

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
District of Columbia

United States of America)
v.)
Emanuel Jackson) Case No. 21-mj-115 (GMH)
_____)
Defendant)

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Part I - Eligibility for Detention

Upon the

- Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or
- Motion of the Government or Court’s own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court’s findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

Part II - Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

- A. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2)** (*previous violator*): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community because the following conditions have been met:
 - (1)** the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):
 - (a)** a crime of violence, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; **or**
 - (b)** an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; **or**
 - (c)** an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); **or**
 - (d)** any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; **or**
 - (e)** any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves:
 - (i)** a minor victim; **(ii)** the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921);
 - (iii)** any other dangerous weapon; or **(iv)** a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; **and**
 - (2)** the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed; **and**
 - (3)** the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; **and**
 - (4)** a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.

- B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3)** (*narcotics, firearm, other offenses*): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses:
- (1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508);
 - (2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;
 - (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;
 - (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; **or**
 - (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.

C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above

- The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above, and detention is ordered on that basis, with the evidence or argument presented by the defendant summarized in Part III.C.
- The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted for the reasons summarized in Part III.

OR

- The defendant has not presented sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption. Moreover, after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted for the reasons summarized in Part III.

Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention

- A. After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:
- By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.
 - By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required.
- B. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:
- Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong
 - Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted
 - Prior criminal history
 - Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision

- History of violence or use of weapons
- History of alcohol or substance abuse
- Lack of stable employment
- Lack of stable residence
- Lack of financially responsible sureties
- Lack of significant community or family ties to this district
- Significant family or other ties outside the United States
- Lack of legal status in the United States
- Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration
- Prior failure to appear in court as ordered
- Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement
- Use of alias(es) or false documents
- Background information unknown or unverified
- Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release

C. OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION:

The defendant's evidence/arguments for release:

Defendant, who is charged with multiple offenses--including assaulting an officer of the United States with a deadly or dangerous weapon--in connection with breach of the Capitol building on January 6, 2020, requested that he be placed into the High Intensity Supervision Program ("HISP"). Defendant acknowledged the seriousness of his charged offenses, but proffered that the Court should consider his alleged conduct in the context of the statements made by former President Trump at the "Stop the Steal" rally shortly before the Capitol was breached. He also emphasized that he is young, has no criminal record, lives in a shelter after experiencing homelessness, and has severe mental health challenges that impact his ability to perform basic functions and that make his incarceration more difficult as he had to be placed in protective custody. As to the potential for future violence, Defendant emphasized that he does not have a cellphone, which would limit his ability to be involved in similar incidents. Last, Defendant highlighted that he turned himself in to law enforcement, and that he was not handcuffed during his transport.

Nature and circumstances of offense(s):

Defendant allegedly struck law enforcement officers with his fist and a baseball bat in two separate attempts to breach the Capitol building as Congress was working to certify the election results of the 2020 election. These are serious charges and involve some of the most egregious conduct seen during the January 6 events, thus this factor favors pretrial detention. According to the government's proffer, at a little before 3:00 p.m., Defendant, who was in a large group of people, struck law enforcement officers with his fists multiple times in what was a successful attempt to enter the Capitol building. Then, about two hours later, Defendant allegedly tried to enter the Capitol building through a different entrance and repeatedly struck law enforcement officers--who were protecting themselves with riot shields--with a metal baseball bat. This shows that his conduct at the Capitol was not a momentary lapse of judgment, but instead, was an ongoing act of violence that disrupted Congressional functions.

The strength of the government's evidence:

The evidence against Defendant is strong, thus this factor favors detention. According to the government's proffer and video footage presented to the Court during the detention hearing, Defendant is captured in multiple videos as he struck officers with his fists and a baseball bat. He also allegedly admitted to his conduct in a post-*Miranda* interview after he turned himself in to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The defendant's history and characteristics, including criminal history:

Defendant is young and has no criminal history. However, he has recently become homeless and struggles with mental health issues--which were discussed in more detail during a sealed portion of the hearing--that are concerning to the Court. Defendant allegedly engaged in violent acts in an attempt to thwart the democratic process; indeed, the charges he faces underscore that he is unlikely to comply with Court orders and therefore is not amenable to community supervision.

The defendant's dangerousness/risk of flight:

Defendant's alleged conduct was a direct and violent attack against law enforcement officers in particular, and the democratic process in general. His conduct occurred over the course of multiple hours and became increasingly violent. This willingness to engage in such violence in support of a cause--a cause that has not gone away--and the direct nature of the attack on law enforcement give the undersigned no confidence that Defendant would comply with any release conditions set by this Court. Thus, no conditions or combination of conditions of release would reasonably assure the safety of the community or law enforcement if he were released.

Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Date: 02/22/2021



G. Michael Harvey
2021.02.22 23:17:27 -05'00'

United States Magistrate Judge