UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA 2 ORLANDO DIVISION 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Orlando, Florida Plaintiff. Case No. 6:21-mj-1221-EJK 4 5 March 15, 2021 - VS -KENNETH HARRELSON, 6 1:01 p.m. 7 Defendant. Courtroom 4C 8 9 DIGITALLY RECORDED DETENTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMBRY J. KIDD UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 10 11 APPEARANCES 12 **GOVERNMENT COUNSEL:** 13 Karen Gable, Esquire U.S. Attorney's Office 14 400 West Washington Street, Suite 3100 15 Orlando, FL 32801 16 **DEFENSE COUNSEL:** 17 Kenneth Barlow, Jr., Esquire Law Office of Corey Cohen, P.A. 18 605 D. Robinson Street, Suite 330 19 Orlando, FL 32801 20 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: 21 Shelli Kozachenko, RPR, CRR, CRC 22 221 North Hogan Street, #185 Jacksonville, FL 32202 23 Telephone: (904) 301-6842 24 (Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by computer.) 25

## TABLE OF CONTENTS Page No. **DEFENSE WITNESSES:** ANGEL HARRELSON DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BARLOW..... CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GABLE..... REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BARLOW..... KENNETH HARRELSON DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BARLOW..... CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GABLE..... REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BARLOW.....

## PROCEEDINGS

March 15, 2021

1:01 p.m.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. United States

District Court in and for the Middle District of Florida is now in session, the Honorable Embry J. Kidd, United States

Magistrate Judge, presiding.

Please be seated.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Case No. 6:21-mj-1221, United States of America versus Kenneth Harrelson.

Counsel, please state your appearance for the record.

MS. GABLE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Karen Gable on behalf of the United States. I'm appearing with Special Agent Kelsey Harris of the FBI.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. BARLOW: Good afternoon, Judge. Ken Barlow of Law Office of Corey Cohen for Mr. Harrelson, who is seated to my right.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Mr. Harrelson, we were originally scheduled to have a preliminary hearing and a detention hearing in your case today. However, I've been informed that a grand jury from the District of Columbia has returned a second superseding indictment charging you and nine others with various federal crimes.

Ms. Gable, can you advise us of the charges against

Mr. Harrelson, as well as potential penalties? 1 2 MS. GABLE: Yes, Your Honor. 3 Pursuant to the indictment, a grand jury has charged the defendant with 18, United States Code, Section 371, 4 5 conspiracy. For that offense the defendant faces a maximum term of imprisonment of five years. 6 7 He has also been charged with a violation of 18, 8 United States Code, Sections 1512(c)(2) and aiding and abetting 9 obstruction of an official proceeding. For that offense the defendant faces a statutory maximum term of 20 years in prison. 10 11 He is also charged with a violation of 18, United 12 States Code, Sections 1361 and 2, which is aiding and abetting 13 in the destruction of government property. For that offense 14 the defendant faces a mandatory -- or a statutory -- a maximum 15 statutory term of imprisonment of ten years. 16 He is also charged with a violation of 18, United 17 States Code, Section 1752(a)(1), which is unlawfully entering 18 and remaining in a restricted building or grounds. For that 19 offense, if he is convicted, he faces a maximum term of 20 imprisonment of one year. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. 22 Mr. Harrelson, have you received a copy of the indictment? 23

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. BARLOW: Judge, I have received it. However,

24

25

Mr. Harrelson's just received a copy here from me in open 1 2 court. He has not had a chance to read it. 3 THE COURT: Well --MR. BARLOW: I attempted -- Judge, I attempted to 4 5 meet with him before the proceeding today, but based upon the amount of time it was taking to get me into the secure 6 7 interview area and my desire not to be late, I had to abandon 8 that attempt and come on up. 9 THE COURT: All right. Well, Ms. Gable has just summarized the charges against you, as well as the potential 10 11 penalties. 12 We can allow time for you to review this second 13 superseding indictment if you wish, or we can proceed. 14 because the grand jury has found that there's probable cause to 15 believe that you've committed these offense -- offenses, you're 16 no longer entitled to a judicial determination of probable 17 cause by way of a preliminary hearing, so we will not be having 18 a preliminary hearing today. 19 Is the United States still seeking Mr. Harrelson's 20 detention? 21 MS. GABLE: We are, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: And does the presumption still apply? 23 MS. GABLE: Yes, it does. 24 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Harrelson. So the United 25 States is still seeking your detention, so we will still have a

```
1
    detention hearing today.
 2
              But, Mr. Barlow, would you like a few minutes to
 3
    review the indictment with Mr. Harrelson?
 4
              MR. BARLOW: Yes, please.
 5
              THE COURT: All right. So we'll recess for 15
 6
    minutes.
              I will come back on the record at 1:20 p.m.
 7
              MR. BARLOW: Thank you, sir.
8
              COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
9
         (Recess from 1:04 p.m. until 1:20 p.m.)
              COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. This Honorable
10
11
    Court is back in session.
12
              Please be seated.
13
              THE COURT: All right, Mr. Barlow. We're back on the
14
    record.
15
              Did you have an opportunity to review the second
16
    superseding indictment with your client?
17
              MR. BARLOW: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
18
              THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Harrelson, do you
19
    understand the charges against you, as well as the potential
    penalties?
20
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
21
22
              THE COURT: All right. So as for the detention
23
    hearing, Mr. Barlow, how would you like to proceed?
24
              MR. BARLOW: Judge, I would start by calling Angel
25
    Harrelson as a witness.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: All right, ma'am. Please step forward
 2
    and be sworn.
 3
              MR. BARLOW: Judge, may I inquire from counsel table,
    or do you want me at the podium?
 4
5
              THE COURT: It will be easier from the lectern.
              MR. BARLOW: All right.
 6
 7
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please raise your right hand to be
8
    sworn.
9
              Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony
    you give in this case is the truth, the whole truth, and
10
11
    nothing but the truth?
12
              THE WITNESS: Yes.
13
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please be seated.
14
              MR. BARLOW: I did not notice any of the COVID
15
    protocols I've seen in the other courtroom. That's why I was
16
    wondering.
17
              THE COURT: Well --
18
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: Could you please state your name
19
    for the record.
20
              THE WITNESS: Angel Harrelson.
21
              ANGEL HARRELSON, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN
22
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. BARLOW:
23
24
    Q.
         Ma'am, would you please spell your first and last name for
25
    the record.
```

- 1 A. A-n-g-e-1, H-a-r-r-e-1-s-o-n.
- 2 Q. And do you know the accused in this instance, Kenneth
- 3 | Harrelson?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. How do you know him?
- 6 A. He's my husband.
- 7 Q. How long have you been married?
- 8 | A. 11 years.
- 9 Q. And do you share children with him?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. How many?
- 12 A. Two.
- 13 Q. What are their names?
- 14 A. Nathan and Amy Harrelson.
- 15 Q. What are their ages?
- 16 A. 14 and 17.
- 17 Q. And do you and Mr. Harrelson reside in the same residence?
- 18 | A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Where is that located?
- 20 A. 2885 St. Marks Drive, Titusville, Florida.
- 21 Q. And if Mr. Harrelson were released on some type of a bond,
- 22 | is that where he would reside?
- 23 | A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. Are there any firearms in that home?
- 25 A. No, sir. They're gone.

- 1 Q. There were? There were some?
- 2 A. They're AirSoft.
- 3 Q. Yeah. And everything's been removed?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Is there a handgun anywhere in that house?
- 6 A. No, gone.
- 7 Q. Is there a rifle anywhere in that house?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Shotgun?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. All right. What other weapons, if any, did you remove
- 12 from the house?
- 13 A. My pistol.
- 14 Q. All right. So there are no weapons anywhere within the
- 15 house?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. How about large hunting knives or things of that nature?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. You removed those as well?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Kitchen knives?
- 22 A. No. I need those.
- 23 Q. You have kitchen knives, then.
- 24 A. I have kitchen knives.
- 25 Q. All right. Do you know whether or not Kenneth Harrelson

- 1 has a passport?
- 2 A. No, he doesn't.
- 3 Q. And you're sure of that?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 | Q. All right. In the time that you have known him, have you
- 6 and he ever traveled outside the continental United States --
- 7 A. No, sir.
- 8 Q. -- the lower 48?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Do you or he have any relatives outside of the United
- 11 | States?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Any friends?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. No place to go outside the United States?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. Do you know where Mr. Harrelson's family is located?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And where is that?
- 20 A. Well, one of them's at my house right now.
- 21 | Q. All right.
- 22 A. And in Georgia. That's it.
- 23 Q. Whereabouts in Georgia?
- 24 A. St. Marys.
- 25 Q. All right. Just over the line, then.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. All right. That's near, what, Kings Bay?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Are you aware of your husband, Mr. Harrelson's current
- 5 | medical condition?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Does he take medication?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And since he has been incarcerated, has his regimen of
- 10 | treatment been interrupted?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Is this contrary to a doctor's instructions?
- 13 | A. I'm sorry?
- 14 Q. The interruption.
- 15 A. It interrupted it.
- 16 Q. Have you made any attempt to provide these medications --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- to the U.S. Marshals Service?
- 19 | A. Yes.
- 20 Q. All right. And the U.S. Marshals let you into the
- 21 | building so you could make arrangements to turn those over,
- 22 | correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. At the end of the day were you able to give those
- 25 | medications to be provided to your husband?

- 1 A. No.
- $2 \mid Q$ . Why is that?
- 3 A. Because I was told the county wouldn't accept outside
- 4 | medication.
- 5 Q. The county being what -- which county?
- 6 A. Seminole County Jail.
- 7 Q. All right. And that is where Mr. Harrelson's being housed
- 8 | currently?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Do you know if stopping this medication is detrimental to
- 11 | your husband's health?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And is it?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 Q. If the Court were to grant a monetary bond, would you be
- 16 able to raise funds with family and friends to post that bond?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. If the Court were to allow bond, would you ensure that
- 19 Mr. Harrelson appeared at any court date?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. If it appeared that he was not going to appear at any
- 22 court date, would you cooperate with federal and local law
- 23 enforcement to make sure that he did, in fact, appear?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. In regards to this particular proceeding, has his

- 1 | continued incarceration had a negative impact on your minor
- 2 children?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Can you describe that for the Court, please.
- 5 A. They're afraid to go to school. They've already been
- 6 asked about his -- their father.
- 7 Q. In the time that you have known your husband, have you
- 8 | ever known him to be a violent person?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Have you ever known him to be involved in a fistfight or a
- 11 | fight or anything of that nature?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Do you know whether or not he served in the military?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And was he discharged honorably or dishonorably?
- 16 A. Honorably.
- 17 Q. And does he receive any type of payment from the
- 18 government in regards to his service?
- 19 A. Veteran, VA disability.
- 20 Q. All right. And his disability is what?
- 21 A. A hundred percent.
- 22 Q. Do you know whether or not he has high blood pressure?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Does he?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. The medication that he receives that you were not able to
- 2 get to him because of Seminole County Jail's policy, does that
- 3 affect his blood pressure?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. It helps to regulate it?
- 6 A. If his hormones are unstable right now, they -- his blood
- 7 pressure's going to be unstable.
- 8 Q. If, as a condition of release, the Court were to order
- 9 Mr. Harrelson to attend any type of medical or psychological
- 10 | treatment, would you participate and/or support that?
- 11 A. If he does, yes.
- 12 Q. Do you know whether or not Mr. Harrelson's disability from
- 13 the VA includes a diagnosis of PTSD?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. Okay. Has the VA determined that that needed treatment?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 | Q. They just said that it was there?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Has the VA prescribed any particular set of treatment for
- 20 any of his disabilities?
- 21 A. Not that I know of. He's been through the treatments,
- 22 | through the surgeries.
- 23 | Q. And if released on bond, you will make every effort to
- 24 ensure that he appears at every court proceeding, regardless of
- 25 where it be, in Washington, D.C., or here?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 MR. BARLOW: Nothing further at this time, Judge.
- 3 THE COURT: Cross-examination?
- 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MS. GABLE:
- 6 Q. Good morning, ma'am -- or good afternoon, ma'am.
- Did you know that the defendant participated in the riots at the Capitol on January 6th of 2021?
- 9 A. It's -- he wasn't there for the riot.
- 10 Q. My question is, did you know that he participated in the
- 11 | riots on January 6th?
- 12 A. On the riot, no.
- 13 Q. Did you know that he was inside the Capitol?
- 14 A. Not until I talked to him.
- 15 Q. And was that when he was in Washington, D.C.? Is that
- 16 when he talked to you about that?
- 17 A. I talked to him, yes.
- 18 Q. And did you -- did you see any pictures or video on his
- 19 telephone that he recorded when he was inside the Capitol?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 | Q. And did you report that activity to law enforcement?
- 22 | A. No.
- 23 Q. Okay. Regarding the defendant's violent character, are
- 24 you aware that in November of 2012 his sister called the police
- 25 because he threatened to shoot her and her kids?

- 1 A. That's not his sister.
- 2 Q. Excuse me?
- 3 A. It wasn't his sister.
- 4 Q. So are you aware that someone did call the police
- 5 because --
- 6 A. That is not his sister.
- 7 Q. -- he threatened to shoot --
- 8 A. And, yes, I'm aware of that, and that didn't happen.
- 9 Q. And are you aware that in 2004 he shot his neighbor's dog?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. And that he admitted to shooting him and not just -- that
- 12 his intent was to scare the dog, not shoot him?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Are you aware that in 2001 he was arrested for battery?
- 15 A. Yes, I'm aware of that, but all that was expunged.
- 16 Q. You talked about weapons in your home.
- 17 A. Uh-huh.
- 18 | Q. Did you --
- 19 A. And all of them have been removed.
- 20 Q. -- have an assault rifle in your home?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 | Q. And did you have a pistol in your home?
- 23 A. They're no longer there. I got rid of them.
- 24 Q. And -- so the assault rifle, you did have that in your
- 25 home?

- 1 A. It's not an assault rifle. As far as I know, that was an
- 2 | AirSoft, and I got rid of them.
- 3 Q. Okay.
- 4 A. I even got rid of my -- my son's AirSoft pistol.
- 5 Q. The defendant is not currently working; is that correct?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 Q. And you currently work, correct?
- 8 A. Not anymore. I lost my job that day.
- 9 Q. And, ma'am, again, did you see any videos or photos of the
- 10 defendant --
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. -- inside the Capitol on his telephone?
- 13 A. No. Only on YouTube videos.
- 14 MS. GABLE: Thank you, ma'am. No further questions.
- 15 THE COURT: Any redirect?
- MR. BARLOW: Yes. Thank you.
- 17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MR. BARLOW:
- 19 Q. Ms. Harrelson, when you make reference to AirSoft items,
- 20 are you talking about items that look like real firearms but
- 21 are nonlethal and shoot rubber projectiles?
- 22 A. Little plastic pellets.
- MR. BARLOW: Thank you, Judge. That's all.
- THE COURT: All right, ma'am. You may step down.
- THE WITNESS: Thank you.

1 THE COURT: Do you have any additional witnesses? 2 MR. BARLOW: Yes, Judge. 3 Defense would call Mr. Kenneth Harrelson. THE COURT: All right, Mr. Harrelson. Step forward 4 5 to the stand and raise your right hand, as best you can, to be sworn. 6 7 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm 8 that the testimony you give in this case is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 10 11 COURTROOM DEPUTY: You may be seated. 12 KENNETH HARRELSON, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BARLOW: 14 15 Please state your name and spell your first and last name Q. 16 for the record. 17 Kenneth Harrelson, K-e-n-n-e-t-h, H-a-r-r-e-l-s-o-n. Α. 18 Q. All right. Mr. Harrelson, you have seen today, this 19 afternoon, the four-count indictment charging you in this 20 proceeding; is that correct? 21 Α. Yes. 22 If the judge were to release you on bond, will you appear, 23 whether it be here or in Washington, D.C., or such other place 24 as designated, as ordered by the Court?

25

Α.

Yes.

- 1 Q. Do you have any access or knowledge of any weapons other
- 2 than those that your wife has testified have been removed from
- 3 | your home?
- 4 | A. No.
- 5 Q. Where are you -- when you're not here in court with us,
- 6 where are you being housed?
- 7 A. Currently in a quarantine unit in Seminole County.
- 8 Q. Seminole County Jail?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. And that would be the John E. Polk Correctional Facility?
- 11 | A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. When you are in that facility, are they depriving you of
- 13 your legal correspondence and items from this court?
- 14 MS. GABLE: Your Honor, excuse me. Objection,
- 15 | relevance.
- 16 THE COURT: Mr. Barlow?
- 17 MR. BARLOW: The relevance has to do with preparation
- 18 of defense, preparation for this hearing, and preparation of
- 19 any future calls now that he's been charged.
- 20 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
- 21 THE DEFENDANT: I have not had any correspondence.
- 22 BY MR. BARLOW:
- 23 Q. All right. What about the papers you brought back from
- 24 | court? Did they take those from you?
- 25 A. Yes, they did.

- 1 Q. Do you have any expectations of what will happen with your
- 2 copy of the indictment when you return?
- 3 A. I imagine they'll be taken like the others were.
- 4 Q. Do you have any medical conditions at the current time?
- 5 A. I have hypertension, PTSD. Currently I have two back
- 6 | surgeries and a shoulder surgery. I have several herniated
- 7 discs in my spine.
- 8 Q. And are you being treated for any of those matters in the
- 9 | Seminole County Jail?
- 10 A. Just checking blood pressure twice a day.
- 11 Q. All right. And why are they checking your blood pressure
- 12 twice a day?
- 13 A. Because I told them that I had hypertension, and they said
- 14 | they wanted to monitor it.
- 15 Q. Prior to your arrest were you under the care of a doctor?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And did that doctor prescribe various injectable
- 18 medications to you?
- 19 A. Yes, he did.
- 20 Q. And how often were you supposed to take these medications?
- 21 A. Twice a week.
- 22 Q. And in regards to those medications, were you told and
- 23 instructed not to discontinue those medications without his
- 24 instruction?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. Since you have been incarcerated, have you been permitted
- 2 or allowed to have this medication?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. Has this failure to allow you to be medicated affected
- 5 | your hypertension?
- 6 A. I believe so, yes.
- Q. What have you experienced in regards to your hypertension
- 8 | since being incarcerated?
- 9 A. I've had some --
- 10 MS. GABLE: Again, Your Honor, I'm going to object on
- 11 the basis of relevancy.
- 12 THE COURT: I will -- I will allow some leeway.
- Go ahead.
- 14 THE DEFENDANT: In speaking with my wife, we've
- 15 noticed some confusion. I had issues filling out paperwork,
- 16 not remembering her mother's name, my mother's name, ages.
- 17 | had issues recalling my sister's name.
- 18 BY MR. BARLOW:
- 19 Q. Did you discuss this with the medical staff at the
- 20 | Seminole County Jail?
- 21 A. I had not at the time of processing, no.
- 22 | Q. Since that time have you?
- 23 A. No. They've just been in to check blood pressure, and
- 24 | that's it.
- 25 | Q. Okay. Do you know what your blood pressure was the last

- 1 | time they checked it?
- 2 A. It was around 169 over 100.
- 3 Q. And for you that is high?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 Q. In regards to your diagnosed mental illness or PTSD
- 6 diagnosis from the VA, have they at any time directed you to
- 7 | treatment for that?
- 8 A. No, they have not.
- 9 Q. Do you have any particular work skills?
- 10 A. I'm a certified welder on both aerospace, structural. I'm
- 11 qualifi- -- certified in precious metal welds, Inconel,
- 12 stainless steel, aluminum, so forth.
- 13 Q. Prior to your arrest were you able to find part-time
- 14 | employment?
- 15 A. On and off, yes. The pandemic has kind of hampered that a
- 16 little bit, but it's -- comes and goes.
- 17 Q. And if you are released from custody, would you attempt to
- 18 procure part-time employment?
- 19 | A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Do you possess a passport?
- 21 | A. No, I do not.
- 22 Q. Have you ever been outside of the continental United
- 23 | States?
- 24 A. No, I have not.
- 25 Q. Do you have any family members, friends, or other contacts

- 1 outside of the United States?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 | Q. Where is your family located?
- 4 A. Other than here, in Southeast Georgia.
- 5 Q. All right. Do you have any family members in Texas?
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. Who?
- 8 A. My aunt and uncle.
- 9 Q. All right. The rest are all in Southeast Georgia?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Where in Southeast Georgia?
- 12 A. Camden County, Kings Bay, St. Marys.
- 13 | Q. All right.
- 14 MR. BARLOW: Thank you, Judge. That's all I have.
- THE COURT: All right. Cross-examination?
- 16 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 17 BY MS. GABLE:
- 18 Q. Mr. Harrelson, the medication that you keep referring to
- 19 during your testimony, it's testosterone, correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And there's no other medication besides that that you're
- 22 referring to, correct?
- 23 A. The HCG and the estrogen blockers.
- 24 Q. Okay. So these are hormones, correct?
- 25 A. Say again?

- 1 Q. These are hormones?
- 2 A. Yes. I have hormone issues because of the pain management
- 3 I was put through through the VA for four years on 180 10
- 4 milligram Lortabs a month. It destroyed my endocrine system,
- 5 and I have the testosterone of an 80-year-old man, which
- 6 affects my blood pressure, my sleeping habits, and a few other
- 7 things.
- 8 Q. And, Mr. Harrelson, it's true that in August of 2004, you
- 9 | shot your neighbor's dog, correct?
- 10 A. Yes, but there's --
- 11 Q. Mr. Harrelson, yes or no?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And, sir, it's true that in January of 2003 you were
- 14 arrested for drug possession, correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And in 2001 you were arrested for battery?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. Then while in the Army, you were cited for using
- 19 marijuana, correct?
- 20 A. No, drinking.
- 21 Q. And also for failure to follow orders, correct?
- 22 A. Not (unintelligible), no.
- 23 Q. And you also used marijuana as recently as three weeks
- 24 ago?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And you don't have a prescription for marijuana, correct?
- 2 A. No, ma'am, I do not.
- 3 | Q. And so you're currently not working right now, correct?
- 4 A. No. ma'am.
- 5 Q. When you unlawfully entered the Capitol on January 6th of
- 6 2021, did you talk to your wife?
- 7 MR. BARLOW: Objection, Judge. Outside the scope.
- 8 | Also assumes facts not in evidence.
- 9 THE COURT: Ms. Gable?
- 10 MS. GABLE: Your Honor, he's been placed under direct
- 11 examination. His wife testified, as a third-party custodian,
- 12 that he did contact her when he was up in Washington, D.C. I'm
- 13 asking him simply to confirm that.
- 14 THE COURT: I'll allow it.
- 15 BY MS. GABLE:
- 16 Q. You can answer the question.
- 17 A. Can you repeat the question, please?
- 18 Q. Yes. When you were up in Washington, D.C., and you
- 19 unlawfully entered the Capitol on January 6th of 2021, did you
- 20 | notify your wife?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 | Q. Did you talk to her that night?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Did you take photos and videos when you were inside the
- 25 | Capitol on your telephone?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. You did not?
- 3 A. Well, there's -- it didn't -- nothing was recorded.
- 4 Q. Did you take photographs?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 | Q. Did you see the picture of yourself inside the Capitol
- 7 holding the phone up?
- 8 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 9 Q. And it's your testimony that nothing recorded on your
- 10 phone.
- 11 A. It was -- it didn't record for some reason. There was
- 12 issues with the phone.
- 13 Q. And do you know Kelly Meggs?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And Connie Meggs?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 MR. BARLOW: Objection, Judge. Outside the scope.
- 18 THE COURT: Ms. Gable?
- 19 MS. GABLE: Your Honor, he's been placed under oath
- 20 to testify regarding this detention hearing. One of the issues
- 21 that the Court needs to consider is the nature and the
- 22 circumstances of the offense.
- 23 THE COURT: Do you have a response?
- 24 MR. BARLOW: Yes, Judge. That does not include
- 25 | trying to build their case against him, you know, what would

amount to a discovery deposition.

My client does have a Fifth Amendment right not to answer questions about his involvement in the alleged offense. He has contested his innocence. He's pled not guilty at this point.

And the cross-examination should be limited only to those matters gone directly into during direct, which are in regards to his medical condition, his ability to flee the country, i.e., doesn't have a passport, the fact that he has no contacts outside the country, things that are relative to bond, not relative to the government's case in chief, which will proceed in the District Court in the District of Columbia.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Harrelson is certainly entitled to his Fifth Amendment rights. However, he did take the stand today with regard to the detention issue, and whether anything that's said on the stand will be subsequently admissible at trial, I assume you'll take that up with the judge at that time with regard to this detention hearing.

But in addition to risk of flight, I do have to consider also danger to the community, as well as the other statutory factors in Section 3142.

So I will allow the United States a bit of leeway to make some inquiry into those matters.

- 24 BY MS. GABLE:
- 25 Q. Do you know Graydon Young?

- 1 A. I -- not exactly, no.
- 2 Q. Were you with him on January 6th, 2021, inside the
- 3 | Capitol?
- 4 A. I'm not sure.
- 5 Q. And did he have his arm on you and his hand on your
- 6 shoulder as you were illegally inside the Capitol?
- 7 A. I don't know.
- 8 Q. And, Mr. Harrelson, did you travel to Washington, D.C.,
- 9 with the express purpose of participating in that rally?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. And did you travel to Washington, D.C., for the express
- 12 purpose of participating in the riot?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Did you plan with other members of the Oath Keepers to go
- 15 to D.C. to attend the rally?
- 16 | A. No.
- 17 Q. Do you know -- are you a member of the Oath Keepers?
- 18 | A. I was, yes.
- 19 MS. GABLE: I have no further questions, Your Honor.
- 20 Thank you.
- 21 THE COURT: Any redirect?
- 22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 23 BY MR. BARLOW:
- 24 Q. Mr. Harrelson, you were asked about an incident with
- 25 your -- about a neighbor's dog?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. Do you wish to explain what happened in that instance?
- 3 A. Yes, I do.
- 4 Q. Proceed.
- 5 A. On that afternoon I heard -- my ex-wife had left to go get
- 6 groceries. I heard a substantial amount of noise in the yard.
- 7 I came out and the neighbor's dog was chasing my ex-wife around
- 8 the yard, attempting to bite her.
- 9 So I went inside and got my handgun and came back
- 10 out, and I cracked a shot off at it. I didn't hit the dog, but
- 11 | it scared it over to the yard.
- 12 And then we went over -- the neighbors called the
- 13 law. The law came to the house. We explained to them what
- 14 happened. And the law said that, you know, not to crack rounds
- 15 off because people were out, and it -- you know, if it happened
- 16 again, to call animal control and the sheriff's department, and
- 17 | they would handle it.
- 18 Q. Did you receive any criminal conviction from that
- 19 | instance?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 | Q. Have you received any criminal convictions?
- 22 | A. No, sir.
- 23 | Q. During your time incarcerated, you were contacted by an
- 24 | individual by the name of Juan Cabrera from the U.S. pretrial
- 25 | services department?

```
Α.
         Yes.
 1
 2
    Q.
         And you spoke with him and disclosed these matters?
 3
    Α.
         Yes.
    Q.
 4
         Thank you.
 5
              MR. BARLOW: Nothing further, Judge.
              THE COURT: All right, Mr. Harrelson. You can take
 6
 7
    your seat.
8
              Do you have any additional witnesses?
9
              MR. BARLOW: No, Judge.
10
              THE COURT: All right. Any evidence by way of
11
    proffer?
12
              MR. BARLOW: No, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
                                             Ms. Gable?
14
              MS. GABLE: Your Honor, we would only proffer from
15
    the criminal complaint affidavit and the indictment, which we
16
    can do by way of argument to the Court.
17
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Why don't you go ahead.
18
              MS. GABLE: The government?
19
              THE COURT: Yes.
20
              MS. GABLE: Your Honor, as the Court is aware, under
21
    18, United States Code, 3142(e)(3)(C), a presumption of
22
    detention exists in this case. It is the government's position
23
    that the defendant has not rebutted the presumption that he is
24
    both a danger to the community and a flight risk.
25
              Turning to the nature and circumstances of the
```

offense charged, Your Honor, the Court shall consider the nature of the offense here.

The defendant is charged with both a crime of violence and a federal crime of terrorism under Section 2332b(g)(5) in the sense that he is charged with an offense that was calculated to influence or affect the conduct of government by intimidation or coercion or to retaliate against government conduct.

And he has been charged with an enumerated offense under 2332b(g)(5)(B), which is destruction of government property. So the Court is to consider that he has been charged with both a crime of violence and a federal crime of terrorism.

Turning to the weight of the evidence against the person, Your Honor, we would suggest to the Court that the weight of the evidence against the defendant is quite strong.

As set forth in the criminal complaint affidavit and the indictment, the defendant is a member of the Oath Keepers, which is a right-wing militia organization.

From at least as early as November 3rd of 2020 through January 6th of 2021, the defendant, along with his codefendants, planned to use violence to breach the Capitol and obstruct congressional proceedings to certify the vote of the electoral college of the 2020 United States presidential election.

During the period of the conspiracy, the defendant

participated and/or hosted meetings of the Oath Keepers on GoToMeeting. On January 3rd of 2021, he, along with Kelly Meggs, hosted a meeting titled "D.C. Planning Call." 18 participants were on the line during this call.

The government has linked the defendant to these meetings by his name, cell phone, his e-mail, and his IP address.

According to messages obtained from social media accounts, these conspirators planned to storm the Capitol and coordinated with a group of co-conspirators who agreed to serve as a quick reaction force to monitor the attack at the Capitol from a distance and be prepared to travel to the Capitol in the event they were called upon, possibly while armed.

One of the conspirators, Mr. Caldwell, also provided maps informing this quick reaction force, or QRF, team how to most effectively reach the Capitol from their staging area.

On January 6th of 2021, the defendant's co-conspirators stormed the Capitol -- the defendant and his co-conspirators stormed the Capitol. The video and photo evidence provided in the complaint affidavit shows the defendant congregating outside the Capitol with some of his co-conspirators, to wit, Mr. Young, Ms. Meggs, and Mr. Steele [verbatim].

Then the video evidence shows some of the conspirators aggressively moving through the crowd and toward

the entrance of the Capitol in a military stack formation with their hands on the shoulders of the individuals in front of them. They were dressed in paramilitary gear, with one of those participants wearing a sign that said "I don't believe in anything. I'm just here for the violence."

Furthermore, they were outfitted in clothing that had the Oath Keepers logos and insignia on it.

As the stack of Oath Keepers moved through the crowd, the defendant was seen in front of them, interacting with them. Video from inside the Capitol then shows the stack of Oath Keepers and other members of the crowd shortly after they breached the Capitol and damaged the doors to the Capitol.

In the video Mr. Harrelson is in front of the group of the Oath Keepers, and it appears that he forcibly entered before them.

When they pushed through that door, Your Honor, they pushed -- they passed at least -- or pushed through at least one law enforcement officer who was trying to stop the crowd from breaching the Capitol.

The Capitol doors that the Oath Keepers and Mr. Harrelson -- through which they breached were significantly damaged. Multiple panes of glass were smashed, and a door handle was missing or broken off.

The stack of Oath Keepers, Your Honor, then congregated inside the north section of the rotunda, as seen

from surveillance footage. The defendant is among that group. 1 2 The video shows his co-conspirator Graydon Young, in Oath 3 Keeper attire, with his hand on the defendant's shoulder, as the defendant records the event with his phone. 4 During the attack, based on communications from a 5 Zello channel called "Stop the Steal," which the conspirators 6 7 had planned to use and communicate with before they breached 8 the Capitol -- the FBI has recovered some of those 9 communications. 10 And in those communications, one of the 11 co-conspirators, Ms. Watkins, communicates, "We have a good 12 group. We have 30 or 40 of us. We are sticking together and 13 sticking to the plan." 14 Then an unknown male states, "You are executing 15 citizen's arrest. Arrest this assembly. We have probable 16 cause for acts of treason, election fraud." 17 Watkins then replies, "We are in the mezzanine. We 18 are in the dome right now. We are rocking it." 19 And then the individual on the channel responds: 20 "Get it, Jess. Do your f'ing thing. This is what --21 everything we f'ing trained for." 22 One of the co-conspirators, Caldwell, also received a

When Caldwell posted inside, he received messages

Facebook message which stated, quote, "All members are in the

tunnels under Capitol. Seal them in. Turn on gas."

23

24

25

such as, "Tom, take that b-i-t-c-h over. All of the legislators are down in the tunnels three floors down. Do like we had to do when I was in the corps. Start tearing out floors. Go from top to bottom and go through back house chamber doors facing north, left down the hallway, down steps," indicating that other members were watching the TV and were communicating with individuals inside and providing them positions of the legislators inside the Capitol.

Mr. Young posted later that evening, "We stormed and got inside."

In the course of these riots, Your Honor, 139 law enforcement officers were assaulted, and the Capitol suffered millions of dollars in damage.

The weight of the evidence against this defendant is strong. There is video evidence. There is photographic evidence of this defendant. He participated in planning meetings. And the e-mail evidence, his phone evidence, the IP address evidence, all of that evidence is very weighty and shows that this defendant not only -- participated in this conspiracy to obstruct government or to obstruct Congress.

And essentially, Your Honor, this -- the offense was so serious, it was really one that was designed to challenge over 244 years of our constitutional democracy.

Turning to the history and characteristics of the person, the defendant admittedly has a mental health -- has

mental health issues. He has PTSD, for which he is not receiving treatment.

He has substance abuse issues, according to the pretrial services investigation report, to include marijuana and alcohol, which he has been dealing with, apparently, since his early 20s.

It is also concerning that at age 31, while in the Army, he was charged with wrongful use of marijuana and failing to obey a general order. And I would just note, Your Honor, given the nature of the offense charged here, the defendant has not shown a respect for the law or a likelihood to follow court orders.

Finally, Your Honor, turning to the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by his release, the defendant has simply not rebutted the presumption of danger, Your Honor.

This defendant is not like the others that have come before this Court. As Judge Lammens said when detaining the defendants -- codefendants Kelly Meggs and Connie Meggs, Judge Lammens wrote: "This case isn't just about breaking the law. We see those cases every day. This case is different. It is more. It is about challenging the very existence of the law. It is about a challenge to the very institution responsible for" -- "responsible for making the law while it was in the process of carrying out its lawful duty. These members of

Congress were carrying out a duty that their oath required them to fulfill.

"When the Court considers the seriousness of the charges and the weight of the evidence, there is only one conclusion. The defendant is a danger to the community and must be detained."

Likewise, Your Honor, in this case, this case just involves a concerted activity by these -- the defendant and his codefendants to obstruct congressional proceedings. There was planning before, during, and after the events had occurred.

And as a result, the members of Congress were evacuated from their respective chambers. The disruption resulted in assault of more than a hundred law enforcement officers, millions of dollars of damage to the Capitol, and death to several individuals.

For those reasons, Your Honor, we would ask the Court to detain the defendant.

In addition, Your Honor, regarding the defendant's proposed custodian, she -- the defendant's wife admitted that she (unintelligible) some information regarding the defendant's participation in these events, and as such, she is not a suitable custodian, Your Honor.

It is possible that she will be a witness in this case, given her knowledge of the events, but more importantly, she didn't report what occurred to law enforcement. And so she

1 is not a suitable custodian. 2 So we would ask the Court to detain this defendant. 3 Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Barlow? 4 5 MR. BARLOW: Yes, Judge. 6 I presume that the Court has a copy both of the 7 indictment as well as the criminal complaint in this matter? 8 THE COURT: I do. 9 MR. BARLOW: And I find the government's argument somewhat interesting in that if you look at the criminal 10 11 indictment, the conduct discussed by my esteemed opponent is 12 attributable to codefendants Caldwell, Crowl, Watkins, Parker, 13 Bennie Parker, Young, Steele, Meggs, both Connie and Kelly. 14 Mr. Harrelson doesn't appear in this indictment till 15 paragraph 56. And it does charge participation in a 16 ComeToMeeting [verbatim] video or ComeToMeeting electronic 17 meeting, on, I believe, January the 3rd. So I would concede 18 that that charge exists. 19 But what we're talking about, showing up in combat 20 gear and things of that nature, the evidence that's been 21 provided to the Court by the government kind of contradicts 22 that. 23 The photographic evidence of Mr. Harrelson allegedly 24 at the Capitol Building, shows him in civilian clothing, no 25 combat gear, shows him not in any stack going into the Capitol

Building.

And as it happens, I've had the occasion to go to the Capitol Building. Those doors don't open inward; they open outward. There's no evidence that's been put before this Court that Mr. Harrelson touched a door, touched a barricade, touched a person, moved a fence.

They have established, I believe, that he was present. They have established that he knows Kelly Meggs, but knowing a co-conspirator does not necessarily make one a co-conspirator.

At the foundation of our country, there were lots of people that knew John Adams. There were lots of people that knew Thomas Jefferson. There were lots of people who knew our founding fathers. That did not mean that they participated in any attempt to overthrow the British government.

Likewise, the allegations asserted against my client here today are allegations only. They lack any proof. Quite frankly, when we look at the indictment, Mr. Harrelson starts to appear -- I think 56 is the first one. He appears again in 71 through 75, dealing with obstruction of an official proceeding.

In Count Three at page 82 [verbatim], he appears alleging damage of government property, but there's no specific government property that he's alleged to have touched, harmed, or anything, so I'm not exactly sure what they're talking about

in that regard.

There's the allegation -- there's no doubt there was damage done to the Capitol Building, but nothing that the government has offered here today is indicative that this man did any of that, other than the fact he was present.

They also say that he entered and remained in a restricted building or grounds. Judge, there may be some basis in that. They have a picture of a person that they believe is Mr. Harrelson, that they say is Mr. Harrelson -- again, not in combat gear, not part of any stack -- standing next to some people that guite -- very -- that are, without a doubt.

And in one of the photographs that they've made allusion to, one of the persons in combat gear has reached out in the direction -- well, at page 15 of the criminal complaint, in paragraph 41, there is a picture of an individual that the government suggests is Mr. Harrelson with his phone in the air -- Mr. Harrelson said it didn't capture anything -- with a person in combat gear with a beard and mustache that appears to be white or gray behind him that they say is touching him on the shoulder.

And this is a black and white picture. It's hard to say if he is or not. But even if he is, that does not mean that he's part of any grand conspiracy.

Under the First Amendment of the United States

Constitution, an individual in this country has the right of

redress, of protest, and being present at a protest where someone else commits a criminal act does not, in and of itself, make one a co-conspirator.

Presence alone is not enough, and the government has put forth nothing before this Court but allegations and not any presumptive proof other than their claims. We've not heard from the FBI agent who's investigated this cause, who is present. We've heard nothing but the charging document, which is nothing but claims not substantiated by proof.

Additionally, we've had testimony from both the defendant and his wife, and he does not have a passport. His family lives either in south -- Southeast Georgia, in the area of St. Marys, Georgia, or here in Florida.

He has ties to the community. He does have a diagnosed mental disorder for PTSD that the -- is apparently not sufficiently worrisome to the VA that they require -- or give him any treatment for it.

But more importantly, as he's being held currently at the Seminole County Jail, it's endangering his health. He's not been allowed to have his medication. Now, granted, the U.S. Marshals Service was willing to accept the medications and make the attempt, but the holding facility has denied action.

I would submit that this Court is empowered to consider the effect on the defendant's health in considering whether or not bond is appropriate.

I would also suggest that if the Court is not inclined to grant bond, that the Court perhaps order the Seminole County Jail to accept his medication so that he can have it.

The undisputed and uncontroverted testimony at this point is that because of medications the VA gave him in the past, his endocrine system is shot, and he has to have these medications to control his blood pressure.

If he doesn't have his blood pressure controlled, there's a danger of stroke, and I would submit to the Court that one of the preliminary signifying symptoms of that is negatively impacted memory.

This is important because it also impacts upon his ability to cooperate with counsel in regards to the preparation of a defense or, if he were to participate with the government, his ability to assist them in their prosecution of others as well.

So it's important that his medical issues be taken care of, and they can more easily be taken care of while out on bond.

It's also important to note, Judge, that when pretrial services met with Mr. Harrelson, they were aware of the facts as alleged by the government.

And yet their recommendation, based upon his physical health, his mental health, the nature of the charges, his risk

of potential -- identified risks of nonappearance, which are essentially the same things argued by the government, their recommendation is that Mr. Harrelson be released on an unsecured bond in an amount to be determined by the Court, with conditions that he report to pretrial services as directed; he not possess firearms, destructive devices, or ammunition; he refrain from use or unlawful possession of any narcotic drug or any controlled substance defined in 21 U.S.C. 802 unless prescribed by a licensed medical practitioner; that he refrain from the excessive use of alcohol; he submit to abuse -- substance abuse testing as directed by pretrial services; and submit to mental health evaluation and treatment as directed by pretrial services, with costs to be borne by the defendant as determined by pretrial services.

Now, that was March 11th, 2021, and that's government pretrial services. So at least one branch of the federal government believes that Mr. Harrelson can remain at large without being an inherent danger to the community or to others or to other property, whether it be public or private.

Mr. Harrelson has said -- stated under oath that he will participate, and he will appear. It is our position that the government has not put forth sufficient factual evidence to establish that a presumption should apply.

They have certainly alleged it, but you haven't received any evidence from the government at all other than the

accusations.

And for that reason it is the defense position that setting bond, as suggested by pretrial services, is appropriate and that the concerns of the government can be adequately covered for or eliminated by the terms and conditions of release by the Court.

They could include things such as home confinement,

GPS monitoring, the substance abuse, and those type things that

pretrial services is suggesting.

So with all due respect to the government's arguments, we are asking the Court to find that the defense has overcome the presumption sought by the government and set bond in a reasonable amount, with the conditions that are suggested by pretrial services and any others that the Court finds appropriate.

Mr. Harrelson will appear as ordered, whether it be in this district or in the District of Columbia, as ordered.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Barlow.

Are you contesting that the presumption does apply based on the nature of the charges, or is your argument to me that it just -- the circumstances are not such that would warrant an application of the presumption?

MR. BARLOW: Judge, I do not believe that the circumstances are as such as the presumption should apply. I

would not dispute that if -- as to the other codefendants, based upon what's in the paperwork that's been provided to me.

But when I read this indictment, it looks as Mr. Harrelson might have been added as an afterthought.

THE COURT: Well, I understand your argument there, but minus just a very technical argument, do you disagree that statutorily the presumption applies based on the nature of the -- based on the charges that are set forth in the second superseding indictment? Because if there's a dispute over that, then we might need to address that.

MR. BARLOW: I believe, in tender to the Court, that an argument can realistically be made by the government. I note that there was argument in regards to, you know, terrorism and terroristic type things, but I haven't seen any disclosures to that effect.

None of the charges, per se, allege any terroristic conduct by Mr. Harrelson, other than being present, and there is the conspiracy count that talks about the one GoToMeeting.

But when we look at the -- at the big picture, we've got all these machinations by the other codefendants from which Mr. Harrelson is noticeably absent from, except that one GoToMeeting.

THE COURT: Well, I understand your argument as to the sufficiency of the evidence. Just as to the application of the statutory presumption -- you know, there are a lot of

```
1
    factors for me to consider, but I just need to know -- make
 2
    sure we're on the same page at the outset, that the presumption
 3
    does apply.
              MR. BARLOW:
                           Judge, I have no statutory authority to
 4
5
    give you that suggests that it doesn't.
 6
              THE COURT:
                                 I understand.
                          Okay.
 7
              MR. BARLOW: But I don't agree that it applies, but I
8
    can't cite to any --
9
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
10
              MR. BARLOW: -- controlling or compelling argument.
11
              THE COURT:
                          All right. Thank you, Mr. Barlow.
12
                          Mr. Harrelson, as the attorneys have been
              All right.
13
    discussing, my consideration is governed by statute, Title 18
14
    of the United States Code, Section 3142.
15
              Because you have been charged -- and recognizing that
16
    you're innocent until proven guilty, but nevertheless, there is
17
    a charging instrument from the grand jury setting forth charges
18
    of 18, U.S.C., Section 1512(c)(2), which I believe is the one
19
    that triggers the presumption because it is one of the offenses
20
    listed in Section 2332b(g)(5)(B) of Title 18, that a
21
    presumption of your detention should apply.
22
              There are two aspects of it. One is risk of flight.
23
    The statute says subject to rebuttal by the person, it shall be
24
    presumed that no condition or combination of conditions will
25
    reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required.
```

That's risk of flight. But then there's also the safety of the community.

I do believe that you've met your burden for production as to risk of flight. I don't think there's really any argument that you're a serious risk of flight. You have ties to the community. You don't possess a passport. You haven't traveled outside the United States.

But that's only one aspect of it. The other aspect is danger to the community.

I think -- I've not heard very much, at least in terms of production from the defense, that addresses danger to the community other than the sufficiency of the evidence for the charges.

Nevertheless, I will assume that you've met your burden of production as to danger to the community and still consider the factors set forth in 18, U.S.C., Section 3142(g), the first of which is the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, including whether it is a crime of violence.

I think the United States makes a good argument that this should be considered a crime of violence, but it is certainly a -- a federal crime of terrorism, so there are two factors that go against you there.

Second, the weight of the evidence against you, understanding that this still has to go to a jury trial, so a jury will ultimately make the determination as to whether

there's sufficient evidence to find you guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

But as to my consideration, I do have to consider that there does appear to be photographic and video evidence of you at the Capitol. The United States apparently has evidence of your conspiring with others by way of these meetings that occurred through the app, some of which you apparently helped organize and some of which perhaps you did not but were nevertheless affiliated with the Oath Keepers and their actions with regard to the Capitol on that day.

So in terms of the conspiracy charge, to me, that seems fairly strong.

As to the other charges, obstruction of an official proceeding and aiding and abetting, based on the information set forth in the complaint and in the indictment, it certainly seems like that was the purpose of what occurred on the Capitol that day, so that evidence -- and to the extent that you were involved in the planning of that and the participation of that, the evidence of that count seems fairly strong.

Destruction of government property, the complaint sets forth several items and portions of the Capitol that were destroyed as a result of the actions that were taken that day. As for whether you specifically destroyed any, that's something that the government's going to have to prove.

Then the final count of which you're charged,

restricted building or ground, I don't think there's really any contention there that you were in restricted building and grounds, that is, posted, cordoned off, or otherwise restricted area within the United States Capitol and its grounds, without lawful authority to do so.

So overall, I find that the evidence against you is fairly strong but, again, recognizing that you're certainly entitled to presumption of innocence and a jury trial. But at this stage of the proceedings, based on the information before me, the evidence does seem fairly convincing.

Your history and characteristics, I do note your physical and mental condition, the -- that you were in the military and that you suffer from PTSD -- although it's not currently being treated, I do note the diagnosis -- your physical condition with regard to the medication that has been prescribed and that you need and that you haven't been receiving.

Financial resources, you don't appear to have -- so you're receiving disability benefits from the VA. It does not appear that you have significant means with which to flee.

Community ties, as I noted, were fairly strong. You have a wife and family here, as well as in South Georgia.

Your past conduct, the United States has pointed out several instances in the past. I don't give very much weight to things like -- at least in terms of this context, to the dog

incident. You've explained the circumstances of that.

The battery is really concerning, the other instances of police being called. But I do note that, as your attorney pointed out, that the charges were ultimately dismissed, so you don't have a criminal history to speak of.

A record concerning appearance in court proceedings, I don't have any indication that you've ever failed to appear at any court proceeding, so that is also in your favor.

Drug or alcohol abuse, I did note that in your past there were some instances involving alcohol, as well as marijuana, which, if you were to be released, you would not be allowed to -- to use marijuana.

And then finally, the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person of the community that would be posed by your release, and that brings us back to the presumption, which even if you meet your burden of production, it's nevertheless a factor that I have to consider, as Congress has decided that the nature of the charges that you're facing are such that the Court should presume that you should be detained.

And I do take the description of the incidents that the United States has proffered and that's contained in the criminal complaint are certainly very concerning, certainly to a Court, and the circumstances under which you'd be appearing before the Court, which are, in themselves, official proceedings.

And yet the criminal complaint describes conduct that is -- that shows an absolute disregard for the validity of official proceedings that are being held by the United States government. So that, to me, is very troublesome.

And I think that in light of the nature of the violence that was -- that has been described by the United States and as set forth in the complaint, in light of your actions with regard to organizing some of these events surrounding it, your affiliation with the organization the Oath Keepers that was involved in perpetrating a lot of this violence, and certainly organizing in a paramilitary style in order to interfere with these official government proceedings, that gives me great pause.

When I consider that, along with the statutory presumption that you shall be detained based on the nature of the charges, I do find that there are no conditions or combination of conditions that will reasonably assure the safety of the community if you were to be released.

So I will order that you be remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal pending further proceedings.

You will be transferred to the District of Columbia, where you will face charges in that jurisdiction.

Was there anything else to take care of today from the United States?

MS. GABLE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: From the defense? 1 2 MR. BARLOW: Yes, Judge. 3 In light of the fact that Mr. Harrelson is to be continued detained, will the Court entertain an ore tenus 4 5 motion to order the Seminole County Jail to accept his medication so that he can receive the treatment that he needs? 6 7 I'm not going to order the jail to accept THE COURT: 8 the medication without more briefing. I will request that the 9 United States Marshals look into it and -- and see what the issue is with the jail. 10 11 I certainly agree that Mr. Harrelson should be 12 receiving his prescribed medication, but I understand that the 13 jail also has their own medical staff and that he is being seen 14 by that medical staff. 15 So I will request that the marshals look into it, but 16 if you believe that Mr. Harrelson continues not to receive the 17 medication that he needs, I'd encourage you to file a motion on 18 that, and we'll have a briefing on the issue. 19 MR. BARLOW: Thank you, Judge. 20 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else? 21 MR. BARLOW: No, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. This hearing is adjourned. 23 24 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 25 (The proceedings were concluded at 2:21 p.m.)

```
CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
 1
 2
 3
    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT )
 4
    MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
 5
 6
               I, court approved transcriber, certify that the
 7
    foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic
 8
 9
    sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
    matter.
10
11
               DATED this 23rd day of March, 2021.
12
13
14
                                   s/Shelli Kozachenko_
                                   Shelli Kozachenko, RPR, CRR, CRC
15
                                   Official Court Reporter
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```