

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	Case No. 21-cr-282 (TSC)
	:	
GRAYSON SHERRILL,	:	
ELLIOT BISHAI,	:	
ELIAS IRIZARRY,	:	
Defendants.	:	

UNITED STATES’ MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

The United States of America hereby respectfully moves the Court for the entry of a protective order, including defendants’ acceptance of the order as contemplated in Attachment A of the proposed order, governing the production of discovery by the parties in the above-captioned case. Hereinafter, any reference to the term “Defendant” refers to each individual defendant captioned above.

A. There is good cause to issue the proposed protective order in this case

1. Defendant is charged via information with offenses related to crimes that occurred at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. None of the defendants are held in this case. In brief, on that date, as a Joint Session of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate convened to certify the vote of the Electoral College of the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election, members of a large crowd that had gathered outside forced entry into the U.S. Capitol, including by breaking windows and by assaulting members of law enforcement, as others in the crowd encouraged and assisted those acts. Scores of individuals entered the U.S. Capitol without authority to be there. As a result, the Joint Session and the entire official proceeding of the Congress was halted until the Capitol Police, the Metropolitan Police Department, and other law

enforcement agencies from the city and surrounding region were able to clear the Capitol of hundreds of unlawful occupants and ensure the safety of elected officials. This event in its entirety is hereinafter referred to as the “Capitol Attack.”

2. The investigation and prosecution of the Capitol Attack will likely be one of the largest in American history, both in terms of the number of defendants prosecuted and the nature and volume of the evidence. Over 400 individuals have been charged in connection with the Capitol Attack. The investigation continues and the government expects that additional individuals will be charged. While most of the cases have been brought against individual defendants, the government is also investigating conspiratorial activity that occurred prior to and on January 6, 2021. The spectrum of crimes charged and under investigation in connection with the Capitol Attack includes (but is not limited to) trespass, engaging in disruptive or violent conduct in the Capitol or on Capitol grounds, destruction of government property, theft of government property, assaults on federal and local police officers, firearms offenses, civil disorder, obstruction of an official proceeding, possession and use of destructive devices, and conspiracy.

3. Multiple individuals charged or under investigation are: (a) charged or expected to be charged with crimes of violence; (b) associated with anti-government militia organizations and other groups (e.g., Proud Boys, Oathkeepers, Three Percenters, Cowboys for Trump) that deny the legitimacy of the United States government; (c) coordinated and/or participated in the violent events which took place at the Capitol; and (d) have made statements indicating an intention to continue in similar violent endeavors until the current administration is overthrown. Dozens of the individuals charged, have been detained pending trial because a judicial officer determined that the release of such person will not reasonably assure the appearance of the

person, as required; will endanger the safety of any other person or the community; and/or will pose a risk of obstruction of justice.

4. In connection with the above-described cases and on-going investigations, law enforcement and the government have obtained and continue to obtain voluminous amounts of information and evidence relating to both charged and uncharged individuals which may be discoverable pursuant to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 16 and 26.2, Local Criminal Rule 5.1(a), the provisions of *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963), *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150, 153-54 (1972), and the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3500. By way of illustration, such information and evidence includes but is not limited to: (a) more than 15,000 hours of surveillance and body-worn camera footage from multiple law enforcement agencies; (b) approximately 1,600 electronic devices; (c) the results of hundreds of searches of electronic communication providers; (d) over 210,000 tips; and (e) over 80,000 reports and 93,000 attachments related to law enforcement interviews of suspects and witnesses and other investigative steps.

5. Many of the above-described materials may contain sensitive information, such as (a) personal identity information as identified in Rule 49.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, as well as telephone numbers, email addresses, driver's license numbers, and similar unique identifying information; (b) information regarding the government's confidential sources; (c) information that may jeopardize witness security; (d) contact information for, photographs of, and private conversations with individuals that do not appear to be related to the criminal conduct in this case; (e) medical or mental health information, (f) sources and methods law-enforcement officials have used, and will continue to use, to investigate other criminal conduct related to the publicly filed charges; and (g) tax returns or tax information. Additional sensitive

materials include surveillance camera footage from the U.S. Capitol Police’s extensive system of cameras on U.S. Capitol grounds, *see* Attachment A (Declaration of Thomas A. DiBiase, General Counsel for the United States Capitol Police), and repair estimates obtained from the Architect of the Capitol that constitute procurement information.

6. Under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, a court “may, for good cause, deny, restrict, or defer discovery or inspection, or grant other appropriate relief” relating to discovery by entering a protective order. Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(d)(1). “The burden of showing ‘good cause’ is on the party seeking the order[.]” *United States v. Cordova*, 806 F.3d 1085, 1090 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (citations and alterations omitted). Once a showing of good cause has been made, the court has relatively unconstrained discretion to fashion an appropriate protective order. *See United States v. O’Keefe*, No. 06-CR-0249, 2007 WL 1239204, at *2 (D.D.C. Apr. 27, 2007) (describing the court’s discretion as “vast”); *Cordova*, 806 F.3d at 1090 (“[A] ‘trial court can and should, where appropriate, place a defendant and his counsel under enforceable orders against unwarranted disclosure of the materials which they may be entitled to inspect.’” (quoting *Alderman v. United States*, 394 U.S. 165, 185 (1969))).

7. “Protective orders vary in range and type ‘from true blanket orders (everything is tentatively protected until otherwise ordered) to very narrow ones limiting access only to specific information after a specific finding of need.’” *United States v. Bulger*, 283 F.R.D. 46, 52 (D. Mass. 2012). “Courts use protective orders . . . to expedite the flow of discovery in cases involving a large amount of sensitive information.” *United States v. Johnson*, 314 F. Supp. 3d 248, 252 (D.D.C. 2018)(internal quotations and citations omitted).

8. Courts also use protective orders when necessary to protect the integrity of on-going investigations. “[W]here public disclosure of certain materials might officially reveal the

sources and methods law-enforcement officials have used, and will continue to use, to investigate other criminal conduct related to the publicly filed charges, courts have found it appropriate to enter a protective order.” *United States v. Smith*, 985 F. Supp. 2d 506, 531 (S.D.N.Y. 2013), citing *United States v. Bin Laden*, No. 98–CR–1023, 2001 WL 66393, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 25, 2001)(noting that the court adopted a protective order because dissemination of discovery materials would “jeopardize the ongoing Government investigation into the activities of alleged associates of the Defendants”).

9. In determining whether to issue a protective order, courts also take into account “the safety of witnesses and others, a particular danger of perjury or witness intimidation, and the protection of information vital to national security.” *Cordova*, 806 F.3d at 1090 (citations and alterations omitted). “Considering the type of crime charged helps assess the possible threats to the safety and privacy of the victim. Defendants accused of securities fraud or shoplifting, for instance, may not pose as great a danger to victims as those charged with crimes of violence.” *United States v. Dixon*, 355 F. Supp. 3d 1, 4 (D.D.C. 2019). “A long record of convictions for violent crimes may suggest a substantial danger to the safety of others. Similarly, a history of failures to follow court orders may justify a more restrictive protective order.” *Id.*

10. In this case, there is good cause to enter the attached proposed protective order. The entry of the order will facilitate the government’s ability to provide voluminous discoverable materials expeditiously, while adequately protecting the United States’ legitimate interests. The Order is reasonable – In the event of a dispute, the Order authorizes the government to remove or reduce a sensitivity designation after a discussion with defense counsel. Further, whenever the redaction of specified information will resolve the basis for which a sensitivity designation was applied, the Order provides that the United States will agree to redaction, and such redaction will

render the materials at issue no longer subject to the Order. In addition, the Order explicitly exempts materials that (1) are, or later become, part of the public court record, (2) were derived directly from either Defendant or that pertain solely to Defendant – e.g., Defendant’s own financial records, telephone records, digital device downloads, social media records, electronic communications, arrest records, and statements to law enforcement, or (3) that the defense obtains by means other than discovery. Finally, the Order is clear that the burden for showing the need for any sensitivity designation always remains with the United States.

B. Unique aspects of Defendants’ cases, and Capitol Attack cases generally, provide good cause to require each defendant to accept the protective order as contemplated in Attachment A of the proposed order.

11. While defense counsel for defendant Sherrill has indicated she does not object to the protective order generally, she does object to their clients’ acceptance of the protective order on the record as contemplated in “Attachment A”¹ (hereinafter “Defendant’s acceptance”) of the proposed order.

12. Defendant’s acceptance in the proposed protective order provides an important enforcement mechanism for securing the safe handling of discovery necessitated by the unique aspects of Capitol Attack cases. The defendants will have access to a large amount of discovery both specific to their own cases and regarding Capitol Attack cases generally; in order to comply

¹ Attachment A, which bears the heading of “Defendant’s Acceptance” asks defendants to sign the attachment indicating the following:

I have read this Protective Order and carefully reviewed every part of it with my attorney. I am fully satisfied with the legal services provided by my attorney in connection with this Protective Order and all matters relating to it. I fully understand this Protective Order and voluntarily agree to it. No threats have been made to me, nor am I under the influence of anything that could impede my ability to understand this Protective Order fully.

As an alternative to signing Attachment A, the government has also suggested the defendants could each engage in a colloquy with this Court on the record in which they acknowledge the same considerations in Attachment A.

with its discovery and disclosure obligations, the Government intends to make voluminous materials available in all pending cases arising out of the events of January 6, 2021, including this one. These materials will include information such as tips, witness statements, and the results of searches performed upon other individuals' devices and accounts. Additionally, Capitol Attack cases often create additional challenges, such as here, where the defendants are geographically separated from their defense counsel. Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic continues to pose even more obstacles that render in-person meetings complicated at best and healthy to avoid all together.² As a result, the proposed protective order contemplates defendants will be given this discovery in order to facilitate its review with restrictions placed on the use and handling of discovery labeled as sensitive and highly sensitive. Such wide-spread access of sensitive information creates additional risk that sensitive information will be mishandled. Defendant's acceptance offsets those risks by ensuring defendants are aware of the order and how sensitive information should be treated.

13. Defendant's acceptance ensures enforcement of the order through underscoring the importance of properly handling applicable discovery and providing accountability should defendants mishandle it. First, signing Attachment A in itself should highlight for each defendant the importance of following the limitations set forth in the protective order and seriousness of properly handling applicable discovery. Second, Defendant's acceptance ensures accountability if either of the defendants violates the order. Without such an acceptance on the

² The two recent standard orders from the District Court for the District of Columbia regarding court functions in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, Standing Order 21-14, In Re: Fourth Extension of Authorization for Use of Video Teleconferences and Teleconferencing for Certain Criminal Juvenile Delinquency Proceedings, and Standing Order 21-20, In Re: Modified Restrictions on Access to Courthouse During the Covid-19 Pandemic, both recognize the importance of limiting personal interactions, social distancing when necessary and use of masks.

record, the defendants could easily skirt responsibility from violating the order through asserting, whether sincere or feigned, that they were either unaware of the order or did not fully understand it. Defense counsel would then be a witness – and likely the only witness – to whether the order was properly explained to their client and whether their client understood how sensitive and highly sensitive information needed to be handled. Positioning defense counsel to be a witness against their client in such a manner creates an intractable problem toward accountability.

14. Moreover, given the larger context of the Capitol Attack, “considering the type of crime charged” further demonstrates the good cause for requiring the defendants to sign Attachment A in addressing “the possible threats to the safety and privacy of the victim.” *Dixon*, 355 F. Supp. 3d. at 4. Notably, the Capitol Attack not only involved members of a large crowd forcing entry into the U.S. Capitol and thereby preventing the Joint Session to break from their proceedings, but the members of the crowd brazenly photographed, recorded, posted on social media and bragged about their crimes in doing so. Indeed, Defendant Bishai can be seen on footage taken by The New Yorker and Getty images appearing to film and photograph his and co-defendants’ activities inside the U.S. Capitol. Such brazen disregard for criminal behavior and functions of the U.S. government likewise indicates a potential brazenness in disregarding orders from this Court. In order to facilitate providing discovery, the defendants will necessarily be placed in a position of trust to properly handle sensitive and highly sensitive discovery. Their obligation to follow this Court’s orders will be the only restraint guarding against mishandling such evidence, including the possibility of posting sensitive information on social media. Consequently, the nature of the charged offenses provides further good cause to require Defendant’s acceptance of the protective order on the record to further ensure its enforcement.

15. Finally, the reasonableness of the proposed protective order, including Defendant's acceptance, is also demonstrated by the fact that, with or without minor modifications, the proposed protective order has already been adopted without opposition in Capitol Attack cases by this Court (*see U.S. v. Bauer*, 21-cr-49) as well as Judges Bates (*see U.S. v. Klein*, 21-cr-236), Berman Jackson (*see U.S. v. Black*, 21-cr-127), Boasberg (*see U.S. v. Jancart*, 21-cr-148), Brown Jackson (*see U.S. v. Nichols*, 21-cr-117), Cooper (*see U.S. v. Barber*, 21-cr-228), Kelly (*see U.S. v. Strong*, 21-cr-114), Kollar-Kotelly (*see U.S. v. Caldwell*, 21-cr-181), Lamberth (*see U.S. v. Munchel*, 21-cr-118), McFadden (*see U.S. v. Fellows*, 21-cr-83), Moss (*U.S. v. Montgomery*, 21-cr-46), Nichols (*see U.S. v. Miller*, 21-cr-119), Sullivan (*see U.S. v. Bonet*, 21-cr-121), and Walton (*see U.S. v. Goodwyn*, 21-cr-153), in addition to Magistrate Judges Faruqui (*see U.S. v. Williams*, 21-mj-99), Harvey (*see U.S. v. Adams*, 21-mj-291), and Meriweather (*see U.S. v. Hernandez*, 21-mj-73). Moreover, recently decided opinions in Capitol Attack cases have determined there is good cause to issue the government's proposed protective order, including Defendant's acceptance, over defense objections to the order. *See U.S. v. Cudd*, 21-cr-68; *U.S. v. McCaughey III*, 21-cr-40.

WHEREFORE, to expedite the government's provision of discoverable materials, and to adequately protect the United States' legitimate interests, the government requests that pursuant to the Court's authority under Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(d)(1), the Court enter the attached proposed order.

Respectfully submitted,

CHANNING D. PHILLIPS
Acting United States Attorney
DC Bar No. 415793

By: /s/RAF
RACHEL A. FLETCHER
Assistant United States Attorney
TX Bar No. 24078505
Violent Crimes and Narcotics Trafficking Section
555 4th Street NW, Room 4840
Washington, D.C. 20530
Office: 202-252-7093
rachel.fletcher@usdoj.gov

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

**GRAYSON SHERRILL,
ELLIOT BISHAI,
ELIAS IRIZARRY,**

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 21-cr-282 (TSC)

PROTECTIVE ORDER GOVERNING DISCOVERY

To expedite the flow of discovery material between the parties and adequately protect the United States' legitimate interests, it is, pursuant to the Court's authority under Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(d)(1), ORDERED:

1. **Materials Subject to this Order.** This Order governs materials provided by the United States at any stage of discovery during this case and which the United States has identified as either "Sensitive" or "Highly Sensitive." Examples of materials that the United States may designate as "Sensitive" or "Highly Sensitive" pursuant to this Order include but are not limited to:

- a. Personal identity information as identified in Rule 49.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, as well as telephone numbers, email addresses, driver's license numbers, and similar unique identifying information;
- b. Information regarding the government's confidential sources;
- c. Information that may jeopardize witness security;
- d. Contact information for, photographs of, and private conversations with individuals that do not appear to be related to the criminal conduct in this case;
- e. Medical or mental health records;
- f. Sources and methods law-enforcement officials have used, and will continue to use, to investigate other criminal conduct related to the publicly filed charges;
- g. Surveillance camera footage from the U.S. Capitol Police's extensive system of cameras on U.S. Capitol grounds;¹

¹ To be clear, this does not include footage from body worn cameras from other police departments that responded on January 6, 2021, the vast amount of which the United States will *not* designate as Sensitive or Highly Sensitive. (Body worn camera footage will be marked Sensitive or Highly Sensitive only if it contains material described in paragraph one above or for a similar reason not anticipated by this Order.)

- h. Repair estimates from the Architect of the Capitol;
- i. Materials designated as “security information” pursuant 2 U.S.C. §1979; and
- j. Tax returns or tax information.

This Order will not be used to designate materials as Sensitive or Highly Sensitive unless such designation is necessary for one of the reasons stated in this paragraph or for a similar reason not anticipated by this Order. The government agrees to make every effort to provide discovery in a manner that will allow for most discovery to be produced without such designations.

2. **Defendant.** Any reference to “Defendant” herein refers individually to each defendant identified in the caption above.

3. **Legal Defense Team.** The “legal defense team” includes defense counsel (defined as counsel of record in this case, including any post-conviction or appellate counsel) and any attorneys, investigators, paralegals, support staff, and expert witnesses who are advising or assisting defense counsel in connection with this case.

4. **Rules for the Handling of Sensitive and Highly Sensitive Materials.**

- a. **Limitations on Use.** Defendant and the legal defense team may use Sensitive and Highly Sensitive discovery materials solely in connection with the defense of this case and any other case connected to the events at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, including any post-conviction or appellate litigation, and for no other purpose, and in connection with no other proceeding, without further order of this Court.
- b. **Limitations on Dissemination.** No Sensitive or Highly Sensitive materials, or the information contained therein, may be disclosed to any persons other than Defendant, the legal defense team, or the person to whom the Sensitive or Highly Sensitive information solely and directly pertains or his/her counsel, without agreement of the United States or prior authorization from the Court.
- c. **Limitations on Reproduction.** Defendant, the legal defense team, and authorized persons shall not copy or reproduce the Sensitive or Highly Sensitive materials except in order to provide copies of the materials for use in connection with this case by Defendant, the legal defense team, the person to whom the Sensitive or Highly Sensitive information solely and directly

pertains or his/her counsel, and other persons to whom the Court may authorize disclosure (collectively, “authorized persons”).

If defense counsel provides Defendant access to Sensitive or Highly Sensitive materials, defense counsel must advise Defendant that Defendant may not record any personal identity information as identified in Rule 49.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or any telephone numbers, email addresses, driver’s license numbers, and similar unique identifying information. By signing the attached affirmation, Defendant agrees not to do so.

Copies and reproductions, and any notes or records made in relation to the contents of the Sensitive and Highly Sensitive materials, are to be treated in the same manner as the original materials.

- d. **Court Filings.** Absent prior agreement by the parties or permission from the Court, no party shall disclose materials designated as Sensitive or Highly Sensitive in any public filing with the Court. Such materials shall be submitted under seal in accordance with Local Criminal Rule 49(f)(6). The Clerk of Court shall accept for filing under seal any filings made in compliance with that Rule and so marked by the parties pursuant to this Order.
- e. **Court Hearings.** The restrictions in this Order shall not limit either party in the use of the materials in judicial proceedings in this case. The procedures for use of designated Sensitive and Highly Sensitive materials during any hearing or the trial of this matter shall be determined by the parties and the Court in advance of the hearing or trial. No party shall disclose materials designated Sensitive or Highly Sensitive in open court without agreement by the parties that such materials may be disclosed in open court or prior authorization by the Court.

5. **Additional Rules for Handling of Sensitive Materials.** The following additional terms apply to Sensitive materials:

- a. **Storage.** Sensitive materials must be maintained in the custody and control of Defendant, the legal defense team, and authorized persons. This restriction shall not apply to the person to whom the Sensitive information solely and directly pertains or his/her attorney.

6. **Additional Rules for Handling of Highly Sensitive Materials.** The following additional rules apply to Highly Sensitive materials:

- a. **Additional Limitations on Dissemination.** Defense counsel may not provide a copy of Highly Sensitive materials to Defendant or permit Defendant to

view such materials unsupervised by defense counsel or an attorney, investigator, paralegal, or support staff person employed by defense counsel. The parties agree that defense counsel or an attorney, investigator, paralegal, or support staff person employed by defense counsel, may supervise Defendant by allowing access to Highly Sensitive materials through a cloud-based delivery system that permits Defendant to view the materials but does not permit Defendant the ability to download; provided that, prior to doing so, defense counsel first provides notice to the United States and allow the United States to file an objection with the Court if no agreement is reached.

- b. **Additional Limitations on Reproduction.** Counsel agrees that prior to showing materials to Defendant designated as Highly Sensitive, counsel or an attorney, investigator, paralegal, or support staff person employed by defense counsel will read Defendant the relevant parts of this Order, and remind Defendant of the consequences of violating the Order. If Defendant takes notes regarding Highly Sensitive materials, counsel or an attorney, investigator, paralegal, or support staff person employed by defense counsel must take reasonable steps to determine whether Defendant has copied any personal identity information as identified in Rule 49.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or any telephone numbers, email addresses, driver's license numbers, and similar unique identifying information.
- c. **Storage.** Highly Sensitive materials must be maintained in the custody and control of the legal defense team and authorized persons. This restriction shall not apply to the person to whom the Highly Sensitive information solely and directly pertains or his/her attorney.

7. **Viewing by Incarcerated Defendants.** If Defendant is in the custody of the United States Marshals Service, defense counsel is authorized to provide a copy of discovery materials to the appropriate point of contact so that the defendant can view the discovery materials, subject to the terms of this Order.

8. **Disputes.** The parties shall make a good faith effort to resolve any dispute about a sensitivity designation before requesting the Court's intervention. The United States may agree to remove or reduce a sensitivity designation without further order of this Court. Whenever the redaction of specified information will resolve the basis for which a sensitivity designation was applied, the United States will agree to redaction, and such redaction will render the materials no longer subject to this Order. Any agreement to reduce or remove a sensitivity designation or to

redact specific information shall be memorialized in writing.

9. **Modification Permitted.** Nothing in this Order shall prevent any party from seeking modification of this Order nor prevent the defense from contesting a sensitivity designation. The parties agree that the burden of demonstrating the need for a protective order remains with the government at all times.

10. **Failure not Waiver.** The failure by the United States to designate any materials as Sensitive or Highly Sensitive upon disclosure shall not constitute a waiver of the United States' ability to later designate the materials as Sensitive or Highly Sensitive but the government must separately identify and memorialize the changed status of those materials in writing.

11. **Automatic Exclusions from this Order.** This Order does not apply to materials that:

- a. Are, or later become, part of the public court record, including materials that have been received in evidence in this or other public trials or hearings;
- b. Were derived directly from Defendant or that pertain solely to Defendant. Examples of such materials include Defendant's own financial records, telephone records, digital device downloads, social media records, electronic communications, arrest records, and statements to law enforcement;² and
- c. Materials that the defense obtains by means other than discovery.

12. **Government's Discovery Obligations.** Nothing in this Order modifies the United States' obligations at any stage of discovery in this case pursuant to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 16 and 26.2, Local Criminal Rule 5.1, 18 U.S.C. § 3500 (the Jencks Act), and the government's general obligation to produce exculpatory and impeachment information in

² Discoverable materials that were derived directly from Defendant or that pertain solely to Defendant are exempt from this Order regardless of whether the United States has designated any such materials as "Sensitive" or "Highly Sensitive" because the same materials are being provided or made available to co-defendants or other persons charged in connection with the events at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021.

criminal cases.

13. **Defense Counsel's Obligations.** Defense counsel must provide a copy of this Order to, and review the terms of this Order with, members of the legal defense team, Defendant, and any other person, before providing them access to Sensitive or Highly Sensitive materials. Defense counsel must obtain a fully executed copy of Attachment A before providing Defendant access to Sensitive or Highly Sensitive materials, and must file a copy with the Court within one week of execution.

14. **No Ruling on Discoverability or Admissibility.** This Order does not constitute a ruling on the question of whether any particular material is properly discoverable or admissible and does not constitute any ruling on any potential objection to the discoverability or admissibility of any material.

15. **Duration.** The terms of this Order shall remain in effect after the conclusion of this case and the parties shall be bound by it unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

SO ORDERED this ____ day of _____, 2021.

HONORABLE TANYA S. CHUTKAN
United States District Judge

ATTACHMENT A

Defendant's Acceptance

I have read this Protective Order and carefully reviewed every part of it with my attorney. I am fully satisfied with the legal services provided by my attorney in connection with this Protective Order and all matters relating to it. I fully understand this Protective Order and voluntarily agree to it. No threats have been made to me, nor am I under the influence of anything that could impede my ability to understand this Protective Order fully.

Date

Defendant