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## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: The parties in the matter of United States of America versus Glenn Wes Lee Croy, please come forward; Criminal Case No. 21-162.

Counsel, please come forward and state your names for the record. Right here, please.

MR. O'CONNOR: This side?
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: The lectern here. Thank you.
MR. O'CONNOR: Good morning, Your Honor.

Clayton O'Connor for the United States. And I am joined by my colleague Jordan Konig.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MS. WEST: Good morning, Your Honor.

Kira Ann West for Mr. Glenn Wes Lee Croy. And joining me at counsel's table is my colleague Nicole Cubbage; she is a member of this court. She is in charge of all of the videos that she has downloaded for me; I am not good at that. So I would ask permission of the Court for her to sit at counsel's table.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you going to be playing videos during this?

MS. WEST: Not unless you ask me to.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, I have seen them all.

MS. WEST: I am sure you have.
It's good to see you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Nice to see you, Ms. West.
All right. Okay. So let me just begin with all of the formalities.

This sentencing hearing for Mr. Glenn Wes Lee Croy is being held in person; but the public access line is being made available for persons to listen to the proceedings remotely.

Anyone listening to the sentencing hearing over the public teleconference line is reminded that: Under my Standing Order, 20-20, recording and rebroadcasting of court proceedings, including those held by video conference is strictly prohibited. Violation of these prohibitions may result in sanctions, including removal of court-issued media credentials, restricted or denial of entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the presiding judge.

All right. So let me just begin by reviewing all of the materials submitted to the Court that I have reviewed in connection with sentencing this morning.

Of course, I have reviewed the probation office's presentence investigation report, docketed at ECF 41; and the sentencing recommendation docketed at ECF 42.

I have also reviewed the following documents submitted by counsel -- and videos -- in advance of the hearing: The sentencing memo from the government, submitted
at ECF 46; the nine videos that were listed in the joint notice of filing of items incompatible with e-filing as to the defendant, docketed at ECF -- the notice was docketed at ECF 47; the sentencing memoranda submitted on behalf of the defendant, docketed at ECF 48; plus another supplemental memo submitted at ECF 51.

I have also looked at two additional videos submitted by the defendant, and a screenshot of a text conversation between the defendant and his codefendant, Mr. Lindsey; and a congressional report, which is all described in the defendant's notice of filing exhibits, docketed at ECF 52.

I have also reviewed Mr. Croy's letter to the Court, docketed at ECF 48-2; two letters from Mr. Croy's sons, docketed at ECF 48-2, as well; and then about nine letters from friends, coworkers, and supervisors, docketed at ECF 48-4.

Does the government have all of these documents?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Am I missing anything from the government?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: And, Ms. West, do you have all of those documents?

MS. WEST: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. So, Mr. Croy, why don't you just stand where you are.

Let me just explain to you how this sentencing hearing will proceed.

You can take your coat off, if you'd like.
THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: The first step is to determine whether the government or you, and your counsel, have any objections to any of the factual or other portions of the presentence investigation report that's been filed in your case.

The second step is to hear from the government; and then I will hear from Ms. West; and then, lastly, I will hear directly from you, if you wish to address the court.

And then the last step will be for the Court to explain the reasons for the sentence to be imposed, and then I will impose sentence. So it's three different steps at this hearing.

Do you have any questions about what is going to be happening during the next hour or so?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Starting with the
presentence investigation report. These were filed -- the presentence investigation report and the sentencing
recommendation were filed on October 6th. And I understand, from the last page of the PSR, that the government has no objections to any of the factual or other determinations set out in the PSR; is that correct?

MR. O'CONNOR: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.

Ms. West, have you and your client read and discussed the presentence investigation report?

MS. WEST: Many times, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And does Mr. Croy have any objection to any of the factual determinations, statements, or any other items contained in the presentence investigation report?

MS. WEST: I sent Ms. Lustig a couple of typos and -- but nothing -- only academic -- nothing else.

THE COURT: So no objections?
MS. WEST: No. No objections.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. West.

Mr. Croy, please stand right where you are.
Are you fully satisfied with your attorney in this case?

MS. WEST: Absolutely.
THE COURT: And do you feel that you have had enough time to talk to Ms. West --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: -- about the probation department's presentence investigation report, the sentencing recommendation, and all of the papers and videos that have been filed in connection with your sentencing here this morning?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: All right. You may be seated.
Okay. Hearing no objection from either side, the Court will accept the factual portions of the presentence investigation report as undisputed and as my findings of fact at sentencing as supplemented by review of the video exhibits in the case, as well as the statement of facts submitted and sworn to by the defendant in connection with his plea hearing.

All right. We're now at the second stage of this hearing where I will hear from the government to discuss application of the factors set out in Section 3553(a) to supplement any of the materials in the government's briefing.

You can step forward to the podium.
MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
Your Honor, before I begin, may I ask: Do you prefer keeping the mask on or -- can I --

THE COURT: Absolutely keep it on.
MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

THE COURT: With all of the breakthrough cases happening in D.C. right now, we are keeping masks on in my courtroom. I know there are some judges who are more lax about that, but not in my courtroom.

MR. O'CONNOR: I think it's a good rule. Thank you.
Your Honor, as you've just indicated, you have seen all of the videos that the defense and the government submitted as a joint exhibit. And those videos, they largely speak for themselves and show the scope of Mr. Croy's criminal conduct on January 6th, as well as the aggravating circumstances that the government characterized in its sentencing memo. And we'd submit and stand by the reasons in the sentencing memo for our request of a punishment at two months of detention, along with $\$ 500$ of restitution.

To highlight these aggravating factors, Mr. Croy went into the Capitol --

THE COURT: Before we get into the aggravating factors, let me just ask you a little bit about, you know, the situation we have here where the government -- by contrast to a number of other cases where the government has either recommended straight probation or probation with some home detention, I think, by my count -- based on a filing in another case made by the government, it's about 12 of those cases.

The government is asking for a two-month period of incarceration for Mr. Croy; and I think the government has stressed that specific deterrence is necessary here.

So before we get into the factors -- the aggravating factors, which I will shortly -- for why specific deterrence is necessary here in the government's view, I did want to understand some fundamentals of the government's recommendation. And the reason -- the reason $I$ want to understand these fundamentals is because normally, in normal circumstances, when there is a need for a specific deterrence it's -- the government usually is asking for a period of supervision, a period of probation, a period of supervised release to follow a period of incarceration. And this is one of those unusual recommendations by the government to say, yes, there is specific deterrence needed here; and yet they're only asking for a period of incarceration with no period of supervision.

And, plainly, I can appreciate the government's position that -- given what happened on January 6th, specific deterrence is a particularly important focus to have at the time of sentencing to ensure that any people who went into the Capitol Building on January 6th, overran police lines -- and this defendant went in not once, but twice -- that we take steps at sentencing to protect the public from defendants who may pose a threat of, advocate
for, or actually engage in the kind of political violence we saw on January 6th.

So specific deterrence is something I take pretty seriously. And it is puzzling to me that the government is opting only for a short period of incarceration, two months -- and I say that in relative terms; for the individual serving two months of incarceration, I am sure it's not a short time. But in the great scheme of things, federal offenses that we see, two months is not that long -but no period of supervision.

So is it better for specific deterrence to have a period of incarceration that's short with no supervision to follow; or, for specific deterrence in a case like this, is it better to have the defendant supervised, monitored, to ensure that there is no repeat of engaging in the kind of conduct that occurred on January 6th?

And so I guess my question to you is: Why are you just -- why are you opting for a period of two months of incarceration rather than a period of probation for a specific deterrence here? Yes.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
Obviously you have hit on an important point; you have articulated it before. And I did listen to your previous sentencings; and I know that there is a limitation as to what you are able to do as the sentencing judge here
based on the crime in front of you being a Class B misdemeanor.

THE COURT: Well, it's interesting you should say that because, you know, every sentencing judge, when they're looking at a sentencing, they want to know: What are all of my options? Right?

MR. O'CONNOR: Sure.
THE COURT: So in a couple of sentencings I had -it seems -- I don't know, I've lived through a trial in between, so maybe it was two weeks ago; maybe it was a week ago. Time becomes a blur.

But I actually was interested, when I was trying to understand what the government's view is of my sentencing options, that the government took the position in two other cases in front of me -- the Griffith and the Torrens cases -- that split sentences for petty offenses was allowable and authorized.

Meaning, Mr. Croy, just -- split sentence really means that you could have a period of probation and a period of incarceration; that's called a split sentence, which is typically barred for both felony convictions and for Class A misdemeanor convictions which may be followed by supervised release after a period of incarceration.

But for probation for petty offenses for which a period of probation is allowed, and a period of up to six
months' imprisonment is allowed -- it's a question: Can you have a split sentence with both?

And the government's position is that a defendant for a -- sentenced to a petty offense can be sentenced to a term of both probation and a term of imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. Section $3561(a)(3) . ~ S o ~ g i v e n ~ t h e ~ g o v e r n m e n t ' s ~$ position on that and what the government says is the need for specific deterrence here, why isn't the government recommending a split sentence in this case?

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
And I know my colleague, Mr. Pierce, had a much more in-depth conversation on that point; and I would only be able to reiterate what that same position is.

THE COURT: Well, please do.
MR. O'CONNOR: Without elaborating more -- I mean, again, Mr. Pierce is much better equipped to answer the nuances of that question.

My understanding is given the cases that you have raised for the government to brief on that there was a position that would defend that. However, that position, as the defense -- I think it was in the Griffith or the Torrens case -- had pointed out, there were some concerns there as well.

I believe you and one of the defense attorneys even kind of -- you know, it's 2021, and here is a new issue
that still hasn't been answered; and I think the uncertainty behind that makes it such that the government cares to be conservative in its sentencing recommendations.

THE COURT: Rather than having -- rather than having me do something that will immediately go up to the D.C. Circuit and have the D.C. Circuit resolve the issue once and for all?

MR. O'CONNOR: So as I understand it, that is the position.

THE COURT: Okay. So because of the -- even though the government takes this position, the government is not making a recommendation for a split sentence in petty offenses in this case or in any other January 6th case; is that right?

MR. O'CONNOR: So I'd have to get back to you on the answer regarding the policy at large for the Capitol riots cases as an entirety. I am not in a position to speak on the government's complete approach for all of those cases. If it's important, I can certainly, you know, arrange to get the Court an answer for that.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Pierce did answer that and said no; I mean, that they're not recommending it in any other January 6th case. And so that -- and this all stems from the fact that the plea is to a Class B misdemeanor.

If Mr. Croy was charged with Class A misdemeanors,
too, and had he been given a plea offer and a conviction for a Class A misdemeanor, we wouldn't be having this discussion. It would be clear that the Court would have the full panoply of sentencing options of a period of incarceration if necessary for specific deterrence, followed by a period of probation which is, frankly, you know, pretty important for a specific deterrence to ensure that the defendant stays on a law-abiding path over a period of time, even post-incarceration, particularly when the period of incarceration recommended even by the government is two months' short; wouldn't you say?

MR. O'CONNOR: Understood, Your Honor.
I mean, again, with the same caveats that you articulated earlier.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. So let me explore this a little bit more because if you look at the special conditions -- discretionary conditions I think it's called, in the statute for probation, there is authorization for periods of probation for either intermittent confinement or confinement at residential reentry centers, which would allow for some period of confinement and very close supervision and, at the same time, a period of supervision on probation. And the government doesn't seem to be looking at those options either for allowing longer periods of supervision for something as important for specific
deterrence and to stop people who actually engaged in the crowds' behavior on January 6th not to do that again.

We don't want a repeat performance of that --
MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- so supervision for a longer period of time is helpful to avoid that. So why isn't the government being more creative even in using some of the discretionary special conditions of probation?

MR. O'CONNOR: And please correct me if I'm misunderstanding the Court's question here -- or premise.

But I do believe that Mr. Pierce had articulated some of that; that that certainly would have satisfied the ability to do -- the intermittent incarceration would have satisfied the ability to both have incarceration and probation and, as the exchange elaborated, that due to the fact of the ongoing pandemic and Bureau of Prisons are reluctant to have people coming in and out of the prisons, that -- for those pragmatic concerns, that that wasn't an option that -- you know, I think the Court would -- you are suggesting what I would agree would be the solution, but it's just not available because of those concerns.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, also, intermittent confinement is not available everywhere. And I have checked; it's not available in Colorado.

MR. O'CONNOR: Sure.

THE COURT: All right. So it's just because of the COVID pandemic situation that the government isn't using some of the discretionary special conditions of probation -MR. O'CONNOR: As I understand -THE COURT: -- to allow for some period of confinement and a longer period of supervision on probation? MR. O'CONNOR: And, again, I have had some conversations with the supervisors who are crafting, you know, the larger policy-strategy approaches for all of the cases; that is a topic that we have discussed.

Again, I would want to bring in somebody else from the office if you wanted a more comprehensive response as to the government's approach --

THE COURT: Well, who is with you?
MR. O'CONNOR: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: The person with you is not one of those, Mr. Konig.

MR. O'CONNOR: Your Honor, my colleague, Jordan Konig, is taking over the codefendant case; he's entered a notice of appearance for that.

THE COURT: I see. Okay.
MR. O'CONNOR: It's similarly situated.
THE COURT: I know I have seen you on the
screen -- excuse me for interrupting.
I know I have seen you on the screen, Mr. Konig;
but people are always -- always a little bit of a different view in person. Thank you.

MR. KONIG: Thank you.
MR. O'CONNOR: I will just say, Your Honor, I believe that is correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me -- I mean, what was interesting is -- when I go back to the plea hearing in this case, and Ms. West made -- she made a comment in her brief about how it was the most difficult plea hearing she had been in; so it made me want to go back and review that plea hearing. It's like, oh. It's not -- never my intent to make Ms. West's life difficult.

And so I actually went back to that plea hearing to see why would that be so difficult. And I noticed that, when I went back, at the plea hearing on September 3, I actually asked you to confirm that if the Court accepted the plea to a petty offense there are only two options the Court can do, probation or a term of imprisonment with no supervision to follow; and you responded that you were fully aware of that consequence.

And so actually at the plea I confirmed with the defendant that the penalties that could result from his guilty plea, since it was a petty offense, is that if there is no prison term imposed he could be subject to probation for a period of up to five years; and there is no supervised
release term that can apply. And if he's sentenced to imprisonment, he would then be free from any supervision from this Court on this charge; and he said he understood the statutory penalties that applied. So that's September 3.

And then fast forward to October 21 in the Griffith case where the Court -- where the government's position is that the sentencing Court may impose the split sentence.

So did the government just have a change of position? Or did it study the matter more and decide, between September 3 and October 21, that oh -- whoops; we think, in our interpretation of $3561(a)(3)$, you actually can have a split sentence for petty offenses? Is that what happened?

MR. O'CONNOR: So, Your Honor, I have not sat in on all of the decision-making meetings about that position, so I am really not equipped to give a comprehensive answer on that.

I have seen some of the litigation in briefing as a result of the question that you posed to the government and leading up to the Griffith case; I don't know the answer to your question. I could suppose that, yes, the government did study it more, in line with the order, and came up with that position.

I apologize if I misspoke on September 3. I think, to those regards, that was my understanding at the time.

THE COURT: Well, no need for apology.
As the briefing we have seen in connection with the Griffith and Torrens sentencing reveals, this is an issue that's unresolved with good reasons and case law on both sides.

But I think the government's hesitancy in urging any of the judges on this court to adopt a split sentence on a petty offense really just confirms that it's an open question with such good arguments on the other side. And I am not going to resolve that issue here; perhaps one of my colleagues will at some point, but not for me right now.

Let me turn to -- but you understand my concern here for specific deterrence. And let me just say, I do agree with you that there is a need for specific deterrence. And when I -- and in most cases when there is a need for specific deterrence, we look for longer periods of supervision to make sure a law-abiding path is complied with. Am I right on that?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes. Okay. Let me just turn to a factual issue because Ms. West has raised concerns about the government's recommended prison term creating unwarranted
sentencing disparity among similarly-situated defendants charged with similar conduct.

Sort of related to that issue is this one mystery in this case. And that mystery -- I will call it the mystery missing woman because the government says in its memo that Mr. Croy, his codefendant -- and then I quote: And a female companion all went to the political rally at the Ellipse and spent the entire day together, going from the rally to the steps of the Capitol, and twice into the Capitol.

The presentence investigation report, the signed statement of offense also note the same thing; that Mr. Croy, Mr. Lindsey, quote: Were also accompanied by an adult female who went inside the U.S. Capitol with them. That's from the PSR, paragraph 18; statement of facts in connection with the underlying plea, paragraph 9.

Mr. Croy, Mr. Lindsey, have both been charged. But if their female companion spent the entire day with them and was right by their side, what happened to her?

MR. O'CONNOR: Certainly.
THE COURT: Isn't that -- I mean, is there some -Ms. West hasn't made this argument necessarily. But should it be a concern that a person engaging in exactly the same conduct amongst the defendant and his codefendant is not charged at all?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor. And I agreed with you on that.

At the time Mr. Croy and Mr. Lindsey were charged, the government did not know who this person was to make an identification such to continue building a case.

I believe -- I have not confirmed -- I do know through the course of working on this case that the FBI has made efforts at identifying who that person is to -- and while I am uncertain where the development of that case is, I do know that it has continued to be looked at and investigated, including through this case.

THE COURT: I see.
MR. O'CONNOR: So I agree with you that it would be odd and there would be a disparity if the government knew of an individual who entered the Capitol and just decided to turn the other way and not bother; and that is not what's happening.

However, as you well know, we can only move forward on investigations and charging decisions with people that we have identified to ensure that we have the right person that we're charging with a criminal offense; and I believe that aspect of the investigation has been continuing to develop.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
Okay. So now let's -- you know, one of the things
that -- one of the points that the defendant's sentencing memo makes, and Ms. West says in her brief -- her reply brief at page 6 -- that the crowd attacking the Capitol on January 6th was not -- and I quote: One cohesive collection of Trump supporters on some collaborative mission to overrun officers in the Capitol; but the group was, in fact, as diverse as the people in this nation with many different reasons for being there that day.

So putting aside the accuracy of her description of the crowd, with so many of them wearing MAGA hats and Mr. Croy himself wearing a Trump sweatshirt, I think Ms. West's point is that the punishment should fit the crime. And I don't think the government has any disagreement with that; is that right? MR. O'CONNOR: Agreed.

THE COURT: Okay. And so then the government goes on and actually explains that: Those who trespassed but engaged in aggravating factors merit serious consideration of institutional incarceration, while those who trespassed but engaged in less serious aggravating factors deserve a sentence more in line with minor incarceration or home confinement. And the government recommends that this defendant falls in the category of having aggravating factors warranting prison time of 60 days. So this is the point where I want to go into what those aggravating factors
are for this defendant.
And as I look at the facts here, this is a defendant who was inside the Capitol Building twice for a total of around 30 minutes; the first time about 17 minutes, the second time for about 10 minutes. And then he was standing around the Capitol grounds for some period before he went into the Capitol the first time and then, in between his two trips, he was hanging around 40 to 45 minutes by the government's estimation.

MR. O'CONNOR: Accurate.
THE COURT: But he didn't engage in preplanning?
MR. O'CONNOR: Correct.
THE COURT: And he brought no dangerous weapons with him or other defensive gear for preparation for any kind of violence; he didn't enter any of the private offices or rooms inside the Capitol Building; and he certainly didn't get into the Senate Chamber or the House Chamber?

MR. O'CONNOR: Correct.

THE COURT: He didn't steal anything when he was inside the Capitol Building?

MR. O'CONNOR: Correct.
THE COURT: He didn't physically attack any police officer or any other person; he didn't personally damage any property inside the Capitol.

And according to the government, he cooperated
with law enforcement when he was arrested and voluntarily gave law enforcement asked-for details concerning his conduct; is that right?

MR. O'CONNOR: Eventually.
THE COURT: Eventually.
MR. O'CONNOR: After the plea agreement.
THE COURT: All right. And he didn't post -- so
that didn't happen at the time of his arrest?
MR. O'CONNOR: Correct.

THE COURT: So it wasn't as prompt as that; it was only after his plea agreement?

MR. O'CONNOR: Correct.
THE COURT: He didn't post inflammatory language publicly --

MR. O'CONNOR: Publicly.
THE COURT: -- on social media that would have
encouraged or incited more political violence, right?
MR. O'CONNOR: Correct.

THE COURT: And he did promptly agree to enter a plea agreement after the offer was extended?

MR. O'CONNOR: Agreed. Agreed.
THE COURT: And would you agree that he has expressed remorse for his criminal conduct?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor.
Again, eventually.

THE COURT: Eventually. Well, in his fairly lengthy letter, he did --

MR. O'CONNOR: Absolutely.
THE COURT: -- I would characterize it as that.

MR. O'CONNOR: Just to say in the immediate days following the riot he expressed sentiments to friends that showed that he was quite proud of what he did, and adamant about it.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. O'CONNOR: And to your point, eventually, yes, through this end of the proceedings I believe he has fully expressed remorse for his conduct.

THE COURT: Right. And I mean, I think, as sentencing judges, you know, we do hope that being shown the error of a defendant's ways they learn from it; and so remorse shown over the course of being involved in criminal proceedings and appreciating the gravity --

MR. O'CONNOR: Agreed.

THE COURT: -- of the circumstances of the offense conduct, it's hard to hold against -- for me at least -- to hold against somebody -- prior to the education that comes with being a defendant in a federal criminal case -statements that they make early on --

MR. O'CONNOR: Understood.

THE COURT: -- as opposed to once they get better
educated.

MR. O'CONNOR: Sometimes it takes a while to set in.

THE COURT: Exactly.

Okay. So the government has identified what it calls a number of critical factors to distinguish among those charged with criminal conduct warranting prison time with aggravating factors versus those that don't. And so I want to turn to what the government has listed in its papers the five aggravating factors it has associated with this defendant's criminal conduct that the government says distinguishes his criminal conduct from other defendants for whom the government has recommended either straight probation or probation with home detention and, in the government's view, believes warrants jail time in this case.

And let me just say at the outset, this is not an easy task. I mean, for petty offenses that are not subject to the guidelines --

MR. O'CONNOR: Sure.
THE COURT: -- but courts must still comply with the Section $3553(a)(6)$ factor of avoiding unwarranted sentencing disparities, we're left to do this in different ways without the guidance from the sentencing guidelines.

MR. O'CONNOR: Understood. And --
THE COURT: If you have sentencing guidelines, you
have the entire sentencing commission apparatus collecting data from all across the country for decades to be able to tell judges: This is the median and average sentences; this is what is normal; this is how you can avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities.

But the government's choice to allow pleas to this petty offense puts us outside the guidelines and, therefore, we have to find alternative mechanisms to address the $3553(a)(6)$ factor of avoiding unwarranted sentencing disparities. So no easy task made more difficult because we don't have the sentencing commission data collection effort that's been going on two (sic) years.

MR. O'CONNOR: To the point I believe you have recognized, defense counsel has recognized, and the government has recognized that this is a novel event in our nation's history, such that there is not a lot of history to fall back on or data to collect about the intricacies involved with this criminal event that was both individual and collective in its application.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. O'CONNOR: Understood --

THE COURT: So your point of that is, even if this was a Class A misdemeanor subject to data collection by the sentencing commission, this was such a unique incident that even data collected by the sentencing commission might not
be helpful?
MR. O'CONNOR: Without going that far, more to empathize, because the government does struggle with making efforts to have recommendations that don't show disparity; that there is some empathy with the task you have described as being a very difficult one; also understanding that the collection of individuals in the Capitol that day all acted very differently.

So while we look at a number of different factors and we highlight, from the government's perspective, what it finds aggravating and makes efforts to make recommendations consistent -- understood, it is a hard task.

THE COURT: It is a hard task.

And so I do appreciate that the government is making transparent the factors that it's looking at; it's enormously helpful, as I think through what I believe are factors that pertain to individual defendants coming before me.

MR. O'CONNOR: On that effort, could I provide one benchmark, if I may? And I wanted to address it because defense counsel had addressed it in the reply and referenced it in its initial submission, and that's the parallel to the Robert Reeder case.

And understanding -- and Ms. West, defense counsel, and I had had several conversations leading up to
the sentencing about --
THE COURT: Can you just pull that microphone up?
MR. O'CONNOR: I'm so sorry, Your Honor.
Is that better?

THE COURT: I think -- I don't know.
Maybe it's -- I think that's much better.
Is that better for you, too, Ms. West?
MS. WEST: Yes. I was having a hard time --
THE COURT: I was, too.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you so much.
Understanding Mr. Reeder's case is a little
difficult to assess -- in looking through the case history, the government had submitted an initial sentencing recommendation -- this was in August. And during that time, the government knew that Mr. Reeder had entered the Capitol twice, had spent approximately a half hour in the Capitol, and, on top of that, had been in and around the Capitol for about an hour; and in that initial recommendation had asked for a sentence of two months' confinement.

Subsequent to that, as I understand it, the government learned of more aggravating evidence regarding this specific defendant, leaving it ultimately in a notice to the Court -- I think it came out -- I can look -September to October, where it eventually asked for -- based on that aggravating evidence, an additional six months of --
rather, not an "additional," it asked ultimately for six months of confinement.

And when talking about this with defense counsel, I said that we were drawing a parallel to the initial recommendation. At no point has the government tried to associate Mr. Croy with directly causing or committing any violence. Insofar as it was referenced, we wanted to make sure that the Court is aware that the government is not alleging Mr. Croy should be analogized to people that did commit violence.

THE COURT: And Mr. Reeder did commit some violence?

MR. O'CONNOR: And, again, $I$ don't know the specific facts. I understand the aggravating --

THE COURT: It's not my case either, so I don't know the facts.

MR. O'CONNOR: -- that the aggravating evidence that the government learned between its initial recommendation and its subsequent recommendation was along those lines.

However, when drawing an analogy to -- and, again, in an effort to be consistent among similarly treated --similarly-situated defendants, in that case the government had initially requested a two-month period of confinement based on the facts that he had entered the Capitol twice;
had spent about a half hour in the Capitol; spent about an hour in and around the Capitol altogether. Based on those facts, $I$ believe that Mr. Croy's situation is fairly comparable; and that was a large part of what led the government to its request now. It's focusing on those aggravating factors and being consistent with what it was requesting amongst different defendants.

THE COURT: Okay. And, in fact, you are only asking for one month incarceration here?

MR. O'CONNOR: Two months.
THE COURT: You are asking for two months. Okay.
There are a lot of these cases.
Okay. So let's just go through the five aggravating factors here.

So the government's memo says that the first aggravating factor is the defendant's decision to enter the Capitol Building for the first time after witnessing law enforcement attempt to keep rioters at bay for over an hour. Is that the first aggravating factor?

MR. O'CONNOR: Agreed. And along the lines of that aggravating factor, where he entered was through the Senate wing door within the first five minutes of it having being breached at that location. That puts him in the Capitol at a very early point of the breach; suggesting, you know, he was close, if not at the very front; you know,
within five minutes of getting to the Capitol. Just associating how he came to be there would suggest that he was close.

I know during the plea colloquy he spoke at length about having seen police officers making efforts not directly at him but towards other rioters about keeping them at bay. Having witnessed that and, then, being in the Capitol within five minutes of it being breached, that's an aggravating factor.

THE COURT: And the Senate wing doors were opened, from my recollection of the videos, because rioters broke the windows on either side and then got in and opened it?

MR. O'CONNOR: Largely, yes. And there was -THE COURT: One person actually kicked down the door --

MR. O'CONNOR: Window. As I have seen it, after that window was kicked in, rioters started flooding in; some rioters then broke open the door from the inside. THE COURT: By kicking it? MR. O'CONNOR: Correct. THE COURT: There was one guy really violently kicking it -MR. O'CONNOR: Correct. Correct. THE COURT: -- and that's what opened it up. MR. O'CONNOR: And then eventually the other
window was --

THE COURT: Also broken.
MR. O'CONNOR: -- also broken.
THE COURT: So people were streaming in from both the broken windows and, then, also through the kicked-down door.

MR. O'CONNOR: And I don't recall if the second window had been broken by the time Mr. Croy came in, but you have people flooding in --

THE COURT: It was, from when -- I think it was, from looking at the video.

MR. O'CONNOR: I would say the scene really draws an image of, you know, someone coming in through the door, while people are streaming in through the windows -- to say that there was no one there to say you couldn't come in is a bit of a distraction; that's not how people enter most buildings, much less the Capitol. And so to come in at that time, it's aggravating --

THE COURT: But let me just -- I just want to focus on this -- the first aggravating factor is witnessing law enforcement attempt to keep rioters at bay for over an hour.

I mean, I think that there are defendants for whom the government has recommended either straight probation or probation with home detention who are both inside and
outside the Capitol with views of law enforcement trying to keep --

MR. O'CONNOR: Sure.
THE COURT: -- the crowd out.

MR. O'CONNOR: Sure.
THE COURT: So to find this to be an aggravating
factor standing alone strikes me as -- doesn't really distinguish this defendant from others.

MR. O'CONNOR: And, Your Honor, fair point.

I'd only offer -- you know, in line with our earlier conversation, every individual that was involved in the riot is hard to assess; so it's not one factor alone that pushes an individual into one camp or another.

Obviously if somebody committed violence, they would be charged with that; that would be a clear distinction --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. O'CONNOR: -- and they would be facing a much different range of criminal --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. O'CONNOR: -- liability. However, at this point, it's a -- it is a collection of various factors that we're looking to associate.

And I do recall -- I think you had mentioned at some point during a sentencing hearing, it's a very human
endeavor. I mean, we are not machines, we don't calculate this out; and the weighing factor, to your point, is difficult --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. O'CONNOR: -- but it's not one factor alone.
THE COURT: Okay. But I -- as I am parsing out
factors -- and I have a number of these cases, so I want to make sure not just that $I$ am at least internally consistent with how I'm looking at factors -MR. O'CONNOR: Right. THE COURT: -- but also not -- when I'm evaluating the government's recommendation, which every sentencing judge takes pretty seriously, as it does any defense recommendation and the reasons for the disparity, as I have here between the government's recommendation of two months' incarceration and the defendant's recommendation of straight probation, you know; so figuring out the reasons behind it -- because what I have to do is fashion a reasonable sentence.

MR. O'CONNOR: Understood.
THE COURT: Okay. And so the second factor is defendant's support of violent, aggressive, and antagonistic actions against law enforcement through his presence in a mob that overwhelmed law enforcement officers and forced them to retreat further into the Capitol and, also, joining
in the chant of, "Whose house?" "Our house." -- while inside the Capitol.

So, by saying this, you are not saying that this defendant actually himself engaged in violent behavior, but that he was in parts of the mob that, at particular times and in particular parts of the Capitol, actually overran police lines.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, and I think you can see that.
I mean, again, it links to when the defendant
entered the Capitol at a very early stage. And you see the video after he enters through the Senate wing doors, he goes into the crypt specifically. And there are two videos that I think are really illustrative; one -- I think it's Exhibit 3 is the CCB (sic) where you see the rioters just -the word I use is "swell."

As they continue to pack in, there is a line of law enforcement officers who are trying to keep people from further entering the Capitol. And the CCV (sic) shows that that size of the crowd -- each by one individual, one individual, one individual -- and Mr. Croy was one of those one individuals who caused the room to swell to the point -and I have watched some video where they weren't nec- -they weren't assaulting any officers; they were certainly aggressive, and they're walking and posturing towards the officers that eventually forced the officers to retreat.

You also see this through Mr. Croy's cell video from the crypt; I think it's Exhibit 2. And in there you get his account pretty firsthand because it's his cell phone video of what he's seeing and what he's observing.

And I submit what it shows is that he got within a person -- if not at the very front of the line, maybe one person back from a law enforcement officer who was part of that line trying to keep rioters at bay. What strikes me is not necessarily just the proximity or the numbers of the crowd swelling around him but, when you hear the audio, you hear the antagonism from the riot that he was a part of -the mob that he was a part of; their chants of "USA," as if it's the rioters who are representing our country. There are chants of, "Whose house?" "Our house" -- to, you know, presumably justify their presence there.

What really struck me was hearing the chant or the jeer: You're on the wrong side. Such to say that the crowd, when facing off with law enforcement, is drawing a distinction and making law enforcement officers the opposition to them. "You're on the wrong side." There is a side here; and they're putting law enforcement officers on the other side of it.

Even without directly engaging in violence, being a number in that mob is aggravating because it was the size of the mob where -- you know, in some conversations about
this -- it is a difficult event because it is one of those instances where the sum is certainly greater than -- the whole is certainly greater than the sum of the parts. While Mr. Croy may have just been a person there, having so many people just being there certainly prevented law enforcement from containing the situation. And, Your Honor, in that antagonistic environment, that's aggravating.

THE COURT: So there are -- from the videos -three different areas within the Capitol Building where Mr. Croy was a member of this mob that was so big it overran police lines in the crypt, in the hallway by the House wing door, and then the second time he went into the building in the Rotunda.

MR. O'CONNOR: Agreed. And just to say -THE COURT: Is that the government's view of what the video evidence shows?

MR. O'CONNOR: If I can elaborate a little bit; largely, yes.

I would submit, when you see the video from the hallway by the House wing door, Mr. Croy initially is certainly part of a crowd that is marching for (sic) law enforcement officers while you see law enforcement officers retreat down the hallway.

THE COURT: You see that clearly. MR. O'CONNOR: Clearly. To be fair, two minutes
later you see a crowd of rioters going back the other way with law enforcement behind them seeming to have control of that hallway; and you see Mr. Croy, in line with the crowd, also walking back. But to your point, it clearly does show there was a time when this riot -- when this mob was pushing back the line of officers, yes.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. So as I -- I want to make sure. As I understand the government's second aggravating factor is not just merely being a member of the crowd because lots of the defendants for whom the government has -- if not all, has recommended already straight probation, or probation with home detention, had been part of the crowd inside the Capitol; it's this defendant's participation at times and in locations where the crowd overran police lines?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Then, third, the government cites the defendant's disregard for the -- and I am quoting you: The severity of his actions when he traipse through the Capitol as if it was an amusement park, including taking fun photos and videos of other rioters dressing statues, and posing for his own photograph by a statue that he would later send to friends.

So, as an aggravating factor, I wanted to know why is this so aggravating? I mean, I think that there are a
number of other defendants for whom the government has recommended straight probation or probation with home detention who also took photos while they were touring the Capitol, with the alarms blaring and the police trying to get them out.

MR. O'CONNOR: A real juxtaposition there, to be acting in that manner; and only to say, correct, Your Honor, there were many people who took photos. There were many people who seemed to be enjoying themselves who completely disregarded the severity of what was happening, such to say as it is one of the factors in fashioning the sentence.

THE COURT: Well, let me just say that my focus right now is not on whether it was offensive, whether it was sophomoric behavior; my focus is on disparity.

So other defendants for whom the government has recommended straight probation or probation with home detention have also taken photos, so how is Mr. Croy's participation in that denigrating behavior to the Capitol, our democracy -- why does it make it more aggravating here for him to warrant two months in jail?

MR. O'CONNOR: To those similarly-situated defendants who also engaged in that same kind of sophomoric behavior, it's not distinguishable; it is one of the many factors of what Mr. Croy did that day.

THE COURT: Okay. So -- all right. So I will
tell you that it somewhat troubles me to say that -- I mean, that him taking pictures of Winston Churchill and Václav Havel dressed up in Trump paraphernalia is such an aggravating factor it deserves jail time. Despite what one might think of that conduct, that didn't make his -- anyway, and so I --

MR. O'CONNOR: Your Honor --
THE COURT: -- it's hard for me to see that as an aggravating factor warranting jail time.

MR. O'CONNOR: Understood.
I think more the point of what that sophomoric behavior illustrates is really the disregard to the severity of what happened because, as Mr. Croy and his colleagues -or co-rioters -- were engaging in that behavior, it came at the time where the riot had successfully -- and thankfully only temporarily -- but had successfully delayed the certification of the presidential election.

And I think it is worth noting that the rioters, when they went into the Capitol, had a severe consequence. What they achieved is significant. And the conduct they engaged in at the time was completely unfitting. To that, I think it is a factor of their intent towards entering the Capitol that they disregarded the severity of what was going on. I think that is notable.

Again, it doesn't stand alone by itself, is not
the only factor involved, but is worth commenting on as part of the nature and circumstances of this offense.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, I mean, let me just say that if the government was viewing this as an aggravating factor warranting jail time, any participant in that mob who took pictures and acted like it was a big party you'd be asking for two months' jail time for thousands of people; and you are not.

MR. O'CONNOR: You are correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So then the fourth aggravating factor is that the defendant wrongfully entered the Capitol Building a second time.

And I just wanted to ask you, point blank, is it -- is the defendant's entering the Capitol a second time, after everything he had seen, both while he was inside the Capitol, while he was hanging around for 45 minutes outside the Capitol before he entered the second time, including seeing somebody come out of the Capitol with a bloody T-shirt -- is it that entering -- reentering, a second time, the Capitol Building in that context the dispositive aggravating factor here for the government to ask for jail time?

MR. O'CONNOR: In addition to the initial time and manner he entered, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Then the government cites, as
an aggravating factor, the fifth and final aggravating factor warranting jail time, that he bragged about breaching the Capitol and defending his actions and the actions of co-rioters to his friends. And I think, in that regard, the government points to the defendant sending a private message to a friend while outside the Capitol Building stating that, "We stormed the Capitol"; that's a quote.

And then, in response to the friend's question, Did congressmen bail? The defendant responded, in part, "absolutely"; and that was on January 7th, I think. No, that was outside the Capitol Building, so that was actually on January 6th.

And then, after the Capitol attack, on January 8th Mr. Croy told his friends, also in a private Facebook post, that it "was a legit and mostly peaceful protest, unlike the burning buildings we see during the summer and are told is mostly peaceful." So these were not public posts.

MR. O'CONNOR: They were not.

THE COURT: They were clearly defending and minimizing the seriousness of the consequences of the conduct on January 6th.

MR. O'CONNOR: I would say it displayed his intent and his pride for that action.

THE COURT: And his pride.
But, as an aggravating factor warranting a prison
term as opposed to straight probation or probation with detention, I look at, for example, Morgan-Lloyd and Jessica Bustle, both of whom used almost exactly the same phrase, "We stormed the Capitol." And Bustle went on to say, "We need a revolution." Morgan-Lloyd went on to say she was so glad she was there; she can now spread the truth about what happened and open the eyes of some of their friends.

So they are much more, in some ways -- compared to what Mr. Croy said -- you know, much more proselytizers than defenders of his own conduct. So how -- and for both Morgan-Lloyd and Jessica Bustle, who I just pulled off one of the government filings to me in another case as comparators -- how does Mr. Croy's messages -- both on January 6th and then the few days afterwards -- amount to an aggravating factor?

MR. O'CONNOR: Again, Your Honor, similar to his manner -- the, again, sophomoric traipsing through the hallways -- it is a part of Mr. Croy's criminal conduct that day. It is part of the nature and circumstances of the offense that the Court should be aware of when fashioning a sentence; it is a factor. Also understanding, as you've just discussed, this one is not the dispositive factor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. O'CONNOR: That one, again, is much more the entering the second time, the amount of time he was in the

Capitol collectively; the amount of time he was in and around the Capitol, as well as having entered very early in the riot; those are certainly much more of the dispositive factors.

I would say that these are more atmospheric as to demonstrating his intent; his joining the crowd; his pride about everything that took part that day that did -- again, while he was not directly engaged in the violence, did include violence.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you.
Mr. O'Connor, is there anything else you want to add? It's been a helpful discussion.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you so much.

I did just want to mention one thing, and I spoke with defense counsel about this briefly.

In the reply the defense had referenced that there was a discovery concern that the government didn't provide something to defense. I did just want to correct it, for the record.

I did respond to Ms. West's discovery --
THE COURT: Could you remind me? What was it?
I remember seeing something about that, but --
MR. O'CONNOR: There is a line in there where we talked about a witness who had observed Mr. Croy had deleted things from his Facebook account.

THE COURT: Oh, yes. But -- and that's why Ms. West submitted the screenshot showing Facebook had blocked -- blocked Mr. Croy's --

MR. O'CONNOR: I believe so. Right.

And Ms. West had asked me for records about that -- that person, and identifying information about that person; and I provided her with the records. They had been previously provided; but $I$ did respond to that email before the filing of the reply to say, Here are the records we have. She acknowledged it in a very nice way. I thought that was the end of -- more or less we had satisfied the concern that she had.

Just insofar as it's in the reply, I did want to correct the record to say that we did -- I did respond to that discovery request; and I believe she will say the same.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, while you are on that point, it was a bit of a puzzle to me -- and I was going to ask Ms. West about it, but maybe $I$ will just ask you.

There was a letter submitted by one of Mr. Croy's friends who said -- a Mr. Kezer -- who said defendant, and I quote, Can be seen in multiple videos telling people not to break anything; and that video evidence shows that he was telling people not to perform illegal actions but to have their voices heard peacefully. That's docketed at ECF 40-4.

I haven't seen videos that say anything like that.

Do those videos exist, or are they in connection with this case?

MR. O'CONNOR: Not that I have seen or collected.
I mean, as you well know, there is plenty, plenty, plenty video out there. I have not seen videos along the lines of what this witness is discussing.

THE COURT: Okay. So -- okay. Because I was just puzzled by that statement in that letter. But maybe Ms. West will be able to explain what this Mr. Kezer was talking about or whether Mr. Kezer was dreaming it or getting people confused.

MR. O'CONNOR: Certainly.
THE COURT: Okay. Anything further?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Ms. West.
So maybe I will just start with Mr. Kezer's
letter. Am I missing -- I tried to be prepared so, when I saw that letter, I wanted to make sure I hadn't missed any videos.

MS. WEST: Your Honor, no, you haven't.
As Mr. O'Connor said, there are gazillions of videos. These are reports of what Mr. Croy has said -- has told friends that happened. We're still finding videos.

We're hopeful that we'll find a video when Mr. Croy was helped after he was pepper sprayed. A police
officer -- I am sure was wearing a body-worn camera -- came over to assist Mr. Croy; I haven't seen that video.

When the woman police officer in the video -- when Mr. -- you mentioned it. When Mr. Croy leaves the video for a little bit, he is actually in a bathroom. He comes out of the bathroom. He has a really nice discussion with those police officers; we haven't seen any body-worn camera on that. I am sure it exists.

THE COURT: Well, I am not so sure about that because -- based on what I have learned through the course of these cases, if it's a Metropolitan Police Department police officer, they're required to wear body-worn cameras if there is footage.

MS. WEST: Yes.

THE COURT: But if it's a Capitol police officer they don't wear cameras. And so if he had an interaction -it depends on -- I think they all look like police officers. But if it was a Capitol police officer, it is highly likely there is no body-worn camera footage.

MS. WEST: Which is unfortunate.
But in that vein, in this Class B misdemeanor -and I should say, Mr. O'Connor is a true southern gentlemen; he has been a pleasure to work with. I have asked him for video after video. He, I know, has spent days looking for things I have asked for, to identify people; every time, he
did it.

It's just that more keeps coming up. After
Mr. Croy's re-arraignment, we had more videos. And as I have mentioned in my brief, I think now I am up to 11 discovery dumps since he pled guilty; that never happens in a case, as this Court knows, in cases that I generally handle that are ten years to life. You don't get discovery after the person pleads guilty.

And to Mr. O'Connor's credit, he was really, really trying hard to find something to make Mr. Croy look more aggravating for this Court so that he could, in fact, say two months' incarceration is what he should have but there just wasn't, thankfully. So --

THE COURT: Well, it is -- in a case of this magnitude, with so many people involved at the Capitol, and the government diligently trying to do its job of making the punishment fit the crime -- I think they also don't want to make a mistake and misevaluate somebody as falling in a lesser category of aggravating circumstances, and then find out that that person engaged in more aggravating conduct than they were initially aware of. And it has happened before me and, I think, in front of other judges where pleas have been postponed because new evidence has surfaced that the government has to evaluate, plus defense counsel; so it's the nature of this particular incident.

MS. WEST: I agree with the Court. And Mr. O'Connor and I both agreed that we wanted to bring you every fact we possibly could that was pertinent to the case.

With regard to what Mr. O'Connor said about what I said in my response about the missing discovery, he did give me that; but he didn't identify who that person was that said Mr. Croy had deleted these things so that we could investigate that. But it became a nonissue because we found a Facebook post where he clearly said that he was banned by Facebook. He didn't -- that wasn't something he did; so that became actually a moot point.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you about a video, joint -- the video footage that was Joint Exhibit 2, which is MS. WEST: Mr. Croy's cell phone in the crypt. THE COURT: Yes. And you can hear the crowd shouting, "Whose house?" "Our house." -- and the rioters shouting: "You are on the wrong team." And a lot of that is the voices that are clearly other people in the crowd in some ways.

But early in that video you can hear a voice very clearly. So it was either Mr. Croy holding the phone, or somebody very close to him; and the voice says, "Where you motherfuckers hiding!" "Get out of the basement with Biden!" Is that Mr. Croy speaking?

MS. WEST: I certainly hope not, Your Honor. I
didn't ask Mr. Croy. I can ask Mr. Croy.
We discussed -- Ms. Cubbage, she is the video expert. We discussed having a voice exemplar done of Mr. Croy so that we could identify who said what and -because I didn't want to rely on Mr. Croy's memory because it was so chaotic. And we decided -- I felt like it wasn't worth -- which you are not going to like; but I felt like: This is a Class B misdemeanor; I am court appointed; my voucher is already over the limit; I have Ms. Cubbage to pay from the government. So I just was really, actually, running out of time; $I$ was looking at so much video.

So I feel like -- there was one thing I did ask Mr. Croy, if it was -- that we just talked about that I did ask him --

THE COURT: Well, let me just say, whether Mr. Croy said it -- it's so clear, it's so close to him, it would be hard to imagine how he didn't hear it to know what people around were doing; and they were looking for congressmen. So it was a good thing all of the Congress people were evacuated.

MS. WEST: Right. So -- and I think --
THE COURT: And I think that that's -- whether he said it or not, you are right; $I$ can imagine why you would hope he didn't say that. But it does give a pretty clear indication of what people right around him, very close to
him -- because it's a clear statement on the video --
MS. WEST: It's scary.
THE COURT: -- are thinking.
MS. WEST: It's scary, quite frankly. Very scary.
And there were a lot of things people said that -just from sitting and talking with Mr. Croy that I could tell wasn't him, things that were very offensive; so I think that I am going to get to that. There were a couple that Mr. O'Connor mentioned.

I do want to talk about a couple of things that the Court brought up, the factual mystery of a woman. That goes along with the Court saying -- and the government saying that Mr. Croy didn't immediately cooperate with the police; that's not true.

Mr. Croy went to the police station, as I described in my brief; he did everything we said. The fact that he didn't give them a statement that day doesn't mean he wasn't cooperative.

He did cooperate immediately as soon as he had legal representation. And I should tell the Court that the codefendant in this case did give an oral statement, a recorded oral statement. And what he says has coalesced with what Mr. Croy has told me, so I wanted the Court to be aware of that.

```
As far as the mystery woman, to me, that's
```

cooperation that Mr. Croy should get credit for in this case. He didn't have to talk about that. The plea agreement -- as the Court says, there is not guidance like we have in the guidelines, like the safety valve; here's the five things you have to do.

Well, in the plea agreement, all of these defendants have agreed to sit down and talk to the government about what happened on January 6th. So Mr. Croy went beyond what he -- describing what he did. He described for the FBI other things; and I think that is super important. And Mr. O'Connor just said they didn't know who she was at that time. What he failed to mention is that Mr. Croy, in his interview, was able to help the FBI. And not only that, Mr. Croy had a receipt for the hotel that they stayed in, which is going to have -- make the government's job easier at trial with the codefendant. So, to me, when criminal defendants go beyond what they have to do, they should be given credit for that; and that's important.

I agree with the Court that this is not an easy task. And Mr. O'Connor said that it's quote-unquote a novel event, which is true; but the law is not novel.

My understanding -- as the people have been prosecuted in D.C. for protests for a long time, and I know how important it is for this Court to treat everybody
equally. And what -- why I wanted the Court to look at this case through the prism of COVID-19 and the protests that we experienced last summer is that really -- people were on edge; everybody was.

And a person like Mr. Croy -- at that time he was unemployed; he has two kids to feed and clothe. Mr. Croy is unique to other defendants because of what happened in Portland, which is where his dying mother was; he couldn't get to her; he was worried about her. And she died last year and he was able to take care of that thankfully, even though he was on release in this case.

But for a period of months, Mr. Croy -- unlike other people whose parents perhaps were not in Portland -watched that happen. And I have to say I watched it happen, and I watched January 6th happen; and I was just stunned.

I just -- I don't know how to say that it was very hard for Mr. Croy to watch that. And he did -- what he did was wrong; he has told this Court that. But he felt like he needed to express himself in a way that turned out, unfortunately, not to be good.

So what I'm trying to say is that Mr. Croy is a good person who made a very bad decision -- not just based on fake news that Donald Trump spewed, but also based on what was happening to him personally; what he had watched for months. So he, as a person, was perhaps more ripe for
his behavior than others is all I am saying.
THE COURT: Well, I don't really want to get into the whole comparison. I know you have brought it up in your papers. Mr. Croy brought it up in his letter; you know, about watching the Black Lives Matter and the protests after George Floyd's murder that happened across the country. There were protests in D.C. I think many protesters who were arrested were processed in Superior Court, not this Court.

To the extent that there were protesters who participated in some of those incidents who were brought up on felony charges and brought to this court -- I had one; a guy who walked -- broke a window in a bank, walked through the bank, took nothing -- took nothing -- 16 months.

MS. WEST: Wow.

THE COURT: I gave him 16 months; below what the government was asking for. So for people to say that they thought people who participated in protests during the summer of 2020 got no punishment, that's not my experience in my court.

MS. WEST: No, it's not.
THE COURT: It is not.
If he wants to be treated like some of those protesters, he wants -- he was given a maximum of a petty offense charge, not a felony charge.

MS. WEST: I agree. I agree.
THE COURT: And that guy walked into a bank, took nothing, at night. There was nobody there. He wasn't obstructing a constitutionally-mandated process --

MS. WEST: I understand. I understand.

THE COURT: -- charged with a felony.
MS. WEST: I understand the Court's frustration.
I just wanted --
THE COURT: So I hear the comparisons to the treatment of people arrested in connection with the riots during the summer of 2020, my experience is felony prosecutions in this Court, and lots of jail time; certainly --

MS. WEST: I think --

THE COURT: -- beyond the six months max for the petty offense charge.

MS. WEST: And I think Judge Lamberth mentioned that in one of his sentencings; that he had watched the testimony of Judge Garland, and how he was going to treat all of these people equally.

I just wanted to point out that Portland had a real place in Mr. Croy's heart, and it was really, really, hard for him at that time is what I wanted the Court to take from that.

THE COURT: Well, I read his letter. I read your
briefing, Ms. West. And I -- you know that old motto that moms tell their kids: Two wrongs don't make a right.

MS. WEST: Yes.
THE COURT: So if he's offended by what he saw in terms of some of the protests in the summer of 2020 because of the violence and criminal conduct that occurred with looting businesses, burning buildings -- which is what he describes in his letter -- you know, okay, well, why should he go and repeat that behavior if he thought it was so wrong?

MS. WEST: As I said --
THE COURT: That argument -- that comparison makes little sense to me, so $I$ wasn't even going to talk about it, because it makes so little sense to me, until you brought it up. And I know your papers are replete with it, as is his letter; but two wrongs don't make a right, it's as simple as that.

My experience with prosecutions in the summer of 2020 -- I only speak from my experience -- is that -- is that people were brought to me facing felony charges.

MS. WEST: I understand, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And not that many cases I think, as most of them were processed in superior court.

Anyway -- so I don't know that there is much more to be said. I do think that the goal of a lot of the
protests in 2020 were to hold police accountable and politicians accountable for police brutality and murder, in George Floyd's case; and it was to improve our political system.

What happened on January 6th is in a totally different category.

MS. WEST: I agree. I agree.
THE COURT: That protest was to stop the government from functioning at all, to stop our democratic process -- and it worked, at least for a period of time. They are not comparable.

So -- but let's go back to this case.
MS. WEST: There are two videos, Your Honor, that you mentioned.

The first one, Exhibit No. 3, you talked about the two windows that were broken, and that he went into the doors when he first entered the Capitol. I watched that video multiple times. There were at least 400 -- I think I put 700 in my brief; and then I went back and said I better start counting. There were at least 400 people ahead of him.

According to Mr. Croy, he did not understand or see the violence until weeks later of what really happened at the Capitol; and even today we're seeing more things about the violence. And there is a --

THE COURT: Well, I think he did say that, even before he went into the Capitol, he saw officers shooting pepper balls and throwing smoke and gas grenades at rioters climbing up the rails to the steps of the Capitol and into the crowd. But, I mean, it's just --

MS. WEST: He knew he shouldn't go in, and he went in any way.

THE COURT: Exactly.
MS. WEST: That's right. That's absolutely right.
But you asked -- there was a chant -- I did ask
Mr. Croy -- because I have a note: "You're on the wrong side." I asked Mr. Croy if that was him because that was that police video when he was so close to the police; he said that wasn't him. That's when we had the discussion of whether we should have a voice exemplar; and we -- I just, basically, ran out of time.

The other video that you talked about is where he's pushed into the Capitol --

THE COURT: Well, in his defense -- Defense Exhibit 1, in that video, I think he is saying -- he does yell to the police: You took an oath to the Constitution, not a fucking -- I think he says -- pirate. "Why you coming over here to my house?" "Protect your precious fucking building?" And he calls them oath breakers. That is the defendant speaking at that point, right?

MS. WEST: It is, because I did ask him about that. THE COURT: So he is part of a crowd that's taunting the police; and this is at $1: 57$ to 2:02. It's just a few minutes before the police were overrun and members of Congress and the Vice President had to be evacuated. Right? MS. WEST: Correct.

I did want to -- $I$ know the Court knows the Reeder case. He has shown a lack of remorse, which I think this Court has just mentioned, how important that is. He had a lack of remorse even after he pled guilty, which I think is a different situation; and he publicly live-streamed the information is what $I$ am told.

I think that, finally -- I agree with the Court that, as far as specific deterrence, a period of probation is, in fact -- it's not supervised release as we know it, but it does provide for supervision to make sure that nothing happens like this again, which I think -- which probation, $I$ think, practically, is better for these lower-level defendants than a period of incarceration because they can be supervised. And as the Court fashions a sentence, I believe I mentioned he would -- I am not sure he would be willing to wear an ankle monitor if the Court wanted that kind of supervision.

You started this hearing by saying -- mentioning the footnote that $I$ wrote, and that your goal is not to make
my job harder. I can't tell this Court what a privilege and gift it is to practice law in this courthouse and in front of you. I have learned -- I am such a better lawyer than I was before I came here.

But the irony is -- I told Mr. Croy before his plea what was going to happen. I said, Mr. Croy, you don't realize how fortunate you are to have Judge Howell. And that plea hearing was so hard for me because I had never heard the level of emotion and angst in your voice in a case; and I have had several cases in front of you. And so I believe -- even though this is such a unique circumstance and unique case -- that this Court will treat Mr. Croy like other similarly-situated defendants and give him a sentence of probation, which would allow him to work and take care of his children which is a very serious issue in this case.

THE COURT: And you have mentioned that also. But I also am looking at a defendant who picked up -- when he's unemployed, and travels to Washington, D.C.; pays for a hotel. He's got -- I mean, it's -- you know, if you are really concerned about your son with diabetes and, you know, supporting your family, what are you doing picking up and traveling across country?

MS. WEST: Well, I think that that's a good
question. But at the time Mr. Croy believed what millions of other Americans believed that Donald Trump told them;
that the "stop the steal" was real. Mr. Croy doesn't believe that now, but he did then. And I think, as Americans, that's what we want our citizens to do, is to address wrongdoing by anyone, but to do it legally.

And Mr. Croy came here to peacefully protest. He didn't know he was going to go into the Capitol. And you mentioned that -- about whether or not that paragraph in my brief was factual; $I$ represent nine people in these cases, and some guy came here just to pray -- just to pray for our country. There were moms that came to hear some women's group talk. I mean, there were all -- Mr. Croy is an American Indian; there are all different races and types.

I agree with the Court. Most of those people were Trump supporters; most of those people. But I have seen hundreds of hours of videos. There are women pushing baby carriages; there are people listening to Elton John. I mean, it started out peacefully and didn't go south until Mr. Trump told everybody to go over to the Capitol.

And what I told Judge Hogan in another case -- I represent a native Texan. As soon as he realized that Donald Trump told him to go to the Capitol but didn't go to the Capitol with him, he was off the list, Donald Trump, because he didn't do what he said he was going to do.

And Mr. Croy has had a similar revelation. At the time he went to D.C., January 6th, he believed what he was
doing as an American was right. He made a bad decision to go into the Capitol; then he did it again, that's wrong. Now he knows that he was misled but his President, like many, many, many millions of others.

THE COURT: Well, let's talk about the second time he went into the Capitol, because that's one of the dispositive aggravating factors in the government's view, and one that $I$ find to be a very aggravating factor in this case.

And you are sensitive to that, Ms. West; and you, sort of, make the arguments about that focused in your brief and state that he did not voluntarily enter the Capitol Building a second time. And you say that he was pushed in by the crowd; it was a surge that carried him into the building and the crowd pushed him through. So you make it seem like he is just -- floats among the ocean, going with the tide.

MS. WEST: I don't think it was quite that way. THE COURT: Well, you didn't say that, but that's my --

MS. WEST: Yes.
THE COURT: So I actually looked at videos 7 and 8 of the moment he goes in the second time around. And I have to say it doesn't look to me like he is simply pushed in by the crowd.

So I wanted to share with you what I saw; you can tell me where I am wrong. But video 7, from his phone, does show a mass of people outside of the Rotunda door. And what is striking to me is that there is a steady stream of people exiting through the doors trying to push through the crowd to get out; steady stream of them. And you can hear a voice in the background saying something about how the police are trying to push them out. There are alarms blaring.

And instead of Mr. Croy joining the stream trying successfully to get out through the crowd out of the Rotunda doors, he isn't moving. He is still facing forward, pushing towards the doors. And, in fact, there are other rioters who are yelling: Get back in there, push forward. And he appears to be one of those people following the directions to push forward and get back in there, rather than following a number of people who are trying successfully -- as I said, a steady stream of people leaving the building.

And then -- that's on the outside of the Rotunda doors. And inside the Rotunda door the CCTV footage shows him, sort of, standing -- sort of looking at his phone; standing around with his phone. And then a crowd of rioters -- and there is a police line trying to keep people from going inside of the Rotunda. And then you see him just standing there. No gassing, no chemical spray at him at that point; he is just standing there.

So then he made his way in, rather than leave with the exiting crowd. And then the police -- then the police line is broken with him, with the crowd, being pushed into the Rotunda. This is not somebody who seems that he just happened to be standing at the wrong place at the wrong time, and that's how he ended up inside the building a second time.

MS. WEST: And I asked Mr. Croy exactly what you just described, and here is what I was told -- and here is what I saw. You are correct, somebody said: Push forward, and get back in there. And I asked Mr. Croy if that was he; and he said no, that wasn't; that was people behind him.

And he said, you know, it's like being at a concert. I said, What do you mean? He said, you know, people are going one way, people are going another way; the people behind me were pushing me. And I said, Well, why couldn't you turn around? And he said that there was a police officer or someone that said turn around, and he physically was pushed so close to the other people that he could not even do that. And people -- he said it was like a group of 20 or 30 people had -- he didn't see it, but he felt from behind him being pushed, being pushed, being pushed, even though you could see people on the left-hand side of that video coming out of the building and out into the outside. So that's how he described that to me.

And then, when I watched video No. 8, somebody said -- as the Court said, at 21 -- he said -- somebody says: Push forward. I said, Well, Mr. Croy, was that you? He said no; that's these people behind me pushing me in.

He said as soon as he got in he was -- believes the police -- he was pepper sprayed, took his glasses off -he can't see without his glasses. Even if he had glasses, if you have been pepper sprayed you can't see. He said a police officer actually helped him and asked him if he needed assistance. And you can see, as you watch the video, that he is, kind of, in a daze. He really doesn't know what to do.

But there is a whole line of police officers trying to get everybody out. I think one of them says: Get on the ground. And Mr. Croy completely complies, once again, with everything the police officer said to him. And he then got out after he was able to clear his eyes with water. So that's why, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yes. But complying that time was after he was told the first time around by a police officer: Leave, exit. So he left, only to come back in.

MS. WEST: Yeah. And that's why -- I had the same questions that Your Honor does; and that's how Mr. Croy described that to me.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. WEST: I think that's all I have, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MS. WEST: Mr. Croy, this is your opportunity to speak to me directly if you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
I just want to start by saying that I am sorry.
I have seen a lot of things since that day, you
know. As the prosecutor said, you know, I did say some things directly after the incident; but I never witnessed no -- no major violence; a lot of pushing; a lot of shoving. And, you know, since then I have seen video footage; and I don't condone violence or aggression.

You know, I am not against police officers. I am not against the government. I am not against -- I am not against anything. I love America. I love my children. And I respect law enforcement.

When I was at the bottom there, and you said that I was a little bit yelling at the police, you know: You are not a tyrant, or whatever; $I$ had just seen them punch a guy. And I had no context for it, I don't know what happened, you know. But $I$ saw him punching him, not trying to detain him. So I was -- I tried to record it; I missed it. And then, you know, you see me yelling at the police officers. It was me being aggressive with the police officers. It was me
saying, you know, Why are you hitting that guy? Why aren't you up there protecting that building?

And then, after they left, I turned around, and it was completely open all the way up to the Capitol. This large group of police officers had moved off into the crowd -- not up towards the Capitol, into the crowd; so I had no idea where they were going off to.

Foolishly, I walked into that building, Your
Honor. I followed along with everybody else. I saw everybody going up. I didn't see police at the top no more. I knew there was police officers who were aggressive behind me now, so I followed the crowd. I tried to stay with them, and I shouldn't have. I definitely should have just left at that point. But all day we were, you know, under this impression that the election had been stolen; that, you know, we were there to make our vote count and, you know, make sure that our voices were heard, you know. And so I was caught up in the group. That's how it was, I was caught up with them.

I went inside that building. I never got aggressive with the police even inside the building, even in the crypt. I wasn't -- I wasn't yelling at people. I wasn't in the front of the line trying to push police officers, never.

And then, when they got pushed back again, I
followed the crowd. I saw a bathroom at the end of the hallway. I went in to use the restroom, washed my hands, respectfully. I didn't touch anything in there. I didn't make a mess, nothing. And when $I$ came out my first question, when I saw a police officer standing there was, Are you guys okay? Immediately, you know. And they asked me if I was okay, and I responded yes.

So then they pointed me on the way. I walked out.
I took some pictures. And when I exited that building, I had no intentions ever of going back in there. And then it was 40 minutes, as you said, that I was milling around outside, just kind of singing; you know, standing around talking with people. And then the guy came out with the bloody shirt and said that a woman had been shot inside.

Like I said, I never saw no violence that day with the group that I was with. I have since seen that HBO documentary. I know that there was violence there now. But I hadn't seen any; and I hadn't seen anybody with weapons or anything like that. The only people I saw with weapons were police officers. So to hear somebody was shot, I couldn't believe it; I had no idea what was going on.

You know, I had already seen -- for the most part, the police officers all day that day were very -- very nice -- you know, congenial, respectful. I was respectful to them; they were respectful to me. The only ones I saw
were the ones at the beginning. And, like I said, I have no context for why that happened. I have no understanding of why that happened; I just saw that it had happened.

And so when I heard that a lady had been shot -you know, I had been watching all of those YouTube videos all summer on. And foolishly, again, I thought maybe if I documented stuff on my phone that you would get the real context of what was going on because, you know, I was watching all of those riots in Portland and, also, because my mom lives in Oregon. I wasn't seeing any of that on the news. So I knew that it was important for people to be out there and actually documenting what was going on. It was important in George Floyd; it was important in BLM, you know, protests all across the country for people to actually be out there documenting who weren't journalists or anything.

So I almost felt like $I$ was trying to do that all day that day, trying to document. But then when $I$ was pushed inside of that building, I was trying to document that whole thing because we were up there; I was trying to find out about the girl that was shot. People were yelling, you know. I tried to record a little bit.

And then once I started to feel like I was being pushed, I immediately put my phone away, you know, because I didn't want my phone broken. By that time, you know, I had
a flag in one hand, I had a phone in the other. Like Ms. West said, at a concert, when you are in a crush situation like that -- I go to a lot of heavy metal concerts, so it's always like crushing. You always get your hands up in front of you and protect your chest; that way you don't get crushed. If you do, then you have got some kind of barrier there to keep you from getting knocked down or light-headed. So that's how I was.

I was pressed up against the front by the police, and they were asking me to go back. I was explaining to them I can't go back, I can't; you know, I am trying, I can't go back.

Then, when they released us, they told me to get on the ground and, at the same time, I was maced; at the same time it seemed like. I mean, my memory is -- you know, obviously it's been ten months; but that's how I remember it. I remember being pushed in there, stuck, face-to-face with the police, and them telling me to go back. I was saying, I can't; I am trying.

And then you could hear people yelling behind me: We're being crushed. They maced me and released us at the same time. They were, like, get on the ground. I told them -- immediately, I put my hands in the air -- you know, from my chest up to the air; I said, I can't, I am maced; I can't see. They said: Go this way. So I wandered off that
way. I didn't have my glasses on because I had taken them off.

As soon as we were released, I took my glasses off, put those in my hoodie. I went off to the left to a door that they directed me to go to. I went out; there was a police officer standing there, and there was a spiral staircase going down. And I told them -- he was, like, get down the stairs right now. I was, like, I am maced; I can't see very good. He offered to help me right away. You know, I was like, really? He was like, yeah, I don't want you to get hurt; I was, like, I appreciate it.

And then, after I exited the building -- again, I met with other police officers that day, very cordial; gave me water. I had no bad interactions that day to base how bad it was until afterwards.

Like I said, the only -- the only group was the first group, you know; and I have no context for it. I don't know if it was warranted for them to be punching some guy like that; but every other interaction with police that day was good.

I didn't see anybody physically assaulting police officers in front of me, you know. And if they were, then $I$ was trying to document that, too. I wasn't just documenting police being on bad behavior; I felt like I needed to document all bad behavior. But I wasn't very good at it
because I was always afraid of getting my phone broke, or -so I would record what I could, and I would put it away.

As soon as we heard that there was a curfew, we left immediately, as soon as -- you know, we got out before the curfew. I never wanted to break the law that day.

I had no idea I was going to the Capitol that day. I thought we were going there for a rally. And then, when Mr. Trump said that -- walk down the street and go to the Capitol, that's what I did. I never saw no signs, no barricades.

When I walked up, I walked right up to that spot where you see me at where the first police officers encounter us; walked right through a crowd with tons of people. I never saw -- I saw the barricade right there with the stairs; but I never saw any signs or anything like that, you know. Then, when I got to the top of the stairs, the doors were open and there was a ramp going up to the doors. We kind of followed along.

The whole time -- like I said in my letter, Your Honor, I was kind of like a lemming. You know, I just kind of followed the crowd. I regret every -- every moment of being inside of that building now, in hindsight, you know.

I -- my children are the most important thing to me, you know; and me being away for two months, I mean, incarcerated -- it not only messes with my job; I lose my
apartment; my kids have to be placed elsewhere, you know, with other people, and it disrupts all of their lives.

I am willing to accept all of the punishment for myself -- for my actions. I have no problem being held accountable for making a mistake. I promise I will learn from my mistake. I will never do anything like that ever again.

You know that I have previous criminal records. Every mistake I have made I have learned from it, you know. I don't go out and repeat the same mistakes.

Like I tell my children, I take those mistakes and I use them as a lesson. And as long as you are not doing the same mistake over and over again, it's not -- it's not a mistake, it's a lesson. And I have learned my lesson from this, Your Honor.

And I sincerely apologize to you --
THE COURT: And what is the lesson you have learned, Mr. Croy, because what was -- what I remember from your plea hearing and what -- you essentially are saying the same thing here today --

THE DEFENDANT: Right.
THE COURT: -- which is you didn't know there was anything wrong with being on the Capitol grounds, going up the Capitol steps, going through the open doors of the Capitol; you were just following the crowd, you didn't know
that there was anything wrong.
It was irksome to hear that --
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: -- at your plea hearing, as it is today, when, at the same time, you saw police shooting pepper bombs, and other kinds of smoke grenades, and using chemical tools that they have to do crowd control, trying to keep people out of the Capitol. You saw police lines in the Capitol.

It's minimizing your -- minimizing your conduct that I heard in what you were saying to me at the plea hearing, and I hear again today.

So tell me, Mr. Croy, what have you learned from this experience?

THE DEFENDANT: I should have never went up the stairs. I should have never, ever -- as soon as I saw that there was a commotion like that, I should have dispersed; I should have left.

I didn't hear anybody say that; but, you know, again, I was caught up. I was caught up at the time. You know, I had been following all kinds of different stories and heard all kinds of different things, even that day.

And, since then, I've learned that a lot of that is not true, Your Honor. You know, I was caught up. I was not in a good emotional place at the time. I was erratic.

I was erratic and frustrated; and I am not -- I am not in that place no more. You know, I have since returned to work. I have since seen evidence, you know. I have since seen context of stuff that $I$ had just gotten snippets of, you know.

Now you get the full context and you realize that a lot of that wasn't even true. You know, I should have never been there in the first -- I mean, to go there for a protest or for a rally, acceptable. But, you know, I had no business walking down there to the Capitol, you know, and going inside of the Capitol, you know.

I mean, I was told to go -- I don't know how protests work. But I figure, you know, we move to a different spot and we stand around with our signs and wave our flags and make our voices heard. I had no idea what was going on.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you, Mr. Croy, also because you have submitted letters from your friends; and they make a bunch of statements, you know, that you have never been disrespectful to any authority figure; you always have a level head and -- that's Mr. Kezer.

Mr. Donnelly says you use good judgment, a very reasonable person. And he believes this incident has been blown out of proportion -- that's Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. Lindsey Walter says you are respectful.

Again, described multiple times as a very respectful person.
Mr. Theisen says that, too.
So, on January 6th, were you behaving in a respectful way as an upstanding citizen should?

THE DEFENDANT: I was not, Your Honor.
You know, like I said, it was a whole summer of COVID; it was a whole summer of fear. It was a whole summer of, you know, not working, collecting unemployment and stimulus checks occasionally. You know, I was frustrated. I felt so frustrated. And then, you know, to go there -like I said, when I got there, it was all camaraderie and, you know, citizens banding together. You know, it was, like, happiness, you know. And to be around people -- you know, I haven't been around people except for children for months and months. So to be there with everybody and just feel like a unity, I just got caught up.

And then later on -- you know, I just kept following along. You know, I had no idea -- normally, I am a very reasonable respectful person, Your Honor. At that time I lost -- I lost my way. I made a mistake. I made a huge mistake.

THE COURT: Well, one of your friends says -- and I ask you about this because is this the new you you're living in? That -- one of your friends says that your conduct on January 6th is being blown out of proportion.

Do you think that it is unfair for you to be held accountable for what happened on January 6th?

THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely not. Absolutely not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you think what is happening here today is blown out of proportion?

THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely not, Your Honor.
You know, when I had people write those letters for me -- I never -- I never told them what to say. You know, there are still people out there who do believe that, Your Honor; and I can't change people's minds. I can talk to them afterwards, but I never asked anybody -- I never told anybody what to put in the letter. I just said, you know, please just write a letter about how you know me and you know, maybe, my kids and -- you know, because my kids are my biggest concern for me here.

I accept full responsibility. I accept full -- I am willing to be fully accountable; $I$ just don't want it to impact my children, that's my main concern. I feel that I need to be held accountable, you know.

Will I learn a lesson from this through probation or through an ankle -- absolutely. I have already learned my lesson. Any time $I$ have ever been in trouble with the law I've learned my lesson. I never did no major jail time -- throughout any of the other criminal acts I
committed, I learned it through probation, through -- you know. You have to want to rehabilitate.

You can't just give somebody rehabilitation and they're going to rehabilitate; they have to want to rehabilitate. And I want to rehabilitate, Your Honor. I want to make amends for this.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Croy, your counsel has said in the sentencing memos, and you have echoed that somewhat in your letter to me, saying you were guilty of being an idiot; that you were a lemming.

THE DEFENDANT: Right.
THE COURT: That you were -- you know, that you were a follower and not a leader. So I do hope that one of the lessons you learn from this is that you do have to think for yourself, not accept what people just tell you as the truth.

Don't just follow directions. You have a responsibility, both as a mature adult --

THE DEFENDANT: Right.
THE COURT: -- but certainly as a citizen in this democracy to figure out what the facts are before you act and to respect what is a foundation of our democracy that was undone by January 6th in significant part --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: -- that we believe in fair elections
and peaceful transitions of power.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: I hope those are some of the lessons that you take from this experience.

THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.
THE COURT: Are you done, Mr. Croy?
THE DEFENDANT: I am, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. I am now going to
explain -- no. I want you to stand right there.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: I am going to explain the sentence I
am about to impose and impose sentence, Mr. Croy.
So after considering the sentencing memoranda
submitted by the parties, the presentence investigation report, the probation department's sentencing recommendation, and hearing argument, I must now consider the relevant factors set up by Congress, in 18 U.S.C. Section $3553(a)$, and ensure $I$ impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing; and these purposes include: The need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, and this was a serious offense; to promote respect for the law; provide just punishment for the offense, deter criminal conduct generally by others who might want to mimic what happened on January 6th; and protect the public from future
crimes by you, Mr. Croy; that's the specific deterrence aspect of what we have talked about during the course of this hearing.

I also have to promote rehabilitation.
And so pursuant to this statute, I must consider specifically the nature and circumstances of the offense; your history and characteristics; the types of sentences available; the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records found guilty of similar conduct, and the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

I am going to begin with the restitution amount owed by this defendant. The statute of conviction here is not covered by the two general restitution statutes codified at 18 U.S.C. Section 3663 and 3663(a); and the Court has no authority to determine -- to determine any restitution amount. This is limited by what the government agrees to in the plea agreement. And the plea agreement here provides for a restitution payment of $\$ 500$, which this Court will order pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section $3663(a)(3)$.

Regarding the nature and circumstances of the offense, the defendant's been convicted of parading, demonstrating, or picketing in a Capitol Building, in violation of 40 U.S.C. Section 5104(e)(2)(G), which is a petty offense Class B misdemeanor.

And as I have made it clear before, though this defendant pleaded guilty to a criminal statute titled parading, demonstrating, or picketing in a Capitol Building, what happened on January 6 th at the U.S. Capitol was not protected First Amendment parade or demonstration, or a picket or a protest.

Mr. Croy's criminal conduct helped facilitate a riot that overwhelmed law enforcement and succeeded in disrupting the proceedings of Congress.

This defendant traveled all the way from Colorado, joined in this crowd, this mob, intentionally, and followed them into the Capitol knowing it was unlawful to be inside the Capitol Building. As he approached the Capitol Building, he witnessed officers shooting pepper balls and throwing smoke and gas grenades at rioters climbing up the rails of the steps to the Capitol and into the crowd.

And in the course of that time, before he went into the Capitol Building the first time, he taunted at officers, calling them oath breakers; yelled at the officers to go protect their precious fucking building. And in his letter to the Court, he admits that he saw officers attempting to bar rioters from breaching the doors of the Capitol Building; but since they weren't guarding another entry, he chose to enter that one instead. And the door he entered was the Senate wing door that -- just minutes before
the defendant walked in -- had been broken into, basically kicked down, because rioters broke down the side windows, got in, and then kicked down that door; so it was open for other members of the crowd to get in.

He took advantage of this opportunity to enter the Capitol even while he knew officers were trying to keep them out because there were very important proceedings going on inside the Capitol that day.

And then, once entering the Capitol Building for the first time, he joined this crowd in letting them know that they did not have control over the building, chanting, "Whose house?" "Our house" -- as he was in the building and walking through the halls.

The sheer numbers of people that he participated with in walking into the building the first time he went in not only broke the police line in the crypt but, in another video, shows that they were -- forced a police line down a hallway that was by the House wing door.

While he was part of this crowd going in, someone very close to him, if not him, yelled, "Where are you motherfuckers hiding?" "Get out of the basement with Biden" -- suggesting that they were -- if not this defendant -- other people in this crowd who were looking for members of Congress.

While inside the Capitol, Mr. Croy messaged a
friend telling them that he was inside and considered it a "good mosh," and that "we stormed that shit." He knew he was storming the Capitol. And then after exiting, when he was told to leave by police officers, he did leave. And then, while standing around outside the Capitol, he messaged a friend at around 3:17 claiming, again, "We stormed the Capitol." And when the friend responded, "Did congressmen bail? He wrote back, "Absolutely, I got videos."

It strains credulity -- in the government's memo it says -- for the defendant to claim he aimlessly followed the crowd to the Capitol that day; and that the evidence shows his lack of intent to do something in the Capitol that day, his lack of understanding where he was in the Capitol, and his herd mentality, rather than a desire to execute a plan to stop the vote that was taking place in the Senate.

This is -- based on the videos that I have seen, this was a defendant who knew -- who followed this crowd into the Capitol hearing all around them what was going on. And he left when asked to by the police, but this is after breaking two police lines while inside the Capitol Building.

Then, when he was outside the building, he says he saw somebody leave the Capitol with a bloody T-shirt; and he went in again knowing, even after the first incursion, that he shouldn't be there.

The defendant admits he knew he wasn't supposed to
be there, but he was in the thick of it; he followed the crowd like a lemming. And he, again, went into the Capitol a second time.

And while the defense brief suggests that he was just pulled in by the crowd, the video evidence shows that this defendant had plenty of opportunities to not go in the second time around because there were many -- a steady stream of people trying to exit the building successfully, and he could have joined them in not going into the building; but he went in a second time where, for the third time, a police line was broken with defendant's participation in this crowd.

So among the factors that $I$ look at in assessing this defendant's role and the overall crowd action on January 6th, are that he was in the Capitol Building twice; the first time for about 17 minutes and then, after being told to leave, he left but he came right back in about 45 minutes later; and he was in, again, for about 9 minutes.

It is to his credit, I guess, he didn't physically attack any police officer or any other person. But he did engage in a verbal altercation outside of the Capitol Building with officers; and he did force police to retreat two to three times as part of the crowd inside the Capitol Building.

He didn't personally damage any property inside
the Capitol, but he certainly took advantage of the damage that other rioters effected to get into the Capitol Building, starting with his first entrance where the video shows rioters breaking the two windows on the side of the Senate wing door and kicking down the Senate wing door for him to get in. He took advantage of the opportunities provided by the other rioters.

He didn't carry posters or signs or brandish a weapon; but he did engage in chants that were going on while he was inside the building, shouting, "Whose house?" "Our house."

He didn't publicly post any inflammatory language on social media before, during, or after January 6th, or make public calls for political violence; but he did, while he was inside the building, not only brag about his actions: "We stormed that shit." "We stormed the Capitol." He answered the friend that Congress members did flee, in response to the question whether those Congress members had been found. So his private messages were disturbing.

He did promptly agree to enter a plea agreement when the plea offer was extended; and he did, at some point after his arrest, cooperate with police.

It is an aggravating circumstance in this case that this defendant made a deliberate choice to follow the mob twice into the Capitol Building.

So, in sum, the nature and circumstances of the offense, and the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense and promote respect for the law, would generally favor a custodial sentence.

The particular circumstances of the defendant's conduct of not physically engaging in violence does put him in a less troublesome category than some other, more aggressive, rioters that day; but, at the same time, his conduct -- placing himself in the early crowds to break into the Capitol Building, so he was part of the crowds that actually broke police lines in two different parts of the Capitol; and then going back into the Capitol after being told to leave the first time and seeing somebody leave with a bloody $T$-shirt -- so he knew the conduct inside the Capitol was getting to be more violent, does make his and distinguishes his conduct as being more aggravating than some of the other defendants I have seen.

Regarding his history and characteristics, he does have several adult criminal convictions, one including for a third degree assault which took place over 20 years ago. And he hasn't had any serious interactions with the criminal justice system since the birth of his son, almost 16 years ago. He is the primary caregiver of his two teenage sons, and he does have steady employment as a bricklayer mason.

Although I do find it troubling that, in the days
immediately following the Capitol attack, he showed no remorse for his actions and, in fact, sent friends the video showing him entering the Capitol Building while the alarm is blaring and the crowd shouting, "Whose house?" "Our house"; and he did basically minimize his conduct that day. He didn't, at the same time, try and post public messages or incite other people to join him in more political violence or in his view; and I do accept that he does have remorse now. He has expressed his apology to America and everyone affected for his role in participating. And there are a number of letters that have been submitted on his behalf that speak to his work ethic, and people who do respect his judgment. And he -- I credit his desire to be a good role model and provider for his sons. It is very unfortunate that those traits and behaviors were not at the forefront of his thinking on January 6th.

The need for the sentence imposed to deter criminal behavior and protect the public from further crimes by this defendant are critical considerations for every sentencing judge; and the seriousness of the criminal conduct witnessed on January 6th only highlights the need for deterrence in the form of a sufficient sentence to deter the defendant and others from engaging in this kind of conduct in the future.
He claims -- this defendant claims he got caught
up in the fervor of a crowd. But being a crowd follower does not create absolution for criminal activity, especially when being a follower, as in this case, as part of a huge mob facilitates and amplifies the criminal conduct of others.

There are consequences to going along with the crowd when the crowd is engaging in absolutely clear and obvious criminal conduct that disrupts the peaceful transition of power after an election, that every legitimate and reputable review has found to be a fair election with the results unassailable.

I do find it to be an aggravating circumstance here that the defendant went into the Capitol Building two times even after seeing the disruption and chaos his actions produced, and being told by the police the first time around not to go in again.

When determining the sentence to impose the importance of deterring future malcontents from disrupting the peaceful transition of power after an election weighs heavily in this Court's consideration.

Now regarding the types of sentences available. He was convicted of a petty offense, a Class B misdemeanor, which provides a maximum term of imprisonment of up to 6 months and up to 5 years' probation. And the government has posited that both a term of probation and a term of
imprisonment may be imposed for a petty offense based on a government statutory construction of 18 U.S.C. Section $3561(a)(3) ; ~ b u t ~ t h e ~ g o v e r n m e n t ~ h a s ~ a l s o ~ p l a i n l y ~ d e c l i n e d ~ t o ~$ recommend such a split sentence to this or any other judge in this court fashioning a sentence for a petty offense, so the government's position does not inspire confidence. But, at the same time, the statute governing the discretionary conditions of probation that may be imposed by a court does provide, as a condition of probation, that intermittent confinement in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons may be imposed under Section $3563(\mathrm{~b})(10)$, or that the defendant be directed to reside at a community corrections facility, including a facility maintained or under contract to the Bureau of Prisons for all or part of the term of probation under Section 3563 (b) (11).

And I do plan -- since Colorado doesn't provide for intermittent confinement, I am going to provide a period of residence at a community corrections facility near where the defendant resides to account for the aggravating conduct in this case.

Regarding the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparity, the defendant raises the fact that other January 6th defendants charged with petty offense misdemeanors have received probationary sentences, and suggests that a custodial sentence here would be an
unwarranted sentencing disparity. There have been a range of sentences, both probationary and custodial, imposed on January 6th defendants convicted of the same petty offense misdemeanor.

And I do find that here, generally, a sentence of probation would be appropriate mostly to ensure that he is subject to supervision, and he doesn't engage in any political violence -- a repeat performance of that, that occurred on January 6th.

Due to the aggravating factors for his offense conduct already noted, his term of probation, as I said, will include special conditions of a 90-day period of home detention, and a 14-day period of residence in a community correctional facility as an alternative to straight imprisonment. This will permit him to work and to support his children, while affording appropriate punishment for his two disruptive trips into the Capitol Building on January 6th.

The message should be clear: Defendants who join a mob to breach police lines and barriers to break into the Capitol to stop the Vice President and joint session of Congress from doing their constitutionally-mandated duty of certifying a presidential election are criminals.

Based on my consideration of these and other factors, I will now state the sentence to be imposed:

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and, in consideration of the provisions of 18 U.S.C. Section 3553, it is the judgment of the Court that you, Glenn Wes Lee Croy, are hereby sentenced to a term of 36 months, 3 years, of probation, on Count 4 of the information.

In addition, you are ordered to pay a special assessment of $\$ 10$ in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 3013.

The Court authorizes supervision and jurisdiction of this case to be transferred to the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado.

While on 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 your conduct while on supervision.

The mandatory conditions include: One, you must 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, and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the Court.

You must make restitution in accordance with your plea agreement, in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 3663.

You are ordered to make restitution to the Architect of the Capitol in the amount of $\$ 500$.

The Court determined you do not have the ability to pay interest and, therefore, waives any interest or penalties that may accrue on the balance.

You shall comply with the following special conditions:

First, substance abuse testing: You must submit to substance abuse testing to determine if you have used a probative substance. You must not attempt to obstruct or tamper with the testing methods.

Residential reentry center: Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section $3563(b)(11), ~ y o u ~ m u s t ~ r e s i d e ~ i n ~ a ~ r e s i d e n t i a l ~$ reentry center for a term of 14 days as promptly as space in a center near your residence becomes available. You must follow the rules and regulations of the center.

After completion of this confinement, the defendant shall participate in a location monitoring program and shall comply with the conditions of home detention set forth next.

You will be monitored in the form of location monitoring technology indicated herein for a period of 90 days, and you must follow the rules and regulations of the location monitoring program. The cost of the program is waived.

Location monitoring technology, at the discretion of the probation officer, including radio frequency
monitoring, GPS monitoring -- including hybrid GPS -SmartLINK or voice recognition; this form of location monitoring technology will be used to monitor the following restriction on your movement in the community: You are restricted to your residence at all times, except for employment, education, religious services, medical, substance abuse or mental health treatment, attorney visits, court appearances, court-ordered obligations, or other activities as preapproved by the probation officer.

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

Restitution payments shall be made to the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court, District of Columbia, for disbursement to the following victim: The Architect of the Capitol, in the amount of $\$ 500$, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, attention Kathy Sherrill, CPA, Ford House Office Building, Room H2-205B, Washington, D.C. 20515. The financial obligations are immediately payable to the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. District Court, 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20001. Within 30 days of any change of address, you shall notify the Clerk of the Court of the change until such time as the financial obligation is paid in full.

The probation office shall release the presentence investigation report to all appropriate agencies which includes the U.S. Probation Office in the approved district of residence in order to execute the sentence of the court.

Treatment agencies shall return the presentence report to the probation office upon the defendant's completion or termination from treatment.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3742, you have a right to appeal the sentence imposed by this Court if the period of imprisonment is longer than the statutory maximum. If you choose to appeal, you must file any appeal within 14 days after the Court enters judgment.

As defined in 28 U.S.C. Section 2255, you also have the right to challenge the conviction entered or sentence imposed if new and currently unavailable information becomes available to you or on a claim you received ineffective assistance of counsel in entering a plea of guilty to the offense of conviction or in connection with sentencing. If you are unable to afford the cost of an appeal, you may request permission from the Court to file an appeal without cost to you.

Are there any objections to the sentence imposed not already noted on the record from the government?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And Ms. West?

MS. WEST: No objections, Your Honor. But I did want to state for the record that he has already paid his restitution.

THE COURT: I did notice that, but I have to order it.

MS. WEST: Yes. I understand. THE COURT: Okay. You may be seated, Mr. Croy. THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Does the government have a motion to dismiss the open counts against Mr. Croy?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor. We would like to dismiss those counts at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. That motion is granted. Is there anything left to address today from the government?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. West?

MS. WEST: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. You are all excused.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, I have a transfer of jurisdiction form.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you very much.
(Whereupon, the proceeding concludes, 11:42 a.m.)
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| 27:17, 27:23, 27:25 | defending [2]-43:3 |  | displayed [1] - 43:22 <br> dispositive [4] - | 64:11, 64:12, 64:19, |
| Dated [1] - 97:14 <br> days [10]-22:24, | 43:19 | $\begin{gathered} \text { deterrence [19] - 9:3, } \\ 9: 6,9: 11,9: 15,9: 20, \end{gathered}$ |  | 73:17, 74:24, 82:22 |
| 25:5, 44:14, 48:24 | $12: 21,12: 24,27:$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:3, 10:11, 10:13, } \\ & \text { 10:20, 12:8, 14:5, } \end{aligned}$ | dispositive [4] - $42: 20,44: 22,45: 3$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { down }[14]-32: 14, \\ 33: 5,38: 23,53: 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2:19, 93:12, | 21, 28:24, 30:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:20, 12:8, 14:5, } \\ & \text { 14:7, 15:1, 19:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disregard [2] - 39:18, } \\ & 41: 12 \end{aligned}$ | :7, 72:7, 72:8, |
| (1) | 3, 45:15, 45:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:7, 15:1, 19:16, } \\ & \text { 19:17, 19:19, 60:14, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 8, 76:10, 83: |
| daze [1] - 66:11 | 18, 49:24, 59:19, | $\text { 81:1, } 88: 22$ | disregarded [2] - | 83:3, 83:17, 86:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DC }_{[3]}-1: 12,1: 16, \\ & 1: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $85: 4$ | develop [1] - 21:23 | 40:10, 41:23 | downloaded [1]-2:17 |
| decades ${ }_{[1]}-27$ | Defense [1]-59:19 defensive [1]-23:14 |  | disrespectful ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { drawing [3] - 30:4, } \\ 30: 21,37: 18 \end{gathered}$ |
| decide [1] - 18:1 | defined [1] - 95:13 | development [1] - 21:9 | disrupting [2] - 82:9,89:18 | draws [1] - 33:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { decided }[2]-21: 15, \\ & 51: 6 \end{aligned}$ | definitely ${ }_{[1]}$-68:13 <br> degree [1] - 87:20 | diabetes [1]-61:20 <br> died [1] - $54 \cdot 9$ |  | dreaming [1] - 47:10 dressed [1] - 41:3 |
| decision [4]-18:17 | delayed [1] - 41:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { different }[15]-5: 16, \\ & 17: 1,22: 7,26: 22, \end{aligned}$ | disruptive ${ }_{[1]}$ - 91:17 <br> disrupts [2]-74:2, | dressing [1] - 39:21 |
| $31: 16,54: 22,63: 1$ | deleted [2] - 45:24 |  |  | drug [2]-92:19, 92:20 |
| decision-making [1] - 18:17 | $50: 7$ | 17:1, 22:7, 26:22, <br> 28:9, 31:7, 34:19, | disrupts [2]-74:2, 89:8 <br> distinction [2]-34:16, | due [2]-15:15, 91:10 |
| decisions [1] - 21:19 | deliberate [1] - 86:24 democracy [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 9,58: 6,60: 11, \\ & 62: 12,75: 21,75: 22, \end{aligned}$ |  | dumps [1]-49:5 <br> during [10] - 2.21 |
| declined [1] - 90:3 | 40:19, 79:21, 79:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 12,75: 21,75: 22, \\ & 76: 14,87: 11 \end{aligned}$ | distinguish [2]-26:6, | during [10]-2:21, |
| deemed [1] - 3:15 | democratic [1] - 58:9 | differently [1] - 28:8 |  | $43: 16,55: 18$ |
| defend [1]-12:20 | 45:6, 81:23, 82:3 demonstration [1] - | difficult [8] - 17:9,17:12, 17:14, 27:10, |  | 56:11, 81:2, 86:1 |
| DEFENDANT [22] - |  |  | distinguishable [1] - 40:23 | duty ${ }_{[1]}-91: 22$ <br> dying [1] - $54: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:18, 5:6, 5:20, 5:22, } \\ & 6: 25,7: 6,67: 6, \end{aligned}$ | demonstration $[1]$ - 82:5 | $38: 1$ | distinguishes [2] - 26:12, 87:16 |  |
| 74:21, 75:3, 75:15, | denial [1]-3:14 <br> denigrating ${ }_{[1]}-40: 18$ | diligently [1]-49:16 | distraction [1] - 33:16 | E |
| 79:11, 79:19, 79:24, | denigrating [1] - 40:18 <br> Department [2]-1:14, | $90: 12$ | $1: 1,1: 8$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:2, 80:5, 80:7, } \\ & \text { 80:10, 96:8, 96:21 } \end{aligned}$ | Department [2]-1:14, 48:11 <br> department's [2]-7:1, | directions [2] - 64:14, 79:17 | district ${ }^{11]}$ - 95:3 <br> District [5] - 92:9 | e-filing ${ }_{[1]}-4: 2$ early [6] - $25: 23$, |
| Defendant ${ }_{[1]}-1: 5$ defendant [43]-4:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { department's }[2]-7: 1 \text {, } \\ & 80: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:17 } \\ & \text { directly }[7]-5: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $92: 10,94: 14,94: 21$ <br> disturbing [1] - 86:19 | 50:20, 87:9 |
| 4:5, 4:8, 4:9, 7:13, | depth [1] - 12:12 DEPUTY [2]-2:2, $2:$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { directly }[7]-5: 13, \\ 30: 6,32: 6,37: 23, \end{gathered}$ | disturbing [1] - 86:19 diverse [1]-22:7 | easier [1] - 53:16 |
| 9:23, 10:14, 12:3, | described [8]-4:11, | disagreement [1] - | docketed [10]-3:21, | easy [3]-26:17, |
| 14:8, 17:22, 20:24, | $28: 5,52: 16,53: ¢$ |  | 3:22, 4:3, 4:5, 4:12 | 27:10, 53:20 |
| 22:23, 23:1, 23:3, | 65:9, 65:25, 66:24, | disassembled [1] - | 5, 4:12, <br> 16 | ECF ${ }_{[12]}-3: 21,3: 22$, |
| 25:22, 29:22, 34:8, |  | 97:10 ${ }_{\text {disbursement }}^{[1]}$ - | 46:24 <br> document [4] - 70:18, | $1,4: 3,4: 4,4: 5 \text {, }$ |
| $36: 4,36: 9, ~ 42: 11$, $43: 5,43: 9,46: 20$, | - 57:8 |  |  | 4:6, 4:12, 4:14, 4:15, |
| 3:5, 43:9, 46:20, | describing [1] - 53:9 |  | $70: 19,72: 23,72: 25$ | 4:17, 46:24 |





| LEE [1] - 1:4 | listening [2] - 3:8, | mandatory [2] - 92:12, | mess [1] - 69:4 | mom [1] - 70:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| left [11] - 26:22, 65:23, | 62:16 | 92:15 | message [2] - 43:5, | moment [2] - 63:23, |
| 66:21, 68:3, 68:13, | litigation [1] - 18:20 | manner [4] - 40:7 | 91:1 | 73:2 |
| 72:4, 73:4, 75:18, | live [1] - 60:11 | 42:24, 44:17, 97:11 | messaged [2] - 83:25, | moms [2] - 57:2, |
| 84:19, 85:17, 96:14 | live-streamed [1] | marching [1] - 38:21 | 84:5 | 62:10 |
| left-hand [1] - 65:23 | 60:11 | mask [1] - 7:23 | messages [3] - 44:13, | monitor [2] - 60:22, |
| legal [1] - 52:20 | lived [1] - 11:9 | masks [1] - 8:2 | 86:19, 88:6 | 94:3 |
| legally [1] - 62:4 | Lives [1] - 55:5 | mason [1] - 87:24 | messes [1] - 73:25 | monitored [2] - 10:14, |
| legit [1] - 43:15 | lives [2] - 70:10, 74:2 | mass [1] - 64:3 | met [1]-72:13 | 93:19 |
| legitimate [1] - 89:9 | living [1] - 77:24 | materials [2] - 3:18, | metal [1]-71:3 | monitoring [7] - |
| lemming [3]-73:20, | Lloyd [3] - 44:2, 44:5, | 7:18 | methods [1] - 93:9 | 93:16, 93:20, 93:22, |
| 79:10, 85:2 | 44:11 | Matter [1] - 55:5 | Metropolitan [1] - | 93:24, 94:1, 94:3 |
| length [1] - 32:4 | local [1] - 92:16 | matter [2]-2:2, 18:11 | 48:11 | month [3]-9:1, 30:24, |
| lengthy [1] - 25:2 | location [6]-31:23, | mature [1] - 79:18 | microphone [1] - 29:2 | 31:9 |
| $\text { less }[4]-22: 20,33: 17,$ | 93:16, 93:19, 93:22, | $\max [1]-56: 15$ | $\text { might }[3]-27: 25$ | months [21]-8:14, |
| $46: 11,87: 7$ | $\text { 93:24, } 94: 2$ | maximum [3]-55:24, | $41: 5,80: 24$ | 10:6, 10:7, 10:9, |
| lesser [1] - 49:19 | locations [1] - 39:14 | 89:23, 95:10 | milling [1] - 69:11 | $10: 18,29: 25,30: 2$ |
| $\text { Iesson }[7]-74: 12$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { look [11] - 14:16, } \\ 19: 19,23: 2,28 \end{gathered}$ | mean [24] - 12:15, | millions [2]-61:24, $63: 4$ | $31: 10,31: 11,40: 20$ $54: 12,54: 25,55: 14$ |
| $78: 23,78: 24$ | $29: 23,44: 2,48: 17,$ | $20: 21,25: 13,26: 17$ | mimic [1] - 80:2 | $55: 16,56: 15,71: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lessons [2] - 79:14, } \\ & 80 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ | $49: 10,54: 1,63: 24,$ | $33: 23,35: 1,36: 9,$ | minds [1] - 78:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 24,77: 15,89: 24, \\ & 92: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | minimize [1] - 88:5 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { letter [15] - 4:13, 25:2, } \\ \text { 46:19, 47:8, 47:17, } \end{gathered}$ | looked [3] - 4:7 $21: 10,63: 22$ | $47: 4,52: 17,59: 5$ | minimizing [3] - | 14:11, 29:19, 35:15, |
| 47:18, 55:4, 56:25, | looking [13] - 11:5 | 65:14, 71:15, 73:24, | minor [1] - 22:2 | 42:7, 49:12 |
| 57:8, 57:16, 73:19, | 23, 28:15, 29:12, | 76:8, 76:12 | minutes [15] - 23:4 | moot [1] - 50:11 |
| 78:13, 78:14, 79:9, | 33:11, 34:23, 35:9, | meaning [1] - 11:18 | 23:5, 23:8, 31:22, | Morgan [3] - 44:2, |
| 82:21 | 48:24, 51:11, 51:18, | means [1] - 11:19 | 32:1, 32:8, 38:25, | $44: 5,44: 11$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { letters [5] - 4:14, 4:16, } \\ 76: 18,78: 8,88: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 61:17, 64:20, 83:23 looting [1] - 57:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mechanisms [1] - } \\ & \text { 27:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $42: 16,60: 4,69: 11$ <br> 82.25, 85:16, 85:1 | Morgan-Lloyd [3] - $44: 2,44: 5,44: 11$ |
| letting [1] - 83:10 | lose [1] - 73:25 | media [3] - $3: 13$ | misdemeanor [10] - | morning [5] - 2:9, |
| level [3] - 60:19, 61:9, | lost [2] - 77:20 | 24:16, 86:13 | 11:2, 11:22, 13:24, | $2: 12,2: 13,3: 19,7: 5$ |
| 76:21 | LOTH [1] - 97:3 | median [1] - 27:3 | 14:2, 27:23, 48:21, | mosh [1]-84:2 |
| liability [1] - 34:21 | Loth [2] - 1:22, 97:16 | medical [1] - 94:6 | 51:8, 81:25, 89:22, | most [8] - 17:9, 19:18, |
| life [2] - 17:12, 49:7 | love [2]-67:16 | meetings [1] - 18:17 | 91:4 | 33:16, 57:23, 62:13, |
| light [1] - 71:8 | lower [1] - 60:19 | member [3]-2:16, | misdemeanors [2] - | 62:14, 69:22, 73:23 |
| light-headed [1] - 71:8 | lower-level [1] - 60:19 | 38:10, 39:9 | 13:25, 90:24 | mostly [3] - 43:15, |
| likely [1] - 48:18 | Lustig [1] - 6:14 | members [5] - 60:4, | misevaluate [1] - | 43:17, 91:6 |
| limit [1] - 51:9 | LUSTIG [1] - 1:21 | 83:4, 83:24, 86:17, | 49:18 | mother [1] - 54:8 |
| limitation [1] - 10:24 |  | 86:18 | misled [1] - 63:3 | motherfuckers [2] - |
| limited [1] - 81:17 | M | memo [8] - 3:25, 4:6, | missed [2] - 47:18, | $50: 23,83: 21$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lindsey }[5]-4: 10 \\ & 20: 13,20: 17,21: 3 \\ & 76: 25 \end{aligned}$ | ma'am [6] - 5:20, 7:6, | $\begin{gathered} 8: 12,8: 13,20: 6, \\ 22: 2,31: 15,84: 9 \\ \text { memoranda }[2]-4: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 23 \\ & \text { missing }[4]-4: 20 \\ & 20: 5,47: 17,50: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { motion [2] - 96:9, } \\ & \text { 96:13 } \\ & \text { motto [1] - } 57: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| line [18] - 3:5, 3:9, | $: 6,79: 24,80: 2$ | 80:13 | mission [1]-22:5 | move [2]-21:18, |
| 18:24, 22:21, 34:10, | maced [4]-71:14 | memory [2] - 51:5, | misspoke [1]-19:1 | 76:13 |
| $36: 16,37: 6,37: 8$ | $71: 21,71: 24,72: 8$ | 71:15 | mistake [8] - 49:18, | moved [1] - 68:5 movement $[1]$ - 94: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 39: 3,39: 6,45: 23 \\ & 64: 22,65: 3,66: 13 \end{aligned}$ | machine [1] - 1:24 | mental [1] - 94:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 5,74: 6,74: 9, \\ & 74: 13,74: 14,77: 20, \end{aligned}$ | moving [1] - 64:11 |
| 68:23, 83:16, 83:17, | machines [1] - 35:1 | mentality [1]-84:14 | 77:21 | $\mathbf{M R}_{[102]}-2: 7,2: 9,$ |
| 85:11 | MAGA [1] - 22:10 | mention [2]-45:14, | mistakes [2] - 74:10 | $4: 19,4: 22,6: 5,7: 21$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lines [11] - 9:23, } \\ & 30: 20,31: 20,36: 7 \end{aligned}$ | magnitude [1] - 49:15 main [1]-78:19 | 53:12 | 74:11 <br> misunderstanding [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 25,8: 5,10: 21 \\ & \text { 11:7, 12:10, 12:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 38:11, 39:15, 47:6, | maintained [1] - 90:13 | $4,$ | - 15:10 | $13: 8,13: 15,14: 12,$ |
| 75:8, 84:20, 87:11, | major [2]-67:11, | 52:9, 56:17, 58:14, | mob [12] - 35:24, 36:5, | 15:4, 15:9, 15:25, |
| 91:20 | 78:24 | 60:9, 60:21, 61:16, | 37:12, 37:24, 37:25, | 16:4, 16:7, 16:15, |
| links [1] - 36:9 | malcontents [1] - | $62: 7$ | $38: 10,39: 5,42: 5,$ | 16:18, 16:22, 17:3, |
| list [1] - 62:22 | 89:18 | mentioning [1] - 60:24 | $82: 11,86: 25,89: 4$ | $17: 4,18: 16,19: 22$ |
| listed [2] - 4:1, 26:9 | mandated [2] - 56:4, | merely [1] - 39:9 | 91:20 | 20:20, 21:1, 21:13, |
| listen [2] - 3:6, 10:23 | 91:22 | merit [1] - 22:18 | model [1] - 88:14 | 22:15, 23:10, 23:12, |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { 23:18, 23:21, 24:4, } \\ \text { 24:6, 24:9, 24:12, } \\ \text { 24:15, 24:18, 24:21, } \\ \text { 24:24, 25:3, 25:5, } \\ \text { 25:10, 25:18, 25:24, } \\ \text { 26:2, 26:19, 26:24, } \\ \text { 27:13, 27:21, 28:2, } \\ \text { 28:19, 29:3, 29:10, } \\ \text { 30:13, 30:17, 31:10, } \\ 31: 20,32: 13,32: 16, \\ 32: 20,32: 23,32: 25, \\ 33: 3,33: 7,33: 12, \\ 34: 3,34: 5,34: 9, \\ 34: 18,34: 21,35: 5, \\ 35: 10,35: 20,36: 8, \\ 38: 14,38: 17,38: 25, \\ 39: 16,40: 6,40: 21, \\ 41: 7,41: 10,42: 9, \\ 42: 23,43: 18,43: 22, \\ 44: 16,44: 24,45: 13, \\ 45: 23,46: 4,47: 3, \\ 47: 12,47: 14,95: 24, \\ 96: 11,96: 16,96: 20 \\ \text { MS }[44]-2: 13,2: 22, \\ 2: 24,4: 25,6: 9,6: 14, \\ 6: 17,6: 22,29: 8, \\ 47: 20,48: 14,48: 20, \\ 50: 1,50: 14,50: 25, \\ 51: 21,52: 2,52: 4, \\ 55: 15,55: 21,56: 1, \\ 56: 5,56: 7,56: 14, \\ 56: 17,57: 3,57: 11, \\ 57: 21,58: 7,58: 13, \\ 59: 6,59: 9,60: 1, \\ 60: 6,61: 23,63: 18, \\ 63: 21,65: 8,66: 22, \\ 67: 1,67: 4,96: 1, \\ 96: 6,96: 18 \\ \text { multiple }[3]-46: 21, \\ 58: 18,77: 1 \\ \text { murder }[2]-55: 6,58: 2 \\ \text { must }[14]-26: 20, \\ 80: 16,81: 5,92: 15, \\ 92: 17,92: 18,92: 19, \\ 92: 22,93: 6,93: 8, \\ 93: 11,93: 13,93: 21, \\ 95: 11 \\ \text { mystery }[5]-20: 3, \\ 20: 4,20: 5,52: 11, \\ 52: 25 \\ \text { names [1] - 2:5 } \\ \text { nation }[1]-22: 7 \\ \text { nation's }[1]-27: 16 \\ \text { native }[1]-62: 20 \\ \text { nature [6] - 42:2, } \\ 44: 19,49: 25,81: 6, \\ 81: 21,87: 1 \end{gathered}$ | ```near \([2]-90: 18,93: 13\) nec [1] - 36:22 necessarily [2] - 20:22, 37:9 necessary [5] - \(3: 15\), 9:3, 9:6, 14:5, 80:19 need [14] - 9:10, 12:7, 19:4, 19:17, 19:18, 44:5, 78:20, 80:20, 81:8, 81:10, 87:2, 88:17, 88:21, \(90: 21\) needed [4] - 9:15, 54:19, 66:10, 72:24 never [21]-17:11, 49:5, 61:8, 67:10, 68:20, 68:24, 69:15, 73:5, 73:9, 73:14, 73:15, 74:6, 75:15, 75:16, 76:8, 76:20, 78:9, 78:12, 78:24 new [4] - 12:25, 49:23, 77:23, 95:15 New [1]-1:11 news [2]-54:23, 70:11 next [2]-5:19, 93:18 nice \([4]-3: 1,46: 10\), 48:6, 69:24 NICOLE \({ }_{[1]}-1: 18\) Nicole [1] - 2:15 night \([1]-56: 3\) nine \([3]-4: 1,4: 15\), 62:8 nobody [1] - 56:3 nonissue [1] - 50:8 normal [2]-9:10, 27:4 normally [2] - 9:9, 77:18 Northeast [1]-1:19 Northwest [1] - 94:22 notable [1] - 41:24 note [2]-20:12, 59:11 noted [2]-91:11, 95:23 notes [1] - 97:5 nothing \([7]\) - 6:15, 55:14, 56:3, 60:17, 69:4 notice [6] - 4:2, 4:3, 4:11, 16:20, 29:22, 96:4 noticed [1] - 17:14 notify [1] - 94:23 noting [1] - 41:18 novel [3]-27:15, 53:21, 53:22 November [2]-1:4, 97:14 nuances [1] - 12:17 null [1] - 97:9``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { observed }[1]-45: 24 \\ & \text { observing }[1]-37: 4 \\ & \text { obstruct }[1]-93: 8 \\ & \text { obstructing }[1]-56: 4 \\ & \text { obvious }[1]-89: 8 \\ & \text { obviously }[3]-10: 22, \\ & 34: 14,71: 16 \\ & \text { occasionally }[1]-77: 9 \\ & \text { occurred }[3]-10: 16, \\ & 57: 6,91: 9 \\ & \text { ocean }[1]-63: 16 \\ & \text { October }[4]-6: 1, \\ & 18: 6,18: 12,29: 24 \\ & \text { odd }[1]-21: 14 \\ & \text { of }[3]-1: 1,1: 2,1: 7 \\ & \text { offended }[1]-57: 4 \\ & \text { offense }[28]-12: 4, \\ & 17: 17,17: 23,19: 11, \\ & 20: 12,21: 21,25: 19, \\ & 27: 7,42: 2,44: 20, \\ & 55: 25,56: 16,80: 21, \\ & 80: 22,80: 23,81: 6, \\ & 81: 11,81: 22,81: 25, \\ & 87: 2,87: 3,89: 22, \\ & 90: 1,90: 5,90: 23, \\ & 91: 3,91: 10,95: 18 \\ & \text { offenses }[6]-10: 9, \\ & 11: 16,11: 24,13: 13, \\ & 18: 14,26: 17 \\ & \text { offensive }[2]-40: 13, \\ & 52: 7 \\ & \text { offer }[4]-14: 1,24: 20, \\ & 34: 10,86: 21 \\ & \text { offered }[1]-72: 9 \\ & \text { office }[3]-16: 12, \\ & 95: 1,95: 6 \\ & \text { Office }[3]-94: 16, \\ & 94: 18,95: 3 \\ & \text { office's }[1]-3: 20 \\ & \text { officer }[16]-23: 23, \\ & 37: 7,48: 1,48: 3, \\ & 48: 12,48: 15,48: 18, \\ & 65: 18,66: 9,66: 16, \\ & 66: 20,69: 5,72: 6, \\ & 85: 20,93: 25,94: 9 \\ & \text { officer }[2]-1: 21, \\ & 94: 17 \\ & \text { ofFICER }[1]-96: 22 \\ & \text { officers }[34]-22: 6, \\ & 32: 5,35: 24,36: 17, \\ & 36: 23,36: 25,37: 19, \\ & 37: 21,38: 22,39: 6, \\ & 48: 7,48: 17,59: 2, \\ & 66: 13,67: 14,67: 24, \\ & 67: 25,68: 5,68: 11, \\ & 68: 24,69: 20,69: 23, \\ & 72: 13,72: 22,73: 12, \\ & 82: 14,82: 19,82: 21, \\ & 83: 6,84: 4,85: 22 \\ & \text { offices }[1]-23: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Official }{ }_{[1]}-1: 23 \\ & \text { official }[1]-97: 16 \\ & \text { old }[1]-57: 1 \\ & \text { once [6] - } 9: 23,13: 7, \\ & 25: 25,66: 15,70: 23, \\ & 83: 9 \\ & \text { one }[50]-9: 14,12: 24, \\ & 16: 16,19: 13,20: 3, \\ & 21: 25,22: 1,22: 4, \\ & 28: 6,28: 19,31: 9, \\ & 32: 14,32: 21,33: 15, \\ & 34: 12,34: 13,35: 5, \\ & 36: 13,36: 19,36: 20, \\ & 36: 21,37: 6,38: 1, \\ & 40: 11,40: 23,41: 4, \\ & 44: 11,44: 22,44: 24, \\ & 45: 14,46: 19,51: 12, \\ & 55: 12,56: 18,58: 15, \\ & 63: 6,63: 8,64: 14, \\ & 65: 15,66: 14,71: 1, \\ & 77: 22,77: 24,79: 13, \\ & 82: 24,87: 19,92: 15, \\ & 92: 19 \\ & \text { ones }[2]-69: 25,70: 1 \\ & \text { ongoing }[1]-15: 16 \\ & \text { open }[8]-19: 11, \\ & 32: 18,44: 7,68: 4, \\ & 73: 17,74: 24,83: 3, \\ & 96: 10 \\ & \text { opened }[3]-32: 10, \\ & 32: 12,32: 24 \\ & \text { opportunities }[2]- \\ & 85: 6,86: 6 \\ & \text { opportunity }[2]-67: 4, \\ & 83: 5 \\ & \text { opposed }[2]-25: 25, \\ & 44: 1 \\ & \text { opposition }[1]-37: 20 \\ & \text { opting }[2]-10: 5, \\ & 10: 18 \\ & \text { option }[1]-15: 19 \\ & \text { options }[5]-11: 6, \\ & 11: 14,14: 4,14: 24, \\ & 17: 17 \\ & \text { oral }[2]-52: 21,52: 22 \\ & \text { order }[4]-18: 24, \\ & 81: 20,95: 4,96: 4 \\ & \text { Order }[1]-3: 10 \\ & \text { ordered }[3]-92: 6, \\ & 92: 24,94: 8 \\ & \text { Oregon }[1]-70: 10 \\ & \text { outset }[1]-26: 16 \\ & \text { outside }[12]-27: 7, \\ & 34: 1,42: 16,43: 6, \\ & 43: 11,64: 3,64: 18, \\ & 65: 25,69: 12,84: 5, \\ & 84: 21,85: 21 \\ & \text { overall }[1]-85: 14 \\ & \text { overran }[4]-9: 22, \\ & 36: 6,38: 10,39: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |








