1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
2	FOR THE	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Criminal Action	
4	Plaintiff,	No. 1:21-cr-0175
5	vs.	Washington, DC October 7, 2022
6	ZACHARY REHL (3),	8:07 a.m.
7	Defendant.	0.07 a.m.
8		/
9	TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY J. KELLY	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
11		
12	<u>APPEARANCES</u> :	
13	For the Government:	JASON MCCULLOUGH
14		USAO-DC 555 4th Street, NW
15		Washington, DC 20001
16		CONOR MULROE DOJ-CRM
17		1301 New York Ave, NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20005
18		NADIA MOORE
19		USAO-NY 271 Cadman Plaza East
20		Brooklyn, NY 11201
21	For the Defendant:	CARMEN HERNANDEZ 7166 Mink Hollow Road
22		Highland, MD 20777
23	Court Reporter:	JEFF M. HOOK
24		Official Court Reporter U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts
25		333 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001
		<u>.</u>

PROCEEDINGS

DEPUTY CLERK: Your Honor, this is criminal matter 21-175, United States of America v. Defendant 3, Zachary Rehl. Present for the government are Jason McCullough, Erik Kenerson, Conor Mulroe and Nadia Moore. Present for the defendant is Carmen Hernandez. Also present by telephone is the defendant, Mr. Rehl.

THE COURT: Good morning to everyone. Before we begin, Ms. Hernandez, we do have your client present by telephone. I just -- I don't know whether I have to -- and obviously you knew he would be present by telephone. I assume he consents to being present by telephone?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, sir. Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And it is an early morning.

THE COURT: It is an early morning. I appreciate everyone -- I know it's a busy time for all of us, so I appreciate everyone being here so early. It is your motion, Ms. Hernandez, so if there's nothing preliminary from either side, I will hear from you.

And I suppose I should also add -- obviously,

Ms. Hernandez, you've already done so, any attorney who
approaches the podium to speak may remove your mask. It
certainly makes it easier to hear. But on the other hand,

1 if someone has a strong preference to keep their mask on, as 2 long as we can hear you, we can proceed. 3 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Your Honor. Again, good morning. Mr. Rehl's wife and his mother are on their 4 way, but they hit D.C. traffic I believe, so let that be a 5 lesson. And I understand there are two of Mr. Rehl's -- two 6 7 of the men who wrote character letters for him are supposed 8 to be available if the Court wants to speak with them on the phone. But they weren't able to make it down this time. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 MS. HERNANDEZ: So --12 THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, I apologize for 13 interrupting you, but just before I forget, I think I 14 mentioned this the last time we were together. I still 15 don't think I have an unredacted version of your motion. 16 MS. HERNANDEZ: I filed a sealed --17 THE COURT: Oh, you did? 18 MS. HERNANDEZ: I filed the sealed version last 19 week I believe. 20 THE COURT: Oh, you did, okay. I'll go back --21 MS. HERNANDEZ: So it should be unsealed. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MS. HERNANDEZ: I can describe the two sections --24 THE COURT: No, I think I know what is in there.

As long as I can go back and look at it, then that's fine.

25

I just wasn't sure if -- I didn't realize you had made that correction.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And one was a sealed matter, but the other one -- and maybe the government will be okay if I discuss that part of it, with the Court's indulgence.

(Discussion off the record)

MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, the other thing that I have not filed is with respect to his two prior counsel. Your Honor, on the record at the first hearing, expressed displeasure with his first -- with Mr. Johnson's timeliness in filing documents and failing to appear and that type of thing. I have a letter from Mr. Rehl, which I can submit to the Court, which he had written at the time. I'm not sure whether that letter actually ever got to the Court from Mr. Rehl at the time. But where he expressed his dissatisfaction, which is why he changed counsel to Mr. Moseley. And I think I can lay out a lot more about Mr. Moseley, I'd rather not do it on the public docket. But he is currently suspended for practice before this Court and before the court of -- the bar of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

THE COURT: I think he was -- if I'm -- just from public reports, I think he's been disbarred in Virginia.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I don't know. But I know he's not eligible to practice in this Court. Right now,

there's even a dispute over -- in the Oath Keepers case, over some discovery that may have been produced to him and what he wants to do with it.

THE COURT: All right. Well, look, you can make -- I think, without going into every chapter and verse about those lawyers, I think for purposes of what you're going to be arguing to me today, I think you can -- I think there's a way to argue that without having to delve into every specific about their status.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct. And while I'd like to think that I'm a very diligent and hard working lawyer, and I've been doing this for a long time, I think there are arguments made that were arguments and facts that were not previously before the Court. So I think that meets the standard for reopening a detention hearing.

THE COURT: That's going to be your argument.

They're going to make an argument that no, no, he had the counsel and that you had this -- not you, but he had this opportunity. I'm here to hear your argument on it, but I understand the argument.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I mean, if the Court wants me to go heavily into that, I'm happy to. But otherwise, I would pass over that and get to the merits, which is I think more important. But if the Court is going to throw me out of court on that basis, I'm happy to spend a lot of time

arguing those points.

THE COURT: Well, I don't want to presuppose what you should argue. I think -- but I think you can, again, make your arguments about the lawyers not being -- perhaps not -- it seems to me that's a fair argument. And if you want to make it, I'm open to hearing it. But -- and I'd rather focus on the merits. But if you have an argument -- and you've laid out some of it in the motion, if you have anything you want me to hear along those lines, or even if you want to submit something afterward that lays out facts -- and you could do it under seal if you think it's appropriate, I'll certainly receive that as well.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I'd rather do it under seal just because I think it's sort of dirty laundry that nobody needs to -- deserves to have displayed.

THE COURT: Understood. Why don't we -- even just before we begin, how quickly do you think you could --

 $\label{eq:ms.hernandez:} \textbf{MS. HERNANDEZ:} \quad \textbf{I} \ \text{can get that to you by the}$ end -- by Saturday.

THE COURT: That's tomorrow.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I've been working seven days a week, as the Court probably is, too, and everyone else here.

THE COURT: I hear you. We'll just say -- I'm just going to say by Tuesday.

MS. HERNANDEZ: That's fine.

THE COURT: Very well.

MS. HERNANDEZ: So I can celebrate Columbus Day.

THE COURT: Please proceed.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Your Honor. On that score, part of the problem is even diligent attorneys, because of the volume of discovery in this case, that's part of the -- I mean, the government alleges -- I shouldn't say alleges. It is true that the government produced the MOSD video like I think a week or two before the hearing, the original detention hearing. But that was a production, a large production, that unless somebody was looking for it and was aware of it, I don't even think there was enough time to go through everything.

So even if the Court were to say, okay, it's not about the lawyers, it's about when the discovery was produced -- and I can tell you, because I attached an e-mail from Mr. Hull who represents Mr. Biggs to government counsel in March, eight months later -- or whatever number of months that is after June, saying can we have a copy of this because he hadn't found it. As the Court knows, other lawyers and myself have all expressed to the Court the difficulty in plotting through all the discovery.

But here we are, and we're here because the government is so kind to me to have given us the gift of another quilty plea yesterday. But I will say this on that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

score, I'll try not to be too snide, Your Honor, but I grew up in New York, so it's almost -- it's by nature. This is the second plea agreement in this case. I'll refer to it as the immaculate plea. I've been doing federal criminal defense most of my entire career, almost my entire career. It's rare that the government allows a defendant to plead guilty to a conspiracy that doesn't say this was the agreement, and I entered into it with Joe, Bill and whomever. Like Mr. Donohoe's plea, this is I didn't know what the -- there was apparently a plan between Mr. Tarrio -- the allegation has been in the indictment and here, there was apparently a plan between Mr. Tarrio, Biggs and Nordean that was formed on the evening of January 6th. I wasn't informed of it, Mr. Donohoe wasn't informed of it. I attached a text message where Mr. Rehl was not informed of it, but it must have been about this. Again, it's a rare occurrence in federal -- in the annals of federal criminal law.

I say that only because I don't think that plea affects or should affect the Court's decision as to Mr. Rehl. Both because nothing in that plea agreement says I entered into an agreement with Mr. Rehl to do X, Y and Z or Mr. Rehl was aware of X, Y and Z. And secondly, because as the Court knows, a detention determination is individual to the person. I've pointed to the Court, because I -- you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know, while Judge Mehta's rulings are not precedent to this Court, I understand that to the extent that he's got the other major conspiracy with similar charges, that the Court is aware of the rulings. And from the start, Judge Mehta has distinguished among the defendants, a number of defendants charged with selective -- with seditious conspiracy. And the most serious charges have been released from day one, including Mr. James who was the first to plead guilty -- Mr. James in the Oath Keepers case, who was the first to plead guilty to seditious conspiracy. He was out before he pled guilty, and he has remained out. And that's -- and he admitted in his statement of offense that -- there's an admission by him that he stockpiled firearms, I believe with Mr. Rhodes, mostly after I think January 6th. So it's not as if his conduct is less serious than what is alleged against Mr. Rehl.

And one more point about the Bertino plea. I would expect the government would come in here and concede Mr. Rehl should be released, because Mr. Bertino not only pled guilty to seditious conspiracy, but he's pleading guilty to a being a felon in possession of multiple firearms. They seized those firearms I believe back in March when they first searched his home and he had not yet pled guilty, yet he's been out all this time.

So if we're talking about fairness, treating like

things alike, Mr. Bertino's been out since March with guns in his house. Mr. Rehl, when the government searched his home, had not a single firearm there nor was he alleged to have firearms here.

THE COURT: Obviously, Ms. Hernandez -- I'll just point out the obvious, that I obviously didn't have the opportunity to make a detention decision with regard to Mr. Bertino until yesterday. What I said at the time, and what I've said regarding -- well, I guess there is -- what I've said in other cases, consistent with what I've said in other cases, which is, look, you would have to concede that taking responsibility for your actions and agreeing to cooperate is something I can consider when determining whether someone -- the future threat someone poses; isn't that fair?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Well, the federal statute says when someone pleads guilty or is convicted, he is -- he shall be sentenced -- he shall be detained, not sentenced; we wait a little while for sentencing. He shall be detained unless there are exceptional circumstances.

THE COURT: Well, clear and convincing evidence that he will not -- that the defendant will not pose a danger to the community or any other person or flee.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Donohoe pled, cooperated and the man is in jail. Mr. Bertino, with guns, plead yesterday

and has been out since March.

THE COURT: Mr. Donohoe -- just for the record,
Mr. Donohoe, as I recall, no party -- he did not ask to
be -- there was no detention decision for me to make.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I understand. I believe it was part of the plea agreement.

THE COURT: Maybe so.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And I understand and I'm glad that the ultimate decision here is Your Honor's. But I'm just pointing out what may be an inconsistency in the government's position.

THE COURT: I understand your argument. I'm just trying to provide further context as to why I might have made certain decisions, and pointing out that in other cases I didn't have a decision to make.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I understand. I mean, I understand that the government often makes exceptions for their cooperators. They have an immense amount of discretion. But, again, I appeal to the Court's sense of justice in -- because Your Honor gets to see everything. In the detention decision, it's up to the Court, it's not up to -- well, in almost every decision, the government gets to say their piece. But it's up to the Court to make a decision.

So to Mr. Rehl. As I've -- as the Court well

knows, Mr. Rehl -- and the Court found at the first hearing, is a lieutenant, not at the top of the pyramid. Apparently now we have two pleas which claim that there was some plan hatched by the top three that was not made known to anybody else so far. And there is, as I say, record evidence from the text messages that that night Mr. Rehl was not with Mr. Biggs, was not with Mr. Nordean, and Mr. Tarrio was not in town and there was no communication. And there's a text message after I think Donohoe sends out a text -- I call them texts, I think they're Telegram messages, where he says the plan is to -- they have a plan or whatever. And Mr. Rehl says: Well, if the plan is still to gather our 10 people and meet at the Capitol, that's great, that's what I'll do. And that is in fact what he did, Your Honor.

But to get back, Mr. Rehl is not alleged to have forcibly entered the Capitol. All the other defendants are alleged except for, well, Mr. Tarrio who wasn't at the Capitol at all. But Biggs, Nordean, Donahue and Pezzola are all alleged in the indictment to have forcibly entered the Capitol. Mr. Rehl enters at 2:57. The allegation in the indictment is that he entered the Capitol. The word forcible is not there. And it's clear, because by the time he enters, there are crowds of Americans entering the Capitol at the same time. I believe he entered at the same time as several members of the Philadelphia Proud Boys,

three or four members -- I believe four, and Mr. Finley who is the president of I want to say the West Virginia Proud Boys.

So they all entered at that point, at 2:53 in the afternoon. The proceedings were over. They were aware because, you know, everyone's audiotaping and videotaping everything that day. They were aware -- and you can hear in the background, they were aware that Vice President Pence had left the building. They were aware the proceedings had been over. And there's a conversation, and there's also FBI 302s by people who have been interviewed saying we decided to go -- someone says they're curious about what happened inside, let's go in, and that's when they decide to go in.

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, just to -- this is hardly the most important point here, but I did notice in your submission you mentioned the same point about Vice President Pence. I don't think he ever -- maybe I've got my facts wrong, but I don't think he ever left the building or left the premises there. Anyway, not that --

MS. HERNANDEZ: I think it's a state secret.

THE COURT: Not that it really matters, but --

MS. HERNANDEZ: My understanding is he had left
the -- he was somewhere -- I don't think -- I don't know,
but I don't think we've ever been told where he was. He was
taken to some secure facility, possibly within the Capitol,

is my best understanding of the facts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HERNANDEZ: But the point is that the word that went out among the crowd -- and that's something I think, Your Honor, is important on what's going on here. There was a lot of information, as the Court could imagine, going through the crowd, because people were listening in to news reports, and because misinformation flows through the crowd. And I'm talking about Mr. Rehl, because as the Court knows -- because I've made this argument before, I frankly -- and I've told the government so this is nothing new. I find the prosecution of Mr. Rehl for seditious conspiracy to be grotesque. Here's a young man who served his country. He's married. He has no prior convictions for any kind of violence. He participated in multiple demonstrations as I quoted from a Secret Service analysis. That comes from a public filing where some entity issued a FOIA request and got some information back from the Secret Service, and that was posted online.

The Secret Service refers to the -- they say we know the Proud Boys have been at multiple rallies where the -- I'm not quoting, I'm paraphrasing. You know, they're -- the Secret Service is always interested in the people they protect. The Secret Service statement says they've never been arrested, there's no evidence that the

Proud Boys, in connection with rallies where the protectee has been around or present, have ever been arrested for committing any violence.

In addition to that, Mr. Rehl is the son and grandson of Philadelphia police officers. I don't know if I could have the Elmo. Mr. Rehl has always supported the police. He has -- here's -- and these are -- is the Elmo on? And this document is from the filing from the discovery that the government has produced. And this is how -- it says January 13th, 2020.

MR. KENERSON: Excuse me just a second, the Court's indulgence. Our monitor is not working.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, I don't have copies for
you. I was planning to, but take my word for it.

As the Court knows, Mr. Rehl was the president of the Proud Boys Philadelphia chapter. And here is a posting from -- I'm not sure exactly, this is some of the discovery that the government has produced. It's dated January 13th, 2020. And it is a fundraising request for a retired Philadelphia police officer whose bar was vandalized by Antifa, and where -- it says Antifa attacked a retired police officer's bar for simply having Trump supporters drink at his bar weeks ago. They broke seven windows costing \$1,500 each, and spray painted on his wall anything will help for repairs.

So I would submit that as Exhibit 1 for this hearing.

THE COURT: Is there any objection from the government to the Court receiving that exhibit?

MR. KENERSON: No.

THE COURT: It shall be admitted.

(Exhibit 1 admitted into evidence)

MS. HERNANDEZ: Here's another document from some chat, I believe it's from Parler, but it's from some discovery the government produced. Again, it's under the caption of the Philadelphia Proud Boys. My understanding is that it was dated June 14th, 2020, and that's from the metadata on the document that was produced to me. Again, I'm not sure whether that's an accurate date, but that's the date -- I'm not sure that's an accurate date of when this event happened, but that's -- that was what was on my discovery matter.

What it shows is the blurred face, my understanding, appears to be a police officer. And then Mr. Rehl and I believe two other members of the Proud Boys Philadelphia chapter. And there are pictures. It says, "After a long week of riots and looting, we stopped in some of the hardest hit districts in the city to give the city police some well-deserved refreshments for our exhausted officers working 15 plus hours a day." And you can see them

delivering food and refreshments I guess in the other pictures.

So there is no basis for finding that Mr. Rehl did in fact or intended to attack police officers. I know the government has focused on a post that he put that said something like police officers who should be tarred and feathered who -- my understanding was it -- when I say my understanding, that's from the government --

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, I'm losing your voice.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Sorry. That's rarely said of me. I know the government says that he posted something about they should be tarred and feathered. My understanding was that was deleted within minutes, and it was after the fact, not -- you know, it was not in the days before.

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, I think you're -- look, I understand the point you're trying to make. Let me just note this: We've got all sorts of defendants, January 6th defendants, some who are former and current police officers -- not in this case. But my point is there are all sorts of folks who, for whatever reason, took actions that day that might have been inconsistent with their prior support for the police, including in fact because they were police officers.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I think Mr. Pezzola is a former Marine who has no history --

is just that it seems to me in the limited time we have available here that your strongest -- that the thing that is most salient is when you're making arguments to me that Mr. Rehl is factually distinguishable from the other defendants in this case. And I know you began with that, but my only point is the idea that he was supportive of the police generally pre-January 6th, okay, I'm not saying it's not relevant.

But I'm also saying -- just I don't know how far it really gets you given kind of all the different cases
I've seen in which folks who might have had those kind of sentiments before January 6th for whatever reason did not act consistent with them that day.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct, Your Honor, and thank you for pointing out what is important to you. I thought that all this information folds into that issue, that he's --

THE COURT: I'm not saying it's irrelevant, but I take your point. And I don't think the government is even in a position to dispute what you're saying about his feelings and associations before January 6th were. I'm not saying they're irrelevant either.

MS. HERNANDEZ: It isn't just before, it's also during and after, I would submit to the Court. And first thank you to the Court for identifying what I should focus

on. Secondly, I agree, some of the conduct on January 6th is -- it's like mind boggling. I remember reading in the paper a firefighter -- a chief firefighter who took a fire extinguisher and threw it at police officers. You know that firefighter has worked with police his whole life.

Anyway, I digress. I do think because he is distinguishable on multiple grounds, and he's distinguishable on grounds that are material to the Court's decision making. The Court has to find in order to detain him, consistent with the Due Process Clause, that he presents an articulable future threat. Not that -- and I think Munchel made that very clear, it's not about the past, it's what the future is. And the Court has to articulate. With all due respect to the Court, I don't believe that the Court in its earlier decision articulated it as the Munchel decision would require.

THE COURT: The Court of Appeals did uphold me twice.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Not me.

THE COURT: I understand, I understand. But in particular, that's why I think your strongest points here are telling me you've already -- you've got two Court of Appeals decisions affirming my decision on the other defendants in this case. So, again, I think that's your strongest play here, is telling me why he is differently

situated.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct. And I will say the following -- and obviously he's -- and I will quote from how he is dissimilarly situated. I'll quote from the government's omnibus motion in opposition to the motions to dismiss: "While unlawfully on Capitol grounds, the defendants engaged in mayhem." And then they go on: "Nordean and Biggs participated in tearing down a black metal fence. Biggs then announced in a video, 'We've just taken the Capitol.' Pezzola robbed a riot shield from an officer, and later posed with it while making a hand gesture associated with the Proud Boys. Donohoe threw a water bottle at a line of law enforcement officers."

It goes on and on -- this is at page five, ECF

454. It goes on and on for several paragraphs at pages five
and six. You know whose name is not listed? Mr. Rehl. And
he -- again, no forcible entry, he is not -- he's a
lieutenant, not a leader. I'll go back to that in a minute.
He did not participate in any of these things. And, you
know, after that original -- when the -- and I know Mr. Hull
is here. I don't like a circular firing squad, but I'm just
trying to make my point as to my client.

After that initial when he started out with them, he goes off and meets the people from Philadelphia. The original plan of the MOSD was to break off into small

groups, not to attack the Capitol, but to have more control over the events of that day. And I hope -- I have the video, the hour and 38 minute video. I've not submitted it to the Court, and I'd ask the Court to view it. I've submitted to the Court the transcript because I thought it would be easier for the Court, but I'm happy to submit the video. You can see Mr. Rehl, even in that video, that he's a much more temperate person than everybody else. Bertino is one of the hotheads, and Bertino appears to have been the one who is -- on December 12th when they were in D.C. and Bertino gets stabbed, Mr. Rehl was in D.C. that day. He was not with the crowd that later got rowdy and got stabbed and all of that.

So, again, at every point that the Court looks at, he is different from everyone else. I simply don't believe that there's evidence before the Court that meets the Munchel standard, the Salerno standard.

THE COURT: So I'll make this point: Munchel -obviously part of what Munchel said was, yes, it refocused
the district courts, to the extent they needed refocusing,
on thinking about the future, the future, the dangerousness,
which is part of the point you're making. Of course, the
other part of Munchel was the passage that I'm well familiar
with in which the Court said, well, the people who are
accused of planning what happened that day are in a totally

separate category.

So you're arguing to me there isn't evidence of that, and fine. But my point is to the extent there is, you know, Munchel kind of --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct.

THE COURT: It's less --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct, but that's why I point to two things. You don't put -- the theory alleged in the indictment and argued by the government is that this was a hierarchical group; Tarrio, Biggs and Nordean were the kings of the hill or however you want to describe it. Your Honor, they have 160,000 messages from all the Proud Boys that they've produced, Telegram messages. Tell me, where is the message that was -- where is the clarion call to go out and attack the Capitol? The only thing they've alleged -- again, I find it --

THE COURT: See, now, there -- I'm sorry, finish your point.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I'd rather address the concerns of the Court, that's the best.

THE COURT: So again, that argument you're making to me, jeez, there's a million whatever they are, text messages, 160,000 of them, okay. But I've got Mr. Donohoe and Mr. Bertino having pled to -- well --

MS. HERNANDEZ: To an immaculate conception

conspiracy.

THE COURT: Look, you can say whatever you want about it. They have pled to a conspiracy to do this, different types of conspiracies. But still, I guess my point is -- and putting aside those pleas, right, put aside those. There's also a lot of other evidence that maybe doesn't directly impact your client. But there's other evidence that is more directly relevant to the other charged defendants. So the idea that, well, just because there's no text message that says let's go storm the Capitol, you know, I think that --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Number one, Your Honor, I'm not asking the Court to find him innocent or not guilty.

THE COURT: I understand, I get it.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Number two, yes, Donohoe pled guilty. You know what, Donohoe took two bottles of water and threw them at police. Donohoe is on video parading through the -- one of the areas of the Capitol with Pezzola while Pezzola has the stolen shield, and somebody's saying: You stole the shield. And I don't know who's answering, but: Yeah, we stole the shield. So yes, if I had been representing Mr. Donohoe, I would have said, you know what, Mr. Donohoe, you're going to be found guilty of some things, whatever they are. So if they're offering you a deal, take it.

THE COURT: I shouldn't have brought -- my point is just this: To the extent I think your best arguments here are why your client is differently situated from the other defendants, the point is that there's no Telegram message from anybody saying here is our planning to storm the Capitol. I guess, again, whether you want to look at defendants who have pled guilty or whether you want to look at defendants for whom the Court of Appeals has upheld their detention, either way my point is your best argument here is: No, at least as to the allegations, my client is differently situated.

MS. HERNANDEZ: He is differently situated.

Number one, Your Honor, to address the Court's -- the Court of Appeals, in per curiam opinions, upheld the Court. But remember, at least at the time that they were before the Court, the argument as to them was they're the ones who tore -- Nordean and Biggs are the ones who tore aside the bicycle rack and let the crowd start --

THE COURT: There were a lot of other allegations too.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And they were higher leaders. But that was part of the argument. That will take me back to a legal argument. So I want to say that. But yes, he is different, because Donohoe actually took violent action that day, and appeared to be supportive of the stealing of the

shield and whatever happened after that. After the fact on January 6th, after the most violent events of the day, there is audio/video of Mr. Donohoe and Mr. Rehl talking to each other, and Rehl saying wow, you know, he was surprised at what happened. And he didn't know that the person who had broken the window was a Proud Boy. And Donohoe says: No, no, that was one of ours. Again, Donohoe was much more aware of what was going on. And Biggs -- I mean, Bertino in his statement of offense, which is accurate, he is on those chats on January 6th egging people on. Mr. Rehl is not on those chats.

So in terms of distinguishing, I know the Court hates this when I do this, but it's so important -- it's so close to my heart because I'm a mother and I have two grown children. Mrs. Rehl is in the courtroom, and she's prepared to take the stand. And Mrs. -- and Mr. Rehl's mother is also in the courtroom. Do you want to know what the biggest difference is -- I mean, to me, I don't -- I think this -- this is relevant to whether Mr. Rehl will do anything to jeopardize being out if you release him. That's his baby who is now 15 months old. And I know, I know it doesn't land well with the Court. But I find it so -- I guess I'm a mother, I remember my husband when my children were little.

I mean, and it isn't -- you know, the family circumstances, a downward variance in the guidelines, are

not about the defendants, they're about what it does to the child. And I'll tell the Court -- and she can testify if the Court wants to hear it from her mouth. She's told me how difficult it is for her when she visits Mr. Rehl and the baby's with her, that the baby doesn't understand why he can't hold her in his arms. This is since their child was born he's been detained. We're doing psychological damage to this child not to have her father around, and that's a known fact that there's evidence.

So to me, you want -- and I think this is relevant, because in deciding the nature and circumstances -- the history and characteristics of the defendant, family circumstances and the support a defendant has is part of that analysis. And the four letters from the men who wrote to you were all veterans who have known

Mr. Rehl for many years. This man is a stable person. He didn't commit -- I mean, and Munchel is very clear what you do with language, that they refer to it as rhetorical bravado. I argued to the Court it's First Amendment protected.

You know, Your Honor, the framers were not concerned with protesters, wild and crazy. The Supreme Court, you can burn a flag and not be prosecuted. You know what the framers were concerned with? The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution to protect us from

a government run amuck. The First Amendment protects -- I know it protects peacefully petitioning our government. But what -- I'm not a kraken lawyer I want to say. I believe very strongly in the First Amendment, very strongly.

Justice Holmes and a lot of other great judges in our history have made clear that conspiracy law and a lot of -- how dangerous those laws are. Like, I am convinced as I stand here that next year or two years from now or five years from now, these seditious conspiracy statutes are going to be used against people from the other tribe. And I think it is a dangerous road for the United States -- as bad as what happened on January 6th is, I know the Court and all the judges in this district are very concerned about that.

I personally think -- I guess maybe because I'm a criminal defense attorney and I've spent my life -- I've spent my life protecting innocent and guilty people from the government. I am very concerned that these laws are being misused. Mr. Rehl did not commit any violence. Mr. Rehl did not express any desire to overthrow the government of the United States. Mr. Rehl is a Marine veteran. Mr. Rehl is married and has a child and another daughter from a previous marriage which he's always kept in touch with. His mother is here. I understand it's a big -- to me, it's a big deal that he's a son and grandson of a police officer. I'm being more personal than I should be. My father was a

police officer for many, many years. I understand what that does to -- you know, what that mentality is. And I know that the Court has pointed to a retired New York City police officer was recently charged. But Mr. Rehl did not exhibit that kind of behavior that day, he didn't. So I don't think it's fair to say -- to say yeah, but how about that police officer. Well, that's not Mr. Rehl. It has never been Mr. Rehl.

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, a couple things, just to be clear. I never wanted to indicate that the things you're arguing to me are not relevant. They are relevant. All I'm saying is I think what is much more relevant is what your client is accused of doing or not doing that day. And you've made your points, I hear you. But I think it only gets you so far, it seems to me, to say -- for the reasons I mentioned, that he had these connections to the police.

And the same thing goes -- just to make clear, you said before, well, you know, it doesn't sit well with me to raise the issue of his child. It's not -- to be clear, the only thing I've expressed in the past is that -- I mean, we are here arguing for his detention, right. In various -- at various times when we've been together for other reasons, you have injected that into the proceeding. I have tolerated it. But the point is it wasn't relevant to what we were discussing on those other occasions, number one.

Number two, again, my point is -- again, I'm not saying it's not relevant. I am saying that, again, I think the far more salient thing here, the far more impactful piece of it seems to me what your argument is, is the extent to which he's differently situated.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And that --

THE COURT: You've made your points, I'm just saying like I don't think it gets you that far to say as heartbreaking as this is -- okay, I'm not -- you know, that's not -- I mean, we all have feelings about things, and I think it is heartbreaking what you're laying out here. But I've got to apply the statute as I -- and you know, as --

MS. HERNANDEZ: I think this is -- I understand, I may be a little heavy handed on it. When I tell -- I appreciate the Court telling me what's important to you, because really, I'm not here to make a speech, I'm here to persuade the Court. I'm happy that the Court says this will be more important to me. I also -- you shouldn't play poker, Your Honor, for high stakes. Because you sometimes -- like I know -- and it's fine, as I've told the Court, if I think it's an important point that I need to push, I will push it because the Court has been very kind; that even though I can tell maybe this is more important to you or not, you don't cut me off. So it's fine. I'd rather

any problems.

know what the Court is thinking than not know, that's the best kind of argument, right.

What is it that the Court needs from me to bring out so that Your Honor will release him today? I would be happy to answer any questions. I've already pointed to the difference to the discrimination that Judge Mehta has done in his cases. He hasn't said okay, you're all in jail, he has not. I've quoted a large -- a lengthy passage from Judge Bates. He released the guy who was -- I think he worked at the White House.

THE COURT: I know the case you're talking about.

MS. HERNANDEZ: He goes through this whole thing,
he released that guy. Let me say something else, none of
the Oath Keepers who have been released, none, have caused

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, just to be clear, I understand the need to make individualized decisions. I've had numerous occasions -- and prosecutors here can attest to, for -- well, other -- non January 6th defendants, but also January 6th defendants, that I have released over their objection. Sometimes there haven't been problems, other times there have been. And those individuals had to be re-incarcerated pending trial on a couple of occasions.

My point is only to make the point to you that I am in the business of making individualized determinations,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and that's why I focus your attention on telling me why he is factually differently positioned.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And I'm here to tell you that his wife and mother came down so that you can hear them personally. Because I think the Court has to consider, in deciding whether to release, the history and characteristics of the defendant, and I think they can fill you in. again, their support for him I believe will go a long way to assuring that whatever release conditions the Court imposes would be upheld. If you -- you know, that's what the case law and the facts show, not just in this case, in all these The more support a person has the more likely they are to abide. And his wife is at home with their baby. She's home taking care of the child, so she has -- again, I don't know whether the Court wants to -- I would like the Court to hear from her. But she has expressed to me she can be home 24/7 if the Court imposed home incarceration -- not home detention, home incarceration. These days you don't need to leave the house. You call Uber or Amazon or whomever, they deliver groceries and everything else. has a family support network in Philadelphia. So I -they're here for that purpose.

The two men who are -- if the Court wants to hear from them, you know, again, high caliber men, no prior convictions, men who served their country who are here to

tell you Mr. Rehl is a decent person who will abide by the Court's decision. Again, his past conduct shows it. I know what the government has said. The other thing, Your Honor, is with respect to almost every fact that the Court was led to rely on -- you know, the fact that he brought programmable radios.

THE COURT: Right, you make --

MS. HERNANDEZ: I said I proffered that I have receipts from -- this is from November 29th. These were purchased in advance of the December -- I said I would -- I proffer that I have those receipts. I have those receipts here. These were purchased in November in advance of December. These were not -- this wasn't something we're going to go fight and we need this. And plus I quote a passage from the discovery the government has produced where Mr. Rehl is talking about the benefit of having these phones or whatever they're called, these radios, in case somebody gets hurt. And he describes at a prior rally somebody was having a heart attack or something, and they were able to get him medical care.

As I say, I have multiple receipts that I can submit to the Court so we don't have to waste time. But they all come from the tactical vest which was purchased in November of 2020. Again, this is I would say Defense Exhibit maybe 4 for the hearing. The date is there. Again,

here is another item, December 4th, 2020, urban ops cargo pants and another radio.

So almost --

and give you a sense here. I've heard you now for about an hour, and I have another hearing at 10:00 o'clock, a pretrial conference at 11:00 o'clock and another matter in the early afternoon. And I have to hear from the government. Here's my point to you: I think, in fairness, I can hear you however you would like for another 15 minutes or so. If you want to put on a witness, now's the time to do so. I'm perfectly -- just like I heard from the government via proffer, I'm perfectly happy -- and I've gotten all -- and I know your objections to that, fair enough, you've made them on paper.

MS. HERNANDEZ: They weren't even proffers.

THE COURT: I'm going to consider what you've written. But in order for me to give them the opportunity to be heard today, I'm going to have to say that like after another 15 minutes, I'm going to have to hear from them.

Now, again, how you want to spend that 10 or 15 minutes is up to you. If you want to put a witness on, that's fine with me. I'm not going to tell you that you couldn't. But I'm just telling you I'm happy to hear your representations. First of all, their very presence here speaks for itself.

You've made that point. But however you want to use that time to your best advantage, I will let you do that. And then I need to hear from the government. I mean, this is a very -- as you say, a very individualized and fact-intensive decision. I'm not going to make it today, but I want to give you the opportunity to be heard for another 10 or 15 minutes before I hear from the government.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I have a 10:00 a.m. before Judge Boasberg too. Three things, Your Honor. Again, that goes to some of the statements the Court has made and some of the factors that the Court has to take into account. The government has argued that he has shown no remorse, blah, blah, blah. The letters from these gentlemen that were sent to you expressed that, in their opinion and in their conversations with him, he has said he wants nothing more with this. And he has done nothing -- he was -- and Judge Bates took this into account in releasing the one guy, that he was -- this happened on January 6th. He was not arrested until March. There's no evidence that he was out there doing anything that would allow the Court to make a finding that he presents an articulable threat to society.

The other thing is the primary basis, my understanding -- and I think the Court brought it up again, that led the Court to detain him was this notion that he was a leader in this group that planned an attack on the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Capitol. As the Court mentioned, Munchel says yes, look at these things. But those who led the -- or planned or led can be --

THE COURT: Differently situated.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Right. And that was based on his leadership in the MOSD. But I submit to the Court that what the Court now knows, and a fair reading of that -- and I know that's not the only MOSD hearing, but that was like the most expansive meeting, it's on video. It really says this is what they wanted. There's no -- nothing in there that says our plan is to attack the Capitol. And Mr. Rehl is quoted as saying, you know, we don't want to repeat -- we don't want an APM -- I forget what he calls it, we don't want another APM thing. He's talking about what happened in D.C., you know -- which let me say this: It appears to me, without disclosing -- just from looking at the evidence, these gentlemen like to drink a lot. And you can read it in the MOSD. You know, they're all talking: Can we go through a rally without everybody getting sick drunk and making fools of themselves. So that's part -- a lot of conversations and things that may have been said, you know, have to be taken with that. But Mr. Rehl at all times is just even tempered. And not just that, his conduct on that day supports that analysis.

As a matter of law, I don't believe the Court can

detain him, because the Court's analysis has been grounded on 1512. Seditious conspiracy, the government has not made an argument that you can detain him. Under D.C. Circuit case law, you have to look at the charges categorically to see if they fit the categories under the statute. The only charges here that fit the categorical permission to detain are the destruction of property. And the Chief Judge of this district has expressed sort of -- I believe it was in the Nordean case, she didn't quite think that the government's view of how aiding and abetting or Pinkerton liability could really bring that charge into the detention decision.

But in particular, as we know, Mr. Rehl did not know that Pezzola was the person -- didn't know he had stolen the shield, didn't know he was the person. So even if you could, there really is a far distance between those events and Mr. Rehl's conduct. And that's shown by the fact that the government has never stood here and argued to you look at that, look at that. They're all focusing on this allegation that their intent was to attack the Capitol and prevent the certification.

And the last thing I'm going to say on that, Your Honor, is that Mr. Rehl -- of all the ones I believe -- I don't know that -- I'm much more familiar with the evidence against Mr. Rehl. He clearly says: Biden is the president,

get used to it, let's plan for it. He's not saying, as some people today, like the former president of the United States continues -- and a lot of members of Congress and people who are running for office, the person who's running for office from Pennsylvania who is a purple heart recipient. There are people out there arguing that the election was stolen and that it was invalid or whatever it is. Mr. Rehl, you don't see that. He accepted it. So it's inconsistent with this notion that he was there to prevent the counting of the Electoral College when he quickly thereafter says, hey -- and he sort of mocks -- there are other text messages, he mocks people who are still saying we've got to stop this or whatever.

So the last thing I'll do before I put his wife and mother on for a short period of time is --

THE COURT: You have 10 minutes.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Is there a question that -- how do

I persuade the Court? What is the question that the Court

needs to -- what is the answer that the Court needs to hear?

What is the point that is troubling the Court about

releasing Mr. Rehl?

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, I've said all along that I think your strongest argument here is arguing that he is factually differently situated from the other defendants. You've made a bunch of arguments along those lines, but I

think -- as I said, I think that's your strongest place to emphasize.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And I believe, Your Honor, that's indisputable that he's factually different on a personal level, on his conduct that day, on his role in the hierarchy, on every aspect of everything. I think he's the most stable of the people here that have appeared before Your Honor. He's the least violent of anybody, verbally and physically. And I have every confidence that his mother and -- and the men who wrote those letters, I thought they were, again, very succinct and to the point. But if the Court will allow me, I'd call Mrs. Rehl, Zachary's wife, to the stand.

THE COURT: All right, you may. Are you going to question and provide testimony or do you want her to simply address me?

MS. HERNANDEZ: I simply want her to address the Court.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Whatever the Court wants.

THE COURT: She can address me then from the podium.

AMANDA REHL: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm

Amanda, I'm Zach's wife. Zachary and me have been together

for over 11 years. He's a great person obviously. I've

been with him for so long because he's a good person. He's a great father. I've watched him, since our relationship, raise his other daughter. She's always been a priority. When her mom like stepped out years ago, he stepped in to raise her without question. She lived with us. She's been with us for years.

This situation has been hard on her. It's been hard on our newborn daughter. She's never met her father other than sitting across from him at a prison. This has been detrimental on him also not being able to be a father, not being able to be a husband, being away from his mom, his stepdad and my parents. He's a family man, a good person. If he were to be released, like he wouldn't be committing crimes. He would take -- he would just be a father, he would want to be home to reconnect with his eldest daughter, meet his youngest daughter. And I would be there constantly. Not to watch him, but just to be a part of his life. Because I know he would not partake in jeopardizing being home with his family.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for being here,
Mrs. Rehl. And you have my sympathy for how much stress I'm
sure this is putting on your family. You may return to your
seat.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, his mother is here, but she'd prefer not to speak, just shy. I will tell you,

my understanding is she's had some medical issues recently.

I don't want to say any more than that. Mr. Rehl also may
want to say a few words to the Court. It's kind of scary to
have a defendant talk to the Court, but I think he may want
to say a few words to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rehl, would you like to address me, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I would love to, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please go ahead, the floor is yours.

THE DEFENDANT: All right, thank you. I actually prepared a little statement here. I just want to start off by saying I understand the seriousness of the charges against me, and completely understand your reluctance on whether to release me. For the last year and a half, I've had a lot of time to reflect on what's really important to me, and why you can rest assured why I will not be a threat. The events on January 6th were absolutely terrible, and I wish it never happened. It was an embarrassment to our country, and I feel terrible for anyone who suffered because of it. If I had the opportunity to turn back the hands of time, I would stay with my wife every time. I'm not a violent person. I don't support any violence that happened that day, and I certainly won't advocate for any violence in the future.

With that said, no protest, no group, no cause is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

worth losing time with your family over or any special moments that could arise -- excuse me.

THE COURT: It's okay, take your time, Mr. Rehl.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. As you know, in front of you sits two of those family members that mean the world to me, my wife and my mother. The other two are my youngest and oldest daughters who couldn't be there today. But I've missed birthdays, barbecues, family get togethers, so it really hit home to me because I really love my family more than words can describe. The most devastating thing for me was not being there to hold my wife's hand while she gave birth to our daughter, or being there to hug my mom when she was diagnosed with cancer. The idea that something could come up again and I wouldn't be there terrifies me to my core, keeps me up at night. It's one of the many reasons why I can say with the utmost certainty that if given the opportunity for bail, I will comply with every condition this Court may ask, and I won't jeopardize that opportunity for anything.

I thank you, Your Honor, for the opportunity to speak today. I hope you could hear the seriousness in my voice, and know I mean everything I say and will not let you down. Thank you.

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

MS. HERNANDEZ: I'll sit down and shut up on that.

THE COURT: That's a trial lawyer for you there.

Let me hear from the government.

MR. KENERSON: Thank you, Your Honor, and good morning. This is Erik Kenerson on behalf of the United States. So the Court was correct back in June of 2021 to detain Mr. Rehl. And it refused again to reopen the hearing in December of 2021. I think since then, the evidence of Mr. Rehl's decision to join the conspiracy was strong then, it's gotten stronger. Since then -- and the charges more serious since that last hearing. And the Court has, of course, heard not only the proffer of facts from the government in Mr. Rehl's two detention hearings, but in I think eight other hearings conducted -- detention hearings conducted between the other five defendants on the indictment in this case. So the Court is very well familiar with the facts.

What those facts show is that this defendant chose to join the group -- chose to join the group on January 6th knowing that it had the unlawful objection -- objective of stopping the certification of the Electoral College vote.

That's what the government's evidence shows in this case.

The defendant knowingly chose to associate with those men.

The defendant knowingly participated in what those men did on January 6th. The defendant was a leader within the structure of the ministry of self-defense. He was not at

the tip top of the pyramid, we agree with Ms. Hernandez on that, but he was certainly a leader within the structure. He was on the operations council. He acted as a leader on the ground on January 6th. He helped lead the group of hundreds -- dozens, if not hundreds, of Proud Boys away from the Washington Monument at 10:00 a.m., away from where the President was speaking; away from where the individuals known as Normies, in the parlance of this case, were listening to the President speak; away from the location where, if there were, as has been kind of expressed throughout this case by Rehl's prior counsel, a worry about Antifa, where those attacks by Antifa would happen, led them away from there and led them straight to the Capitol.

There was discussion in the text messages, chains of which Rehl was a participant about targeting the Capitol. There was -- so he was well aware of the criminal objective of what was going on on January 6th. And what he -- his own state of mind, what the Court has in terms of evidence of what Mr. Rehl was trying to accomplish on January 6th is also very strong. The Court had found back in June of 2021 that the defendant's posts suggest that the violence should continue after January 6th. Again, this is reading the Court's findings from page 57 of the June 30th, 2021 transcript. Again, on January 6th, he, the defendant, wrote: "I find this hard to believe now. I'm proud as fuck

of what we accomplished yesterday, but we need to start planning. We are planning for a Biden presidency." The reference to a Biden presidency is in regards to being "proud as fuck" of what happened on January 6th.

And he referred to law enforcement officers who defended the Capitol as they deserve to be tarred and feathered, and he called them turncoats. And that was what the Court highlighted just on June 30th. The government has since proffered additional statements. These the government proffered during the defendant's first motion to reopen the hearing. And these are the -- some of the statements that the defendant claims the Court can't consider, but of course Wisconsin v. Mitchell says the Court can consider the defendant's words for his motive or his intent.

At 1:15 p.m. on January 6th, he texted a group:

"Everyone raided the Capitol." This is, for context, 30

minutes prior to when the group of rioters, including a

number of Proud Boys, pushed up the stairs onto the

scaffolding. It's nearly an hour before Mr. Pezzola broke

the window with the shield. And he's on -- at that point on

the Capitol grounds within the restricted area, and chose to

use the word "raided" and the word "we" -- sorry, not "we,"

that's not this one, "Everyone raided the Capitol."

At 1:34 he texted: "We are at a standstill," again, here suggesting that he was part of a group adverse

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to the police trying to push forward. "Cops" -- this is back to his words, "Cops are dropping concussion bombs and pepper spraying. People are pepper spraying and fighting back riot cops." That standstill was of course broken, as the government has argued to this Court, when a number of members of the Proud Boys gathered at the base of the stairs under the scaffolding, overran the U.S. Capitol Police defenses and surged up the stairs. At 2:29 p.m., defendant sent a message to a group that said: "Civil war started."

On January 7th, he texted: "Trump basically conceded, we lost our country. We should held the Capitol." January 7th: "Once Pence turned his back, he was fucked, but was hoping we all sent a message yesterday. I guess that was the message to ben" -- B-E-N, and I believe that's, "bend the knee. It's depressing." Again, January 7th: "Looking back, it sucked. We" -- again, that word we, "We should held the Capitol. After Trump conceding today, it all seemed like a waste." He continued: "The reason why it feels like a waste is because instead of all of these politicians getting scared and realizing they need to answer for this fraud, they're all turning on Trump and cucking, they're doubling down on their actions. Everyone shoulda showed up armed and took the country back the right way." Mr. Rehl did not think that he or the group he joined went far enough on January 6th. Those were his

words on January 7th.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the Court has already I think -- with regard to Mr. Rehl -- and I think the Court brought up that the Telegram chats don't explicitly have directions to attack The Court's heard this argument I think in all the Capitol. the detention hearings so far in this case, including on January 30 -- excuse me, June 30, 2021 when the Court said: "Although much of the evidence is uncontroverted insofar as it's Telegram chats, photos and videos, it's also true that much of the government's evidence is circumstantial about the details of the alleged conspiracy." But what the Court found -- and we think that this is correct, is that: best evidence of the conspiracy is what the conspirators did, acted in concert to do" -- this is, again, from the June 30th transcript, "and what happened from their coordinated actions. And here, that includes interference with the certification of the Electoral College vote. Although Mr. Rehl may have been somewhat surprised by exactly how that came about or the group's degree of success, I don't think that undermines the evidence of prior planning and coordination."

And most -- in the most recent detention hearing, the Court held in this case writ large, with respect to Mr. Tarrio: "Similarly, Tarrio argues that essentially the government does not have a smoking gun, perhaps in the form

of direct evidence of an order from Tarrio to other Proud

Boys to storm the Capitol. True. But, again, that's hardly

necessary for the evidence to be very strong in the

aggregate for detention purposes."

Mr. Rehl has brought up a number of issues surrounding I guess his prior counsel in the case. One thing we would note about those arguments is that there has been no allegation by Ms. Hernandez that either prior counsel were ineffective in their representation of Mr. Rehl at the detention hearings. The case she cited from the Chief Judge, Thorne, where the Chief Judge allowed someone to reopen a hearing, it was a suppression hearing I think. And that case did involve allegations of ineffective assistance, or at least what would have been tantamount to ineffective assistance. And the Chief Judge found in that case that those situation were unique.

We don't have those types of allegations from Ms. Hernandez here. Certainly any lawyer who looks at a case might see things differently. It's unquestionable that both Mr. Johnson and Mr. Moseley put forth substantive arguments to the Court, made the best arguments they could based on the evidence available to them at the time.

THE COURT: Mr. Kenerson, what do you make of the argument that given the volume of discovery -- even if it's not ineffective assistance, that at least insofar as there

was evidence that was produced but that reasonably wasn't available in the sense that, again, given the volume, counsel just might not have been aware of, for example, the video that Ms. Hernandez mentioned? I know you have separate arguments, I'm sure, as to why the video is not material and doesn't change the analysis. Okay, I get that.

But what do you make of the argument that at least I should consider that to be evidence that was not reasonably available to the defendant; that even if it was in their possession -- his possession, that really just given the timing and given the practicalities of the volume of discovery in this case, that that's something I can consider?

MR. KENERSON: Certainly. And we do certainly have our evidence on the substantive, and we will be happy to answer any questions the Court may have. But with regard to kind of the argument as to whether or not Mr. Rehl or Mr. Rehl's counsel at the time had effective access to the video, what we would note is that the government relied upon that same video in the June 30th hearing. So Mr. Rehl's counsel was aware that the government was relying on this video.

The government's disclosure letter that -- under which that video went, the cover letter, described that there was a Miami Proud Boy, so on and so forth, and

describes the MOSD. It listed the members who spoke, at least the members who had been charged at that point who spoke on the video. So all counsel would have had to have done to find that particular video was say oh, the government is looking for this, let me reread the letters to see if anything has come up. And sure enough, we make a description of that video in the letter. It wasn't a matter of looking necessarily for a needle in a haystack for that particular video given where everything was on June 30th, 2021.

Ms. Hernandez also brought up, I think, the
Bertino plea. One thing we would note both about
Mr. Bertino's plea and Mr. Donohoe's plea -- which I
understand she takes issue with in terms of the government's
quantum of proof, is that the Court accepted both of those
pleas. The Court accepted Mr. Donohoe's plea to conspiracy,
the Court accepted Mr. Bertino's plea to conspiracy. And in
the charging documents on both of those cases, it charged
that both of those defendants conspired with a number of
people, including Zachary Rehl. And she, of course -- I
think if defense had their way here, the Court would not
consider Mr. Bertino's plea at all substantively, but would
only consider the fact that he's been released in talking
about Mr. -- where Mr. Rehl stands.

I think, as the Court pointed out -- and we just

want to make sure we stress this, is that the Court made the finding that Mr. Bertino's decision to cooperate with the United States puts him in a different position than where Mr. Rehl is sitting right now. And Mr. Bertino --

THE COURT: Not just to cooperate, but to take responsibility.

MR. KENERSON: Correct, and Mr. Bertino in fact did so prior to being charged. He walked in with an information filed by the government and pled guilty prior to the government even charging him. So going back to -- we led with this a little bit, Mr. Rehl knew the criminal objective, he joined the conspiracy. Ms. Hernandez wants to say, okay, he wasn't a leader, but he was, as the Court found, a lieutenant. I think Ms. Hernandez relied, at least in her papers, on this other defendant who was interviewed and said that he wasn't calling the shots. She left out that that same defendant said Nordean was calling the shots, which is essentially the government's theory of the case. And it's completely consistent with the idea that Rehl was a lieutenant and a leader, even if not the top leader.

He joined this group. He was in these conversations that led to discussion of more animosity towards the police leading up to January 6th. He was on chats where people talked about storming the Capitol. He was in the group where the description of the group was:

"Fit in or fuck off." He joined that group willingly. He makes a big argument about, oh, he wasn't at the Airbnb on January 5th, so therefore he could not have known the plan. All he was told was to meet at the Washington Monument.

Again, the question for the Court to consider is not whether the defendant knew every single step in any plan that may have been laid out, or whether he received some sort of text message from someone saying: Mr. Rehl, we need you to be here or we need you to be there at this time, and here's the objective. He -- what the Court needs to decide is that he agreed with others to join this conspiracy to do the unlawful objectives of the conspiracy, whether that be the 1512(k), the seditious conspiracy, or 372. And that is what the evidence shows. That's what the evidence shows for all the reasons that we laid out earlier.

I want to talk just a minute about the question about whether he forcibly entered the Capitol versus not forcibly entered the Capitol, and the comparison that Ms. Hernandez makes to Mr. Donohoe. One thing I would note is that at the time the Court decided Mr. Donohoe's detention hearing, he had not been charged with, nor did the Court have in front of it, any evidence regarding whether he threw a bottle. And she says that in connection with the other defendants in the case, the others are charged to have forcibly entered, he is not. Mr. Donohoe did not enter the

Capitol at all. So in terms of whether he's similarly or not situated to other defendants, Mr. Donohoe did not enter the Capitol at all on that day. And, of course, Mr. Tarrio as well was not present in D.C. on January 6th at all.

So whether someone took individual actions on the ground on January 6th certainly is relevant, but is not the be all, end all of the Court's analysis. The be all, end all is what did he agree to do, what did he join, what was his role and what is his danger going forward.

THE COURT: Nor was -- now that I think about, nor was Mr. Bertino.

MR. KENERSON: Correct, Mr. Bertino was not there as well. One thing I want to hit -- just address briefly is the notion of the defendant's kind of support for the police. I think the Court's correct, we have no reason to doubt that in June 2020, and as a general matter, Mr. Rehl supports the police. I think what is clear, though, from the evidence is that by January 6th, 2021, given of course all of the defendant's rhetoric from November 2021 that we heard -- that the Court heard about in June of 2021, and statements leading up to January 6th that -- and especially his reference to kind of turncoats, and to his actions on the ground where he films himself and other members of the Proud Boys and other members of the mob running over police barricades that had just been trampled.

He later texts people: "This is how it all started," and talks about that in a glowing manner: "USA, so much patriotism." By January 6th, whatever views he has of the police writ large, he does not believe that police that he doesn't view to be quote, unquote on his side get the same type of deference. That's why he's referring to U.S. Capitol Police as turncoats. That's why he thinks it's patriotic that everyone rush through the First Street barricades where members of the police had just been trampled by a mob.

One thing I'd note, too, Ms. Hernandez spoke about Mr. Biggs and his statement that: "We've just taken the Capitol," walking up the Capitol steps. That, of course, is not a statement that Mr. Rehl made. However, it is a statement that his co-conspirator made. And the Court, I think, can take it as evidence of the conspiracy that the defendant joined, that right after that First Street breach happens, Mr. Biggs, one of his co-conspirators and one of the leaders above him in the pyramid, says: "We've just taken the Capitol. We've gone through every barricade thus far." And Rehl was with them. I think the fact that he's storming with them up there is evidence in and of itself that he joined the unlawful plan that day.

One thing I'll note -- and I don't -- Ms. Hernandez, I know, and the Court had a back and forth

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about Mr. Rehl and having a son -- or daughter, excuse me, at home who is very young obviously, and how that is a very stressful situation for him and for his family. government certainly does not doubt any of that. But the argument that Ms. Hernandez put forth was that this child was -- is essentially what's going to keep him on the straight and narrow. This is an argument that also was previously raised by Mr. Johnson back in June of 2021. Court considered it -- and, again, this is page 54 from the transcripts. Certainly the Court found family ties that weigh in the defendant's favor, but the Court found: "Even the wife, who would have been pregnant with a child, did not stop him from taking the actions that he did related to January 6th." Mrs. Rehl was, in fact, pregnant on January 6th. Mr. Rehl knew that, and it didn't stop him from taking the actions that he took.

One note on the radios, and the timing of the purchase of the radios and the tactical pants and the vest that Ms. Hernandez brought up, is I don't think it should give the Court any comfort that he purchased those in November of 2020 as opposed to January 2021. That was, of course, after the election and as the defendant's rhetoric was escalating, as his co-conspirators -- soon to be co-conspirators' rhetoric was escalating. I'm not sure the fact he bought those in November of 2020 as opposed to

January 2021 moves the needle much.

The Court did engage, I think back in June of 2020, in an analysis of the defendant's future dangerousness. I know Ms. Hernandez thinks it was not enough, but the Court found, essentially for the reasons that the government is putting forth here today -- his joining in the conspiracy, his statements after the conspiracy evincing essentially that this isn't over, that shows that nothing has changed in the Court's analysis on that front, that future dangerousness is still there. And in fact, the government's case against Mr. Rehl has only gotten stronger since January 6th. I understand that some of the defendants' friends have put forth some letters. I understand the defendant's wife has addressed the Court.

THE COURT: And Mr. Rehl has.

MR. KENERSON: And Mr. Rehl has addressed the Court, certainly. And all of this is looking now a year and a half later with trying to get him out of jail. So I don't -- all of them -- and I don't blame them for doing this, are going to put forth the best qualities that they can of Mr. Rehl. That's the role they play in this. Their role is to put forth the best qualities they can of Mr. Rehl. And he has certainly been incarcerated since March of 2020 I think, so it's quite some time, quite some time after -- 2021, thank you. That's quite some time after

the offense. So he certainly had some time to think. But I also don't think the Court should put too much stock in what he will or will not do.

And I do want to bring to the Court's attention just a couple of things. One, I think -- I would note before I do this that what I'm about to proffer for the Court is from a text message from the defendant to his wife. I think that we have put what the defendant has done in proffering the wife as a witness, and himself talking about what he will and will not do at home, makes his texts to his wife relevant, and that's why I'm saying this before I start.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Can I see it before you do it, see if there's marital privilege?

MR. KENERSON: That's why I raised it. Yes, you can see it. But I do believe that stuff that is on point to what the defense has raised has essentially been waived marital privilege wise.

MS. HERNANDEZ: So I think it's not relevant to anything. It's November 8th, 2020 before anything happens.

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, you're going to argue to me and tell me it's not relevant, but you don't have any other objection?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Well, again, I think there's a marital privilege. I don't think it's a big deal, Your

Honor, but I think there's a marital privilege. Obviously the government has downloaded everything from his phone regardless of privilege.

THE COURT: Do you object to me hearing it and receiving it here today, subject to those objections?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Subject to those objections. I'm not waiving those objections for the future, Your Honor. I want you to hear it, because I want the Court to release him and be confident when you release him. But I think there may be marital privilege, so I don't want to waive it for the future.

THE COURT: All right. But you don't object to me hearing it here today, all right.

MR. KENERSON: Just to be clear, before I go further, there are a few more things that I will -- that come from these text messages that I think I would present to the Court in summary form as proffer.

MS. HERNANDEZ: So here I would object. He could have brought these up so we wouldn't be having this back and forth right now. Perhaps this could be done in a post hearing memo or something, Your Honor, where we can discuss it. I don't know exactly what he's bringing up. Obviously these are from November of 2020, so they've had them for a while.

THE COURT: Ms. Hernandez, we'll discuss this in a

1 moment. You obviously were going to submit something 2 relating to the prior counsel, that you were going to submit under seal but also provide the government. So we can talk 3 about it. 4 5 Mr. Kenerson, why don't we -- some of the other matters, why don't we table them for now. You can submit 6 7 them to me, and Ms. Hernandez will have the opportunity to see them and respond after today. 8 9 MR. KENERSON: Certainly, that's fine. reserving those issues, if the Court does not have any 10 11 further questions, I don't have anything else. 12 THE COURT: Well, I think Ms. Hernandez said --13 MR. KENERSON: Oh, just the one? 14 THE COURT: The one that you didn't have an 15 objection to me hearing that here today. Correct, 16 Ms. Hernandez? 17 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes. 18 MR. KENERSON: This is from November 8th, 2020. 19 The defendant is texting his wife Mrs. Rehl: "I don't know what to say. I'm fighting to make sure our baby has a 20 21 future under freedom instead of communism. You can or 22 cannot walk to WaWa right now, give me some time to 23 respond." But the first portion is the relevant portion. 24 THE COURT: Very well. Why don't --

Ms. Hernandez, why don't you submit what you were planning

25

on doing on Tuesday. I'll have the government -- why don't we do this -- and why doesn't the government submit, if appropriate under seal, what you want to put before me, Mr. Kenerson. And either side can respond by Friday to whatever the other side submits, and I'll take it all under advisement.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And I hope to discuss whatever it is in the texts with the government beforehand if I have any objections.

MR. KENERSON: Certainly we'll talk.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, could I have just 10 minutes to respond?

THE COURT: You can have five.

MS. HERNANDEZ: First of all, Your Honor, this is the video -- this is the post that Mr. Rehl said about:
"I'm proud as hell of what we did yesterday," or whatever.
It's a post of Americans on the Mall with American flags.
There's no attack on the Capitol, there's no police
brutality, nothing -- or police -- attacks on police or anything. Number two, the government says --

THE COURT: Hold on, Ms. Hernandez, this is an important point. You're saying -- first of all, the Elmo isn't connected. Why don't you just tell me -- or you can just represent to me, what is the context? It's post

1 January 6th, he's saying: "I'm proud of what we 2 accomplished yesterday." MS. HERNANDEZ: I don't know if this -- this is --3 my understanding is this is the photo -- can you -- do I 4 5 have to turn it on? THE COURT: All right, here we go. 6 7 MS. HERNANDEZ: It's a photo -- this isn't a photo of people fighting with police or attacking the Capitol. 8 9 Look at the -- the view is looking towards the Washington 10 Monument, and thousands of people at a political rally. 11 THE COURT: Right, understood. But just tell me 12 the connection between this photograph and the statement. 13 He texted it at the same time? 14 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, that's my understanding, that 15 this was -- when he says "We're proud as hell of what we 16 accomplished yesterday," this was the photograph he 17 attached. 18 THE COURT: Okay. MS. HERNANDEZ: And let me say, Your Honor, 19 20 Mr. Finley, who is the president of the Proud Boys from West 21 Virginia, said something about at the moment -- his plea agreement describes what he saw, he saw the attacks. At the 22 23 moment, he said he's proud as heck, and said to Rehl:

"Great job," or something like that, and he was allowed to plea -- he's been out all the time, and he was allowed to

24

25

plea to a misdemeanor.

THE COURT: Sure. He is not charged with a seditious conspiracy.

was with them the whole time. His statement of facts is equal to or worse than Mr. Rehl's. He directs the members of his group, of his chapter, to delete after the fact -- you know, obstructive conduct after the fact, he directs them to delete their messages. So anyway, look, to respond to the -- you know, the government says I haven't alleged ineffectiveness with respect to the other defendants. And I have not, I'm not making a claim of ineffective. I could, but I'm not making it.

The first time I appeared before Your Honor in

December when I came into the case, I said to the Court -and I quoted from the transcript: "Mr. Rehl at this date
has not seen any discovery in the case." The two lawyers he
had before him had not shared any discovery with Mr. Rehl.
So whether that amounts to an ineffective counsel claim,
we'll file something in the next couple days. I don't think
I have to make an ineffective -- I don't want to make it. I
don't think -- I don't want to be in that position. But I
will make it -- I'll make whatever arguments I deem
necessary in order to get the Court to consider.

You know, the government says -- number one, Your

Honor, I am not asking the Court to find Mr. Rehl not guilty. A jury will decide that. The only issue for the Court is whether the Court -- whether the government has proved by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Rehl presents an articulable future threat. So I don't want to spend too much time refuting the government's arguments as to what they can prove or what they've proved or what the evidence shows, because I don't think that directly -- given that Mr. Rehl himself did not commit any violence, did not attack anyone, did not destroy property, did not throw bottles at anybody, and that there is scant evidence that he directed any of this happening -- or no evidence I would argue, I don't think -- he's not charged with murder, and so that somehow whether he's innocent or not isn't placed into this.

And a lot of -- again, I've made these arguments before. A lot of what the government seeks to rely on are First Amendment protected activities. Yes, he bought those items before coming to a political rally in December -- which no one has claimed was anything other than First Amendment protected activity. And I relayed the Court back to the Secret Service's analysis of the Proud Boys. And the Secret Service documents reflect that they did have evidence in their possession that there were anti-Trump groups that had the intent to disrupt what was going to go on on January

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6th. And the Secret Service documents reflect that a number of those members of those groups they identify had been arrested at prior events. Contrast that with the Proud Boys.

The government says -- said, and I agree -- first of all, for the reasons I already told the Court, Donohoe, whether the Court knew it at the time or not, stands differently. He threw bottles at the cop, and he walked around with the shield and all of that. Bertino, by his own admission, and by the text messages that I have reviewed, is egging people on in a completely different way from Mr. Rehl. But the government did say that the most important -- I'm trying to find the exact words they used. The most important is what he did that day. And, again, I won't -- I'd tell the Court what he did that day is consistent or refutes the government's burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence. It's their burden by clear and convincing evidence, and I think the Court has heard more than enough in light of Mr. Rehl himself, and in light of all the other comparable cases in this district, I think, and how the other judges have dealt with this.

The government, I think, misstated the evidence.

This is a complex case. I'm not accusing them of doing anything wrong, I just think they overstated what the evidence shows. ECF 454, pages five and six, the government

lays out what the defendants did as their introductory paragraph. They do not say -- and I do not believe the evidence will show, that Mr. Rehl was with Biggs and Nordean when they went forward and attacked the Capitol or whatever it is the government's saying. And it's clear from these paragraphs that they do not include Mr. Rehl in any of the factual assertions of what they did. And you don't see them -- I mean, they have shown a video where Nordean and Biggs go off and do a video of whatever with a bunch of people around them. Mr. Rehl is not there at that point. Mr. Rehl -- I don't know at which exact point he disassociates himself from those two, but he ends up with the Philadelphia Proud Boys.

I have not -- we've discussed -- I've discussed this with the government, the exact moment that happens. I haven't found that video yet, but very early on he no longer is with the others. The government claims that there's clear evidence. Again, I don't think -- I'm not asking the Judge to find -- this is not a trial. But the government continues to say Mr. Rehl knew the criminal objective of this conspiracy. I haven't seen the evidence. I'm not saying that a jury will acquit him, because a jury is a jury, and how they perceive the evidence. But if we're going to lay out facts, and if we're going to lay out the evidence, I haven't seen it. I haven't seen -- and, yes,

people were saying a lot of things. As I say, Your Honor, these men were often drinking. Admittedly, by their own admission, they're drinking and saying a lot of BS. Bertino being one of the primary ones. By the way, Bertino is the one, in my understanding, who brings Pezzola into the organization.

Mr. Rehl was present in December in D.C. when
Mr. Pezzola was here, but has never had a conversation with
him. Pezzola is alleged to have been in some of those
chats, but there's never a back and forth involving
Mr. Rehl. And Mr. Pezzola -- who, again, Mr. Pezzola, I
don't want to pile on him, but he's another -- there's a lot
of people who acted in ways that day that are
incomprehensible given who they are and who they had been
all their lives. And I think that's part of the -- what
happens at a rally and politics, people lose control and
everything else.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Hernandez.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, I just think that the Court -- that the government has failed to meet its burden. I think the Court has more than enough evidence to support a release on whatever conditions the Court deems necessary. Although I haven't made much of an argument, I think we're going to -- on this point, there are issues -- I don't know what's going to happen once the Court tries to -- where is

he going to be housed at some point? I mean, that's a whole issue. I mean, my conversations with the deputy marshal still seem like that whole thing is up in the air.

THE COURT: Okay. There's one other thing before we go that I want to just clarify, and mostly I think with you. So just as a technical matter, I think whatever I do here has to be an indicative ruling. Do you agree?

Because --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Oh, stay the --

THE COURT: Yeah, because his detention is sitting before the circuit now. Technically I don't have jurisdiction to release him today, even if I wanted to. But the point is I would -- I mean, if I were to do that, one way or the other, what I'm doing here is an indicative ruling. You'll go back to the circuit. If I release him, you'll say we withdraw our appeal; if I hold him, you'll say no, we need to plow ahead.

MS. HERNANDEZ: That's my understanding. And my understanding is that the way the rule is written -- and I should have looked at the rule more carefully before I came today, essentially the circuit will back off and let the district court, if the Court wants to, take it.

THE COURT: They would send it back down. I mean, you would ask them to do that, they would send it back down and then I would technically release him.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Correct, correct, correct. I think if the Court even wanted to tell the circuit that you were -- even before you wrote the opinion that you were -- I think there's provision for the Court to say: I plan to write an opinion or I plan to make a ruling or something like that. I'll look at the rule and see, but I think there is a provision so that you don't have to wait until you write the opinion to let the Court know.

THE COURT: To start the mechanism, all right.

MS. HERNANDEZ: And again, thank you, Your Honor.

I think I fight hard for my clients. I mean no disrespect
to the Court. I know I make a lot of jokes sometimes and I
don't know how they land. It's my nature. I thank the
Court for its time and its consideration.

THE COURT: That's quite all right, Ms. Hernandez. I certainly don't mind you fighting hard for your client. I think as we get closer to trial, we're all going to have to be more disciplined about addressing only what's in front of us, and me hearing arguments, making decisions and moving forward one way or the other. But I understand your position.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You're very welcome. So what we'll do then is if the government wants to submit something, talk to Ms. Hernandez, see if there are objections. Submit whatever

you would like, let's just say -- let's do this: Let's say Wednesday, to give you a little bit of extra time. Ms. Hernandez, I'll give you until Wednesday to file whatever you would like. Obviously you are welcome to file something sooner if you would like. And if either side wants to respond to the other's submission, we can do that by the following Monday. So Wednesday, and then Monday I'll have everything and we'll go forward that way. Anything further from you, Ms. Hernandez? MS. HERNANDEZ: No, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Anything further from the government? MR. KENERSON: No, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Very well, I'll take this under advisement, and the parties are dismissed for today. (Proceedings adjourned at 9:56 a.m.)

December 28, 2022

DATE

CERTIFICATE

I, Jeff M. Hook, Official Court Reporter, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Jeff M. Hook

	1		
\$	454 [2] 20/15 63/25		air [1] 66/3
\$1,500 [1] 15/24	4th [2] 1/14 33/1	24/24 actions [8] 10/12	Airbnb [1] 51/2 alike [1] 10/1
1 13/24	5		allegation [4] 8/11
	54 [1] 54/9	52/5 52/22 54/13	12/20 36/20 47/8
'We've [1] 20/9	555 [1] 1/14	54/16	allegations [4]
0	[57 [1] 43/23	activities [1]	24/10 24/19 47/13
	5th [1] 51/3	62/18	47/17
0175 [1] 1/4	 6	activity [1] 62/21	alleged [10] 9/16
1	6th [35] 8/13 9/15	actually [3] 4/14	10/3 12/15 12/17
10 [5] 12/12 33/21	17/17 18/8 18/13	24/24 40/10 add [1] 2/22	12/19 22/8 22/15 46/11 61/10 65/9
34/6 37/16 59/12	18/21 19/1 25/2	addition [1] 15/4	alleges [2] 7/7 7/8
10:00 [1] 33/6	25/10 27/12 30/19	additional [1] 44/9	allow [2] 34/20
10:00 a.m [2] 34/8	30/20 34/18 40/17	address [7] 22/19	38/12
43/6	42/18 42/24 43/4	24/13 38/16 38/17	allowed [3] 47/11
11 [1] 38/25 11201 [1] 1/19	43/17 43/19 43/22 43/24 44/4 44/15	38/21 40/7 52/13	60/24 60/25
11:00 [1] 33/7	45/25 50/23 52/4	addressed [2] 55/14 55/16	allows [1] 8/6 almost [5] 8/2 8/5
12th [1] 21/10	52/6 52/18 52/21	addressing [1]	11/22 32/4 33/3
 1301 [1] 1/16	53/3 54/14 54/15	67/18	along [3] 6/9 37/22
13th [2] 15/10	55/12 60/1 63/1	adjourned [1] 68/15	37/25
15/18 14+b [1] 16/12	17	admission [3] 9/13	Although [3] 46/8
 14th [1] 16/12 15 [6] 16/25 25/21	700 [1] 1/16	63/10 65/3	46/18 65/23
33/10 33/20 33/21	7166 [1] 1/21	admitted [3] 9/12 16/6 16/7	always [4] 14/23
34/6	7 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 7 +	Admitted]y [1] 65/2	15/6 27/22 39/3 Amanda [1] 38/24
1512 [2] 36/2 51/13	45/16 46/1	advance [2] 32/10	Amazon [1] 31/19
160,000 [2] 22/12	8	32/12	Amendment [5] 26/19
22/23		advantage [1] 34/2	27/1 27/4 62/18
175 [1] 2/3	8:07 [1] 1/6	adverse [1] 44/25	62/21
1:15 p.m [1] 44/15 1:21-cr-0175 [1]	8th [2] 56/20 58/18	a.a	
1/4	9	68/14 advocate [1] 40/23	26/25 AMERICA [2] 1/3 2/3
1:34 [1] 44/24	9:56 a.m [1] 68/15	affect [1] 8/20	American [1] 59/18
2	A		Americans [2] 12/23
		affirming [1] 19/23	59/18
20001 [2] 1/14 1/25 20005 [1] 1/17	a far [1] 36/16 a.m [4] 1/6 34/8	afternoon [2] 13/5	among [2] 9/5 14/4
2020 [13] 15/10	43/6 68/15	33/8 afterward [1] 6/10	amount [1] 11/18
15/19 16/12 32/24	abetting [1] 36/10	again [44] 3/3 6/3	amounts [1] 61/19 amuck [1] 27/1
33/1 52/16 54/21	abide [2] 31/13	8/16 11/19 16/10	lanalvsis [9] 14/16
54/25 55/3 55/24	32/1	16/13 19/24 20/17	26/14 35/24 36/1
56/20 57/23 58/18 2021 [13] 42/5 42/7	able [4] 3/9 32/19 39/10 39/11	21/14 22/16 22/21	48/6 52/7 55/3 55/9
43/20 43/23 46/7	above [2] 53/19	24/6 25/7 29/1 29/1	
49/10 52/18 52/19	69/5	29/2 31/8 31/14 31/24 32/2 32/24	animosity [1] 50/22
52/20 54/8 54/21	above-entitled [1]	32/25 33/21 34/9	annals [1] 8/17 announced [1] 20/9
55/1 55/25	69/5	34/23 38/11 41/14	anti [1] 62/24
2022 [1] 1/5	absolutely [1]	42/6 43/22 43/24	anti-Trump [1]
20777 [1] 1/21	40/17 accepted [4] 37/8	44/25 45/15 45/16	62/24
24/7 [1] 31/17	49/15 49/16 49/17	46/14 47/2 48/2	Antifa [4] 15/21
[271 [1] 1/19	access [1] 48/18	51/5 54/9 56/24 62/16 63/14 64/18	15/21 43/12 43/12 APM [2] 35/13 35/14
 29th [1] 32/9	accomplish [1]	65/11 67/10	apologize [1] 3/12
2:29 p.m [1] 45/8	43/19	against [5] 9/16	apparently [3] 8/10
2:53 in [1] 13/4	accomplished [3] 44/1 60/2 60/16	27/10 36/25 40/13	8/12_12/2
2:57 [1] 12/20	account [2] 34/11	55/11	appeal [2] 11/19
3	34/17	aggregate [1] 47/4 ago [2] 15/23 39/4	66/16 Appeals [4] 19/17
30 [3] 44/16 46/7	accurate [3] 16/14	agree [5] 19/1 43/1	
46/7	16/15 25/9	52/8 63/5 66/7	appear [1] 4/11
302s [1] 13/11	accused [2] 21/25	agreed [1] 51/11	APPEARANCES [1]
30th [5] 43/23 44/8 46/15 48/20 49/9	28/13 accusing [1] 63/23	agreeing [1] 10/12	1/11
333 [1] 1/24	acquit [1] 64/22	agreement [6] 8/3	appeared [3] 24/25
372 [1] 51/13	across [1] 39/9	8/8 8/21 8/22 11/6 60/22	38/7 61/14 appears [3] 16/19
38 [1] 21/3	act [1]	ahead [2] 40/9	21/9 35/15
4	acted [3] 43/3	66/17	apply [1] 29/12
4 for [1] 32/25	46/14 65/13	aiding [1] 36/10	appréciate [3] 2/17
- IOI [I] 32/23			

	-	10 Thed 01/13/23 Tag	1
A	attention [2] 31/1 56/4	65/4 Bertino's [5] 10/1	13/18 bunch [2] 37/25
appreciate [2] 2/19 29/16	attest [1] 30/18	49/13 49/17 49/22 50/2	64/9 burden [3] 63/16
approaches [1] 2/24		best [10] 14/1	63/17 65/20
appropriate [2] 6/12 59/3	attorneys [1] 7/5 audio [1] 25/3	22/20 24/2 24/9 30/2 34/2 46/13	burn [1] 26/23 business [1] 30/25
area [1] 44/21	audio/video [1]	47/21 55/20 55/22	busy [1] 2/18
areas [1] 23/18 argue [4] 5/8 6/3	25/3 audiotaping [1]	bicycle [1] 24/18 Biden [3] 36/25	С
56/21 62/13 argued [5] 22/9	13/6	44/2 44/3	Cadman [1] 1/19 caliber [1] 31/24
26/19 34/12 36/18	available [5] 3/8 18/3 47/22 48/2	big [4] 27/23 27/24 51/2 56/25	call [4] 12/9 22/14
45/5 argues [1] 46/24	48/9 AVE [1] 1/16	biggest [1] 25/17 Biggs [13] 7/17	31/19 38/12 called [2] 32/17
arguing [7] 5/7 6/1	Avenue [1] 1/24	8/12 12/7 12/18	44/7
22/2 28/11 28/21 37/6 37/23	aware [11] 7/12 8/23 9/4 13/5 13/7	20/8 20/9 22/10 24/17 25/8 53/12	calling [2] 50/16 50/17
argument [25] 5/16 5/17 5/19 5/20 6/5	13/8 13/9 25/8	53/18 64/3 64/9 Bill [1] 8/8	calls [1] 35/13 came [4] 31/4 46/19
6/7 11/12 14/10	away [6] 39/11 43/5	birth [1] 41/12	61/15 66/20
22/21 24/9 24/16 24/22 24/23 29/4	43/6 43/7 43/9 43/13	birthdays [1] 41/8 bit [2] 50/11 68/2	can [53] 3/2 3/2 3/23 3/25 4/12 4/17
30/2 36/3 37/23	В]black [1] 20/8	5/4 5/7 6/3 6/18 7/2 7/16 7/19 10/13
46/5 47/24 48/7 48/17 51/2 54/5	B-E-N [1] 45/14	blah [3] 34/12 34/13 34/13	13/7 16/25 21/7
54/7 65/23 arguments [14] 5/13	baby [4] 25/20 26/5 31/13 58/20	blame [1] 55/19 blurred [1] 16/18	23/2 26/2 26/23 29/24 30/18 31/4
5/13 6/4 18/4 24/2	baby's [1] 26/5	Boasberg [1] 34/9	31/7 31/16 32/21
37/25 47/7 47/21 47/21 48/5 61/23	back [26] 3/20 3/25 9/22 12/15 14/18	bombs [1] 45/2	33/10 35/3 35/17 35/18 35/25 36/3
62/6 62/16 67/19 arise [1] 41/2	20/18 24/22 40/20 42/5 43/20 45/2	boots [1] 61/4 born [1] 26/7	38/21 40/16 41/10 41/16 44/13 48/12
armed [1] 45/23	45/4 45/12 45/16	 both [6] 8/21 47/20	53/16 55/21 55/22
arms [1] 26/6 around [4] 15/2	45/23 50/10 53/25 54/8 55/2 57/19	49/12	56/13 56/16 57/21 58/3 58/6 58/21
26/8 63/9 64/10 arrested [4] 14/25	62/21 65/10 66/15	bottle [2] 20/13 51/23	59/4 59/14 59/24 60/4 62/7 68/6
15/2 34/18 63/3	background [1] 13/8	 bottles [3] 23/16	cancer [1] 41/13
articulable [3] 19/11 34/21 62/5		62/11 63/8 bought [2] 54/25	Capitol [39] 12/13 12/16 12/18 12/20
articulate [1]	Bankruptcy [1] 1/24	62/18	12/21 12/24 13/25 20/6 21/1 22/15
articulated [1]	15/22 15/23	Boys [18] 12/25	23/10 23/18 24/6
19/15 aside [3] 23/5 23/5	barbecues [1] 41/8 barricade [1] 53/20	13/3 14/21 15/1 15/16 16/11 16/20	35/1 35/11 36/20 43/13 43/15 44/6
24/17	barricades [2]	20/12 22/12 43/5	44/16 44/21 44/23
	52/25 53/9 base [1] 45/6	44/18 45/6 47/2 52/24 60/20 62/22	45/7 45/12 45/17 46/5 47/2 50/24
assistance [3] 47/14 47/15 47/25	based [2] 35/5 47/22	63/4 64/13 bravado [1] 26/19	51/17 51/18 52/1 52/3 53/7 53/13
associate [1] 42/22	basically [1] 45/10	breach [1] 53/17	53/13 53/20 59/19
associated [1]	basis [3] 5/25 17/3 34/22	briefly [1] 52/13	60/8 64/4 Capitol.
associations [1] 18/21	Bates [2] 30/9 34/17	bring [3] 30/3 36/11 56/4	caption [1] 16/11 care [2] 31/14
assume [1] 2/12	beforehand [1] 59/8	bringing [1] 57/22	32/20
assured [1] 40/16 assuring [1] 31/9	began [1] 18/6 begin [2] 2/9 6/17	brings [1] 65/5 broke [2] 15/23	career [2] 8/5 8/5 carefully [1] 66/20
attached [3] 7/16	behalf [1] 42/4 behavior [1] 28/5	44/19	cargo [1] 33/1
8/15 60/17 attack [10] 17/4	ben [1] 45/14	broken [2] 25/6 45/4	CARMEN [2] 1/20 2/6 case [31] 5/1 7/6
21/1 22/15 32/19 34/25 35/11 36/20	bend [1] 45/15 benefit [1] 32/16	Brooklyn [1] 1/19 brought [8] 24/1	8/3 9/9 17/19 18/6 19/24 30/11 31/10
46/4 59/19 62/10	Bertino [17] 9/17	32/5 34/23 46/3	31/11 32/17 36/4
attacked [2] 15/21 64/4	9/19 10/8 10/25 21/8 21/9 21/11	47/5 49/11 54/19 57/19	36/9 42/15 42/21 43/8 43/11 46/6
attacking [1] 60/8 attacks [3] 43/12	22/24 25/8 49/12 50/4 50/7 52/11	brutality [1] 59/20 BS [1] 65/3	46/23 47/6 47/10 47/13 47/16 47/19
59/20 60/22	52/12 63/9 65/3	building [2] 13/9	48/12 50/18 51/24
	1	l .	l .

	city [3] 16/23	conduct [7] 9/15	cooperate [3] 10/13
C	16/23 28/3	19/1 32/2 35/23	50/2 50/5
case [4] 55/11	civil [1] 45/9		cooperated [1]
61/15 61/17 63/23	claim [3] 12/3	conducted [2] 42/13	10/24
cases [8] 10/10	61/12 61/19	42/14	cooperators [1]
10/11 11/14 18/11	claimed [1] 62/20	conference [1] 33/7	
30/7 31/12 49/18	claims [2] 44/12	confidence [1] 38/9	coordinated [1]
63/20	64/17	confident [1] 57/9	46/16
categorical [1]	clarify [1] 66/5		coordination [1]
36/6	clarion [1] 22/14 Clause [1] 19/10		46/21
categorically [1] 36/4	Clause [1] 19/10 clear [16] 10/21	connection [3] 15/1 51/23 60/12	cop [1] 63/8
categories [1] 36/5	12/22 19/12 26/17	connections [1]	copies [1] 15/13 cops [3] 45/1 45/2
category [1] 22/1	27/6 28/10 28/17	28/16	45/4
category [1] 22/1 cause [1] 40/25 caused [1] 30/14	28/19 30/16 52/17	CONOR [2] 1/15 2/5	copy [1] 7/19
caused [1] 30/14	57/14 62/4 63/17	consents [1] 2/12	core [1] 41/15
celebrate 1 7/2	I 63/17 64/5 64/18	consider [11] 10/13	correction [1] 4/2
certain [1] 11/14 certainly [16] 2/25	clearly_[1] 36/25	31/5 33/17 44/12	costing [1] 15/24
certainly [16] 2/25	client [7] 2/9	44/13 48/8 48/13	counci [1] 43/3
6/12 40/23 43/2			counse [13] 4/8
47/18 48/14 48/14	24/10 28/13 67/16	61/24	4/16 5/18 7/17
52/6 54/4 54/10 55/17 55/23 56/1	clients [1] 67/11 close [1] 25/14	consideration [1]	43/11 47/6 47/9 48/3 48/18 48/21
58/9 59/10 67/16	close [1] 25/14 closer [1] 67/17	considered [1] 54/9	
certainty [1] 41/16	co [4] 53/15 53/18	consistent [5]	counting [1] 37/9
certification [3]	54/23 54/24	10/10 18/14 19/10	country [5] 14/14
36/21 42/20 46/17	co-conspirator [1]	50/19 63/16	31/25 40/19 45/11
certify [1] 69/4	53/15	conspiracies [1]	45/23
chains [1] 43/14	co-conspirators [2]	23/4	couple [4] 28/9
change [1] 48/6	53/18 54/23	conspiracy [25] 8/7	30/23 56/5 61/20
changed [2] 4/16	co-conspirators' [1]		course [9] 21/22
55/9	54/24	14/13 23/1 23/3	42/11 44/12 45/4
chapter [4] 5/5	College [3] 37/10	27/6 27/9 36/2 42/8	49/20 52/3 52/18
15/16 16/21 61/7	42/20 46/17	46/11 46/13 49/16	53/13 54/22
character [1] 3/7 characteristics [2]	COLUMBIA [1] 1/1 Columbus [1] 7/2	49/17 50/12 51/11 51/12 51/13 53/16	court [158] Court's [14] 4/5
26/12 31/6	comfort [1] 54/20	55/7 55/8 61/3	8/20 11/19 15/12
charge [1] 36/11	coming [1] 62/19	64/21	19/8 24/13 32/2
charged [10] 9/6	commit [3] 26/17	conspirator [1]	36/1 43/23 46/5
23/8 28/4 49/2	27/18 62/9	53/15	52/7 52/15 55/9
49/18 50/8 51/21	committing [2] 15/3	conspirators [3]	56/4
51/24 61/2 62/13	39/13	46/13 53/18 54/23	courtroom [2] 25/15
charges [6] 9/3 9/7		conspirators' [1]	25/17
36/4 36/6 40/12	4/20	54/24	courts [2] 1/24
42/9	communication [1]	conspired [1] 49/19	21/20
charging [2] 49/18	12/8	constantly [1]	cover [1] 48/24
50/10 chat [1] 16/9	community [1] 58/21		cr [1] 1/4
chats [6] 25/10	community [1] 10/23 comparable [1]	Constitution [2]	crazy [1] 26/22 crimes [1] 39/14
25/11 46/4 46/9	63/20	context [3] 11/13	crimes [1] 39/14 criminal [8] 1/3
50/24 65/10	comparison [1]	44/16 59/25	2/2 8/4 8/17 27/15
chief [5] 19/3 36/7	51/18	continue [1] 43/22	43/16 50/11 64/20
47/11 47/11 47/15	completely [3]	continued [1] 45/18	CRM [1] 1/16
child [8] 26/2 26/6	40/13 50/19 63/11	continues [2] 37/3	crowd [5] 14/4 14/7
26/8 27/21 28/19	complex [1] 63/23	64/20	14/9 21/12 24/18
31/14 54/5 54/12	comply [1] 41/17	Contrast [1] 63/3	crowds [1] 12/23
children [2] 25/15	concede [2] 9/18	control [2] 21/1	cucking [1] 45/22
25/23 chose [4] 42/17	10/11	65/16	curiam [1] 24/14
chose [4] 42/17 42/18 42/22 44/21	conceded [1] 45/11 conceding [1] 45/18	conversation [2]	curious [1] 13/12
circuit [5] 36/3	conceding [1] 45/18 conception [1]	13/10 65/8 conversations [4]	current [1] 17/18 currently [1] 4/19
66/11 66/15 66/21	22/25	34/15 35/21 50/22	cut [1] 29/25
67/2	concerned [4] 26/22		
circular [1] 20/21	26/24 27/13 27/17	convicted [1] 10/17	D
circumstances [4]	concerns [1] 22/19	convictions [2]	D.C [7] 3/5 21/10
10/20 25/25 26/12	concert [1] 46/14	14/14 31/25	21/11 35/15 36/3
26/13	concussion [1] 45/2	convinced [1] 27/7	52/4 65/7
circumstantial [1]		convincing [4]	damage [1] 26/7
46/10	conditions [2] 31/9		danger [2] 10/23
cited [1] 47/10	65/22	63/18	52/9
	l .	l	<u> </u>

<u> </u>	20/7 23/9 24/4 24/7	24/12 29/5 31/2	16/8 16/13
D dangerous [2] 27/7	24/8 26/1 30/19	35/4 37/24 47/19	documents [4] 4/11
27/11			49/18 62/23 63/1 DOJ [1] 1/16
dangerousness [3] 21/21 55/4 55/10	61/11 64/1 defendants' [1]	difficulty [1] 7/22 digress [1] 19/6	DOJ-CRM [1] 1/16 Donahue [1] 12/18
date [6] 16/14	55/13	diligent [2] 5/11	done [6] 2/23 30/6
	defended [1] 44/6	7/5	34/16 49/4 56/8
61/16 69/10 dated [2] 15/18	defense [6] 8/5 27/15 32/24 42/25	direct [1] 47/1 directed [1] 62/12	57/20 Donohoe [20] 8/14
16/12	49/21 56/17	directions [1] 46/4	10/24 11/2 11/3
daughter [7] 27/21 39/3 39/8 39/15	<pre>defenses [1] 45/8 deference [1] 53/6</pre>	directly [3] 23/7 23/8 62/8	12/9 20/12 22/23 23/15 23/16 23/17
39/16 41/12 54/1	degree [1] 46/19	directs [2] 61/6	23/22 23/23 24/24
daughters [1] 41/7 day [21] 7/2 9/8	delete [2] 61/7 61/9	61/8 dirty [1] 6/14	25/3 25/6 25/7 51/19 51/25 52/2
13/7 16/25 17/21	deleted [1] 17/13	disassociates [1]	63/6
18/14 21/2 21/11 21/25 24/25 25/2	<pre>deliver [1] 31/20 delivering [1] 17/1</pre>	64/12 disbarred [1] 4/23	Donohoe's [4] 8/9 49/13 49/16 51/20
28/5 28/13 35/24	delve [1] 5/8	disciplined [1]	doubling [1] 45/22
38/5 40/23 52/3 53/23 63/14 63/15	demonstrations [1] 14/16	67/18 disclosing [1]	doubt [2] 52/16 54/4
65/13	depressing [1]	35/16	down [8] 3/9 20/8
days [4] 6/21 17/14 31/18 61/20	45/15 deputy [1] 66/2	disclosure [1] 48/23	31/4 41/23 41/25 45/22 66/23 66/24
DC [5] 1/5 1/13	describe [3] 3/23	discovery [13] 5/2	downloaded [1] 57/2
1/14 1/17 1/25 deal [3] 23/24	22/11 41/10 described [1] 48/24	7/6 7/15 7/22 15/8	downward [1] 25/25 dozens [1] 43/5
27/24 56/25	describes [3] 32/18	32/15 47/24 48/12	drink [2] 15/23
dealt [1] 63/21 December [8] 21/10	49/1 60/22 description [2]	61/17 61/18 discretion [1]	35/17 drinking [2] 65/2
32/10 32/13 33/1	49/7 50/25	11/19	65/3
42/7 61/15 62/19 65/7	deserve [1] 44/6	discrimination [1]	dropping [1] 45/2
December 4th [1]	<pre>deserved [1] 16/24 deserves [1] 6/15</pre>	30/6 discuss [4] 4/5	drunk [1] 35/19 due [2] 19/10 19/14
33/1	desire [1] 27/19		during [2] 18/24
decide [3] 13/13	destroy [1] 62/10 destruction [1]	discussed [2] 64/14 64/14	<u>44/10</u> E
51/10 62/2	36/7	discussing [1]	e-mail [1] 7/16
51/20	details [1] 46/11 detain [6] 19/9	28/25 discussion [3] 4/6	earlier [2] 19/15
deciding [2] 26/11	34/24 36/1 36/3	43/14 50/22	51/15
31/6 decision [17] 8/20	36/6 42/6 detained [3] 10/18	dismissed [1] 68/14	early [5] 2/16 2/17 2/19 33/8 64/16
10/7 11/4 11/9	10/19 26/7	displayed [1] 6/15	easier [2]
11/15 11/21 11/22 11/24 19/9 19/15	detention [18] 5/15 7/10 8/24 10/7 11/4	aispieasure [1] 4/10	21/6 East [1] 1/19
19/16 19/23 32/2	11/21 24/9 28/21	dispute [2] 5/1	ECF [2] 20/14 63/25
34/5 36/12 42/8 50/2	31/18 36/11 42/12 42/13 46/6 46/22	18/20 disrespect [1]	effective [1] 48/18 egging [2] 25/10
decisions [4] 11/14	47/4 47/10 51/21	67/11	63/11
19/23 30/17 67/19 deem [1] 61/23	66/10 determination [1]	disrupt [1] 62/25 dissatisfaction [1]	eight [2] 7/18 42/13
deems [1] 65/22	8/24	4/16	either [6] 2/20
defendant [26] 1/7 1/20 2/3 2/6 2/7	determinations [1] 30/25	dissimilarly [1]	18/22 24/9 47/8 59/4 68/5
8/6 10/22 26/13	determining [1]	distance [1] 36/16	eldest [1] 39/15
26/13 31/7 40/4 42/17 42/22 42/23	10/13 detrimental [1]	distinguishable [3] 18/5 19/7 19/8	election [2] 37/6 54/22
42/24 43/24 44/12	39/10	distinguished [1]	Electoral [3] 37/10
45/8 48/9 50/15 50/17 51/6 53/17	devastating [1] 41/10	9/5 distinguishing [1]	42/20 46/17 eligible [1] 4/25
56/7 56/8 58/19	diagnosed [1] 41/13	25/12	Elmo [3] 15/6 15/7
defendant's [9] 43/21 44/10 44/14	difference [2] 25/18 30/6	district [9] 1/1 1/1 1/10 1/24 21/20	59/23 else [8] 6/22 12/5
52/14 52/19 54/11	different [7] 18/11	27/13 36/8 63/20	21/8 21/15 30/13
54/22 55/3 55/14 defendants [22] 9/5	21/15 23/4 24/24 38/4 50/3 63/11	66/22 districts [1] 16/23	31/20 58/11 65/17
9/6 12/16 17/17	differently [10]	docket [1] 4/18	40/18
17/18 18/6 19/24	19/25 24/3 24/11	document [3] 15/8	emphasize [1] 38/2
		l .	

end - general 1.21 Ci 00		- : ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	
E	64/23 64/25 65/21	28/15 29/3 29/3	focus [3] 6/7 18/25
end [3] 6/19 52/7	evincing [1] 55/8 exact [3] 63/13	29/8 36/16 45/25 46/6 53/21	31/1 focused [1] 17/5
52/7			focusing [1] 36/19
ends [1] 64/12	exactly [3] 15/17	27/25 39/2 39/8	FOIA [1] 14/18
enforcement [2]	46/19 57/22	39/10 39/14	folds [1] 18/17
20/13 44/5	example [1] 48/3	favor [1] 54/11	folks [2] 17/20
engage [1] 55/2		FBI [1] 13/10	18/12
engaged [1] 20/7 enough [7] 7/12	exceptional [1] 10/20	feathered [3] 17/7 17/12 44/7	following [2] 20/3 68/7
33/15 45/25 49/6		federal [4] 8/4	food [1] 17/1
55/5 63/19 65/21	11/17	8/17 8/17 10/16	fools [1] 35/20
enter [2] 51/25		fee] [1] 40/19	For the Defendant [1]
52/2 entered [10] 8/8	$41/2 \ 46/7 \ 54/1$	feelings [2] 18/21	1/20
	exhausted [1] 16/24 exhibit [5] 16/1	29/10 feels [1] 45/19	forcible [2] 12/22 20/17
12/21 12/24 13/4	16/4 16/7 28/4	felon [1] 9/21	forcibly [5] 12/16
51/17 51/18 51/25	32/25	fence [1] 20/9	12/19 51/17 51/18
entering [1] 12/23		few [3] 40/3 40/5	51/25
enters [2] 12/20	Exhibit maybe [1]	57/15 5:5-5 [1] 26/24	foregoing [1] 69/4
12/23 entire [2] 8/5 8/5	32/25 expansive [1] 35/9	Fifth [1] 26/24 fight [2] 32/14	forget [2] 3/13 35/13
entitled [1] 69/5	expect [1] 9/18		form [2] 46/25
	explicitly [1] 46/4	fighting [4] 45/3	57/17
entry [1] 20/17	express [1] 27/19	58/20 60/8 67/16	formed [1] 8/13
equal [1] 61/6	expressed [8] 4/9	file [3] 61/20 68/3	former [3] 17/18
ERIK [3] 1/12 2/4 42/4	4/15 7/21 28/20 31/16 34/14 36/8	68/4 filed [4] 3/16 3/18	17/24 37/2 forth [10] 47/20
escalating [2]	43/10 34/14 30/6	4/8 50/9	48/25 53/25 54/5
54/23 54/24		filing [3] 4/11	55/6 55/13 55/20
especially [1]	21/20 22/3 24/2	14/17 15/8	55/22 57/20 65/10
52/21	29/4	fill [1] 31/7	forward [5] 45/1
essentially [7]	extinguisher [1]	films [1] 52/23	52/9 64/4 67/20
46/24 50/18 54/6 55/5 55/8 56/17	19/4 extra [1] 68/2	find [10] 14/12 19/9 22/16 23/13	68/8 found [11] 7/20
66/21		25/22 43/25 49/4	12/1 23/23 43/20
even [20] 5/1 6/9	F	62/1 63/13 64/19	46/12 47/15 50/14
	face [1] 16/18	finding [3] 17/3	54/10 54/11 55/5
18/19 21/7 29/24	facility [1] 13/25	34/20 50/2	64/16
	fact [18] 12/14 17/4 17/13 17/22	findings [1] 43/23 fine [8] 3/25 6/25	four [3] 13/1 13/1 26/14
50/20 54/11 66/12	25/1 26/9 32/4 32/5	22/3 29/21 29/25	Fourth [1] 26/24
67/2 67/3	34/4 36/17 49/23	33/22 38/19 58/9	framers [2] 26/21
evening [1] 8/13	50/7 53/21 54/14	finish [1] 22/17	26/24
event [1] 16/16	54/25 55/11 61/7	Finley [2] 13/1	frankly [1] 14/11
events [5] 21/2 25/2 36/17 40/17	61/8	60/20 fine [1] 10/3	fraud [1] 45/21 freedom [1] 58/21
63/3	fact-intensive [1] 34/4	fire [1] 19/3 firearm [1] 10/3	Friday [1] 50/21
everybody [2] 21/8	factors [1] 34/11	firearms [4] 9/14	friends [1] 55/13
35/19	facts [10] 5/13	9/22 9/22 10/4	front [4] 41/4
everyone [9] 2/8	6/11 13/18 14/1	firefighter [3]	51/22 55/10 67/18
2/18 2/19 6/22 21/15 44/16 44/23	31/11 42/11 42/16 42/17 61/5 64/24	19/3 19/3 19/5 firing [1] 20/21	fuck [3] 43/25 44/4 51/1
45/23 53/8	factual [1] 64/7		fucked [1] 45/13
leveryone's [1] 13/6	factually [4] 18/5	9/8 9/10 9/23 12/1	fundraising [1]
evidence [46] 10/21	31/2 37/24 38/4	18/24 26/19 27/1	15/19
12/5 14/25 16/7	failed [1] 65/20	27/4 33/25 44/10	further [5] 11/13
21/16 22/2 23/6 23/8 26/9 34/19	failing [1] 4/11 fair [5] 6/5 10/15	53/8 53/17 58/23 59/15 59/23 61/14	57/15 58/11 68/9 68/11
35/16 36/24 42/7	28/6 33/14 35/7	62/18 62/20 63/5	future [12] 10/14
42/21 43/18 46/8	fairness [2] 9/25	fit [3] 36/5 36/6	19/11 19/13 21/21
46/10 46/13 46/20	33/9	51/1	21/21 40/24 55/3
47/1 47/3 47/22	familiar [3] 21/23	five [6] 20/14	55/10 57/7 57/11
48/1 48/8 48/15 51/14 51/14 51/22	36/24 42/15 family [12] 25/24	20/15 27/8 42/14 59/14 63/25	58/21 62/5
52/18 53/16 53/22		59/14 63/25 flag [1] 26/23	G
62/4 62/8 62/11	39/19 39/22 41/1	flags [1] 59/18	gather [1] 12/12
62/12 62/23 63/17	41/5 41/8 41/9 54/3	flee [1] 10/23	gathered [1] 45/6
63/18 63/22 63/25	54/10	floor [1] 40/9	gave [1] 41/11
64/3 64/18 64/21	far [10] 12/5 18/10	flows [1] 14/8	general [1] 52/16

		L	EO /1E CO /1O C1 /14
G		hearings [5] 42/12	59/15 60/19 61/14 62/1 65/1 65/19
generally [1] 18/8	groups [3] 21/1 62/24 63/2	42/13 42/13 46/6 47/10	67/10 67/22 68/10
gentlemen [2] 34/13	arown [1] 25/1/	heart [3] 25/14	68/12
35/17	guess [8] 10/9 17/1		Honor's [1] 11/9
gesture [1] 20/11			HONORABLE [1] 1/9
gets [7] 11/20	27/14 45/14 47/6		HOOK [3] 1/23 69/3
11/22 18/11 21/11	guidelines [1]	heavily [1] 5/22	69/10
28/15 29/8 32/18	25/25	heavy [1] 29/15	hope [3] 21/2 41/21
gift [1] 7/24	guilty [16] 7/25	heck [1] 60/23	59/7
given [11] 7/24	8/7 9/9 9/10 9/11	held [3] 45/11	hoping [1] 45/13
18/11 41/16 47/24	9/20 9/21 9/24	45/17 46/23	hotheads [1] 21/9
48/2 48/11 48/11	10/17 23/13 23/16		hour [3] 21/3 33/6
49/9 52/18 62/8	23/23 24/7 27/16	60/15	44/19
65/14	50/9 62/2	help [1] 15/25	hours [1] 16/25
glad [1] 11/8	gun [1] 46/25	helped [1] 43/4	house [3] 10/2
glowing [1] 53/2 goes [6] 20/14	guns [2] 10/1 10/25	here's [5] 14/13	30/10 31/19
goes [6] 20/14	[guy [3] 30/9 30/13	15/7 16/8 33/9	housed [1] 66/1
20/15 20/24 28/17	34/17	51/10	hug [1] 41/12
30/12 34/9	H	HERNANDEZ [39] 1/20	Hull [2] 7/17 20/20
good [8] 2/8 2/13			hundreds [2] 43/5
2/15 3/4 38/23 39/1		3/12 10/5 13/14	43/5
39/12 42/3	55/18		hurt [1] 32/18
government [68]	hand [3] 2/25 20/11		husband [2] 25/23
1/12 2/4 4/4 7/7	41/11	43/1 47/8 47/18	39/11
7/8 7/17 7/24 8/6	handed [1] 29/15	48/4 49/11 50/12	lI
9/18 10/2 11/17	hands [1] 40/20	50/14 51/19 53/11	
11/22 14/11 15/9	happen [2] 43/12		idea [4] 18/7 23/9
15/18 16/4 16/10	65/25	55/4 56/21 57/25	41/13 50/19
17/5 17/8 17/11	happened [12] 13/12	58/7 58/12 58/16	identify [1]63/2
18/19 22/9 27/1	16/16 21/25 25/1	58/25 59/22 65/18	identifying [1]
27/2 27/17 27/19	25/5 27/12 34/18	67/15 67/25 68/3	18/25
32/3 32/15 33/9	35/14 40/18 40/22	68/9	imagine [1] 14/6
33/13 34/3 34/7	44/4 46/15	hey [1] 37/10	immaculate [2] 8/4
34/12 36/2 36/18	happening [1] 62/12	hierarchical [1]	22/25
42/2 42/12 44/8	happens [4] 53/18	22/10	immense_[1] 11/18
44/9 45/5 46/25	56/20 64/15 65/16	hierarchy [1] 38/6	impact [1] 23/7
48/19 48/21 49/5	happy [8] 5/22 5/25	high [2] 29/20	impactful [1] 29/3
50/9 50/10 54/4	21/6 29/18 30/5	31/24	important [13] 5/24
55/6 57/2 58/3 59/1		higher [1] 24/21	13/15 14/5 18/16
59/2 59/8 59/21	hard [6] 5/11 39/7	Highland [1] 1/21	25/13 29/16 29/19
61/10 61/25 62/3	39/8 43/25 67/11	highlighted [1]	29/22 29/24 40/15
62/17 63/5 63/12	67/16	44/8	59/23 63/13 63/14
63/22 63/25 64/15	hardest [1] 16/23 hardly [2] 13/15	hill [1] 22/11	imposed [1] 31/17
64/17 64/19 65/20	hardly [2] 13/15	himself [5] 52/23	imposes [1] 31/9
67/24 68/11	47/2	56/9 62/9 63/19	incarcerated [2]
government's [12]	hatched [1] 12/4	64/12	30/23 55/23
11/11 20/5 36/10	hates [1] 25/13	history [4] 17/25	incarceration [2]
42/21 46/10 48/23	haystack [1] 49/8	26/12 27/6 31/6	31/17 31/18
49/14 50/18 55/11	hear [22] 2/21 2/25	hit [4] 3/5 16/23	include [1] 64/6
62/6 63/16 64/5	3/2 5/19 6/9 6/23	41/9 52/13	includes [1] 46/16
grandson [2] 15/5	13/7 26/3 28/14	hold [4] 26/6 41/11	
27/24	31/4 31/16 31/23	59/22 66/16	17/22 44/17 46/6
great [5] 12/13	33/8 33/10 33/20	Hollow [1] 1/21	49/20
27/5 38/25 39/2	33/24 34/3 34/7	Holmes [1] 27/5	incomprehensible [1]
60/24	37/19 41/21 42/2	home [13] 9/23 10/3	[.65/14]
grew [1] 8/1	57/8	31/13 31/14 31/17	inconsistency [1]
	heard [9] 33/5	31/17 31/18 31/18	11/10
grotesque [1] 14/13	33/12 33/19 34/6	39/15 39/19 41/9	inconsistent [2]
ground [4] 43/4	42/11 46/5 52/20	54/2 56/10	17/21 37/8
52/6 52/23 61/4	52/20 63/18	Honor [41] 2/2 2/14	
grounded [1] 36/1	hearing [24] 1/9		indicative [2] 66/7
grounds [4] 19/7	4/9 5/15 6/6 7/9	11/20 12/14 14/5	66/14
19/8 20/6 44/21	7/10 12/1 16/2	18/15 22/11 23/12	indictment [5] 8/11
group [16] 22/10	32/25 33/6 35/8	24/13 26/21 29/20	12/19 12/21 22/9
34/25 40/25 42/18	42/6 42/10 44/11	30/4 32/3 34/9	42/15
42/18 43/4 44/15	46/22 47/12 47/12	36/23 38/3 38/8	indisputable [1]
44/17 44/25 45/9	48/20 51/21 57/4	38/23 39/24 40/8	38/4
45/24 50/21 50/25	57/13 57/21 58/15	41/20 42/3 57/1	individual [2] 8/24
50/25 51/1 61/7	67/19	57/7 57/21 59/12	52/5
			<u> </u>

	173 TOR Document 00	- :	
I	18/21 19/1 25/2 25/10 27/12 30/19	K	47/25 48/7 49/2 50/14
individualized [3]	30/20 34/18 40/17	keep [2] 3/1 54/6	leave [1] 31/19
30/17 30/25 34/4 individuals [2]	42/18 42/24 43/4 43/17 43/19 43/22	Keepers [3] 5/1 9/9 30/14	led [8]
30/22 43/7	43/24 44/4 44/15	keeps [1] 41/15	43/13 50/11 50/22
indulgence [2] 4/5	45/10 45/12 45/16	KELLY [1] 1/9	left [5] 13/9 13/18
15/12 ineffective [7]	45/25 46/1 46/7 50/23 51/3 52/4	KENERSON [6] 1/12 2/5 42/4 47/23 58/5	13/19
47/9 47/13 47/15	52/6 52/18 52/21	59/4	lengthy [1] 30/8 less [2] 9/15 22/6
47/25 61/12 61/19 61/21	53/3 54/14 54/14 54/21 55/1 55/12	kept [1] 27/22 kind [13] 7/24	less [2] 9/15 22/6 lesson [1] 3/6
ineffectiveness [1]	60/1 62/25	14/15 18/11 18/12	letter [5] 4/12
61/11 information [4]	January 13th [2] 15/10 15/18	22/4 28/5 29/23 30/2 40/3 43/10	4/14 48/23 48/24 49/7
14/6 14/18 18/17	January 2021 [2]	48/17 52/14 52/22	letters [6] 3/7
50/9	54/21 55/1	kings [1] 22/10	26/14 34/13 38/10
informed [3] 8/14 8/14 8/15	January 30 [1] 46/7 January 5th [1]	knee [1] 45/15 knew [6] 2/11 50/11	49/5 55/13 level [1] 38/5
initial [1] 20/23	51/3	51/6 54/15 63/7	liability [1] 36/11
injected [1] 28/23 innocent [3] 23/13	January 6th [1] 55/12	64/20 knowing [1] 42/19	lieutenant [4] 12/2 20/18 50/14 50/20
27/16 62/14	January 7th [4]	knowingly [2] 42/22	life [4] 19/5 27/15
inside [1] 13/13 insofar [2] 46/8	45/10 45/12 45/16	42/23 known [5] 12/4 26/9	27/16 39/18
47/25	46/1 JASON [2] 1/13 2/4	26/15 43/8 51/3	11 gnt [2] 63/19 63/19
instead [2] 45/19	jeez [1] 22/22	knows [6] 7/20 8/24	likely [1] 31/12
58/21 intended [1] 17/4	DEFF [3] 1/23 69/3 69/10	12/1 14/10 15/15 35/7	limited [1] 18/2 lline [1] 20/13
intensive [1] 34/4	jeopardize [2]	kraken [1] 27/3	lines [2] 6/9 37/25
intent [3] 36/20 44/14 62/25	25/20 41/18 jeopardizing [1]	L	listed [2] 20/16 49/1
interested [1]	39/18	laid [3] 6/8 51/7	listening [2] 14/7
14/23	job [1] 60/24	51/15 land [2] 25/22	43/9
interference [1] 46/16	Joe [1] 8/8 Johnson [2] 47/20	67/13	little [6] 10/19 25/23 29/15 40/11
interrupt [1] 33/4	54/8	language [1] 26/18	50/11 68/2
interrupting [1] 3/13	Johnson's [1] 4/10 join [5] 42/8 42/18	large [4] 7/11 30/8 46/23 53/4	lived [1] 39/5 lives [1] 65/15
interviewed [2]	42/18 51/11 52/8	last [6] 3/14 3/18	location [1] 43/9
13/11 50/15 into [15] 5/5 5/8	joined [6] 45/25 50/12 50/21 51/1	36/22 37/14 40/14 42/10	long [6] 3/2 3/25 5/12 16/22 31/8
3/22 0/0 0/22 10/1	JJ/I/ JJ/ZJ	later [5] 7/18	39/1
18/17 20/25 28/23	joining [1] 55/7	20/11 21/12 53/1 55/18	longer [1] 64/16
34/11 34/17 36/11 61/15 62/14 65/5	jokes [1] 67/12 JUDGE [12] 1/10 9/1	laundry [1] 6/14	look [14] 3/25 5/4 10/11 17/15 23/2
introductory [1]	9/4 30/6 30/9 34/8	law [7] 8/18 20/13	24/6 24/7 35/1 36/4
64/1 invalid [1] 37/7	34/16 36/7 47/11 47/11 47/15 64/19	27/6 31/11 35/25 36/4 44/5	36/19 36/19 60/9 61/9 67/6
involve [1] 47/13	Judge to [1] 64/19	laws [2] 27/7 27/17	looked [1] 66/20
involving [1] 65/10 irrelevant [2]	judges [3] 27/5 27/13 63/21	lawyer [4] 5/11 27/3 42/1 47/18	looking [7] 7/11 35/16 45/16 49/5
18/18 18/22	June [14] 7/19	lawyers [5] 5/6 6/4	49/8 55/17 60/9
is I [1] 8/9	16/12 42/5 43/20	7/15 7/21 61/17 lay [3] 4/17 64/24	looks [2] 21/14
issue [5] 18/17 28/19 49/14 62/2	43/23 44/8 46/7 46/15 48/20 49/9	64/24	47/18 looting [1] 16/22
66/2	52/16 52/20 54/8	laying [1] 29/11	lose [1] 65/16
issued [1] 14/17 issues [4] 40/1	55/2 June 14th [1] 16/12	lays [2] 6/10 64/1 lead [1] 43/4	losing [2] 17/9 41/1
47/5 58/10 65/24	June 2020 [1] 52/16	leader [8] 20/18	lost [1] 45/11
item [1] 33/1 items [1] 62/19	June 30 [1] 46/7 June 30th [5] 43/23	34/25 42/24 43/2 43/3 50/13 50/20	lot [17] 4/17 5/25 14/6 23/6 24/19
J	44/8 46/15 48/20	50/20	27/5 27/6 35/17
jail [3] 10/25 30/7	49/9	leaders [2] 24/21 53/19	35/20 37/3 40/15
55/18	jurisdiction [1] 66/12	leadership [1] 35/6	62/16 62/17 65/1 65/3 65/12 67/12
James [2] 9/8 9/9	jury [4] 62/2 64/22	leading [2] 50/23	love [2] 40/8 41/9
January [45] 8/13 9/15 15/10 15/18	64/22 64/23 justice [2] 11/20	52/21 least [8] 24/10	М
17/17 18/8 18/13	27/5		mail [1] 7/16

М	61/6_63/2	66/20 67/18	Mr. Tarrio [6] 8/11
major [1] 9/3	memo [1] 57/21	morning [8] 2/8	8/12 12/7 12/17
makes [5] 2/25	men [9] 3/7 26/15 31/23 31/24 31/25	2/13 2/15 2/16 2/17 3/4 38/23 42/4	46/24 52/3 Mrs [1] 25/16
11/17 51/2 51/19	38/10 42/22 42/23	MOSD [6] 7/8 20/25	Mrs. [5] 25/15
56/10	65/2	35/6 35/8 35/18	38/12 39/21 54/14
making [10] 18/4	mentality [1] 28/2	49/1	58/19
19/9 20/11 21/22 22/21 30/25 35/19	mentioned [5] 3/14	Moseley [3] 4/17	Mrs. Rehl [5] 25/15
61/12 61/13 67/19	13/16 28/16 35/1 48/4	4/18 47/20 most [12] 8/5 9/7	38/12 39/21 54/14 58/19
Mall [1] 59/18	merits [2] 5/23 6/7	13/15 18/4 25/2	Ms. [37] 2/9 2/20
man [4] 10/25 14/13	Imessage [10] 8/15	I 35/9 38/7 41/10	2/23 3/12 10/5
26/16 39/12	12/9 22/14 23/10		13/14 17/9 17/15
manner [1] 53/2 many [4] 26/16 28/1	24/5 45/9 45/13	63/14 mostly [2] 9/14	28/9 30/16 33/4 37/22 43/1 47/8
28/1 41/15		66/5	47/18 48/4 49/11
March [6] 7/18 9/23	12/10 22/12 22/13	mother [10] 3/4	50/12 50/14 51/19
10/1 11/1 34/19	22/23 37/11 43/14	25/14 25/16 25/23	53/11 53/25 54/5
55/24	57/16 61/9 63/10	27/23 31/4 37/15	54/19 55/4 56/21
Marine [2] 17/25 27/20	met [1] 39/8	38/9 39/24 41/6 motion [6] 1/9 2/19	57/25 58/7 58/12 58/16 58/25 59/22
marital [5] 56/14	metal [1] 20/9	3/15 6/8 20/5 44/10	65/18 67/15 67/25
56/18 56/25 57/1	Miami [1] 48/25	motions [1] 20/5	68/3 68/9
57/10	might [5] 11/13	motive [1] 44/14	Ms. Hernandez [37]
marriage [1] 27/22 married [2] 14/14	17/21 18/12 47/19 48/3	mouth [1] 26/3 moves [1] 55/1	2/9 2/20 2/23 3/12
27/21	military [1] 18/1	moves [1] 55/1 moving [1] 67/19	10/5 13/14 17/9 17/15 28/9 30/16
marshal [1] 66/2	million [1] 22/22	Mr. [157]	33/4 37/22 43/1
mask [2] 2/24 3/1	mind [3] 19/2 43/18		47/8 47/18 48/4
material [2] 19/8	67/16	9/19 10/8 10/25	49/11 50/12 50/14
48/6 matter [9] 2/2 4/3	ministry [1] 42/25 Mink [1] 1/21	22/24 50/4 50/7 52/11 52/12	51/19 53/11 53/25 54/5 54/19 55/4
16/17 33/7 35/25	minute [3] 20/18	Mr. Bertino's [5]	56/21 57/25 58/7
49/7 52/16 66/6	21/3 51/16	10/1 49/13 49/17	58/12 58/16 58/25
69/5 matters [2] 13/21	minutes [8] 17/13	49/22 50/2	59/22 65/18 67/15
58/6	33/10 33/20 33/21 34/7 37/16 44/17	Mr. Biggs [4] 7/17 12/7 53/12 53/18	67/25 68/3 68/9 much [12] 21/8 25/7
may [14] 2/24 5/2	59/13	Mr. Donohoe [11]	28/12 36/24 39/21
11/10 29/15 35/21	misdemeanor [1]	8/14 10/24 11/2	46/8 46/10 53/3
38/14 39/22 40/2 40/4 41/18 46/18	61/1		55/1 56/2 62/6
48/16 51/7 57/10	misinformation [1]	23/23 25/3 51/19 51/25 52/2	65/23 MULROE [2] 1/15 2/5
mavbe [7] 4/4 11/7	missed [1] 41/8	Mr. Donohoe's [4]	multiple [5] 9/21
13/17 23/6 27/14	misstated [1] 63/22 misused [1] 27/18	8/9 49/13 49/16	14/15 14/21 19/7
29/24 32/25 mayhem [1] 20/7	misused [1] 2//18 Mitchell [1] 44/13	51/20 Mn Finley [2] 12/1	32/21 Munchel [9] 19/12
	Mitchell [1] 44/13 mob [2] 52/24 53/10		Munchel [9] 19/12 19/15 21/17 21/18
2/4	mocks [2] 37/11	Mr. Hull [2] 7/17	21/19 21/23 22/4
MD [1] 1/21	37/12	20/20	26/17 35/1
mean [18] 5/21 7/7 11/16 25/8 25/18	mom [3] 39/4 39/11 41/12	Mr. James [2] 9/8 9/9	murder [1] 62/13 must [1] 8/16
25/24 26/17 28/20	moment [4] 58/1	Mr. Johnson [2]	myself [1] 7/21
29/10 34/3 41/5	60/21 60/23 64/15	47/20 54/8	N
41/22 64/8 66/1	moments [1] 41/2	Mr. Johnson's [1]	
66/2 66/13 66/23 67/11	Monday [2] 68/7 68/7	4/10 Mr. Kenerson [3]	NADIA [2] 1/18 2/5 name [1] 20/16
mechanism [1] 67/9	monitor [1] 15/12	47/23 58/5 59/4	narrow [1] 54/7
medical [2] 32/20	months [3] 7/18	Mr. Moseley [3]	nature [3] 8/2
40/1	7/18 25/21	4/17 4/18 47/20	26/11 67/13
meet [4] 12/13 39/16 51/4 65/20	Monument [3] 43/6 51/4 60/10	Mr. Nordean [1] 12/7	nearly [1] 44/19 necessarily [1]
meeting [1] 35/9	MOORE [2] 1/18 2/5	Mr. Pezzola [5]	49/8
meeting [1] 35/9 meets [3] 5/14	more [26] 4/17 5/23	17/24 44/19 65/8	necessary [3] 47/3
20/24 21/16	9/17 21/1 21/8 23/8		61/24 65/22
Mehta [2] 9/4 30/6 Mehta's [1] 9/1	25/7 27/25 28/12 29/3 29/3 29/19	Mr. Rehl [88] Mr. Rehl's [9] 3/4	need [10] 29/22 30/17 31/19 32/14
members [13] 12/25	29/24 31/12 31/12	3/6 25/16 36/17	34/3 44/1 45/21
13/1 16/20 37/3	34/15 36/24 40/2	42/8 42/12 48/18	51/8 51/9 66/17
41/5 45/6 49/1 49/2	41/9 42/9 50/22	48/20 61/6	needed [1] 21/20 needle [2] 49/8
52/23 52/24 53/9	57/15 63/19 65/21	Mr. Rhodes [1] 9/14	43/0
	1	1	1

	175-131C Document 03		
N	51/12 obstructive [1]	<pre>ops [1] 33/1 order [4] 19/9</pre>	parties [1] 68/14 party_[1] 11/3
needle [1] 55/1	61/8	33/18 47/1 61/24	lpass [1] 5/23
needs [5] 6/15 30/3 37/19 37/19 51/10	obvious [1] 10/6 obviously [12] 2/11	organization [1]	passage [3] 21/23 30/8 32/15
network [1] 31/21	2/22 10/5 10/6 20/3	original [3] 7/10	past [3] 19/12
new [4] 1/16 8/2	21/19 38/25 54/2	20/20 20/25	28/20 32/2
14/12 28/3	57/1 57/22 58/1	other's [1] 68/6	patriotic [1] 53/8
newborn [1] 39/8 news [1] 14/8	68/4 occasions [3] 28/25	others [3] 51/11 51/24 64/17	patriotism [1] 53/3 peacefully [1] 27/2
next [2] 27/8 61/20	30/18 30/23	otherwise [1] 5/22	peacefully [1] 27/2 Pence [3] 13/8
night [2] 12/6	occurrence [1] 8/17		13/17 45/12
41/15 nobody [1] 6/14	October [1] 1/5 off [8] 4/6 20/24	out [32] 4/17 5/24 6/8 6/10 9/10 9/11	pending [1] 30/23 Pennsylvania [1]
non [1] 30/19	20/25 29/25 40/11	9/24 10/1 10/6 11/1	37/5
none [2] 30/13	51/1 64/9 66/21	11/10 11/14 12/9 14/4 18/16 20/23	people [25] 12/13
30/14 nor [4] 10/3 51/21	offense [3] 9/12	14/4 18/16 20/23	13/11 14/7 14/24
52/10 52/10	25/9 56/1 offering [1] 23/24 office [2] 37/4	22/14 25/20 29/11 30/4 34/19 37/6	20/24 21/24 25/10 27/10 27/16 37/2
Nordean [10] 8/13	office [2] 37/4	39/4 49/25 50/16	37/3 37/6 37/12
	0.7.	,,,	38/7 45/3 49/20
22/10 24/17 36/9 50/17 64/3 64/8	officer [7] 15/20 16/19 20/11 27/24	60/25 64/1 64/24 64/24	50/24 53/1 60/8 60/10 63/11 64/10
Normies [1] 43/8	28/1 28/4 28/7	over [11] 5/1 5/2	65/1 65/13 65/16
note [9] 17/17 47/7	officer's [1] 15/22	5/23 13/5 13/10	pepper [2] 45/3
48/19 49/12 51/19 53/11 53/24 54/17	officers [9] 15/5 16/25 17/4 17/6	21/2 30/20 38/25	45/3 per [1] 24/14
56/5		41/1 52/24 55/8 overran [1] 45/7	perceive [1] 64/23
notice [1] 13/15	20/13 44/5	overstated [1]	perfectly [2] 33/12
notion [3] 34/24	Official [2] 1/23	63/24	33/13
37/9 52/14 November [9] 32/9	69/3 often [2] 11/17	overthrow [1] 27/19 own [3] 43/17 63/9	pernaps [3] 6/4 46/25 57/20
32/12 32/24 52/19	65/2	65/2	period [1] 37/15
54/21 54/25 56/20	old [1] 25/21	P	permission [1] 36/6
57/23 58/18 November 2021 [1]	oldest [1] 41/7 omnibus [1] 20/5	p.m [2] 44/15 45/8	person [14] 8/25 10/23 21/8 25/5
52/19	once [2] 45/12	page [3] 20/14	26/16 31/12 32/1
November 29th [1]	65/25	43/23 54/9	36/14 36/15 37/4
32/9 November 8th [2]	one [33] 4/3 4/4	pages [2] 20/15 63/25	38/25 39/1 39/12
56/20 58/18	9/8 9/17 21/9 21/10 23/12 23/18 24/13	painted [1] 15/24	40/22 personal [2] 27/25
now's [1] 33/11	25/7 28/25 34/17	pants [2] 33/2	38/4
number [14] 7/18	41/15 44/23 47/6	54/18	personally [2]
9/5 23/12 23/15 24/13 28/25 29/1	49/12 51/19 52/13 53/11 53/18 53/18	paper [2] 19/3 33/15	27/14 31/5 persuade [2] 29/18
44/18 45/5 47/5	53/24 54/17 56/5	papers [1] 50/15	37/18
49/19 59/21 61/25	58/13 58/14 61/25	parading [1] 23/17	petitioning [1]
63/1 numerous [1] 30/18	62/20 65/4 65/5 66/4 66/13 67/20	paragraph [1] 64/2 paragraphs [2]	27/2 Pezzola [12] 12/18
NW [3] 1/14 1/16	ones [4] 24/16	20/15 64/6	17/24 20/10 23/18
1/24	24/17 36/23 65/4	paraphrasing [1]	23/19 36/14 44/19
NY [2] 1/18 1/19	online [1] 14/19 only [14] 8/19 9/19	14/22 parents [1] 39/12	65/5 65/8 65/9 65/11 65/11
0	18/7 22/15 28/14	parlance [1] 43/8	Philadelphia [9]
o'clock [2] 33/6	28/20 30/24 35/8	Parler [1] 16/9	12/25 15/5 15/16
33/7 Oath [3] 5/1 9/9	36/5 42/11 49/23 55/11 62/2 67/18	part [13] 4/5 7/5 7/6 11/6 21/19	15/20 16/11 16/21 20/24 31/21 64/13
30/14	onto [1] 44/18	21/22 21/23 24/22	phone [2] 3/9 57/2
object [3] 57/4	open [1] 6/6	26/14 35/20 39/17	phones [1] 32/16
57/12 57/18 objection [5] 16/3	operations [1] 43/3	44/25 65/15	photo [3] 60/4 60/7
30/21 42/19 56/23	opinion [4] 34/14 67/3 67/5 67/8	partake [1] 39/18 participant [1]	60/7 photograph [2]
58/15	opinions [1] 24/14	43/15	60/12 60/16
objections [6]	opportunity [9] 5/19 10/7 33/18	participate [1]	photos [1] 46/9
33/14 57/5 57/6 57/7 59/9 67/25	3/19 10// 33/18 34/6 40/20 41/17	20/19 participated [3]	physically [1] 38/9 pictures [2] 16/21
objective [5] 42/19	41/18 41/20 58/7	14/15 20/8 42/23	17/2
43/16 50/12 51/10	opposed [2] 54/21	particular [4]	<pre>piece [2] 11/23</pre>
64/20 objectives [1]	54/25 opposition [1] 20/5	19/21 36/13 49/4 49/9	29/4 pile [1] 65/12
	opposition [1] 20/3	.5,5	U

	28/16 45/1 45/7	46/20 47/6 47/8	67/7
P	50/23 52/15 52/17	50/8 50/9 58/2 63/3	
Pinkerton [1] 36/10	52/24 53/4 53/4	priority [1] 39/3	26/7
place [1] 38/1	53/7 53/9 59/19	prison [1] 39/9	public [3] 4/18
nlaced [1] 62/14		privilege [6] 56/14	
placed [1] 62/14 Plaintiff [1] 1/4	59/20 59/20 60/8 political [2] 60/10	privilege [6] 56/14 56/18 56/25 57/1	
			purchase [1] 54/18
plan [14] 8/10 8/12	62/19		purchased [4] 32/10
12/3 12/11 12/11	politicians [1]	probably_[1] _6/22	32/12 32/23 54/20
12/12 20/25 35/11	45/20	problem [1] 7/5	purple [1] 37/5
37/1 51/3 51/6		problems [2] 30/15	purpose [1] 31/22
53/23 67/4 67/5	portion [2] 58/23	30/21	purposes [2] 5/6
planned [2] 34/25	58/23	<pre>proceed [2] 3/2 7/3</pre>	47/4
35/2	pose [1] 10/22	proceeding [1]	push [3] 29/23
planning [7] 15/14	posed [1] 20/11 poses [1] 10/14	28/23	29/23 45/1
21/25 24/5 44/2	poses [1] 10/14	proceedings [4]	pushed [1] 44/18
44/2 46/21 58/25	position [5] 11/11		put [14] 17/5 22/8
play [3] 19/25	18/20 50/3 61/22	69/5	23/5 33/11 33/22
29/19 55/21	67/21	Process [1] 19/10	37/14 47/20 54/5
Plaza [1] 1/19		produced [10] 5/2	55/13 55/20 55/22
plea [17] 7/25 8/3	possession [4] 9/21	7/8 7/16 15/9 15/18	56/2 56/8 59/3
8/4 8/9 8/19 8/21	48/10 48/10 62/24	16/10 16/13 22/13	puts [1] 50/3
9/17 11/6 49/12	possibly [1] 13/25	32/15 48/1	putting [3] 23/5
49/13 49/13 49/16	nost [5] 17/5 57/20	production [2] 7/10	39/22 55/6
49/17 49/22 60/21	59/16 59/18 59/25	7/11	pyramid [3] 12/2
60/25 61/1		proffer [5] 32/11	43/1 53/19
plead [4] 8/6 9/8		33/13 42/11 56/6	
	17/11		Q
9/10 10/25	posting [1] 15/16	57/17	_ *
pleading [1] 9/20			qualities [2] 55/20
pleads [1] 10/17	practicalities [1]	44/9 44/10	55/22
pleas [3] 12/3 23/5	48/11	<pre>proffering [1] 56/9</pre>	quantum [1] 49/15
49/16	practice [2] 4/19		quickly [2] 6/17
Please [2] 7/3 40/9	4/25	programmable [1]	37/10
pled [9] 9/11 9/20	pre [1] 18/8	32/6	quite [5] 36/9
9/24 10/24 22/24	pre-January [1]	proof [1] 49/15	55/24 55/24 55/25
23/3 23/15 24/7	18/8	property [2] 36/7	67/15
50/9	precedent [1] 9/1	62/10	quote [4] 20/3 20/4
plotting [1] 7/22		prosecuted [1]	32/14 53/5
plow [1] 66/17	preference [1] 3/1	26/23	quoted [4] 14/16
plus [2] 16/25	pregnant [2] 54/12	prosecution [1]	30/8 35/12 61/16
32/14	54/14	14/12	quoting [1] 14/22
podium [2] 2/24	preliminary [1]	prosecutors [1]	
38/22			R
point [40] 9/17	2/20	30/18	rack [1] 24/18
		protect [2] 14/24	radio [1] 33/2
10/6 13/4 13/15	prepared [2] 25/15	26/25	madias [4] 33/2
13/16 14/3 17/16		protected [3] 26/20	
17/19 18/1 18/7	presence [1] 33/25	62/18 62/21	32/17 54/17 54/18
18/19 20/22 21/14			raided [3] 44/16
21/18 21/22 22/3	2/5 2/6 2/9 2/11	protecting [1]	44/22 44/23
22/7 22/18 23/5	2/12 15/2 52/4	27/16	raise [3] 28/19
24/1 24/4 24/9	57/16 65/7	protects [2] 27/1	39/3 39/5
28/24 29/1 29/22	presents [3] 19/11	27/2	raised [3] 54/8
30/24 30/24 33/9	34/21 62/5	protest [1]40/25	56/15 56/17
34/1 37/20 38/11		protesters [1]	rallies [2] 14/21
44/20 49/2 56/16	44/3	26/22	15/1
59/23 64/10 64/11		proud [26] 12/25	rally [5] 32/18
65/24 66/1 66/13	13/8 13/17 15/15	13/2 14/21 15/1	35/19 60/10 62/19
pointed [4] 8/25	36/25 37/2 43/7	15/16 16/11 16/20	65/16
28/3 30/5 49/25	43/9 60/20	20/12 22/12 25/6	rare [2] 8/6 8/16
pointing [3] 11/10	presuppose [1] 6/2	43/5 43/25 44/4	rare v [1] 17/10
11/14 18/16	pretrial [1] 33/7	44/18 45/6 47/1	rather [5] 4/18 6/7
points [4] 6/1	prevent [2] 36/21	48/25 52/24 59/17	6/13 22/19 29/25
19/21 28/14 29/7	37/9	60/1 60/15 60/20	re [1] 30/23
poker [1] 29/20	previous [1] 27/22	60/23 62/22 63/3	re-incarcerated [1]
police [34] 15/5	previous [1] 27/22 previously [2] 5/14		30/23
15/7 15/20 15/22			read [1] 35/17
	54/8 primary [2] 34/22	prove [1] 62/7	reading [3] 19/2
16/19 16/24 17/4	primary [2] 34/22	proved [2] 62/4	
17/6 17/18 17/22	65/4	62/7	35/7 43/22
17/23 18/8 19/4	prior [14] 4/8	provide [3] 11/13	realize [1] 4/1 realizing [1] 45/20
19/5 23/17 27/24	14/14 17/21 31/24	38/15 58/3	
28/1 28/3 28/6	32/18 43/11 44/17	provision [2] 67/4	really [10] 13/21

R	relevant [14] 18/9 23/8 25/19 26/11	riots [1] 16/22 road [2] 1/21 27/11	self [1] 42/25 self-defense [1]
really [9] 18/11 29/17 35/9 36/11	28/11 28/11 28/12 28/24 29/2 52/6	robbed [1] 20/10	42/25 send [2] 66/23
	56/11 56/19 56/22	55/21 55/22	66/24
reason [4] 17/20	58/23 relied [2] 48/19	rowdy [1] 21/12 rule [3] 66/19	sends [1] 12/9 sense [3] 11/19
18/13 45/19 52/15 reasonably [2] 48/1	50/14 reluctance [1]	66/20 67/6 ruling [3] 66/7	33/5 48/2 sent [3] 34/13 45/9
48/9 reasons [6] 28/15	40/13 rely [2] 32/5 62/17	66/15 67/5	45/13 sentenced [2] 10/18
28/22 41/15 51/15	relying [1] 48/21	run [1] ²⁷ /1	10/18
	remained [1] 9/11 remember [3] 19/2	running [3] 37/4 37/4_52/24	sentencing [1]
receipts [4] 32/9 32/11 32/11 32/21	24/15 25/23 remorse [1] 34/12	rush [1] 53/8 S	sentiments [1] 18/13
receive [1] 6/12 received [1] 51/7	remove [1] 2/24 reopen [3] 42/6	Salerno [1] 21/17	separate [2] 22/1 48/5
receiving [2] 16/4	44/10 47/12	salient [2] 18/4	serious [3] 9/7
recent_[1] 46/22	reopening [1] 5/15 repairs [1] 15/25	same [8] 12/24	9/15 42/10 seriousness [2]
40/1	repeat [1] 35/12 Reporter [3] 1/23	12/24 13/16 28/17 48/20 50/17 53/6	40/12 41/21 served [2] 14/13
recipient [1] 37/5	1/23 69/3 reports [2] 4/23	60/13 Saturday [1] 6/19	31/25 Service [7] 14/16
record [5] 4/6 4/9 11/2 12/5 69/5	14/8 represent [1] 59/25	saw [2] 60/22 60/22	14/19 14/20 14/23
refer [2] 8/3 26/18	representation [1]	13/11 18/8 18/10	14/24 62/23 63/1 Service's [1] 62/22
reference [2] 44/3 52/22	47/9 representations [1]	18/18 18/20 18/22 23/19 24/5 25/4	seven [2] 6/21 15/23
referred [1] 44/5 referring [1] 53/6	33/24 representing [1]	28/12 29/2 29/2 29/8 35/12 37/1	several [2] 12/25 20/15
refers [1] 14/20	23/22 represents [1] 7/17	37/12 40/12 51/8	shall [4] 10/18 10/18 10/19 16/6
$62/23 \ 63/\bar{1}$	request [2] 14/18	64/5 64/22 65/1	shared [1] 61/18
refocused [1] 21/19 refocusing [1]	15/19 require [1] 19/16	65/3 scaffolding [2]	shield [8] 20/10 23/19 23/20 23/21
21/20 refreshments [2]	reread [1] 49/5 reserving [1] 58/10	44/19 45/7 scant [1] 62/11	25/1 36/15 44/20 63/9
16/24 17/1 refused [1] 42/6	respect [5] 4/8 19/14 32/4 46/23	scared_[1] 45/20	short [1] 37/15 shots [2] 50/16
refutes [1] 63/16	61/11	score [2] 7/5 8/1	50/17
regard [3] 10/7	respond [6] 58/8 58/23 59/4 59/13	58/3 59/3	shoulda [3] 45/11 45/17 45/23
46/2 48/16 regarding [2] 10/9	61/9 68/6 responsibility [2]	sealed [3] 3/16 3/18 4/3	show [3] 31/11 42/17 64/3
51/22 regardless [1] 57/3	10/12 50/6 rest [1] 40/16	searched [2] 9/23 10/2	showed [1] 45/23 showing [1] 63/16
regards [1] 44/3 REHL [101]	restricted [1]	seat [1] 39/23 second [2] 8/3	shown [3] 34/12 36/17 64/8
Rehl's [10] 3/4 3/6	44/21 retired [3] 15/19	15/11	shows [8] 16/18
25/16 36/17 42/8 42/12 43/11 48/18	15/21 28/3 return [1] _39/22	secondly [2] 8/23 19/1	32/2 42/21 51/14 51/14 55/9 62/8
48/20 61/6 related [1] 54/13	reviewed [1] 63/10 rhetoric [3] 52/19	secret [9] 13/20 14/16 14/18 14/20	63/25 shut [1] 41/25
relating [1] 58/2 relationship [1]	54/22 54/24 rhetorical [1]	14/23 14/24 62/22 62/23 63/1	shy [1] 39/25 sick [1] 35/19
39/2	26/18	sections [1] 3/23	side [5] 2/21 53/5
release [11] 25/20	Rhodes [1] 9/14 right [26] 3/10	secure [1] 13/25 seditious [8] 9/6	59/4 59/5 68/5 similar [1] 9/3
30/4 31/6 31/9 40/14 57/8 57/9	4/25 5/4 23/5 28/21 30/2 32/7 35/5	27/9 36/2 51/13	similarly [2] 46/24 52/1
65/22 66/12 66/15 66/25	38/14 39/20 40/6 40/10 41/24 45/24	61/3 seeks [1] 62/17	simply [4] 15/22 21/15 38/15 38/17
released [8] 9/7 9/19 30/9 30/13	50/4 53/17 57/12	seem [1] 66/3	single [2] 10/3
30/14 30/20 39/13	57/13 57/20 58/22 60/6 60/11 65/18	seems $[\bar{4}]$ 6/5 18/2	51/6 sit [2] 28/18 41/25
	67/9 67/15 68/13 riot [2] 20/10 45/4		sits [1] 41/5 sitting [3] 39/9
37/21	rioters [1] 44/17	selective [1] 9/6	50/4 66/10

	175 TOR Document 05		
S	40/11 44/1 56/12 67/9	submit [14]	8/12 12/7 12/17 22/10 46/24 46/24
situated [9] 20/1	started [3] 20/23	21/6 32/22 35/6	47/1 52/3
20/4 24/3 24/11	45/9 53/2	58/1 58/2 58/6	tearing [1] 20/8
24/12 29/5 35/4 37/24 52/2		58/25 59/2 67/24	technical [1] 66/6
	43/18 statement [9] 9/12	67/25 submits [1] 59/5	technically [2] 66/11 66/25
47/16 54/3	14/24 25/9 40/11	submitted [2] 21/3	Telegram [5] 12/10
six [2] 20/16 63/25	53/12 53/14 53/15	21/5	22/13 24/4 46/4
Sixth [1] 26/25	60/12 61/5	substantive [2]	46/9
small [1] 20/25 smoking [1] 46/25	statements [5] 34/10 44/9 44/11	47/20 48/15 substantively [1]	telephone [4] 2/6 2/10 2/11 2/12
snide [1] 8/1	52/21 55/7	49/22	telling [5] 19/22
society [1] 34/21	STATES [9] 1/1 1/3	success [1] 46/20	19/25 29/16 31/1
somebody [3] 7/11 32/17 32/18	1/10 2/3 27/11 27/20 37/2 42/5	succinct [1] 38/11 sucked [1] 45/16	33/24 temperate [1] 21/8
somebody's [1]	50/3	suffered [1] 40/19	tempered_[1] 35/23
23/19	status [1] 5/9	suggest [1] 43/21	terms [4] 25/12
somehow [1] 62/14	statute [3] 10/16	suggesting [1]	43/18 49/14 52/1
someone [8] 3/1 10/14 10/14 10/17	$29/12 \ 36/5$	44/25	terrible [2] 40/17
13/12 47/11 51/8	statutes [1] 27/9 stay [2] 40/21 66/9	summarv [1] 57/17	40/19 terrifies [1] 41/14
52/5	stay the [1] 66/9	support [8] 17/22	testify [1] 26/2
sometimes [3] 29/21	 stealing [1] 24/25	26/13 31/8 31/12	testimony [1] 38/15
30/21 67/12 somewhat [1] 46/18	step [1] 51/6 stendad [1] 39/12	31/21 40/22 52/14 65/21	texted [4] 44/15 44/24 45/10 60/13
somewhere [1] 13/23	stepdad [1] 39/12 stepped [2] 39/4		texting [1] 58/19
son [3] 15/4 27/24	39/4	supporters [1]	texts [4] 12/10
54/1	steps [1] 53/13 still [6] 3/14	15/22	53/1 56/10 59/8
soon [1] 54/23 sooner [1] 68/5	still [6] 3/14 12/12 23/4 37/12	supportive [2] 18/7 24/25	theory [2] 22/8 50/18
sorry [4] 15/13	55/10 66/3		thereafter [1]
17/10 22/17 44/22	stock [1] 56/2	52/17	37/10
sort [4] 6/14 36/8 37/11 51/8	stockpiled [1] 9/13 stole [2] 23/20		therefore [1] 51/3
sorts [2] 17/17	23/21	suppression [1]	thinking [2] 21/21 30/1
17/20	stolen [3] 23/19	47/12	Thorne [1] 47/11
speak [5] 2/24 3/8	36/15 37/6		though [2] 29/24
39/25 41/21 43/9 speaking [1] 43/7	stood [1] 36/18 stop [3] 37/12	sure [12]	52/17 thought [3] 18/16
speaks [1] 33/25	54/13 54/15	39/22 48/5 49/6	21/5 38/10
special [1] 41/1	stopped [1] 16/22	50/1 54/24 58/20	thousands [1] 60/10
specific [1] 5/9	stopping [1] 42/20 storm [3] 23/10	61/2	threat [5] 10/14 19/11 34/21 40/16
speech [1] 29/17 spend [3] 5/25	24/5 47/2	sure if [1] 4/1 surged [1] 45/8	62/5
33/21 62/6	storming [2] 50/24	surprised [2] 25/4	three [3] 12/4 13/1
spent [2] 27/15	53/22	46/18	34/9
27/16 spoke [3] 49/1 49/3	straight [2] 43/13 54/7	surrounding [1] 47/6	threw [5] 19/4 20/12 23/17 51/23
53/11	Street [3] 1/14	suspended [1] 4/19	63/8
spray [1] 15/24	53/8 53/17	sympathy [1] 39/21	throughout [1]
spraying [2] 45/3 45/3	stress [2] 39/21 50/1	T	43/11 throw [2]
squad [1] 20/21		table [1] 58/6	62/10
stabbed [2] 21/11	$[strong [4] \overline{3}/1 42/8]$	tactical [2] 32/23	thus [1] 53/20
21/12 stable [2] 26/16	43/20 47/3	54/18 +31k [5] 40/4 51/16	ties [1] 54/10
stable [2] 26/16 38/7	stronger [2] 42/9 55/12	talk [5] 40/4 51/16 58/3 59/10 67/24	timeliness [1] 4/10 times [3] 28/22
stairs [3] 44/18	strongest [5] 18/3	talked [1] 50/24	30/22 35/22
45/6 45/8	19/21 19/25 37/23	talking [9] 9/25	timing [2] 48/11
stakes [1] 29/20 stand [3] 25/16	38/1 strongly [2] 27/4	14/9 25/3 30/11 32/16 35/14 35/18	54/17 TIMOTHY [1] 1/9
27/8 38/13	27/4	49/23 56/9	tip [1] 43/1
 standard [3] 5/15	structure [2] 42/25	talks [1] 53/2	today [16] 5/7 30/4
21/17 21/17	43/2	tantamount [1]	33/19 34/5 37/2
stands [2] 49/24 63/7	stuff [1] 56/16 subject [2] 57/5	47/14 targeting [1] 43/15	41/7 41/21 45/18 55/6 57/5 57/13
standstill [2]	57/6	tarred [3] 17/6	58/8 58/15 66/12
44/24 45/4	submission [2]	17/12 44/6	66/21 68/14
start [6] 9/4 24/18	13/16 68/6	Tarrio [9] 8/11	together [3] 3/14
	L		

- Cogether Suscited Ci Oo	210 1011 200amoni 00	- 1 a - 22, 23, 25	3 32 31 30
Т	46/8	49/3 49/4 49/7 49/9	
together[2]	lunder [12] 6/11 6/13 16/10 36/3		65/25 67/18 White [1] 30/10
2½/22 38/24	36/5 45/7 48/23	videos [1] 46/9	who's [2] 23/20
togethers [1] 41/8	58/3 58/21 59/3	videotaping [1]	37/4
told [6] 13/24 14/11 26/3 29/21	59/5 68/14 undermines [1]	13/6 view [4] 21/4 36/10	whole [5] 19/5 30/12 61/5 66/1
51/4 63/6	46/20	53/5 60/9	66/3
tolerated [1] 28/24	understood [2] 6/16	views [1] 53/3	whomever [2] 8/9
tomorrow [1] 6/20	60/11	violence [7] 14/15	31/20
took [8] 17/20 19/3 23/16 24/24 34/17		15/3 27/18 40/22 40/23 43/21 62/9	whose [2] 15/20 20/16
	1/10 2/3 27/11	violent [4] 24/24	wife [14] 3/4 31/4
45/23 52/5 54/16 top [4] 12/2 12/4	27/20 37/2 42/4	25/2 38/8 40/22	31/13 37/14 38/12
TJ/ 1 JU/ LU	J J U / J	Virginia [4] 4/21	38/24 40/21 41/6
tore [2] 24/17 24/17	unlawful [3] 42/19 51/12 53/23	4/23 13/2 60/21 visits [1] 26/4	54/12 55/14 56/7 56/9 56/11 58/19
totally [1] 21/25	unlawfully [1] 20/6	voice [2] 17/9	wife's [1] 41/11
totally [1] 21/25 touch [1] 27/22	unless [2] 7/11	41/22	wild [1] 26/22
towards [2] 50/23 60/9		volume [4] 7/6	willingly [1] 51/1
town [1] 12/8	unquestionable [1] 47/19	47/24 48/2 48/11 vote [2] 42/20	window [2] 25/6 44/20
traffic [1] 3/5	unquote [1] 53/5		windows [1] 15/23
trampled [2] 52/25	unredacted [1] 3/15	W	Wisconsin [1] 44/13
53/10 transcript [6] 1/9	junsea leu [1] 3/21		wise [1] 56/18 wish [1] 40/18
21/5 43/24 46/15	11/21 11/23 33/22	waive [1] 57/10	withdraw [1] 66/16
61/16 69/4	34/23 41/14 41/15	waived [1] 56/17	within [5] 13/25
transcripts [1] 54/10	41/25 44/18 45/8 45/23 46/3 47/5	waiving [1] 57/7 walk [1] 58/22	17/13 42/24 43/2 44/21
treating [1] 9/25	49/6 49/11 50/23	walked [2] 50/8	without [5] 5/5 5/8
trial [4] 30/23	52/21 53/13 53/22	63/8	35/16 35/19 39/5
42/1 64/19 6//1/	54/19 57/19 57/22		witness [3] 33/11
tribe [1] 27/10 tries [1] 65/25		wall [1] 15/24 wants [12] 3/8 5/3	33/22 56/9 word [6] 12/21 14/3
troubling [1] 37/20	24/14 31/10	5/21 26/3 31/15	15/14 44/22 44/22
true [4] 7/8 46/9	luphold [1] 19/17	31/23 34/15 38/20	45/17
47/2 69/4 Trump [5] 15/22	upon [1] 48/19 urban [1] 33/1		words [7] 40/3 40/5 41/10 44/14 45/2
45/10 45/17 45/21	USA [1] 53/1		46/1 63/13
62/24	USAO [2] 1/13 1/18	Washington [7] 1/5	worked [2] 19/5
try [1] 8/1	USAO-DC [1] 1/13	1/14 1/17 1/25 43/6	30/10
trying [7] 11/13 17/16 20/22 43/19		51/4 60/9 waste [3] 32/22	working [4] 5/11 6/21 15/12 16/25
	used [3] 27/10 37/1	45/18 45/19	world [1] 41/5
Tuesday [2] 6/24	63/13	watch [1] 39/17	worry [1] 43/11
59/1 turn [2] 40/20 60/5		watched [1] 39/2 water [2] 20/12	worse [1] 61/6
turncoats [3] 44/7	V	23/16	worth [1] 41/1 wow [1] 25/4
52/22 53/7		WaWa [1] 58/22	writ [2] 46/23 53/4
turned [1] 45/12	15/20	way [12] 3/5 5/8	write [2] 67/5 67/8
turning [1] 45/21 twice [1] 19/18	variance [1] 25/25 various [2] 28/21	24/9 31/8 45/24 49/21 63/11 65/4	written [3] 4/13 33/18 66/19
two [21] 3/6 3/6	28/22	66/14 66/19 67/20	wrong [2] 13/18
3/23 4/8 7/9 12/3	verbally [1] 38/8	68/8	63/24
16/20 19/22 22/8 23/15 23/16 25/14	verse [1] 5/5 version [2] 3/15	ways [1] 65/13 wednesday [3] 68/2	wrote [5] 3/7 26/15 38/10 43/25 67/3
27/8 29/1 31/23	3/18	68/3 68/7	
41/5 41/6 42/12	versus [1] 51/17	week [4] 3/19 6/22	Υ
59/21 61/17 64/12	vest [2] 32/23	7/9 16/22 weeks [1] 15/23	year [3] 27/8 40/14
type [2] 4/11 53/6 types [2] 23/4	54/18 veteran [1]	weeks [1] 15/23 weigh [1] 54/11	55/17 years [7] 26/16
47/17	veterans [1] 26/15	welcome [2] 67/23	27/8 27/9 28/1
U	via [1] 33/13	68/4	38/25 39/4 39/6
U.S [4] 1/24 26/25	<pre>Vice [2] 13/8 13/16 video [23] 7/9 20/9</pre>	well-aeserved [1] 16/24	yesterday [8] 7/25 10/8 10/25 44/1
45/7 53/7	21/3 21/3 21/7 21/7	weren't [2] 3/9	45/13 59/17 60/2
Uber [1] 31/19	23/17 25/3 35/9	33/16	60/16
ultimate [1] 11/9		West [2] 13/2 60/20	
uncontroverted [1]	48/20 48/22 48/24	what's [6] 14/5	28/3
	<u> </u>		

Υ		
young [2] 14/13 54/2 youngest [2] 39/16 41/6		
54/2 Voungest [2] 39/16		
41/6		
Z		
Zach's [1] 38/24 ZACHARY [4] 1/6 2/3 38/24 49/20 Zachary's [1] 38/12		