for a speech and he was there solely for a speech. What he's saying there is we want to go up. This is not about just going for a speech. At this point before he's even breached the line, before he goes up to the tunnel, he wants to go up. And I think the next part is also telling, which I'm going to continue to play until 3 minutes and 15 seconds.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: He says -- right now he's talking to the law enforcement officer. "You guys are part of that system.

You're just as bad as Antifa." In Mr. Thompson's world, he's an alt-right supporter, and totally his right to do so. Being an Antifa supporter is the enemy. And basically what he's doing at this point is now he's creating law enforcement as the enemy.

And from that point is when you'll see more and more violence and more activity of Mr. Thompson being engaged in that violence. But I do think it's also important

1 to show the path that Mr. Thompson takes to go up, because it 2 wasn't an easy path to get to that tunnel. And when he gets up 3 to the tunnel, you're also going to see the breaks that he smoking a cigarette, talking to his brother on the 4 5 phone. You're going to see all of that, which belays the idea 6 that he was overwhelmed, confused, disoriented, suffering from 7 ASD characteristics which made it impossible for him to control himself. 8 9 And what I'm going to do is to change the PowerPoint 10 slide, which I know is Government's Exhibit 1, which the Court 11 has seen before. But I just want to walk through a couple of 12 the salient pieces before that so that we're all following what 13 the government is saying about what he was doing that day. 14 THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Chawla, this is the court reporter. It sounds like you're brushing up against the 15 16 microphone on your computer. 17 MR. CHAWLA: Okay. I'll hold it off then. Is this 18 better? 19 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. 20 MR. CHAWLA: Can you see the PowerPoint presentation? 21 Is that what's being shown? 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 MR. CHAWLA: Okay. Your Honor, I'm going to focus in 24 on just a few of these slides, which I know the Court has seen

already. You see Mr. Thompson again on the frontline here, but

25

I want to start on Images 9 and 10. Image 9 you see

Mr. Thompson crawling up the side of the barricades, moving up
to get to where he wants to go. So he has to climb literally
up about 10 feet to get to the stairs and then walk up further.
So you see an image here of Mr. Thompson climbing up the side
of the building to get to where he wants to go.

You then see in Slide 11 him walking up the staircase after climbing up, and you can see people below climbing up that same area to get to where Mr. Thompson was. You see Mr. Thompson again climbing up. These are all from videos that were available either online or -- online themselves available or from the government evidence that we've got -- we've submitted. That's Government's Exhibit 1A, 1B, and 1C.

In the video on -- that's associated with this, that's the full footage trans- -- storm, you see Mr. Thompson talking to people, laughing to people, engaging with them. Again, eye-to-eye contact. No issue or problems there.

Then you see here on No. 15, Mr. Thompson, again, at 2:35 to 2:45, the incident down at the -- at the front, which we saw before was at 2:28. When he gets to the top of the -- this is now the inaugural stage, he takes a break. He smokes a cigarette. He looks relaxed. And not only that, he takes -- he takes out his cell phone. He starts looking at his cell phone, and he even makes a call. You can see on page -- on No. 18 and the close-up on 19, he's on the phone. We've

cross-checked the cell phone records we have of Mr. Thompson.

He's talking to his brother at that time. It's about a

59-second phone call, but it's a connected call. It's not an
attempt fail. It's a 59-second phone call.

And I do pause here because the -- to be clear, the defense expert says -- or when the defendant suggests that if his brother was there, if only he could talk to his brother, no violence would have occurred. But in truth, it appears that Mr. Thompson was speaking to his brother before he went in. And the fact that he had the ability to reach out to him, and also later to his mother, indicates he did have the ability and wherewithal and presence to even talk to them as he's going through this particular moment in time on the west front of the Capitol. That's who he's reaching out to.

From thereafter, on paragraph -- from No. 21, 22 -- you see him in 21 pointing to the tunnel, talking to another individual, communicating with them. Again, eye contact. Hand gestures, pointing up to the tunnel.

And then for the next 13 minutes, he then goes into the tunnel. You can see him coming up through the tunnel. You can see him seeing people leave the tunnel who are bloodied and are injured. You can see the violence as he's coming up through to the tunnel. And I think the Court is aware from the unbelievable video and some of the other videos we've presented, some of the violence that occurs inside the tunnel,

which is significant.

And to that, I do want to play a portion of that unbelievable video. This is Exhibit 3 in the government's material. I don't want to play all 13 minutes of while he's there. I'm just going to skip through some various sections, but, again, to highlight, Mr. Thompson didn't just do a one-strike with an ASP. That's sort of what was indicated in some of the expert report analysis. That's not what occurred.

Mr. Thompson pushed with multiple people. He helped take shields from law enforcement officers, give shields to other rioters who were attacking law enforcement officers. He threw a speaker on an individual, blooding that person. And even after striking the sergeant -- W.B. in this case -- and pushing at him and striking, obviously, the -- the fallen rioter who was gasping for air who was literally telling the officer he couldn't breathe, Mr. Thompson still stayed in the tunnel, still pushing through.

He's trying to get to the other side. This is not about I'm upset, there was supposed to be a speech. He's trying to get through the police line to get into the building.

And so I'm going to move from the PowerPoint to Exhibit 3, which is the unbelievable video.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: Can you see that video, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CHAWLA: I'm going to move forward to about 1 minute and 30 seconds, which I think captures right when you see Mr. Thompson about to walk in, so -- 1:29.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: The Court can see there's an individual wearing a gray sweater who's telling people what to do. He's telling them, "Wait here. Then when I need help, keep going, keep pushing, push, push." This is not just a "I want to see what's going on." There's a concerted effort here to break through the police line. There's literally thousands of protesters; and a handful of law enforcement officers protecting members of Congress and people inside that were sheltering nearby.

And at this moment in time, Mr. Thompson is talking with people. You see him interact with people, and you see him actually put hands on people, talk with people, and use his hands when discussing issues, you'll see within the video.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: You saw Mr. Thompson there help take some of the shields after being pulled out from the crowd. There's an individual next to Mr. Thompson in a blue jacket. That individual has a TASER in his hand. The Court may even hear the buzzing even from where this photographer is taking these images. And you're going to see him show the TASER to multiple people, display it to law enforcement. It's also in

1 our government memorandum. And that person is right next to 2 Mr. Thompson. 3 (The video recording was played.) MR. CHAWLA: The chant there is, "Let us in. 4 5 in. Let us in." 6 (The video recording was played.) 7 MR. CHAWLA: You see Mr. Thompson jumping up and 8 As the Court may be aware, there's a tunnel area here 9 that was fabricated for the inauguration, which has a wooden 10 floor. You see Mr. Thompson essentially invigorating himself 11 as he gets closer and closer to the line knowing what he's 12 about to do. 13 (The video recording was played.) 14 MR. CHAWLA: You see now the shield's being passed 15 There's an image that Mr. Thompson is assisting in forward. 16 pushing the shields forward. They're using the shields now 17 against the law enforcement officers. Having taken it from 18 them, now they use it against them. 19 (The video recording was played.) 20 MR. CHAWLA: At this point Mr. Thompson is joining in 21 in the push. Now that they've locked the shields together, 22 they're using them essentially as a phalanx to try to push 23 through the officers on the other side. You see on the other 24 side as well, the law enforcement officers pushed through the 25 first -- there's two doorways in that tunnel area.

pushed now to the second doorway. Essentially if they can push
past this, they're in the Capitol. They're that close.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: The person holding up his hand, that's the victim in our case, Sergeant W.B. You can see him. He's actually asking the crowd to stop pushing because they're actually hurting another rioter. You heard Sergeant W.B. also say prior to that, "Back up. Back up." When we get to his body-worn camera, for literally about 3 minutes -- in that 3-minute period he says back up 42 times, including the moment right before Mr. Thompson swings down with his baton, which, again, is inconsistent with what he told the expert, which was that no one ever told him to leave; I think Sergeant Bogner said it at least 40 times in his presence. And he's in the front yelling into the crowd.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: That's Sergeant Bogner again saying,

"Get out. Get out." He also says, "Back up." As you see him

push forward as well, they're deploying pepper spray. And

you'll see pepper spray being deployed by the rioters against

the officers as well.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: You see a person there holding the shield. That's Mr. Thompson pushing the shield forward at this point as well. And in the 13 minutes he's in the tunnel,

Your Honor, I counted, using the CCTV camera, 190 people came in and out of the tunnel, many of them committing violent acts against the officers during Mr. Thompson's time in there and trying to also get to the same objective, behind the line.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: Now, Your Honor, at the moment they're in the left-hand side of the screen, you saw a speaker being hoisted up. Mr. Thompson in a moment is about to assist other people in throwing the speaker forward, and it hits another rioter, but he's trying to hit the officers with the very heavy speaker.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: You'll see the individual in the brown come back toward and through and he says, "Who threw that speaker?" You'll see him put his hand to his head, showing blood that he has just received, and now retreating because of that speaker being thrown on his head.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: Pausing at 10:10. You can see the person in the red where they're wearing a brown backpack in front of Sergeant W.B. He's asking for help, asking for assistance. You'll hear -- in Sergeant W.B.'s video, you're going to hear him say, "I'll get you an ambulance as soon as we can get to the line. I can't call for somebody now." He tells everyone, "Back up. Back up." And as he does that, as he's

yelling, "Back up," that's when Mr. Thompson hits Sergeant W.B. and also hits the rioter who has fallen to the ground and needs assistance.

(The video recording was played.)

MR. CHAWLA: You'll see Sergeant Bogner make eye contact directly with the defendant, and also yelling at the time "Back up" after being hit as well.

And you're going to -- I'm going to stop the unbelievable video at this point because I think it's captured in the other video. But Mr. Thompson, even after that strike, stays in that same area for several minutes while other people continue to assault officers in the frontline.

And, again, these are inconsistent -- what we're showing here is inconsistent with what the expert was told by Mr. Thompson. To be fair, Mr. Thompson told us all these things during his debrief with us and was candid with us. I don't know if there was a miscommunication with the expert or -- because the expert didn't have these videos, didn't review the videos, didn't know what to ask of him or how to ask it in a way that would be on specific issues because they weren't viewing the video during the interview. But I would say that Mr. -- Mr. Thompson was candid with the government when he debriefed about his activity in the tunnel.

I'm going to play now for the Court, just briefly, the few moments of Sergeant Bogner's video, just for about a minute

1 and a half, just to show how many times Sergeant Bogner is yelling, "Back up. Back up." Shows him giving assistance to 2 3 that rioter. They've pulled him through the line and provide him first aid on the other side of the line. But you're going 4 5 to see Sergeant Bogner being as gracious and kind as one can under pressure. 6 7 Let me share that screen. Can you see the screen now, Your Honor? 8 9 THE COURT: Not yet. Now I can. 10 (The video recording was played.) 11 MR. CHAWLA: There's an officer -- Sergeant W.B. is 12 telling the crowd to back up and just leave. They're yelling 13 to him, "This is our effing country. Get out of our way. 14 is our effing country." (The video recording was played.) 15 16 MR. CHAWLA: We're pausing at 3:26. The gentleman 17 who's fallen on the right in the red says, "I have asthma. I 18 can't breathe. Help me." And you hear Sergeant Bogner 19 engaging with him, while also trying to fend off the crowd, 20 including Mr. Thompson. 21 (The video recording was played.) 22 MR. CHAWLA: As he says, "I will get you an 23 ambulance," that's when Mr. Thompson strikes and hits 24 Sergeant Bogner in the hand and obviously hits the rioter, who 25 has fallen onto the ground. But as you can hear consistently,

he's yelling, "Back up. Back up." He is, I think, engaging in what everyone would hope to be best law enforcement practice someone could use without using lethal force to push back and also show courtesy to people who are in need, something that Mr. Thompson clearly was not showing at that moment.

At this point, Your Honor, I'm going to stop playing this video. And I think that what happens thereafter, as the Court knows, Mr. Thompson is — is in the tunnel for a little while longer but then leaves. But he then stays outside the tunnel area, and he stays outside the tunnel area while some of the most significant violence takes place. This is when officers are being attacked with crutches, with all manner of hockey sticks, poles, and all manner of things; that

Mr. Thompson is sitting outside watching all these things. So

I'm going to go back to the PowerPoint to show that material.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Mr. Chawla, we're getting a lot of feedback from your microphone.

MR. CHAWLA: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't hold it up.

That's my fault. Is that better? I will -- sorry. That's my fault.

After -- this is now looking after Mr. Thompson leaves. He leaves at approximately 3:05. You can see him leaving. He's been hit with pepper spray. He's leaving the area, the tunnel area. He makes a call about 6 minutes later to his

mother and makes another call -- I think in duration, the first call is about 7 minutes. The second call is about 14 minutes. Then he calls her again at around 4:00 and 4:15. Again, the whole time he's here, he's out in front of the tunnel area where this violence is occurring.

So looking at page 32 of Government's Exhibit No. 1, you're going to see this is after officers have pushed out the protesters from the tunnel, but they're being assaulted at the tunnel entrance. Officer Fanone is being pulled out at this time. Other officers from the Metropolitan Police Department are being pulled out by rioters inside. Mr. Thompson is not assaulting them, but he is engaging with the crowd, talking to people, again, eye-to-eye contact, visible in that video, 1C.

And you see him now without his cap on. You see him outside looking on when some of this additional violence is occurring for an additional two hours. This is at 4:25, approximately. You see officers being pulled out here and other people being assaulted at the front of the gate -- of the tunnel entrance again.

Again, 4:25, you see Mr. Thompson at the bottom left. Page 36, this is now 4:26. Again, you see officers being pulled out at this point. You see a man with a hockey stick attacking the law enforcement officers, other people using regular sticks and poles as well.

Again, Mr. Thompson with his university of -- his

Washington State jacket on. This is at 4:27. This is one of the officers being pulled out. You see Mr. Thompson in red circled there. That officer is being assaulted with batons and crutches while he's being pulled out from the tunnel area. This is on page 38 of Government Exhibit No. 1.

Again, 4:27, he's there. Again, more violence, and it continues. We captured one on -- this is page 41 of Government Exhibit 1, a gentleman using a piece of furniture stolen from inside of the Capitol as a weapon. There's people inside of the tunnel again in front of Mr. Thompson.

He is in the crowd between 4:45 and 5 o'clock. He's present all the way until the Virginia State Police finally break through the front line and deploy some munitions, some -- I think it was some tear gas grenades and other objects to finally disperse the crowd from the tunnel area.

So Mr. Thompson arrives at the Capitol about 2:20, 2:25, and he's there all the way to 5 o'clock, at the heart of the violence. Now, I -- I believe that Mr. Thompson may have been disoriented, maybe his -- his autism Level 1 maybe had an impact on him, but he was able to talk to other people, could have left at any time, and he chose not to.

And so in terms of the government's view of his conduct, it is very serious. And even though the autism may be a factor, this is not -- it could not amount for all the criminal conduct that we've seen and just gone over.

In terms of weighing the 3553 factors here, Your Honor, we've laid it out in our paperwork why we believe the requested 48 months is appropriate. The guideline sentence is appropriate.

Since we filed our papers, there was another sentencing in a 19 U.S.C. 111 case (b). That was United States v. Robert Palmer. That was before Judge Chutkan. That's 21-cr-328.

Mr. Palmer lost, I believe, his acceptance of responsibility points and was sentenced to a guideline range and got the maximum of 63 months, and Mr. Palmer was involved in assaulting officers with a wooden plank and a fire extinguisher. While in the same time frame that Mr. Thompson is watching on,

Mr. Palmer was assaulting officers at that tunnel area.

He did not injure an officer. There was no finding that the specific officer was injured by his throwing of the fire extinguisher, deployment of the fire extinguisher or using a wooden plank, but he still received 63 months.

And I think, as the Court is aware, Mr. Fairlamb, who was also 111 but not while armed, received 41 months from this Court, just over a -- about three weeks ago now.

The only reason why the government is not asking for a higher sentence, which frankly would be appropriate given the violence in the lower West Terrace and the threat to our democracy that this violence caused, is because of his cooperation, which was early and extensive and, I think,

unique.

I don't know of any other defendant who pled guilty to a 111(a) or (b) offense without having been arrested first. He agreed to cooperate. He met multiple times with the government. I met with him three times for probably about ten hours. I can tell the Court that the suggestion of what's in the Vineland-3 study was not there at all. He was -- he was able to engage, showed eye contact. We interacted with him. We didn't have masks, but it was video. My understanding is when he met with the expert, it was in person for only a couple hours, but he was both masked at the time so it was hard to see.

But Mr. Thompson understood questions, was on point when responding, didn't have difficulty viewing video or information, didn't show trauma from the event, was able to engage, was able to talk about other people's conduct, talked about communications he had with other people while there, his recollection of those; and was candidly very competent, very forthright, and did not sense any issues or problems in terms of our communication.

So in terms of where he is today, I don't know what he was as a child and where he has developed or where he's at, but he's been able to engage in relationships, hold steady jobs, travel, travel for a living, traveling for work, travel to go to protests as well, which indicate to the government that if

he is in the ASD spectrum, he is at the very, very low end of that spectrum. He's very high performing, and it didn't impact an out-of-quideline variance in this case.

With that, Judge, I appreciate your patience working through the technical issues, and I do apologize for my microphone causing the static, but with that, I am prepared to answer questions if the Court has any, but the government can submit on those papers.

THE COURT: No. Give me a moment.

(Off the record.)

THE COURT: I have a deliberating jury in another case. They've sent a note that they have a verdict. I'm going to wait just to make sure I have all the counsel there, and I might stop and take the verdict and then hear from the defendant. And I'll let you-all get yourselves together, but until I have counsel, we'll go ahead and finish this. But if counsel are all here, I could let that jury go and go ahead and take the verdict. I don't think it will take very long to just take the verdict, but I don't want to waste your time if all counsel aren't here. I'll know in just another minute. It's in another courtroom. We don't have to stop everything here, but I'll just go to another courtroom to take the verdict.

(Off the record.)

THE COURT: All right. They're not ready. So we'll go ahead, Ms. Kelley. We can't hear you. You're on mute.

1 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: I -- I will have to unmute. 2 Give me one second. They should be able to hit something on their screen to unmute themselves. 3 THE COURT: Can you hear me now? 4 5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Ms. Kelley, can you click 6 anything? There should be something popping up to unmute 7 yourself. Well, I can't do anything further, so I need 8 somebody on your end to unmute yourself. 9 Okav. Thank you. 10 THE COURT: You're unmuted. 11 THE DEFENDANT: We're good now. It's unmuted. 12 MS. KELLEY: All right. With the Court's permission, 13 I'd like to move to the head of the table. 14 THE COURT: Sure. 15 MS. KELLEY: Thank you. 16 May it please the Court, we are not going to get into a 17 frame-by-frame recitation of the video that has been presented 18 to this Court, in large part because much of it is ambiguous 19 and because Mr. Thompson does not even figure in -- in many of 20 those frames. 21 Instead, what we are going to focus on are the answers 22 to three major questions. Number one, why did Mr. Thompson not 23 extricate himself from the tunnel and the Capitol premises that 24 day? Number two, why did Mr. Thompson strike the officer? And 25 number three, what assurances can we give the Court that

Mr. Thompson will never engage in conduct like this again?

In terms of the first issue: Why did Mr. Thompson not extricate himself from the Capitol premises or the tunnel that day? As is noted in the presentence report, as well as Dr. Sperry's report, Mr. Thompson attended numerous political rallies, in part because of his passion to politics and in part because of his fixation on governmental affairs. This, in short, was his social life. And at none of those prior rallies had there been any sort of violent outbreak; otherwise Mr. Thompson would not have been in Washington on that fateful day last January.

Instead, because of his autism spectrum disorder, he was uniquely vulnerable to what was going on on the Capitol grounds that day. In short, people with autism spectrum disorder process social cues much more slowly than you and I would, than neurotypical people would. And they do this for a number of different reasons: Number one, because of their cognitive inflexibility; that is to say, Mr. Thompson was convinced that the President was going to come to the Capitol grounds that day and speak.

A neurotypical person very quickly into the events that day would understand that the President was not going to appear and, instead, violence was erupting. Mr. Thompson did not process that because of his cognitive inflexibility and rigidity, and that's why in large part he stayed on those

grounds for hours and hours upon end, even after the event was over.

And what the Court would see in footage that was not shown in today's presentation is there are many shots of Mr. Thompson with just a bewildered and befuddled look on his face. Clearly events got out of control, and because of his suggestibility, because of his vulnerability, he was uniquely subject to what went on that day.

However, later the gravity of what he had done, the gravity of that day in history came home when he learned from other people that his image was all over social media. And at that point in time Mr. Thompson's morals, his ethics, his sense of citizenship kicked in. He retained counsel. He sat down with the government, as -- as was previously noted. He took responsibility for his actions. Again, this is unique in a constellation of January 6th defendants.

There has been talk in filings and in today's presentation that Mr. Thompson was malingering and that there were problems with the Vineland test. But in terms of the malingering, this is -- this is not the case because, as was shown in Dr. Sperry's report, there are other family members who have autism spectrum disorder. And, indeed, Mr. Thompson was diagnosed as a child, but as is also noted in Dr. Sperry's report, medical records, unfortunately, are not available of what Mr. Thompson was like as a child because the physician who

diagnosed him died and, despite the best efforts of his mother, those records are unavailable.

In terms of treatment records specifically for ASD throughout the years, again, those are not available because they do not exist. In short, Mrs. -- Mrs. Le Vergne, Devlyn Thompson -- Devlyn Thompson's mother never specifically sought treatment for Devlyn's autism spectrum disorder because in her words, we just wanted Devlyn to be Devlyn.

So with the support and the love of friends and family, everyone took care of Devlyn. They understood that while he was tremendously intelligent and very kind, he also was a bit different. And because it didn't cause any type of destructive social dysfunction, they let it be.

However, as I'll discuss later, January 6th was the clarion call to Devlyn, as well as to his family. In terms of the Vineland report -- or Vineland test administered by Dr. Sperry -- suffice it to say that Dr. Sperry is one of not only this country's foremost experts on autism spectrum disorder, but one of the world's foremost experts. And the Vineland test administered by Dr. Sperry was intent -- was administered as intended; that is to say, to one person who knew Mr. Thompson's adaptive facilities the best in the entire world, and that, again, is his mother.

This is an extremely long test with a series of standardized interview questions, and in short, there is no --

no room for fabrication, and those tests -- those -- those responses were also cross-referenced with the interview that Mr. Thompson gave Dr. Sperry. In short, Dr. Sperry, given her experience and education, would have been able to have detected any sort of malingering or any sort of withholding of information.

And a final note in terms of Mr. Thompson's alleged not being truthful or not being forthcoming with Dr. Sperry.

Wanting to see, wanting to hear a speech by the President is not inconsistent with being on the Capitol grounds or even being in that tunnel. But, unfortunately, it's precisely because of his autism spectrum disorder that he did not have the ability, the cognition, to extricate himself from the events of that day.

And finally, in terms of the government's time spent with Mr. Thompson and their -- their inability, if you will, to find anything different or to find a diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder, to state the obvious, the assistant U.S. attorney is not an expert, and the government did not retain an expert to evaluate Dr. Sperry's report.

However, as Your Honor knows from reading Dr. Sperry's report, uneven development is a hallmark of autism spectrum disorder. That is to say, some people like Mr. Thompson can be highly, highly functional in many areas. They can be articulate. They can be intelligent. They can master certain

life skills. Yet at the same time, they can be deficient in many other areas. And that characterizes Mr. Thompson. That characterizes many people on the spectrum.

And also, as Your Honor will probably remember from having read Dr. Sperry's report, another hallmark of autism spectrum disorder is the ability of people like Mr. Thompson to mask their disability. That is to say, they can participate in a conversation, they can even maintain eye contact, but they taught themselves to do that. It's mimicked behavior. It doesn't come from any innate ability, and it usually is not done with any deep understanding that neurotypical people would have.

In terms of the second issue I'd like to address: Why on earth did Devlyn strike the officer that day? Devlyn to this day doesn't know why that happened, but the significance for this Court is that Devlyn is genuinely, deeply remorseful for what happened. The Court read as a part of Exhibit B, Mr. Thompson's heartfelt and sincere letter to the agent who he assaulted. We will not try and minimize that offense.

However, as the government itself noted in the brief, the officer never needed medical attention, thankfully, and that baton that Devlyn used that day was one that he found on the ground. In other words, he did not go into that tunnel with -- armed with his own baton bent on hurting anyone, let alone a member of law enforcement. And as Devlyn points out in

his letter to the officer, one of the reasons why he is so troubled and why he did is because he himself has a family member who is a member of law enforcement.

Indeed, the numerous other letters, which are attached as Exhibit D in Mr. Thompson's memorandum attest to the fact that Devlyn is peaceful, he is kind, and he has never, ever in his life manifested any tendency of violence.

And the third point I would like to cover is: What's to prevent Mr. Thompson from doing this again? He will probably never lose his love for government. He will never lose his fixation with things political, and his ideology will probably never change, but what is going to change in part, in large part, because of the events of that day is that Devlyn and his family realize the fundamental need for Devlyn receiving weekly concentrated, targeted therapy. As I said previously, the family never sought out training -- or therapy, but now they have.

One of the reasons this Court -- or one of the fundamental building blocks of change, as this Court knows, is accepting responsibility, and Devlyn has mastered that first step. He has taken responsibility for his actions, and he is genuinely remorseful, and now he is ready to move on.

We have found a therapist who is willing to work with Devlyn. He has been engaged in therapy for over 35 years, specializing in treating people on the autism spectrum, and he

is going to work with Devlyn -- or with Mr. Thompson in order to rectify his cognitive inflexibility, to better understand social cues, and, most importantly, to understand why he broke the law that day.

Devlyn will never again be unsupervised. Family will be with him to make sure that things do not get out of control, that he does not go into emotionally charged situations like transpired on the grounds of the Capitol that day.

Autism spectrum disorder does not prevent you -- one from learning from one's mistakes. In fact, research shows -- shows that people on the autism spectrum are hugely disciplined, and once rules are clearly defined for them, they follow those rules rigidly and almost religiously.

In conclusion, Mr. Thompson does not minimize what happened on January 6th. He does not minimize the danger that day posed to our democracy and to our rule of law. But what we would request the Court to do is to separate Mr. Thompson from those 700 other individuals that day because of who Devlyn is and because of the potential that he can become.

We would ask this Court to be as merciful as possible.

We detail in our filings the fact that the Bureau of Prisons is ill equipped to accommodate someone with his disabilities, his issues, and his vulnerabilities. Indeed, someone like Devlyn would be uniquely vulnerable within our prison system, and we would, therefore, ask this Court to fashion a sentence that

1 will allow him to return to his friends and his family as soon 2 as possible so he can engage in a meaningful process of 3 rebuilding his life and to becoming, once again, the law-abiding productive citizen that he can indeed be. 4 5 And at this point in time -- or if the Court would like to ask me questions -- Mr. Thompson would like to address the 6 7 Court. 8 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to take a short recess 9 and take the verdict in the other case, and I'll be back in 10 just a few minutes, probably 10, 15 minutes. So I'll come back 11 as soon as I can. 12 (Recess taken.) 13 THE COURT: Okay. Is everyone ready to go forward? 14 And I'll hear from Mr. Thompson, if you're on. 15 MS. KELLEY: Yes, thank you. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Thompson, I know you'd be 17 nervous at a time like this thumb. If there's anything you'd 18 like to say, I'm certainly interested in hearing. 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor, for 20 allowing me to speak. 21 There's nothing that can be said to change the events or 22 to make up for my actions that day. Defending those decisions 23 that I made in the heat of the moment is not possible. So I'm

not going to try to use my time here given preciously by the

24

25

Court to do so.

We only get one real chance at our lives, Your Honor, and, unfortunately, I have scarred mine with a mistake that will not be forgotten. No matter the punishment given by the Court, the real penance will forever lie within me; that of which was lost by me, tangibly and intangibly, making me miserable and mounting as time passes. Indeed, the shame has already been done.

To borrow a quote from the very great Martin Luther, "This life is not about righteousness, but growth in righteousness, not health, but healing" --

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you for waiting.

THE DEFENDANT: -- "not being but becoming, not rest but exercise. We are not yet what we shall be, but we are on the way."

I've never been one to use my autism as a crutch to lean on, nor do I believe that it abdicates me from any sort of personal responsibility. Dr. Sperry did help me better understand how these factors played into my decision-making that day, and although I plan to abstain from any circumstances that could become emotionally charged in the future, I do plan on continuing the treatment plan recommended to me to improve upon my ability to handle any such high-stress situation.

Since I cannot alter my thoughtless decisions, the best that I can do now is embrace my mistakes as an opportunity for personal growth. C.S. Lewis said, "We can ignore even

pleasure. But pain insists on being attended to. God whispers to us in our pleasures, speaks to our conscience, but shouts in our pains: it is (inaudible).

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, sir. You're going to have to repeat.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. C.S. Lewis said, "We can ignore even pleasure. But pain insists on being attended to. God whispers to us in our pleasures, speaks in our conscience, but shouts in our pains: it is his megaphone to rouse a deaf world."

I'll admit that before this, there are times where those -- those words fell on deaf ears, and the path forward for me is one of intense personal scrutiny and seeking outside help to continue to become the version of myself.

I know the Court's time is precious so I'll work to try to conclude this statement. Quickly, I do want to say to my family, including my mother watching this, thank you for all of your support. We all know that this mistake is an aberration of my life, and (inaudible) that has been given, but I also need to trust and love to help me become that supreme version of myself.

It's the last quote, I promise. In the words of Winston Churchill, "To build may have to be a slow and laborious task of years. To destroy can be thoughtless act of a single day."

For me, the destruction happened in a matter of just a couple

hours, and the Court can -- rest assure, Your Honor, that I'll never make the same mistake again and will return to my simple life with my family.

All I can ask for is mercy and grace from the Court and forgiveness from God. Thank you for your time, Your Honor.

God bless you and God bless America. There's no place I'd rather call home.

That's all I have for you.

THE COURT: Well, that was an impressive statement, Mr. Thompson, and I'll tell you, you're a difficult case for me because I am sympathetic to the cause of autism. The difficulty is in a case like this, the attack on the Capitol that day was an attack on the rule -- the very rule of law in our country. And the -- the violence that happened that day was such a blatant disregard for the institutions of government and the orderly process of the administration of a democratic process of government that it has to be viewed as a serious offense.

And the attack on the police officers in particular, autism can't excuse it. You had a 90,000-a-year job that you were able to function at adequately to hold a job like that. You're working, you're an intelligent person, and there really -- I understand the -- what you now say are your views of expressing regret for what happened, but the Court has to look at the -- not only the seriousness of the offense and

adequate deterrence, specific deterrence in your case, but it also has to look at the general deterrence of what kind of a message is sent to the public and to others who may be in the same position you're in at the time of the next election or at the time the next circumstances like this are presented, and the Court has to take a lot into account.

So when I look at the sentencing guidelines, in my view I really can't see a justification for going below the guidelines. I see a justification so -- you did an early plea. You did cooperate from the outset. You've done everything you could to say you know you were wrong, and you say today you know you were wrong. And I give you the bottom end of the guidelines as an appropriate sentence; but to actually depart down from the guidelines, I don't think, can be justified, and I do not agree with a downward departure from the guidelines in your case.

I don't think I have to do any more than give you the bottom end of the guidelines, because I think that's an appropriate sentence for an early plea and for your acceptance of responsibility here, total cooperation with the government from the time you were first contacted, and your cooperation in this process. And you deserve credit for that, and you deserve credit for what you've said in this sentencing process and what you've said today, but -- and you deserve credit for -- I've never seen such wonderful letters from your family and friends

about what a good person you are overall. So I take this as an anomaly that day.

But it's a serious offense, and, you know, the longer I looked at those tapes and the length of time you were there, the more difficult it is for me to figure out how to justify a downward departure. It wasn't just -- you didn't come up and just sock a guy in the face as Fairlamb did; or you just didn't suddenly pick up a tool and hit him over the head with it. You were shoving and pushing and cooperating and participating in this riot for hours. It -- it's not something I could justify a downward departure.

So that's why I'm doing this. I don't expect you to agree or accept it readily, but I'm going to explain to you that's what I'm doing.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and its consideration of the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3553, as well as the advisory sentencing guidelines, it is the judgment of the Court that you, Devlyn Thompson, are hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 46 months on Count 1. You're further sentenced to serve 36 months of supervised release on Count 1.

In addition, you're ordered to pay a special assessment of a hundred dollars required to be imposed by 18 U.S.C. § 3013. In addition, you should pay the balance of restitution owed of \$2,000 as you agreed upon in your plea

agreement.

Following supervision, you shall abide by the following mandatory conditions, as well as the standard conditions of supervision, which are imposed to establish the basic expectations for any conduct while on supervision. The mandatory conditions include: One, you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. Two, you must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. Three, you must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. You must submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervision, at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the Court. And four, you must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation office.

You shall comply with the following special conditions:

Restitution obligation. You must pay the balance of any
restitution owed as directed by the probation office at
whatever rate they determine.

Two, you must provide the probation office access to any requested financial information, authorize release of any financial information. The probation office may share financial information with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

Three, you must submit to substance abuse testing to determine if you used a substance -- a prohibited substance. You must not attempt to obstruct or tamper with the testing method.

And four, you must participate in an inpatient and/or outpatient substance abuse treatment program, follow the rules and regulations of that program. The probation office shall supervise your participation in the program, provide a location with all the duration and intensity, et cetera.

Five, cognition behavioral treatment. You must participate in the cognitive behavioral treatment program, follow the rules and regulations of that program: provider, location, modality, duration, intensity, et cetera. The probation officer will supervise your probation.

Participation in the program. Such programs may include group sessions led by counselors or participation in the program administered by the probation office.

Six, community -- that's not necessary.

Within 45 days of release from incarceration, you shall appear before the Court for a reentry progress hearing. The probation officer in the district in which you're supervised shall submit a progress report to the Court within 30 days of the reentry. Actually, I'm not going to impose that because I don't know whether the court where you're living will have that program. So I'll delete that.

The Court finds you do not have the ability to pay a fine; therefore, waives imposition of a fine in this case.

Restitution payments may be made to the Clerk of the Court of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for

disbursement to the following victim: Architect of the Capitol, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Attention: Kathy Sherrill, CPA, Ford House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Financial obligations are immediately payable to the Clerk of Court, U.S. District Court, 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. Within 30 days of any change of address, you shall notify the Clerk of the Court of the change until such time as the defendant's financial obligations are paid in full.

Probation office shall release the presentence report to all appropriate agencies, which includes the probation office in the approved district of residence, in order to execute the sentence of the Court.

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 3742, you may have the right to appeal the sentence imposed. If you choose to appeal, you must file any appeal within 14 days after I enter judgment as defined in 28 U.S.C. 2255. You have the right to challenge the conviction entered and sentence imposed if new or currently unavailable information becomes available to you or on the claim that you received ineffective assistance of counsel in entering your plea of guilty to the offense of conviction or in connection with sentencing. If you're unable to afford the cost of an appeal, you may request permission from the Court to file an appeal without cost to you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Pursuant to the D.C. Circuit opinion in U.S. v. Hunter, are there any objections to the sentence imposed that are not already noted on the record? By the government? MR. CHAWLA: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: By Ms. Kelley? MS. KELLEY: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Time served in -- in the pretrial detention will be credited. And, Ms. Kelley, did you have a specific -- I don't know whether -- the Bureau of Prisons has some experience with autism and what facility they might be able to send him to. I don't know if it's better to make a recommendation that he be assigned a facility that has autism or whether he -- it's better to recommend confinement close to where he's -- to where his relatives are or -- if that -- which is more important. What do you want me to recommend? What does he want me to recommend? MS. KELLEY: The problem with the skills program offered through the Bureau of Prisons is it's only offered in Danbury, Connecticut. THE COURT: Yes. MS. KELLEY: And his mother is in Seattle, Washington. And I think at this point in time, if the BOP can put him in a facility within 500 miles of his -- his family, that would be best.

1 THE COURT: Better? So you would say recommend confinement closer to family? 2 MS. KELLEY: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I -- and I don't have any 4 5 problem -- okay. Okay. Supportive family is the way I'll put it in the -- in the recommendations. 6 7 Anything else you want me to say in the recommendation then? 8 9 MS. KELLEY: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you. 10 THE COURT: Okay. The report will have the -- I 11 think the report will be adequate for the Bureau of Prisons 12 when they're making the assignment. So hopefully they'll see 13 that. 14 Danbury is probably unlikely anyway because I think all of their facilities are full. So, you know, probably a long 15 16 shot anyway. 17 All right. Anything else either counsel have? 18 MR. CHAWLA: Nothing from the government. Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I will wish you the 20 best, Mr. Thompson. I know this is disappointing, but I -- you 21 have some great potential. You know, you did it when you were 22 working before. You had great potential before that day. I 23 hope to see something good come to you in the future as well. 24 I certainly don't want to see you back on violations of 25 supervised release. Good luck to you.

```
1
               The Court will be in recess.
                  (Proceedings were concluded at 3:50 p.m.)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
2	
3	I, Nancy J. Meyer, Registered Diplomate Reporter,
4	Certified Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that the above
5	and foregoing constitutes a true and accurate transcript of my
6	stenograph notes and is a full, true, and complete transcript
7	of the proceedings to the best of my ability.
8	
9	Dated this 3rd day of January, 2022.
10	
11	/s/ Nancy J. Meyer Nancy J. Meyer
12	Official Court Reporter Registered Diplomate Reporter
13	Certified Realtime Reporter 333 Constitution Avenue Northwest
14	Washington, D.C. 20001
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	i de la companya de