

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

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>	:	
	:	<b>CASE NO. 21-cr-78 (RCL)</b>
v.	:	
	:	
<b>JOHN SULLIVAN,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant.</b>	:	

**GOVERNMENT’S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE**

Defendant John Sullivan, who is charged in connection with events at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, has moved to transfer venue in this case to the District of Utah. Sullivan fails to establish that he “cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial” in this district, Fed. R. Crim. P. 21(a), and this Court should deny his motion.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Judges on this Court have denied motions for change of venue in dozens of January 6 prosecutions, and no judge has granted a change of venue in a January 6 case. *See, e.g., United States v. Ramey*, 22-cr-184, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Jan. 30, 2023) (DLF); *United States v. Eckerman, et al.*, No. 21-cr-623, Minute Order (D.D.C. Jan. 26, 2023) (CRC); *United States v. Pollock, et al.*, No. 21-cr-447, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Jan. 25, 2023) (CJN); *United States v. Gossjankowski*, No. 21-cr-12, ECF No. 114 (D.D.C. Jan. 25, 2023) (PLF); *United States v. Adams*, No. 21-cr-212, ECF No. 60 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2023) (ABJ); *United States v. Rhine*, No. 21-cr-687, ECF No. 78 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2023) (RC); *United States v. Oliveras*, No. 21-cr-738, ECF No. 52 (D.D.C. Jan. 17, 2023) (BAH); *United States v. Sheppard*, No. 21-cr-203, ECF No. 62 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2022) (JDB); *United States v. Samsel, et al.*, No. 21-cr-537, ECF No. 227 (D.D.C. Dec. 14, 2022) (JMC); *United States v. Gillespie*, No. 22-cr-60, ECF No. 41 (D.D.C. Nov. 29, 2022) (BAH); *United States v. Barnett*, No. 21-cr-38, ECF No. 90 (D.D.C. Nov. 23, 2022) (CRC); *United States v. Bender, et al.*, No. 21-cr-508, ECF No. 78 (D.D.C. Nov. 22, 2022) (BAH); *United States v. Sandoval*, No. 21-cr-195, ECF No. 88 (D.D.C. Nov. 18, 2022) (TFH); *United States v. Vargas Santos*, No. 21-cr-47, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2022) (RDM); *United States v. Nordean, et al.*, No. 21-cr-175, ECF No. 531 (D.D.C. Nov. 9, 2022) (TJK); *United States v. Ballenger*, No. 21-719, ECF No. 75 (D.D.C. Oct. 28, 2022) (JEB); *United States v. Eicher*, No. 22-cr-38, ECF No. 34 (D.D.C. Oct. 20, 2022) (CKK); *United States v. Schwartz, et al.*, No. 21-cr-178, ECF No. 142 (D.D.C. Oct. 11, 2022) (APM); *United States v. Nassif*, No. 21-cr-421, ECF No. 42 (D.D.C. Sep. 12, 2022) (JDB); *United States v. Brock*, No. 21-cr-140, ECF No. 58 (D.D.C. Aug. 31, 2022) (JDB); *United States v. Jensen*, No. 21-cr-6, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Aug. 26, 2022) (TJK); *United*

## BACKGROUND

On January 6, 2021, 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. While the certification process was proceeding, a large crowd gathered outside the United States Capitol, entered the restricted grounds, and forced entry into the Capitol building. As a result, the Joint Session and the entire official proceeding of the Congress was halted until law enforcement was able to clear the Capitol of hundreds of unlawful occupants and ensure the safety of elected officials.

John Sullivan traveled from Utah to Washington, D.C., to attend and film the “Stop the Steal” rally on January 6, 2021. Afterwards, Sullivan joined rioters at the U.S. Capitol where he filmed a crowd pushing through several police barriers on the west side of the Capitol. After the crowd broke through the last barricade. As Sullivan and the others approach the Capitol Building, Sullivan can be heard in his video saying at various points: “There are so many people. Let’s go.

---

*States v. Seitz*, No. 21-cr-279, Minute Order (D.D.C. Aug. 17, 2022) (DLF); *United States v. Strand*, No. 21-cr-85, ECF No. 89 (D.D.C. Aug. 17, 2022) (CRC); *United States v. Williams*, No. 21-cr-618, ECF No. 63 (D.D.C. Aug. 12, 2022) (ABJ); *United States v. Herrera*, No. 21-cr-619, ECF No. 54 (D.D.C. August 4, 2022) (BAH); *United States v. Garcia*, No. 21-cr-129, ECF No. 83 (D.D.C. July 22, 2022) (ABJ); *United States v. Rusyn, et al.*, No. 21-cr-303, Minute Entry (D.D.C. July 21, 2022) (ABJ); *United States v. Bledsoe*, No. 21-cr-204, Minute Order (D.D.C. July 15, 2022) (BAH); *United States v. Calhoun*, No. 21-cr-116, Minute Order (D.D.C. July 11, 2022) (DLF); *United States v. Rhodes, et al.*, No. 22-cr-15, ECF No. 176 (D.D.C. June 28, 2022) (APM); *United States v. Williams*, No. 21-cr-377, Minute Entry (D.D.C. June 10, 2022) (BAH); *United States v. McHugh*, No. 21-cr-453, Minute Entry (D.D.C. May 4, 2022) (JDB); *United States v. Hale-Cusanelli*, No. 21-cr-37, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Apr. 29, 2022) (TNM); *United States v. Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 78 (D.D.C. Apr. 18, 2022) (APM); *United States v. Alford*, 21-cr-263, ECF No. 46 (D.D.C. Apr. 18, 2022) (TSC); *United States v. Brooks*, No. 21-cr-503, ECF No. 31 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2022) (RCL); *United States v. Bochene*, No. 21-cr-418, ECF No. 31 (D.D.C. Jan. 12, 2022) (RDM); *United States v. Fitzsimons*, No. 21-cr-158, Minute Order (D.D.C. Dec. 14, 2021) (RC); *United States v. Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32, Minute Order (D.D.C. Oct. 15, 2021) (DLF); *United States v. Caldwell*, 21-cr-28, ECF No. 415 (D.D.C. Sept. 14, 2021) (APM).

This shit is ours! Fuck yeah,” “We accomplished this shit. We did this together. Fuck yeah! We are all a part of this history,” and “Let’s burn this shit down.”

Sullivan entered the Capitol via a broken Senate Wing Door. Once inside the Capitol Building, Sullivan roamed the building with other individuals who unlawfully entered. During one of his interactions with others, Sullivan can be heard in the video saying, “We gotta get this shit burned,” “it’s our house motherfuckers,” and “we are getting this shit.” Sullivan ignored law enforcements commands to leaving and told the officers to stand down, so they would not get hurt. Sullivan encouraged other rioters, explaining he was “ready” because he had “been in so many riots.”

Sullivan filmed the crowds trying to break open doors as the House and the Speaker’s Lobby. At both locations, Sullivan informed other members of the crowd he had a knife which allowed him to cut to the front of the crowd. At the front of the Speaker’s Lobby crowd, Sullivan filmed the crowd trying to break down the doors’ glass windows. Sullivan can be heard telling law enforcement to “go home” while encouraging those attempting to break the windows to “Get this shit!” Shortly thereafter, the video includes footage of a female getting shot as she tries to enter through the window opening. Sullivan later claimed to be a journalist but admitted he did not have any press credentials.

Based on his actions on January 6, 2021, the defendant was charged with Obstruction of an Official Proceeding, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2), and 2; Civil Disorder in violation of U.S.C. § 231(a)(3), and 2; Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building and Grounds with a dangerous weapon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1) and (b)(1)(A); Disorderly and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds with a dangerous weapon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2) and (b)(1)(A); Unlawful Possession of a Dangerous Weap on Capitol

Grounds or Buildings, in violations of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(1)(A)i); Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building, in violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D); Parading, Demonstrating, or Picketing in a Capitol Building, in violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G); False Statement or Representation to an Agency of the United States, in violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(2); and Aiding and Abetting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2.

The defendant now moves for a change of venue. ECF No. 84. He contends that prejudice should be presumed in this district for two reasons, under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 2: prejudice and convenience. *Id.* at 2. Each of the defendant's arguments is without merit, and the motion should be denied.

### **ARGUMENT**

The Constitution provides that “[t]he trial of all Crimes . . . shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed.” U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2, cl. 3. The Sixth Amendment similarly guarantees the right to be tried “by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.” U.S. Const. amend. VI. These provisions provide “a safeguard against the unfairness and hardship involved when an accused is prosecuted in a remote place.” *United States v. Cores*, 356 U.S. 405, 407 (1958). Transfer to another venue is constitutionally required only where “extraordinary local prejudice will prevent a fair trial.” *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. 358, 378 (2010); *see* Fed. R. Crim. P. 21(a) (requiring transfer to another district if “so great a prejudice against the defendant exists in the transferring district that the defendant cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial there”).

The primary safeguard of the right to an impartial jury is “an adequate voir dire to identify unqualified jurors.” *Morgan v. Illinois*, 504 U.S. 719, 729 (1992) (italics omitted). Thus, the best course when faced with a pretrial publicity claim is ordinarily “to proceed to voir dire to ascertain

whether the prospective jurors have, in fact, been influenced by pretrial publicity.” *United States v. Campa*, 459 F.3d 1121, 1146 (11th Cir. 2006) (en banc). “[I]f an impartial jury actually cannot be selected, that fact should become evident at the voir dire.” *United States v. Haldeman*, 559 F.2d 31, 63 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (en banc) (per curiam). And, after voir dire, “it may be found that, despite earlier prognostications, removal of the trial is unnecessary.” *Jones v. Gasch*, 404 F.2d 1231, 1238 (D.C. Cir. 1967).

**I. The Venue is not Prejudicial**

**a. Size and characteristics of the community**

The defendant suggests that an impartial jury cannot be found in Washington, D.C., despite the District’s population of nearly 700,000. *See* No. ECF 84 at 4. Although this District may be smaller than most other federal judicial districts, it has a larger population than two states (Wyoming and Vermont). The relevant question is not whether the District of Columbia is as populous as the Southern District of Texas in *Skilling*, but whether it is large enough that an impartial jury can be found. In *Mu’Min v. Virginia*, 500 U.S. 415, 429 (1991), the Court cited a county population of 182,537 as supporting the view that an impartial jury could be selected. And *Skilling* approvingly cited a state case in which there was “a reduced likelihood of prejudice” because the “venire was drawn from a pool of over 600,000 individuals.” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 382 (quoting *Gentile v. State Bar of Nev.*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1044 (1991)). There is simply no reason to believe that, out of an eligible jury pool of nearly half a million, “12 impartial individuals could not be empaneled.” *Id.*

**b. The Pretrial Publicity Does Not Support a Presumption of Prejudice in This District.**

**i. The Pretrial Publicity Related to January 6 Does Not Support a Presumption of Prejudice in This District.**

The defendant contends that a change of venue is warranted based on pretrial publicity in relation to both January 6 and Sullivan himself. E.C.F. No. 84 at 4). “The mere existence of intense pretrial publicity is not enough to make a trial unfair, nor is the fact that potential jurors have been exposed to this publicity.” *United States v. Childress*, 58 F.3d 693, 706 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *see Murphy v. Florida*, 421 U.S. 794, 799 (1975) (juror exposure to “news accounts of the crime with which [a defendant] is charged” does not “alone presumptively deprive[] the defendant of due process”). Indeed, “every case of public interest is almost, as a matter of necessity, brought to the attention of all the intelligent people in the vicinity, and scarcely any one can be found among those best fitted for jurors who has not read or heard of it, and who has not some impression or some opinion in respect to its merits.” *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145, 155-56 (1878). Thus, the “mere existence of any preconceived notion as to the guilt or innocence of an accused, without more,” is insufficient to establish prejudice. *Irvin v. Dowd*, 366 U.S. 717, 723 (1961). “It is sufficient if the juror can lay aside his impression or opinion and render a verdict based on the evidence presented in court.” *Id.*

The Supreme Court has recognized only a narrow category of cases in which prejudice is presumed to exist without regard to prospective jurors’ answers during voir dire. *See Rideau v. Louisiana*, 373 U.S. 723 (1963). In *Rideau*, the defendant’s confession—obtained while he was in jail and without an attorney present—was broadcast three times shortly before trial on a local television station to audiences ranging from 24,000 to 53,000 individuals in a parish of approximately 150,000 people. *Id.* at 724 (majority opinion), 728-29 (Clark, J., dissenting). The

Court concluded that, “to the tens of thousands of people who saw and heard it,” the televised confession “in a very real sense *was* Rideau’s trial—at which he pleaded guilty to murder.” *Rideau*, 373 U.S. at 726. Thus, the Court “d[id] not hesitate to hold, without pausing to examine a particularized transcript of the voir dire,” that these “kangaroo court proceedings” violated due process. *Id.* at 726-27.

Since *Rideau*, the Supreme Court has emphasized that a “presumption of prejudice . . . attends only the extreme case,” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 381, and the Court has repeatedly “held in other cases that trials have been fair in spite of widespread publicity,” *Nebraska Press Ass’n v. Stuart*, 427 U.S. 539, 554 (1976). In the half century since *Rideau*, the Supreme Court has never presumed prejudice based on pretrial publicity. *But see Estes v. Texas*, 381 U.S. 532 (1965) (presuming prejudice based on media interference with courtroom proceedings); *Sheppard v. Maxwell*, 384 U.S. 333 (1966) (same). In fact, courts have declined to transfer venue in some of the most high-profile prosecutions in recent American history. *See In re Tsarnaev*, 780 F.3d 14, 15 (1st Cir. 2015) (per curiam) (capital prosecution of Boston Marathon bomber); *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 399 (fraud trial of CEO of Enron Corporation); *United States v. Yousef*, 327 F.3d 56, 155 (2d Cir. 2003) (trial of participant in 1993 World Trade Center bombing); *United States v. Moussaoui*, 43 F. App’x 612, 613 (4th Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (unpublished) (terrorism prosecution for conspirator in September 11, 2001 attacks); *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 70 (Watergate prosecution of former Attorney General John Mitchell and other Nixon aides).

In *Skilling*, the Supreme Court considered several factors in determining that prejudice should not be presumed where former Enron executive Jeffrey Skilling was tried in Houston, where Enron was based. *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 382-83. First, the Court considered the “size and characteristics of the community.” *Id.* at 382. Unlike *Rideau*, where the murder “was committed

in a parish of only 150,000 residents,” Houston was home to more than 4.5 million people eligible for jury service. *Id.* at 382. Second, “although news stories about Skilling were not kind, they contained no confession or other blatantly prejudicial information of the type readers or viewers could not reasonably be expected to shut from sight.” *Id.* Third, “over four years elapsed between Enron’s bankruptcy and Skilling’s trial,” and “the decibel level of media attention diminished somewhat in the years following Enron’s collapse.” *Id.* at 383. “Finally, and of prime significance, Skilling’s jury acquitted him of nine insider-trading counts,” which undermined any “supposition of juror bias.” *Id.*

Although these *Skilling* factors are not exhaustive, courts have found them useful when considering claims of presumptive prejudice based on pretrial publicity. *See, e.g., In re Tsarnaev*, 780 F.3d at 21-22; *United States v. Petters*, 663 F.3d 375, 385 (8th Cir. 2011). And contrary to the defendant’s contention, those factors do not support a presumption of prejudice in this case.

**ii. The Pretrial Publicity Related to Sullivan Does Not Support a Presumption of Prejudice in This District.**

The defendant also asserts that a fair trial cannot be had in D.C. because of news coverage about himself. ECF No. 84 at 5. But even “massive” news coverage of a crime does not require prejudice to be presumed. *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 61. Sullivan has not pointed to any salacious new coverage about himself, or any specific news coverage for that matter. Unlike most cases involving pretrial publicity, where the news coverage focuses on the responsibility of a single defendant (as in *Rideau* or *Tsarnaev*) or small number of co-defendants (as in *Skilling* and *Haldeman*), the events of January 6 involved thousands of participants and have so far resulted in charges against more than 900 people. The Court can guard against any spillover prejudice from the broader coverage of January 6 by conducting a careful voir dire and properly instructing the jury about the need to determine a defendant’s individual guilt.

And, in any event, any threat of such spillover prejudice is not limited to Washington, D.C. because much of the news coverage of January 6 has been national in scope. *See Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 64 n.43 (observing that “a change of venue would have been of only doubtful value” where much of the news coverage was “national in [its] reach” and the crime was of national interest); *United States v. Boehene*, No. 21-cr-418-RDM, 2022 WL 123893, at \*3 (D.D.C. Jan. 12, 2022) (“The fact that there has been ongoing media coverage of the breach of the Capitol and subsequent prosecutions, both locally and nationally, means that the influence of that coverage would be present wherever the trial is held.” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Thus, the nature and extent of the pretrial publicity do not support a presumption of prejudice.

**c. Passage of time before trial**

In *Skilling*, the Court considered the fact that “over four years elapsed between Enron’s bankruptcy and Skilling’s trial.” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 383. In this case, twenty-five months have already elapsed since the events of January 6, and more time will elapse before trial. This is far more than in *Rideau*, where the defendant’s trial came two months after his televised confession. *Rideau*, 373 U.S. at 724. Although January 6 continues to be in the news, the “decibel level of media attention [has] diminished somewhat,” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 383. Moreover, only a relatively small percentage of the recent stories have mentioned Sullivan, and much of the reporting has been national in scope, rather than limited to Washington, D.C.

**d. The jury verdict**

Because Sullivan has not yet gone to trial, the final *Skilling* factor—whether the “jury’s verdict . . . undermine[s] in any way the supposition of juror bias,” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 383—does not directly apply. But the fact that *Skilling* considered this factor to be “of prime significance,” *id.*, underscores how unusual it is to presume prejudice before trial. Ordinarily, a case should

proceed to trial in the district where the crime was committed, and courts can examine after trial whether the record supports a finding of actual or presumed prejudice. In short, none of the *Skilling* factors supports the defendant's contention that the Court should presume prejudice and order a transfer of venue without even conducting voir dire.

The defendant suggests that this factor actually *supports* his claim of prejudice because the other jury trials involving January 6 defendants have resulted in prompt and (until recently) unanimous guilty verdicts. ECF No.84 at 5-6. But although the *Skilling* indicated that a split verdict could “undermine” a presumption of prejudice, it never suggested that a unanimous verdict—particularly a unanimous verdict in a separate case involving a different defendant—was enough to establish prejudice. The prompt and unanimous guilty verdicts in other January 6 jury trials resulted from the strength of the government's evidence. Moreover, juries in two recent January 6 trials have either been unable to reach a verdict on certain counts, *see United States v. Williams*, No. 21-cr-618 (D.D.C.), or have acquitted on some counts, *see United States v. Rhodes, et al.*, No. 22-cr-15, ECF No. 410 (D.D.C. Nov. 29, 2022). This indicates that D.C. jurors are carefully weighing the evidence and not reflexively convicting January 6 defendants on all charges. And, as explained below, the jury selection in those cases actually indicates that impartial juries can be selected in this district.

**II. A Change of Venue Is Not Warranted Under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 21(b) Based on Convenience or the Interest of Justice.**

The defendant argues (ECF No. 84 at 3 and 7) that this Court should transfer venue to the District of Utah under Rule 21(b), which allows transfer to another district “for the convenience of the parties, any victim, and the witnesses, and in the interest of justice.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 21(b). The defendant asserts that a change in venue is necessary because he and his witnesses live in Utah and one of the numerous charges arose out of conduct in Utah. ECF No. 84 at 7. These arguments

do not support a transfer of venue under Rule 21(b).

“There is a general presumption that a criminal prosecution should be retained in the original district.” *United States v. Bowdoin*, 770 F. Supp. 2d 133, 138 (D.D.C. 2011) (quoting *United States v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R.*, 538 F. Supp. 200, 205 (D.D.C. 1982)). That presumption is rooted in the Constitution, which states that “[t]he trial of all Crimes . . . shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed.” U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2, cl. 3. And it is reflected in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which state that, “[u]nless a statute or these rules permit otherwise, the government must prosecute an offense in a district where the offense was committed.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 18. To obtain a change of venue under Rule 21(b), a defendant must demonstrate that trial in the district where the crime occurred “would be so unduly burdensome that fairness requires the transfer to another district of proper venue where a trial would be less burdensome.” *Bowdoin*, 770 F. Supp. 2d at 138 (quotations marks omitted). Factors a court considering a motion to transfer venue are:

(1) location of the defendant; (2) location of possible witnesses; (3) location of events likely to be in issue; (4) location of documents and records likely to be involved; (5) disruption of the defendant’s business; (6) expense to the parties; (7) location of counsel; (8) relative accessibility of place of trial; (9) docket condition of each district of division involved; and (10) any other special elements which might affect the transfer.

*Id.* at 137-38. Those factors strongly support keeping the prosecution in this District. The events at issue took place in the District of Columbia, and the witnesses and evidence are in this District. Holding a trial in the District of Utah would require a significant expenditure of government funds for the prosecution team and witnesses to travel to that district.

Moreover, none of the defendant’s reasons for transfer under Rule 21(b) supports an interest of justice transfer. A trial in the District of Utah would undoubtedly be more convenient for the defendant. But that fact alone is not sufficient to justify transfer, particularly considering

that the defendant chose to travel to Washington, D.C. to commit his crimes at the U.S. Capitol. [

The defendant's claim that venue should be transferred under Rule 21(b) because the District of Utah would provide him with a fairer jury pool, (ECF No. 84 at 3-7) is similarly unavailing. As explained above, the defendant cannot obtain a change of venue based on prejudicial publicity under the constitutional standard or Rule 21(a). And the defendant cannot use Rule 21(b)'s "interest of justice" standard as an alternative way to raise a claim of "local community prejudice." *Jones v. Gasch*, 404 F.2d 1231, 1238 (D.C. Cir. 1967). In *Jones*, the D.C. Circuit denied a petition for mandamus which challenged the presiding judge's denial of his motion to transfer under Rule 21(b) based on a claim of prejudicial publicity. *Id.* at 1234, 1238-39. The court of appeals held "that the standard of Rule 21(a) is the exclusive gauge by which circumstances of that character (prejudice) are to be measured." *Id.* at 1239. The defendant has failed to establish that he cannot receive a fair trial in this District, and the defendant has failed to articulate a basis for transfer under Rule 21(b).

### **III. The January 6-Related Jury Trials That Have Already Occurred Have Demonstrated the Availability of a Significant Number of Fair, Impartial Jurors in the D.C. Venire.**

At this point, more than a dozen January 6 cases have proceeded to jury trials, and the Court in each of those cases has been able to select a jury without undue expenditure of time or effort. *See Murphy*, 421 U.S. at 802-03 ("The length to which the trial court must go to select jurors who appear to be impartial is another factor relevant in evaluating those jurors' assurances of impartiality."); *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 63 (observing that "if an impartial jury actually cannot be selected, that fact should become evident at the voir dire"). Instead, the judges presiding over nearly all of those trials were able to select a jury in one or two days. *See United States v. Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32, Minute Entries (Feb. 28 & Mar. 1, 2022); *United States v. Robertson*, No. 21-cr-34,

Minute Entry (Apr. 5, 2022); *United States v. Thompson*, No. 21-cr-161, Minute Entry (Apr. 11, 2022); *United States v. Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, Minute Entry (Apr. 25, 2022); *United States v. Hale-Cusanelli*, No. 21-cr-37, Minute Entry (May 23, 2022); *United States v. Anthony Williams*, No. 21-cr-377, Minute Entry (June 27, 2022); *United States v. Bledsoe*, No. 21-cr-204, Minute Entry (July 18, 2022); *United States v. Herrera*, No. 21-cr-619, Minute Entry (D.D.C. August 15, 2022); *United States v. Jensen*, No. 21-cr-6, Minute Entries (Sep. 19 & 20, 2022); *United States v. Strand*, No. 21-85, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Sep. 20, 2022); *United States v. Alford*, No. 21-cr-263, Minute Entry (Sep. 29, 2022); *United States v. Riley Williams*, No. 21-cr-618, Minute Entries (D.D.C. Nov. 7 & 8, 2022); *United States v. Schwartz*, No. 21-cr-178, Minute Entries (D.D.C. Nov. 22 & 29, 2022); *United States v. Gillespie* No. 22-cr-60, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Dec. 19, 2022); *United States v. Barnett*, 21-cr-38, Minute Entries (D.D.C. Jan. 9 & 10, 2023); *United States v. Sheppard*, No. 21-cr-203, Minute Entries (D.D.C. Jan. 20 & 23, 2023); *United States v. Eckerman*, No. 21-CR-623, Minute Entry (D.D.C. Jan. 23, 2023). The only exceptions have trials involving seditious conspiracy charges. See *United States v. Rhodes, et al.*, No. 22-cr-15, Minute Entries (Sept. 27, 28, 29; Dec. 6, 7, 8, 9, 2022). And, using the first five jury trials as exemplars, the voir dire that took place undermines the defendant's claim that prejudice should be presumed.

In *Reffitt*, the Court individually examined 56 prospective jurors and qualified 38 of them (about 68% of those examined). See *Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32, ECF No. 136 at 121. The Court asked all the prospective jurors whether they had "an opinion about Mr. Reffitt's guilt or innocence in this case" and whether they had any "strong feelings or opinions" about the events of January 6 or any political beliefs that it would make it difficult to be a "fair and impartial" juror. *Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32, ECF No. 133 at 23, 30. The Court then followed up during individual voir dire. Of the 18 jurors that were struck for cause, only nine (or 16% of the 56 people examined) indicated that

they had such strong feelings about the events of January 6 that they could not serve as fair or impartial jurors.<sup>2</sup>

In *Thompson*, the Court individually examined 34 prospective jurors, and qualified 25 of them (or 73%). See *Thompson*, No. 21-cr-161, ECF No. 106 at 170, 172, 181, 190, 193. The court asked the entire venire 47 standard questions, and then followed up on their affirmative answers during individual voir dire. *Id.* at 4-5, 35. Of the nine prospective jurors struck for cause, only three (or about 9% of those examined) were stricken based on an inability to be impartial, as opposed to some other cause.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, in *Robertson*, the Court individually examined 49 prospective jurors and qualified 34 of them (or about 69% of those examined). See *Robertson*, No. 21-cr-34, ECF No. 106 at 73. The Court asked all prospective jurors whether they had “such strong feelings” about the events of January 6 that it would be “difficult” to follow the court’s instructions “and render a fair and impartial verdict.” *Robertson*, No. 21-cr-34, ECF No. 104 at 14. It asked whether anything about the allegations in that case would prevent prospective jurors from “being neutral and fair” and whether their political views would affect their ability to be “fair and impartial.” *Id.*

---

<sup>2</sup> For those struck based on a professed inability to be impartial, see *Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32, ECF No. 133 at 49-54 (Juror 328), 61-68 (Juror 1541), 112-29 (Juror 1046); ECF No. 134 at 41-42 (Juror 443), 43-47 (Juror 45), 71-78 (Juror 1747), 93-104 (Juror 432), 132-43 (Juror 514); ECF No. 135 at 80-91 (Juror 1484). For those struck for other reasons, see *Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32, ECF No. 134 at 35-41 (Juror 313, worked at Library of Congress); ECF No. 134 at 78-93 and ECF No. 135 at 3 (Juror 728, moved out of D.C.); ECF No. 135 at 6-8 (Juror 1650, over 70 and declined to serve), 62-73 (Juror 548, unavailability), 100-104 (Juror 715, anxiety and views on guns), 120 (Juror 548, medical appointments); ECF No. 136 at 41-43 (Juror 1240, health hardship), 53-65 (Juror 464, worked at Library of Congress), 65-86 (Juror 1054, prior knowledge of facts).

<sup>3</sup> For the three stricken for bias, see *Thompson*, No. 21-cr-161, ECF No. 106 at 51-53 (Juror 1242), 85-86 (Juror 328), 158-59 (Juror 999). For the six stricken for hardship or inability to focus, see *Thompson*, No. 21-cr-161, ECF No. 106 at 44 (Juror 1513), 45 (Juror 1267), 49-50 (Juror 503), 50-51 (Juror 1290), 86-93 (Juror 229), 109-10 (Juror 1266).

at 13, 15. The Court followed up on affirmative answers to those questions during individual voir dire. Of the 15 prospective jurors struck for cause, only nine (or 18% of the 49 people examined) indicated that they had such strong feelings about the January 6 events that they could not be fair or impartial.<sup>4</sup>

In *Webster*, the Court individually examined 53 jurors and qualified 35 of them (or 66%), *Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 115 at 6, though it later excused one of those 35 based on hardship, *Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 114 at 217-18. The Court asked all prospective jurors whether they had “strong feelings” about the events of January 6 or about the former President that would “make it difficult for [the prospective juror] to serve as a fair and impartial juror in this case.” *Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 113 at 19. During individual voir dire, the Court followed up on affirmative answers to clarify whether prospective jurors could set aside their feelings and decide the case fairly. *See, e.g., id.* at 32-33, 41-42, 54-56, 63, 65-66. Only 10 out of 53 prospective jurors (or about 19%) were stricken based on a professed or imputed inability to be impartial, as opposed to some other reason.<sup>5</sup> The *Webster* Court observed that this number “was

---

<sup>4</sup> For those struck based on a professed inability to be impartial, see *Robertson*, No. 21-cr-34, ECF No. 104 at 26-34 (Juror 1431), 97-100 (Juror 1567); ECF No. 105 at 20-29 (Juror 936), 35-41 (Juror 799), 59-70 (Juror 696), 88-92 (Juror 429); ECF No. 106 at 27-36 (Juror 1010), 36-39 (Juror 585), 58-63 (Juror 1160). For those struck for other reasons, see *Robertson*, No. 21-cr-34, ECF No. 104 at 23-26 (Juror 1566, hardship related to care for elderly sisters), 83-84 (Juror 1027, moved out of D.C.); ECF No. 105 at 55-59 (Juror 1122, language concerns), 92-94 (Juror 505, work hardship); ECF No. 106 at 16-21 (Juror 474, work trip); 50-53 (Juror 846, preplanned trip).

<sup>5</sup> Nine of the 19 stricken jurors were excused based on hardship or a religious belief. *See Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 113 at 46 (Juror 1464), 49-50 (Juror 1132), 61 (Juror 1153), 68 (Juror 951), 78 (Juror 419); *Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 114 at 102-04, 207, 217 (Juror 571), 188 (Juror 1114), 191 (Juror 176), 203-04 (Juror 1262). Of the ten other stricken jurors, three professed an ability to be impartial but were nevertheless stricken based on a connection to the events or to the U.S. Attorney’s Office. *See Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 113 at 58-60 (Juror 689 was a deputy chief of staff for a member of congress); *Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 114

actually relatively low” and therefore “doesn’t bear out the concerns that were at root in the venue transfer motion” in that case. *Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 115 at 7.

In *Hale-Cusanelli*, the Court individually examined 47 prospective jurors and qualified 32 of them (or 68%). *Hale-Cusanelli*, No. 21-cr-37, ECF No. 91 at 106, 111. The Court asked prospective jurors questions similar to those asked in the other trials. *See Hale-Cusanelli*, No. 21-cr-37, ECF No. 90 at 72-74 (Questions 16, 20). Of the 15 prospective jurors struck for cause, 11 (or 23% of those examined) were stricken based on a connection to the events of January 6 or a professed inability to be impartial.<sup>6</sup>

In these first five jury trials, the percentage of prospective jurors stricken for cause based on partiality is far lower than in *Irvin*, where the Supreme Court said that “statement[s] of impartiality” by some prospective jurors could be given “little weight” based on the number of other prospective jurors who “admitted prejudice.” *Irvin*, 366 U.S. at 728. In *Irvin*, 268 of 430 prospective jurors (or 62%) were stricken for cause based on “fixed opinions as to the guilt of petitioner.” *Id.* at 727. The percentage of partiality-based strikes in these first five January 6-related jury trials—between 9% and 23% of those examined—is far lower than the 62% in *Irvin*. The percentage in these cases is lower even than in *Murphy*, where 20 of 78 prospective jurors (25%) were “excused because they indicated an opinion as to petitioner’s guilt.” *Murphy*, 421 U.S. at 803. *Murphy* said that this percentage “by no means suggests a community with sentiment so poisoned against petitioner as to impeach the indifference of jurors who displayed no animus

---

at 139-41 (Juror 625’s former mother-in-law was a member of congress); 196-98 (Juror 780 was a former Assistant U.S. Attorney in D.C.).

<sup>6</sup> *See Hale-Cusanelli*, No. 21-cr-37, ECF No. 90 at 61-62 (Juror 499), 67-68 (Juror 872), 84-85 (Juror 206), 91-94 (Juror 653); ECF No. 91 at 2-5 (Juror 1129), 32 (Juror 182), 36 (Juror 176), 61-62 (Juror 890), 75-78 (Juror 870), 94-97 (Juror 1111), 97-104 (Juror 1412). For the four jurors excused for hardship, see *Hale-Cusanelli*, No. 21-cr-37, ECF No. 90 at 77-79 (Juror 1524), 99 (Juror 1094); ECF No. 91 at 12 (Juror 1014), 31 (Juror 899).

of their own.” *Id.* As in *Murphy*, the number of prospective jurors indicating bias does not call into question the qualifications of others whose statements of impartiality the Court has credited.

Far from showing that “an impartial jury actually cannot be selected,” *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 63, the first five January 6-related jury trials have confirmed that voir dire can adequately screen out prospective jurors who cannot be fair and impartial, while leaving more than sufficient qualified jurors to hear the case. The Court should deny the defendant’s request for a venue transfer and should instead rely on a thorough voir dire to protect the defendant’s right to an impartial jury.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the defendant’s motion to transfer venue should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

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

By: /s/ Rebekah Lederer  
REBEKAH LEDERER  
Pennsylvania Bar No. 320922  
Assistant United States Attorney  
U.S Attorney’s Office for District of Columbia  
601 D St. N.W, Washington, DC 20530  
Tel. No. (202) 252-7012  
Email: rebekah.lederer@usdoj.gov