

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Case No.: 21-CR-508 (BAH)
LUKE WESSLEY BENDER and	:	
LONDON BRYCE MITCHELL,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**UNITED STATES’ OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT
MITCHELL’S MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT SIX**

Because 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G) is neither overbroad nor vague on its face, the statute applies to defendant Landon Bryce Mitchell’s conduct on January 6, 2021. Count Six of the Indictment therefore states an offense, and the United States opposes Mitchell’s Motion to Dismiss Count Six, ECF No. 51.

BACKGROUND

On January 6, 2021, Mitchell and his co-defendant, Luke Wessley Bender, traveled together to the former President’s “Stop the Steal” rally and joined the group of individuals who marched to the Capitol, made their way to the restricted Capitol grounds, and climbed scaffolding onto the upper west terrace area. From there, Mitchell and Bender unlawfully entered the Capitol building, went into the Rotunda, made their way down several hallways, and eventually walked into the Senate chamber and onto the Senate floor. They remained on the Senate floor together for approximately five minutes until a group of Capitol Police officers arrived and directed them to leave. While on the Senate floor, Mitchell and Bender leafed through and examined documents on the Senators’ desks, went onto the Senate dais, and posed for pictures. Their conduct was captured on Capitol surveillance video, their own cell phones, and video from others present at the Capitol on January 6, 2021.

Mitchell was charged by Indictment on December 8, 2021. Count Six of the Indictment, challenged here by a motion to dismiss, charges that he “willfully and knowingly paraded, demonstrated, and picketed in any United States Capitol Building,” in violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G). ECF No. 18 at 3.

LEGAL STANDARD

Rule 12 permits a party to raise in a pretrial motion “any defense, objection, or request that the court can determine *without a trial on the merits.*” Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b)(1) (emphasis added). A defendant may move before trial to dismiss an indictment, or a count thereof, for “failure to state an offense.” *See* Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b)(3)(B)(v).

When assessing the sufficiency of criminal charges before trial, an indictment “must be viewed as a whole and the allegations [therein] must be accepted as true.” *United States v. Bowdoin*, 770 F. Supp. 2d 142, 145 (D.D.C. 2011)). The “key question” is whether “the allegations ... , if proven, are sufficient to permit a petit jury to conclude that the defendant committed the criminal offense as charged.” *Id.* “[T]he validity of an indictment ‘is not a question of whether it could have been more definite and certain.’” *United States v. Verrusio*, 762 F.3d 1, 13 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (quoting *United States v. Debrow*, 346 U.S. 374, 378 (1953)). And an indictment need not inform a defendant “as to every means by which the prosecution hopes to prove that the crime was committed.” *United States v. Haldeman*, 559 F.2d 31, 124 (D.C. Cir. 1976).

Indeed, “[i]f contested facts surrounding the commission of the offense would be of *any* assistance in determining the validity of the motion, Rule 12 doesn’t authorize its disposition before trial.” *United States v. Pope*, 613 F.3d 1255, 1259 (10th Cir. 2010) (Gorsuch, J.). Criminal cases have no mechanism equivalent to the civil rule for summary judgment. *United States v. Bailey*, 444 U.S. 394, 413, n.9 (1980) (motions for summary judgment are creatures of civil, not

criminal trials); *Yakou*, 428 F.2d at 246-47 (“There is no federal criminal procedural mechanism that resembles a motion for summary judgment in the civil context”); *United States v. Oseguera Gonzalez*, No. 20-cr-40 (BAH), 2020 WL 6342940, at *5 (D.D.C. Oct. 29, 2020) (collecting cases explaining that there is no summary judgment procedure in criminal cases or one that permits pretrial determination of the sufficiency of the evidence). Dismissal of a charge does not depend on forecasts of what the government can prove.

When ruling on a motion to dismiss for failure to state an offense, a district court is limited to reviewing the face of the indictment and more specifically, the language used to charge the crimes. *United States v. Bingert*, No. 21-cr-91 (RCL), 2022 WL 1659163, at *11 (D.D.C. May 25, 2022) *3 (a motion to dismiss challenges the adequacy of an indictment on its face and the relevant inquiry is whether its allegations permit a jury to find that the crimes charged were committed); *United States v. McHugh*, No. 21-cr-453 (JDB), 2022 WL 1302880, at *2 (D.D.C. May 2, 2022) (a motion to dismiss involves the Court’s determination of the legal sufficiency of the indictment, not the sufficiency of the evidence); *United States v. Puma*, No. 21-cr-454 (PLF), 2020 WL 823079, at *4 (D.D.C. Mar. 19, 2022) (quoting *United States v. Sumia*, 643 F. Supp. 2d 51, 60 (D.D.C. 2009)); *United States v. DeCarlo*, No. 21-cr-73 (BAH), ECF No. 66 at 31.

BACKGROUND REGARDING SECTION 5104

Congress passed the predecessor statute to Section 5104, which prohibits certain “unlawful activities” in Capitol Buildings, or on Capitol Grounds, or both, in 1946. *See* Act of July 31, 1946, 60 Stat. 719, 720 (then codified at 40 U.S.C. § 193); *see Bynum v. U.S. Capitol Police Bd.*, 93 F. Supp. 2d 50, 53 (D.D.C. 2000). One provision in the 1946 legislation made it a crime to “parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages” or to display “any flag, banner or device designed

or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement” on Capitol Grounds. *See* 40 U.S.C. § 193g (1964).¹

In 1967, Congress enacted the provision at issue here, which makes it a crime “willfully and knowingly [to] parade, demonstrate, or picket in any of the Capitol Buildings.” 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G) (originally enacted as 40 U.S.C. § 193f(b)(7)). The 1967 legislation thus “ma[de] clear that the 1946 act relates not only to the Capitol Grounds but also to acts committed within the Capitol Building itself as well as other buildings located on the Capitol Grounds.” 113 Con. Rec. H29,390 (daily ed. Oct. 19, 1967) (statement of Rep. Anderson). In 1972, a three-judge panel of this Court struck down the prohibition in Section 193g (parading on Capitol Grounds), reasoning that although the government had a substantial interest in protecting the Capitol Grounds, that interest was not sufficient to “override the fundamental right to petition ‘in its classic form’ and to justify a blanket prohibition of all assemblies, no matter how peaceful and orderly, anywhere on Capitol Grounds.” *Jeanette Rankin Brigade v. Chief of Capitol Police*, 342 F. Supp. 575, 585 (D.D.C. 1972). In reaching that conclusion, the three-judge panel identified “existing laws regulating conduct” in the Capitol that its decision did not affect, including the prohibition at issue here. *See id.* at 587-88.

ARGUMENT

Mitchell’s motion to dismiss the Section 5104(e)(2)(G) count is without merit and should be denied. Mitchell advances three arguments: (1) Section 5104(e)(2)(G) is “substantially overbroad,” ECF No. 51 at 3-7; (2) Section 5104(e)(2)(G) is “unconstitutionally vague on its face,” *id.* at 7-11; and (3) Count Six, which charges a violation of Section 5104(e)(2)(G), fails to state an

¹ The prohibition contained certain exceptions not relevant here. *See* 40 U.S.C. §§ 193j & 193k (1964).

offense, *id.* at 11-12. The same meritless arguments recently were rejected by Judges John D. Bates and Dabney L. Friedrich when they were raised by other January 6 defendants. *See United States v. Nassif*, No. 21-cr-421 (JDB), 2022 WL 4130841, at *2-*8 (D.D.C. Sept. 12, 2022); *United States v. Seitz*, 21-cr-279 (DLF), ECF No. 51 at 11-19 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2022).

I. Section 5104(e)(2)(G) is not unconstitutional as overbroad.

The statute is not overbroad. *See Seitz*, 21-cr-279 (DLF), ECF No. 51 at 12-14. In the First Amendment context, as in others, “[f]acial challenges are disfavored.” *Washington State Grange v. Washington State Republican Party*, 552 U.S. 442, 450 (2008). Facial overbreadth challenges—in which a defendant asserts that a statute, constitutionally applied to her, is nevertheless invalid because it would be unconstitutional in a “substantial number” of *other* cases, *id.* at 449 n.6 (internal quotation marks omitted)—are even more exceptional. “‘Because of the wide-reaching effects of striking down a statute on its face at the request of one whose own conduct may be punished despite the First Amendment,’” overbreadth is “‘strong medicine’ to be employed ‘only as a last resort.’” *Los Angeles Police Dep’t v. United Reporting Publ’g Corp.*, 528 U.S. 32, 39 (1999) (quoting *New York v. Ferber*, 458 U.S. 747, 769 (1982)); *cf. Virginia v. Hicks*, 539 U.S. 113, 119 (2003) (noting the “substantial social costs created by the overbreadth doctrine when it blocks application of a law to . . . constitutionally unprotected conduct”) (emphasis omitted).

The Supreme Court has therefore “vigorously enforced the requirement that a statute’s overbreadth be *substantial* . . . relative to the statute’s plainly legitimate sweep.” *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 292. “[T]he mere fact that one can conceive of some impermissible applications of a statute is not sufficient to render it susceptible to an overbreadth challenge.” *Members of the City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent*, 466 U.S. 789, 800 (1984). Rather, “there must be a realistic danger that the statute itself will significantly compromise recognized First Amendment protections of parties

not before the Court.” *Id.* at 801. And laws that are “not specifically addressed to speech” are far less likely to present such a danger. *Hicks*, 539 U.S. at 124; *see id.* (observing that “an overbreadth challenge” to such a law will “[r]arely, if ever, . . . succeed”).

Mitchell’s challenge fails that demanding standard. Because “it is impossible to determine whether a statute reaches too far without first knowing what the statute covers,” the “first step in overbreadth analysis is to construe the challenged statute.” *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 293. The prohibition in Section 5104(e)(2)(G) presents “no ambiguity”; it “tells the citizen that it is unlawful for him” to parade, demonstrate, or picket inside the Capitol Building. *Jeanette Rankin Brigade*, 342 F. Supp. at 583. The operative verbs—parade, demonstrate, and picket—principally target conduct rather than speech, and those verbs are paired with the “willfully and knowingly” scienter requirements, *see Williams*, 553 U.S. at 294 (focusing on scienter requirement in determining that statute was not overbroad). And the subsequent six words, “in any of the Capitol Buildings,” makes clear that the statute prohibits conduct within a nonpublic forum, which cabins the overbreadth of which Mitchell complains. *Nassif*, 2022 WL 4130841, at *4. At the very least, Mitchell cannot show that Section 1512(c)(2) is “substantial[ly]” overbroad relative to its “plainly legitimate sweep.” *Washington State Grange*, 552 U.S. at 449 n.6 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Mitchell’s own prosecution—which involves physically trespassing into the restricted Capitol and, specifically, the Senate Chamber—is illustrative of the numerous constitutionally legitimate applications of the statute to conduct and unprotected speech. And far from showing a “realistic danger” of constitutionally problematic applications in other cases, *Taxpayers for Vincent*, 466 U.S. at 801, Mitchell fails to identify a single actual example of a prosecution based on protected speech. The limitations inherent in the crime of conviction, moreover, render the

possibility of any such prosecutions marginal at best, and any such case could be the subject of an as-applied challenge. Nothing at all calls for the “strong medicine,” *Los Angeles Police Dep’t*, 528 U.S. at 39 (internal quotation marks omitted), of overbreadth invalidation.

Mitchell’s citations to case law show the weaknesses of his overbreadth claim. First, he relies on *Bynum v. U.S. Capitol Police Bd.*, where Judge Friedman ruled that a Capitol Police regulation interpreting Section 5104(e)(2)(G)² that defined “demonstration activity” to include “holding vigils” and “sit-ins” swept too broadly because it “invited the Capitol Police to restrict behavior that is no way disruptive.” 93 F. Supp. 2d at 53, 57. As an initial matter, *Bynum*’s invalidation of a Capitol Police regulation—which was applied to an individual who was denied permission to pray inside the Capitol building—does not inform the statutory challenge that Mitchell presses here.³ Moreover, Judge Friedman in *Bynum* (and Judge Bates in *Nassif*) concluded that the inside of the Capitol building is a nonpublic forum, where the government may restrict First Amendment activity if “the restrictions are ‘viewpoint neutral’ and ‘reasonable in light of the purpose served by the forum.’” *Id.* at 56 (citing *Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund*, 473 U.S. 788, 806 (1985)); *see also Nassif*, 2022 WL 4130841, at *4. He reasoned that, although the regulation went too far, Section 5104(e)(2)(G) itself set forth “legitimate purposes,” *Bynum*, 93 F. Supp. 2d at 57, that were “aimed at controlling only such conduct that would disrupt the orderly business of Congress—not activities such as quiet praying, accompanied by bowed heads and folded hands,” *id.* at 58.⁴ In short, Judge Friedman concluded

² At the time, the provision was Section 193(f)(b)(7).

³ Similarly inapposite here is Mitchell’s invocation of a current Capitol Police regulation. Mitchell does not—and could not—challenge that regulation in this case.

⁴ Mitchell argues that the legislative debate over what became Section 5104(e)(2)(G) undercuts Judge Friedman’s interpretation that the statute was designed to prevent conduct that disrupted congressional business. *See* ECF No. 51 at 6. Even putting aside the irrelevance of legislative history when interpreting unambiguous statutes, Mitchell confuses congressional debate about

that, unlike the regulation at issue in *Bynum*, the statute itself was not “substantial[ly]” overbroad relative to its “plainly legitimate sweep.” *Washington State Grange*, 552 U.S. at 449 n.6 (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also Nassif*, 2022 WL 4130841, at *4.

Mitchell’s reliance on *Lederman v. United States*, 89 F. Supp. 2d 29 (D.D.C. 2000), is likewise unavailing. Like *Bynum*, *Lederman* involved a challenge to a Capitol Police regulation, and is of marginal, if any, relevance for that reason. Furthermore, the regulation at issue there limited the areas within the Capitol *Grounds* in which individuals could engage in “demonstration activity,” which in *Lederman* involved the distribution of leaflets in support of the arts. *Id.* at 32. Relying in part on *Jeanette Rankin Brigade, supra*, Judge Roberts in *Lederman* concluded that the entire Capitol Grounds constitute a traditional public forum, *id.* at 37, and that although the regulation left open alternative channels for expression, its imposition of a total ban burdened more speech than necessary. *Id.* at 38-39. The hypothetical “group of congressional staffers” whose conduct would violate the regulation (and who Mitchell cites, ECF No. 51 at 6-7) “stood outside the Capitol,” and thus “within a traditional public forum.” *Id.* at 41. But Section 5104(e)(2)(G)’s prohibition applies only within the nonpublic forum inside the Capitol buildings, rendering the hypothetical inapt. As Judge Friedrich held, the statute does not cover a substantial amount of protected expressive activity. *Seitz*, 21-cr-279 (DLF), ECF No. 51 at 14.

Finally, Mitchell digresses at various points—where precedent and the language of the statute do not support his argument—to statements during the House debate on the statute. But legislative history “is an uneven tool that cannot be used to contravene plain text.” *Bingert*, 2022 WL 1659163, at *11 (citing *Milner v. Dep’t of Navy*, 562 U.S. 562, 574 (2011)); *see also Nassif*,

whether to add an additional intent requirement to the existing “willfully and knowingly” scienter in the statute with the actus-reus question—what type of conduct does “demonstrate” in Section 5104(e)(2)(G) encompass—at issue in *Bynum*.

2022 WL 4130841, at *7 (defendant’s “reliance on legislative history is misplaced where the plain text of the statute leaves no need to resort to alternative methods of interpretation.”). The floor statements on which Mitchell relies are “particularly ‘unreliable.’” *United States v. Powell*, No. 21-cr-179, ECF No. 73, at 6 (D.D.C. July 8, 2022) (citing *Duplex Printing Press Co. v. Deering*, 254 U.S. 443, 474 (1921)). For example, in at least one instance, Mitchell’s citation to the legislative history is misleading. He accurately quotes Representative O’Neal’s statement that O’Neal is “a little bit disturbed” about the language of the predecessor to Section 5104(e)(2)(G), *see* ECF No. 51 at 3, but omits the later discussion in which O’Neal makes clear that the basis for his concern was that the prohibition does not also include the Capitol Grounds. *See* 113 Con. Rec. H29,390 (daily ed. Oct. 19, 1967) (statement of Rep. O’Neal) (asking if “anyone would have an objection to adding the word ‘grounds’ to the new language”).⁵

II. Section 5104(e)(2)(G) is not unconstitutionally vague.

Mitchell also is incorrect when he asserts that Section 5104(e)(2)(G) is “unconstitutionally vague on its face.” ECF No. 51 at 7-11.⁶ His flawed argument should be rejected, as it was when

⁵ Other representatives clarified that the law enacted in 1946 already included a similar prohibition that applied to the Capitol Grounds. *See* 113 Con. Rec. H29,390 (daily ed. Oct. 19, 1967) (statement of Rep. Colmer) (noting that such an addition “would be surplusage”).

⁶ As a general matter, one making such a facial vagueness challenge must demonstrate that the law is “impermissibly vague in all its applications”; one whose conduct is “clearly proscribed cannot complain of the vagueness of the law as applied to the conduct of others.” *Vill. of Hoffman Ests.*, 455 U.S. 489, 494-95 (1982). Mitchell cannot surmount that demanding standard. Where the facial challenge relies on a First Amendment theory, a facial challenge may be available where the challenger shows that the law in question “reaches a substantial amount of constitutionally protected conduct.” *See Nunez by Nunez v. City of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 935, 940 (9th Cir. 1997) (citing *Kolender v. Lawson*, 461 U.S. 352, 359 n.8 (1983)). Even assuming that is viable theory under governing law, *see Quigley v. Giblin*, 569 F.3d 449, 457-58 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (questioning the breadth of “First Amendment vagueness doctrine”), Mitchell’s facial vagueness claim fails for the same reasons that his overbreadth challenge falls short.

raised by other January 6 rioters in *Nassif*, 2022 WL 4130841, at *7, and *Seitz*, No. 21-cr-279 (DLF), ECF No. at 51 at 7-8.

The Due Process Clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments prohibit the government from depriving any person of “life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” U.S. Const. amends. V, XIV. An outgrowth of the Due Process Clause, the “void for vagueness” doctrine prevents the enforcement of a criminal statute that is “so vague that it fails to give ordinary people fair notice of the conduct it punishes” or is “so standardless that it invites arbitrary enforcement.” *Johnson v. United States*, 576 U.S. 591, 595 (2015). To ensure fair notice, “[g]enerally, a legislature need do nothing more than enact and publish the law, and afford the citizenry a reasonable opportunity to familiarize itself with its terms and to comply.” *United States v. Bronstein*, 849 F.3d 1101, 1107 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (quoting *Texaco, Inc. v. Short*, 454 U.S. 516, 532 (1982)). To avoid arbitrary enforcement, the law must not “vest[] virtually complete discretion” in the government “to determine whether the suspect has [violated] the statute.” *Kolender v. Lawson*, 461 U.S. 352, 358 (1983).

A statute is not unconstitutionally vague simply because its applicability is unclear at the margins, *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 306, or because a reasonable jurist might disagree on where to draw the line between lawful and unlawful conduct in particular circumstances, *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. 358, 403 (2010). “Even trained lawyers may find it necessary to consult legal dictionaries, treatises, and judicial opinions before they may say with any certainty what some statutes may compel or forbid.” *Bronstein*, 849 F.3d at 1107 (quoting *Rose v. Locke*, 423 U.S. 48, 50 (1975) (per curiam)). Rather, a provision is impermissibly vague only if it requires proof of an “incriminating fact” that is so indeterminate as to invite arbitrary and “wholly subjective” application. *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 306; see *Smith v. Goguen*, 415 U.S. 566, 578 (1974). The

“touchstone” of vagueness analysis “is whether the statute, either standing alone or as construed, made it reasonably clear at the relevant time that the defendant’s conduct was criminal.” *United States v. Lanier*, 520 U.S. 259, 267 (1997).

A statutory provision is therefore “not rendered unconstitutionally vague because it ‘do[es] not mean the same thing to all people, all the time, everywhere.’” *Bronstein*, 849 F.3d at 1107 (quoting *Roth v. United States*, 354 U.S. 476, 491 (1957)). A statute is instead vague where it fails to specify any “standard of conduct . . . at all.” *Coates v. Cincinnati*, 402 U.S. 611, 614 (1971). “As a general matter,” however, a law is not constitutionally vague where it “call[s] for the application of a qualitative standard . . . to real-world conduct; ‘the law is full of instances where a man’s fate depends on his estimating rightly . . . some matter of degree.’” *Johnson*, 576 U.S. at 603-04 (quoting *Nash v. United States*, 229 U.S. 373, 377 (1913)).

Mitchell fails to overcome the strong presumption that Section 5104(e)(2)(G) passes constitutional muster. *See United States v. Nat’l Dairy Products Corp.*, 372 U.S. 29, 32 (1963) (“The strong presumptive validity that attaches to an Act of Congress has led this Court to hold many times that statutes are not automatically invalidated as vague simply because difficulty is found in determining whether certain marginal offenses fall within their language.”).

Section 5104(e)(2)(G) does not tie criminal culpability to “wholly subjective” terms such as “annoying” or “indecent” that are bereft of “narrowing context” or “settled legal meanings,” *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 306, nor does it require application of a legal standard to an “idealized ordinary case of the crime,” *Johnson*, 576 U.S. at 604. That the statute makes it unlawful to “willfully and knowingly . . . parade, demonstrate, or picket in any of the Capitol Buildings,” gives rise to “no such indeterminacy.” *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 306; *see also Nassif*, 2022 WL 4130841, at *7. That is, the plain language clearly prohibits an individual from engaging in disruptive

conduct inside the Capitol building. *See Bynum*, 93 F. Supp. 2d at 57-58 (explaining that Capitol Police regulation at issue in that case was unnecessary because Congress had provided “more than sufficient guidance” in Section 5104(e)(2)(G)’s statutory text). While “it may be difficult in some cases to determine whether these clear requirements have been met,” “‘courts and juries every day pass upon knowledge, belief and intent—the state of men’s minds—having before them no more than evidence of their words and conduct, from which, in ordinary human experience, mental condition may be inferred.’” *Id.* (quoting *American Communications Ass’n, CIO v. Douds*, 339 U.S. 382, 411 (1950)).⁷

As Judge Bates explained as he rejected an identical argument that Section 5104(e)(2)(G) “does not define the offense so as to put ordinary people on notice of what is prohibited,” ECF No. 51 at 7; *Nassif*, 2022 WL 4130841, at *6,

The definition of demonstrate—“to make a public demonstration; esp. to protest against or agitate for something,” Oxford English Dictionary (3d ed. 2005), or “to make a public display of sentiment for or against a person or cause,” as by “students demonstrating for the ouster of the dictator,” Webster’s New International Dictionary (3d ed. 1993)—is not so vague as [defendant] contends. When read “in light of its neighbors,” *McHugh I*, 2022 WL 296304, at *12, “parade” and “picket,” it is clear that § 5104(e)(2)(G) prohibits taking part in an organized demonstration or parade that advocates a particular viewpoint—such as, for example, the view that the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election was in some way flawed.

Accordingly, Judge Bates held, as this Court should, that “§ 5104(e)(2)(G) is not unconstitutionally vague on its face.” *Id.* at *7.

III. Count Six states an offense.

Finally, the Court should reject Mitchell’s mistaken claim that Count Six of the Indictment fails to state an offense. “The government must prove only that [defendant] paraded,

⁷ For the reasons given above, Mitchell’s reliance on scattered comments during the floor debate in the House does not require a different outcome.

demonstrated, or picketed in a Capitol building, which is exactly what the indictment alleges. The terms are clear and do not require further elaboration.” *Seitz*, 21-cr-279 (DLF), ECF No. 51 at 19.

That is because the main purpose of an indictment is to inform the defendant of the nature of the accusation. *See United States v. Ballestas*, 795 F.3d 138, 148-149 (D.C. Cir. 2015). An indictment need only contain “a plain, concise, and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c). An indictment is sufficient under the Constitution and Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure if it “contains the elements of the offense charged and fairly informs a defendant of the charge against which he must defend,” *Hamling v. United States*, 418 U.S. 87, 117 (1974), which may be accomplished, as it is here, by “echo[ing] the operative statutory text while also specifying the time and place of the offense.” *United States v. Williamson*, 903 F.3d 124, 130 (D.C. Cir. 2018).

Count Six, which alleges that Mitchell “willfully and knowingly paraded, demonstrated, and picketed in any United States Capitol Building,” ECF No. 18 at 3, “clears th[e] low bar,” *see United States v. Sargent*, No. 21-cr-258 (TFH), 2022 WL 1124817, at *1 (D.D.C. Apr. 14, 2022), to sufficiently plead a violation of Section 5104(e)(2)(G). First, Count Six includes the essential elements of Section 5104(e)(2)(G): it alleges that Mitchell engaged in the prohibited conduct (parading, demonstrating, and picketing in any Capitol Building), and alleges that he did so with the requisite mental state (willfully and knowingly). Count Six further alleges that the offense was committed on or about a specific date (January 6, 2021), and that the offense was committed in a specific district (the District of Columbia). “That is adequate to put him on notice of the charge against him.” *Seitz*, 21-cr-279 (DLF), ECF No. 51 at 18.

Although some cases involve a crime “that must be charged with greater specificity,” *United States v. Resendiz-Ponce*, 549 U.S. 102, 109 (2007), this is not one of them. The

paradigmatic example comes from *Russell v. United States*, 369 U.S. 759 (1962), where the defendant was charged under a statute that makes it a crime for a witness called before a congressional committee to refuse to answer any question “pertinent to the question under inquiry.” 2 U.S.C. § 192. The indictment’s failure in *Russell* to identify the subject of the congressional hearing rendered it insufficient because “guilt” under that statute “depend[ed] so crucially upon such a specific identification of fact.” *Russell*, 369 U.S. at 764. That feature is not present here because guilt under Section 5104(e)(2)(G)—or under any of the other charges that the defendant here faces—does not depend on any such “specific identification of fact.” See *Resendiz-Ponce*, 549 U.S. at 110 (not applying *Russell* to the illegal re-entry statute at issue in that case because guilt did not turn upon “a specific identification of fact”); *Williamson*, 903 F.3d at 131 (not applying *Russell* to statute criminalizing threats against federal officers); see also *United States v. Apodaca*, 275 F. Supp. 3d 123, 153 n.17, 154-56 (D.D.C. 2017) (not applying *Russell* to statute criminalizing use of firearms in connection with drug trafficking crimes).

Faced with an identical challenge to nearly identical charging language, Judge Bates explained that,

[A]lthough the information is pithy, it “contains the elements of the offense charged”—that Nassif “paraded, demonstrated, or picketed” within a Capitol building—and “fairly informs” Nassif of the charge against which he must defend—that he violated the statute on January 6, 2021, in the District of Columbia. *Hamlings*, 418 U.S. at 117. No more is required, and hence the Court concludes that Count Four of the information states an offense.

Nassif, 2022 WL 4130841, at *8. Because the Indictment here satisfies Rule 7’s pleading standard, both Mitchell’s proposition that the government should have included “specifics” to allege “some form of verbal or symbolic expression of a feeling, belief, or idea,” ECF No. 51 at 12, and his invocation of the rule of lenity, *id.*, are misplaced. Simply put, Count Six provides a “plain,

concise, and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1). Nothing else is needed.

CONCLUSION

Because 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G) is neither overbroad nor vague on its face, the statute applies to Mitchell’s conduct on January 6, 2021, and Count Six of his Indictment states an offense, the Court should deny his motion to dismiss.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW M. GRAVES
United States Attorney
D.C. Bar No. 481052

By: /s/ Jordan A. Konig
JORDAN A. KONIG
Supervisory Trial Attorney, Tax Division,
U.S. Department of Justice
Detailed to the U.S. Attorney’s Office
For the District of Columbia
P.O. Box 55, Washington, D.C. 20044
202-305-7917 (v) / 202-514-5238 (f)
Jordan.A.Konig@usdoj.gov

/s/ Samantha R. Miller
SAMANTHA R. MILLER
Assistant United States Attorney
New York Bar No.: 5342175
United States Attorney’s Office
For the District of Columbia
601 D Street, NW 20001
Samantha.Miller@usdoj.gov