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So, Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Plofchan, I'm going to ask your client, Mr. Plofchan, to just have his right hand -- or I'll ask the Courtroom Deputy to perform -- or to conduct the arraignment.

So, Mr. Douyon.
MR. PLOFCHAN: Yes.

Your Honor, just to let you know, for some reason, you came up in the screen where Mr. Caldwell was, so I can't see my client. But if you all can see the hands, $I$ can trust that that'll happen. I just can't see him at this point.

DEPUTY CLERK: And, Counsel, this is Jean-Claude, the Courtroom Deputy. If you can press "\#8" on your screen, you should be able to open up more windows.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Very well. Thank you.

THE COURT: Did that work for you, Mr. Plofchan? Can you see Mr. Caldwell now?

MR. PLOFCHAN: It did, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Good.

DEPUTY CLERK: Okay.
Mr. Caldwell, do you wish to waive the formal reading of the indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: No. No, sir, I do not.
MR. PLOFCHAN: We do not.

DEPUTY CLERK: Okay.

Let me -- give me one moment.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Plofchan, let me just make sure: Are you asking for a formal reading or are you waiving a formal reading?

MR. PLOFCHAN: Actually, we're waiving the formal
reading, Your Honor. We did receive the indictment.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
DEPUTY CLERK: Mr. Caldwell, in Criminal Case

No. 21-28-1, you have been charged with the following counts:

Count 1, conspiracy, in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 371;

Count 2, obstruction of an official proceeding, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1512 (c) (2);

Count 3, destruction of government property, in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 1361;

And Count 4, restricted building or grounds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. $1752(a)(1)$ and (2).

How do you wish to plead?

THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty.

DEPUTY CLERK: Your Honor, a plea of not guilty will be entered for the defendant.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well.
Thank you, Counsel.
Mr. Caldwell, thank you.

All right. Let's turn next to case status. And let's start with the protective order that was filed this afternoon, and there was an opposition filed as well.

You know, government counsel, I'm happy to hear from you further about the basis for the protective order. And so if there's anything more you'd like to add, I'm happy to hear it, particularly if you've got a response to the opposition that was filed.

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.

We just wanted to make clear that that's actually, in terms of what we are hoping to provide to the defense as initial discovery, includes the source documents from which we are drawing a number of the messages and statements that we are relying on in our indictment and in our opposition to Mr. Caldwell's motion to reconsider his detention status.

Those messages include personal identifying information, to include names and phone numbers of the individuals with whom Mr. Caldwell communicated. And then in the context of the records that we are pulling from the co-defendants' accounts, there's the information of the people with whom the co-defendants communicated. We also pulled a number of messages from the accounts of the co-defendants themselves.

And we would like to provide all of these records in total and unredacted to provide Mr. Caldwell and his
attorney with an opportunity to view those in their complete context so that they can fully understand, and to the extent that they believe, as Mr. Plofchan has asserted, that anything is taken out of context, we want them to have the opportunity to review the entire context.

But it's normally our practice to go through, and if we don't have a protective order, to redact all personal identifying information, and that would take time, and we would really like to get the materials to the defense faster.

And so we're seeking this protective order in order to try to get a more fulsome sampling or a more fulsome copy, a neat, complete copy of these records to the defense as quickly as possible. And that's really what's driving this request for a protective order.

THE COURT: I guess the question that follows, then, is -- I mean, because the protective order is much broader than that. I mean, the protective order, at least as I read it, effectively bars the use of any material, whether it's personal identifying information or not, for any purposes other than in the context of the case. And so, you know, the particular reason that you've articulated for needing a protective order, there's not exactly a thick -- a breadth of this protective order.

And so I mean, I can understand the government's
desire to want to -- to push all of this material out without having to go through the process of redacting it. And perhaps you can reach some agreement with Mr. Plofchan about doing that. But in terms of the scope of the report as it's presently drafted, it's much broader than that concern.

And I'll just highlight a couple of cases that my colleagues have recently drafted but you all may be aware of that sort of talks about the scope of protective orders and what the government needs to show in order to justify them.

And, you know, first, is by Judge Bates at 314 F.Supp.3d 248; it's called United States versus Jimmy Lee Johnson. And then there's another decision by Judge McFadden at 355 F.Supp.3d 1, United States v. Dixon.

In both of those cases, the courts set forth essentially the standards and really do place a burden on the government to not only justify the protective order but to ensure that the protective order sort of fits the reason for the meat of it, and $I$ just don't think the present protective order does that.

So --

MS. RAKOCZY: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- I guess -- go ahead.

MS. RAKOCZY: I apologize for interrupting,

Your Honor.

THE COURT: No. That's all right.
MS. RAKOCZY: We're happy to work with

Mr. Caldwell's attorney to craft a protective order that could be narrower.

This is the standard protective order that we submit in our cases. And so in the interest of trying to get something on the record so that we could provide discovery as quickly as possible, that's what we chose to file.

It's my understanding Mr. Plofchan opposes any protective order whatsoever at this point in time. So we filed what we filed because it is our standard order. We're happy to work to amend that if we can reach an agreement with Mr. Plofchan, but I'm not sure if we will be able to.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Your Honor, if $I$ could be heard on this very briefly.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. PLOFCHAN: The issue for us is, first, the government came and did a search warrant and took my client's phones and computers. And, therefore, my client had access to all that information that was on his phones and computers. And now the government is saying, we don't want you to use the information that was on your phones and computers. And we want to either have you agree that you won't use it or we want to redact it. Well, my client
doesn't have access to the information unless he gets the information from his phones and computers.

So to the extent that they're seeking any kind of protective order or anything that was already on my client's material, $I$ don't think there's any basis for it whatsoever.

With regard to -- and that was why -- one of the things we objected to. If there was some third-party message and so forth, that may be a different thing, but the government hasn't identified that.

More importantly, right now, Ms. Rakoczy indicated that, oh, well, we have the co-defendants or the co- -alleged -- alleged co-conspirators.

Well, to the extent that there's a co-conspirator, my client's entitled to that information as well, because it also goes to the issue of whether it's impeachment material, and whether, if they contacted and used a number, and my client is able to show that, hey, that's not my number and I didn't get that text, $I$ don't want to have something inferred to me, then that's a defense that he can rely on. And for them to redact that, or to say that we can't use it in any way, shape, or form we want -THE COURT: Mr. Plofchan, hang on. Let me just sort of share with you my general views about this. And then -MR. PLOFCHAN: Okay.

THE COURT: -- maybe the thing here is to let the parties go forward.

In terms of personal identifying information -let me back up.

You know, the presumption under the Federal Rules, and, frankly, under the due process clause, is that the defendant will receive all the material that the government believes is relevant to assisting in preparation of the defense. I mean, that's what needs to be disclosed under Rule 16.

There is no cutout to withhold something from the defendant just because it's personally identifying, unless there's a justification for it.

And so if, for example, there's personally identifying information, $I^{\prime} m$ not saying in this case, but, for example, of a victim, then perhaps there's a justification for withholding that personally identifying information; or if there's a potential threat to a witness, for example, there is a justification for withholding that.

But this general notion that something is personally identifying information and, therefore, is personally identifying information, and for that reason and that reason alone, it can be withheld from the defendant, I'm not sure that's accurate and that's correct.

You know, the defendant is entitled to the
material the government has; and if there's some reason to limit what the government is going to provide him, then the government needs to justify it.

Now, in terms of how that material then gets used if it's disclosed to him in full, that may be a separate issue. You know, certainly it can be used in furtherance of the defense, certainly it can be used for any other lawful purposes.

But the bottom line is that it's not adequate, in my view, for the government to simply say that it's personally identifying information and, therefore, we're going to redact it, I think there has to be some justification for that, along the lines of what $I$ discussed earlier.

And so here's what I would suggest, and I know there's a great volume of material here:

Mr. Plofchan, in the interest of pushing this material out to you so you can begin to review it, what I would urge you to consider is to accept this material, at least tentatively, pursuant to sort of the general restrictions laid out in this proposed order, but that we very quickly try and reach some agreement on the material and limits that are appropriate if not, because otherwise what $I$ fear is that it's going to take a little bit of time for you all to negotiate something and it's going to delay
you getting the material.
If that's something that you'd be prepared to do and I think the government, it sounds like, is prepared to turn this over sooner, rather than report. So, you know, at a minimum, if you accept it in sort of an attorneys'-eyes-only capacity, that would be a helpful start, at least for you to get the material.

Mr. Plofchan, you're on mute. I can't hear you.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Your Honor, I'm happy, pursuant to this, to initially see it as attorneys' eyes only. And then if the government wishes to identify those particular items they wish there to be further restriction, we can discuss that. But I don't want to come back to the court for permission, which is what that order implied, permission for me to use it or something along those lines.

So if -- and I can propose that if they want to give it to me originally and then they have a certain period of time in which they want to make a further motion on restriction. But absent that motion being made, then $I$ can use it, you know, for any lawful purpose.

DEPUTY CLERK: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Plofchan, hang on. It looks like we lost government counsel. So let's just put a pause on this for a moment.

MS. RAKOCZY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I did call

THE COURT: I'm sorry, are you back, Counsel?
MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor. I called in. For some reason, the video cut out, so I'm now on the telephone line.

THE COURT: All right.
Mr. Plofchan, you can continue.
MR. PLOFCHAN: So I was saying that if they want to -- I can agree that for the first 30 days, it would be attorneys' eyes only. And then if the government wants to identify specific items that they want to have a further restriction, we can address it at that time. But then if we don't, I want it to be presumed that I can use it for any lawful purpose.

I just have a difficulty agreeing to a restriction on something I haven't even seen yet, because I don't know how it will affect my client.

Unlike the government, every time I have to come back to the Court to address something, it's using very scarce resources that my client doesn't necessarily have and would like to spend on other aspects of his defense.

THE COURT: Okay.
Well, government counsel, do you want to add anything here before we kind of move on? I think we've maybe reached a place where at least there's at least some
interim agreement as to how we can move forward.
MS. RAKOCZY: I think that's right, Your Honor.
I think if Mr. Plofchan is willing to agree to
what -- I think what he said was, let's say, a 30-day period where this material would be for, in his words, "attorneys' eyes only" and then the government can file a supplemental protective order motion and discuss with Mr. Plofchan if we can work out the terms of maybe a more narrow protective agreement to submit to the Court, then we can provide the initial discovery to Mr. Plofchan as soon as possible.

THE COURT: Okay.
Well, it sounds like everybody is on the same page; I don't think I need to commit anything to an order.

And so I think what we'll do here is, subject -the agreements in -- both parties have agreed for 30 days, that discovery that gets turned over will be for attorneys' eyes only. And in the interim, what you will all do is attempt to negotiate a narrower protective order, and hopefully you can do that.

All right. Well, with that, let me, then, turn back to the government and just ask if there is -- so I know -- just quickly in terms of my own edification, I know Ms. Watkins is now before this Court and I know she's before Magistrate Judge Faruqui for a detention hearing. But what is the status of Mr. Crowl?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.

Mr. Crowl had his detention hearing in front of the judge in Ohio in -- approximately, it was about ten days ago now.

He was ordered detained and then this matter was indicted, so he did not actually need to have a preliminary hearing out there. It's my understanding that he was turned over to the custody of the marshals for transport here. But I have not received notification that he has arrived yet in this area and he has not had his initial appearance. Ms. Watkins did have hers this afternoon.

THE COURT: Okay.

Right.
And I understand she's -- that detention hearing for Ms. Watkins has been deferred to next week.

Okay. Well, that's helpful.
All right. Before we turn, then, to the bond-review motion, are there any other issues we ought to take up or is there anything else anybody wants to discuss about case status or any other details anybody wants to bring to my attention or issues that need to be brought to my attention?

MR. PLOFCHAN: Yes, Your Honor, if I could.
And only because it happened today.
And I understand the Court's desire to begin the
He was ordered detained and then this matter was
indicted, so he did not actually need to have a preliminary
hearing out there. It's my understanding that he was turned
over to the custody of the marshals for transport here. But
I have not received notification that he has arrived yet in
this area and he has not had his initial appearance.
Ms. Watkins did have hers this afternoon.
THE CoURT: Okay.
arraignment, but, as the Court's aware, certain deadlines begin running from the arraignment, unless the Court rules otherwise, I am actually -- after today's hearing, I am going -- the Court doesn't need to know all my personal world, but I've been married 34 years on Sunday and we're going on a vacation as a couple for two weeks. And I would rather not have to worry about some of the triggering motions in the time frames in that two-week period, because I am the lead counsel here in the office.

And I didn't know if it might be possible for the Court to grant me an additional two weeks on any of the motions for good cause or any of the time frames that regard, perhaps, a request for bill of particulars or a request for any motion that we might have to dismiss the indictment, et cetera, any time frames that may be applicable.

THE COURT: Well, let's put a hold on that until the end of this hearing and we can talk scheduling, because I was going to raise the issue of next-steps timing of -basically, timing of next steps. And to the extent that you intend to file any motions, talk about what those might be and when you might be prepared to file them.

And then we obviously should talk about speedy trial. Although given the fact that Mr. Crowl hasn't appeared here, the clock really will not have started. But,
nevertheless, we should talk about speedy trial before we adjourn.

So let's move, then, to the bond-review motion that's been filed.

Let me start with government counsel and I'll hear from you. I've got some questions I'd like to ask, but I'm happy to hear from you.

Both parties can assume I've carefully read all the papers. And then, Mr. Plofchan, I've also reviewed the exhibits that were emailed over to me this afternoon. So I've reviewed everything that the parties have submitted to the Court.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So let me -- government counsel, can you hear us?

MS. RAKOCZY: I can. I'm sorry, Your Honor. It sounded a little far apart. I apologize.

THE COURT: That's okay.

MS. RAKOCZY: Did you want to hear the government's argument first?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MS. RAKOCZY: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, Mr. Caldwell was ordered detained by the District Court in the Western District of Virginia when he was first presented, and that he was detained pursuant to

Section (f)(2)(B) of the detention statute because of the risk-of-flight concerns here.

Mr. Caldwell is charged by way of indictment with a number of serious offenses. And he's charged for his role in the conspiracy to obstruct the congressional proceedings of January 6th of 2021.

The government's allegations in the indictment are concerning about the role that Mr. Caldwell played in this conspiracy.

Mr. Caldwell is alleged to have played a role in assisting various members of this conspiracy, who came from multiple states across the nation, to descend upon the Capitol for the express purpose of disrupting these congressional proceedings, and he played a significant role in coordinating that.

He not only discussed plans through the text messages and Facebook messages that are quoted in the indictment and in our detention memorandum, he arranged for a number of the parties to stay at the same hotel in Northern Virginia, to allow, in his words, "quick access to the city."

He coordinated with members of the conspiracy, who came from a different state, in order to serve as what, in his terms, would be a "quick reaction force," and, in his own words -- the role of that quick reaction force would be
to have, in his words, "the goodies," which would seem to be the weapons, "in case things go bad and we need to get heavy." Those are Mr. Caldwell's own words.

Mr. Caldwell also sent maps to the individuals who
were going to serve in that quick-reaction force so that those individuals would have an easy and quick way to get into the city and to the capitol.

Mr. Caldwell discussed with other individuals the possibility of having weapons available as well. He discussed with an individual, who's believed to be affiliated with a separate group called the Three Percenters in discussing how to transport weapons potentially across the Potomac River by boat.

The rhetoric in Mr. Caldwell's messages is of grave concern to the government. He talks repeatedly about how there would need to be violence. He talked about how, in his mind, this was the type of thing that they would have to rise to the level of using violent means and weapons in order to "stop this." And by stopping "this," the content of the messages that he exchanges makes clear that what he is trying to stop is the certification of the results of the election and the peaceful transfer of power.

From the government's perspective, there are grave concerns --

THE COURT: I'm sorry --

MS. RAKOCZY: -- about Mr. Caldwell's ability to follow the Court's -- any instructions or any conditions that this Court might set.

He uses rhetoric that suggests that he does not respect the rule of law; that he will take action if he does not agree with them.

He talks, for example, that how he says this is an ongoing mission of his cause, that, in his mind, this is the beginning, essentially, and that this must continue.

And so from the government's perspective, we do not believe there are conditions or combinations of conditions that could assure that he would comply with the Court's orders and that he would return to court.

He's also, we would note, as we explain in both the indictment and our detention memorandum, Mr. Caldwell has taken some steps to conceal evidence in this case. He has deleted or unsent certain Facebook messages. He's taken photographs down from social media that evidence his involvement in these crimes.

When the co-defendants, Ms. Watkins and Mr. Crowl, came to stay at his residence after the events of the 6th, he offered to essentially stash what he referred to as the saddle rattle, which we are inferring to be the camouflage and protective gear that the individuals in this conspiracy wore during the attack on the Capitol. He also stashed
those items at his house. And he, then, encouraged Mr. Crowl and Ms. Watkins to engage in, essentially, evasive measures as they came to his home to make sure that they were not followed.

Based on all of this, which is largely
Mr. Caldwell's own words, his own photos that he posted to his own cell phone account and social media accounts and then corroborative records that we see in the records of the other co-defendants, records that we see from the hotel where he books rooms for himself and several of his co-conspirators, these show grave concern that Mr. Caldwell cannot be trusted by this court to comply with any court orders and to return to court, and we believe that the risk to the community is incredibly strong, given the role he played in coordinating this offense.

I'm happy to answer any additional questions of the Court.

THE COURT: I do have some questions. Thank you, Counsel.

I guess the first question $I$ have is, as I read the bail statute, and $I$ think as the bail statute's been interpreted by the D.C. Circuit, the government, under 32 -$3142(f)$, has to sort of establish one of the conditions under $3142(f)$ in order to establish a hearing, in order to be granted a hearing.

And what the D.C. Circuit has said in U.S. versus Singleton is that unless one of those circumstances is met, detention is not an option. This is Singleton, 182 F.3d at 7, at page 8 or 9 .

And so what -- you know, under that subsection of the Bail Reform Act, which -- you know, typically we see cases here in which there's a crime of violence or usually the person has multiple felonies. But which of the factors under $3142(f)$ do you claim is sort of the gateway to getting a hearing and a threshold for a detention evaluation?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.
As I believe the Court in the Western District of Virginia found, I believe it was a hold under (f) (2) (B).

And we do agree here that there is a serious risk that Mr. Caldwell would obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice in this matter.

Given what we already know and what the grand jury has found probable cause to include in the indictment, which is that he has taken steps to conceal and obstruct evidence -- and destroy evidence in this case. He unsent messages that then showed up in the co-defendant's Facebook account, so we know what those messages were.

But he tried to take back evidence that discussed his involvement in the crime. He took down photos. He actually says to somebody in a text message that he is
taking down photographs from Facebook. And this is after January 6th.

He encouraged the co-defendant to stash evidence at his home at the time, and clearly did not believe that he was going to be found out, because he was encouraging the co-defendants to make sure that they weren't followed to his home.

And so here we are invoking (f) (2) (B), the risk of obstruction in this matter.

THE COURT: But (f) (2) (B), at least as I read the Bail Reform Act, (f) (2) (B) essentially kind of opens the door to potential detention. But then in terms of actual pretrial detention, you have to either establish that no combination of conditions will ensure the safety of the community or that the -- or the person's return to court.

MS. RAKOCZY: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: And so if I'm hearing what you're saying is that in order -- he qualifies for detention by virtue of his obstructive conduct; but that beyond that, the basis for detention is actually that he poses and continues to present -- pose a danger to the community.

Is that a fair understanding of how you see things?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor, that is correct.

Both a danger to the community and that his return
to court is also a concern, given his disregard for this Court's authority.

THE COURT: Okay.

Can I just follow-up, then, on some of the factual proffer that you made, and $I$ just have a few questions.

You know, it's been suggested, or at least been argued by the defendant and his counsel in the affidavit that his wife submitted, that he's not a member of the Oath Keepers, that he's not a member of this sort of militia organization or this anti-government organization.

What is the evidence, in your view, that suggests the contrary?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.

And to be clear, you know, the Oath Keepers is an organization that does collect members from individuals. You can send in a contribution through the website and become a dues-paying member.

We do not have evidence that Mr. Caldwell is a "dues-paying member" of the Oath Keepers; however, there are numerous individuals throughout the nation who affiliate with the Oath Keepers by virtue of associating with the belief system that the Oath Keepers put forth, and engaging in conduct that shows that they are with the Oath Keepers.

In this particular instance, Mr. Caldwell conspired with members of the Oath Keepers, who are both
literal dues-paying members of the Oath Keepers, and Ms. Watkins would be one example in that, and individuals who are affiliates of the Oath Keepers.

Affiliates of the Oath Keepers do things like actually wear paraphernalia that has the Oath Keepers insignia on them.

And so members of this group that marched up the east side of the Capitol and entered through the central doors into the rotunda, and that, of course, included Ms. Watkins and Mr. Crowl, they were wearing clothing that had patches for the Oath Keepers. Some of them were wearing T-shirts that had the Oath Keepers' name or logo on them.

Mr. Watkins -- I'm sorry, Mr. Caldwell coordinated with members of the Oath Keepers like Ms. Watkins and Mr. Crowl in planning this attack. Mr. Caldwell also has associated and coordinated with the founder and leader of the Oath Keepers, an individual who's referred to in the indictment and in our detention memo as Person One.

There are messages that are quoted in the indictment and in the detention memo where Mr. Caldwell references the degree to which Mr. -- the leader of the organization is making plans for the events of January 6th.

He also -- and we have reference to this in the detention memo -- Mr. Caldwell participated in earlier rallies and events that occurred in November and December of

2020 with the Oath Keepers. He actually -- and I'm struggling to recall --

I think that we quoted it in our detention memorandum -- but he actually directly communicated with the founder and leader of the Oath Keepers during the march in November 2020 that shows that he was participating in that event with the founder of the Oath Keepers, as well as Ms. Watkins and Mr. Crowl.

So the evidence shows what we would suggest and what we allege in the indictment and our memo, which he-- a strong affiliation with the Oath Keepers. We cannot say he's a dues-paying member, but he is certainly strongly affiliated with this organization and he actively planned the events of January 6th with several members, including at least one dues-paying member.

THE COURT: Okay.

And am I correct that at least as of now, the government's position is that it does not have evidence that Mr. -- or at least doesn't have photographic or video evidence that Mr. Watkins actually entered the building, entered the Capitol complex?

MS. RAKOCZY: Well, entered the building, yes, Your Honor.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Your Honor, Mr. Caldwell.
I apologize. You called him "Mr. Watkins" in the question.

THE COURT: Oh. I meant Mr. Caldwell. If I said "Watkins," I apologize.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Thank you.

MS. RAKOCZY: Your Honor, Mr. Caldwell -- the government's allegations are that Mr. Caldwell, we know for certain that he entered into the Capitol grounds, he passed through an area on the west side of the Capitol that was set up for the inauguration platform at the time.

We have a photograph included in the complaint, the affidavit in support of the complaint that was initially filed in this matter, that appears to show Mr. Caldwell traveling through essentially a tunnel through the scaffolding on the west side of the Capitol.

We also have photographs that Mr. Caldwell posted to his Facebook account of himself on the west side of the Capitol, and then photographs from where he was on the west side of the Capitol, which we believe to be the western terrace on the west side of the Capitol.

He discusses in his messages how, around the time that he is -- excuse me, says that he has breached the Capitol, he does say the word "inside" as he's narrating his actions to other individuals. But what we can't say for sure is that by "inside," he means inside the building, as opposed to inside the restricted area on the outside of the building. But he does say words to the effect of "I'm now
inside." He was literally inside.

And so we do have both photographic evidence and evidence from his messages that allow us to say -- to allege -- with certainty that he got as far as the west terrace of the Capitol building, which is very clearly an off -- an out-of-bounds, off-limits area that day.

And the messages suggest that he knew that, given that he described observing some people who he believed to be members of the Proud Boys organization and getting in a scuffle with police as this group is breaching. But he also uses words to say, in messages, in describing his own conduct, that he "assaulted the Capitol" and that he "stormed the Capitol."

And so we would allege that the evidence is strong that Mr. Caldwell was in this prohibited area of the Capitol grounds and knew that.

We do not have photo or video of him inside the Capitol building at this time. We can't say it doesn't exist certainly, but we mention that we don't have that.

THE COURT: Okay.

Another question for you -- a few more questions:

One of the, I think -- I can't remember if it was a text message or a social media posting, Mr. Caldwell makes -- and I think he does this more than once -- uses the phrase "hunt at night."

Does the government have an understanding as to what Mr. Caldwell meant by that term?

MS. RAKOCZY: There is a message -- and I'm wondering if $I$ could find it in the indictment, but there is a message where Mr. Caldwell is saying, I believe, to Mr. Crowl, but I'm not 100 percent certain, that he's discussing, $I$ think, in particular, why the hotel that he suggests everyone stays at is a good hotel. And I think he discusses how it would allow them to be in a good location to hunt at night.

And I believe at the time that he's referring to the fact that they might need to go on the lookout for members of Antifa. There's a theme that runs through the messages, that there is this concern that they will need to do battle with members of Antifa.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RAKOCZY: I believe that that's quoted in the indictment.

THE COURT: Right.
There's also a reference to -- on -- it's sometime on or around January 1st, messaging about having to go -"maybe can go do some night hunting." And that's what you think that means?

MS. RAKOCZY: From the context of the other statements, that's our inference.

THE COURT: Okay.
In terms of the search that was performed at his home, there's a suggestion of -- well, let me back up:

It's not clear to me whether -- there's a suggestion of a recent purchase of ammunition and a weapon that looks like a cell phone.

Can you tell me a little bit more about that, and, in fact, whether any weapons were found at the time of the search, one? And, two, whether you have any reason to believe that he may actually own weapons but that they weren't found at the time of the search?

MS. RAKOCZY: Your Honor, I have not much evidence beyond what the Court has, which is that what was discovered was a weapon that is designed to look like a pistol. It was -- words on the gun were effectively that it was designed by a company that's made to look like cell phones.

There were also -- it's my understanding that there were invoices for a firearm.

THE COURT: Okay.
But that item that was a weapon disguised or made to look like a cell phone, was that actually found at his home or just a receipt for it?

MS. RAKOCZY: I think it was more that the invoices were found, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

And do you have any reason to believe, based on ATF records or anything like that, whether he actually owns firearms that weren't found on the property?

MS. RAKOCZY: I don't have that information at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
One additional question, and that concerns this document that was recovered from the house called -- that had the words "death list" on it.

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And apparently -- I mean, you described it as a handwritten document, and it has the name of an election official from another state on that document?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Can you describe that for me or -- and I think it would be difficult to get it to me, but can you describe that document for me in any greater detail?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.
I do have a photograph of the document that I could provide to chambers and to counsel, if that would be helpful.

But it appears to be a pre-existing, pre-printed notepad that has written on it, in handwriting, the words "death list:"

And then underneath it, there is a scribble that's
illegible. And then there is a location name given of a particular place in a particular state.

And then there is a name of someone, that's the name of the election official.

And then an arrow that points down to say -- it says "with," and then it names a relative of that person. THE COURT: It names a relative of the election official?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
And can you tell me where that was found?
MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.
It was recovered from the desk inside of an area that appeared to be an office within the home.

THE COURT: And can you tell me whether the election official is somebody who has received some publicity in connection with this past election?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor, the person did. And I'm happy to provide it to counsel and the Court.

Candidly, the only reason we didn't name the person was that we just did not -- we were concerned about putting that person's name into the media again.

But I'm happy to provide a copy to counsel and the Court.

THE COURT: Sure.

And I don't want you to provide the name. I don't know that it's appropriate to, at least at this juncture, to disclose that name publicly.

But I do think I would like to take -- I would like to see that document.

MS. RAKOCZY: Certainly, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So if you would provide that to chambers, and a copy to Mr. Plofchan, I would appreciate that.

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.

One last question: Also, the receipt that you referenced and the online purchases of ammunition and the cell phone that looks like a firearm, do you have a date on when those purchases were made?

MS. RAKOCZY: I don't, Your Honor, but I'm confident that $I$ could find that out pretty quickly for the Court and counsel.

THE COURT: Okay. It would be helpful to have that information as well.

Okay.
All right. Those are the questions I had,
Counsel. Thank you for the information.
Mr. Plofchan, I'll turn it over to you.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
As you know -- and I think the Court went down the path under -- detention is only permissible and the government can ask for detention if we're at 3142(f). And yet the Court has a certain (audio disconnected) if there's going to be detention, where the Court has to evaluate the four factors, only three of which I believe are applicable in this case.

But one of the first of it is the nature of the offense as charged. And one of the things that I didn't actually include in -- Your Honor, in the -- that the Court indicated that it had read the amendment. And we have correspondence, obviously, from the government that indicates that they can't place my client in the Capitol.

More importantly, in their brief in response to the detention hearing on page 18 of 22 -- and this is what is somewhat concerning -- they specifically say, it is of no matter that Caldwell was not physically part of the stack of Oath Keepers that stormed the Capitol January 6th. Like any coach on the sideline, he's allegedly just as responsible.

Well, that's not true. And I looked at that as a concession by the government that they have no evidence that for three of the four charges they brought against my client, there's no evidence that he was in the Capitol, that he damaged any property.

And we actually -- and I had included it as part of my exhibits --

THE COURT: Counsel, if I can interrupt you.
I thought about that.

And I mean, I guess the question is -- I mean, they've also charged him with aiding and abetting, destruction of government property and -- for example. And so the fact that he actually didn't himself destroy property doesn't necessarily absolve him of that count.

MR. PLOFCHAN: They haven't, Your Honor. They've charged him -- they just charged him with destruction.

I'm not aware of an aiding-and-abetting charge. That wasn't what he was arraigned for.

THE COURT: The indictment does state, Section 1361 -- 18 U.S.C. Section 1361 and 18 U.S.C. 13 -excuse me -- and 8 U.S.C. Section 2.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Actually -- and, Your Honor, to be clear, it actually says that on -- in the caption. But in the document itself with regard to the indictment, it doesn't mention anything about 1362. And there's nothing in it that --

THE COURT: 18 U.S.C. Section 2. I may have misspoke.

At the bottom of page 14 , there alleges a violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 1361 and 18 U.S.C. 2 .

MR. PLOFCHAN: When I look at 18 U.S.C. 1361, I'm not -- the Court's indulgence here, because I'm trying to find -- I started in one room and we came in, so all my material is in there.

There is no Section 2 in 18 U.S.C. 1361.

THE COURT: No, no, no.
I'm sorry. Maybe this is -- this is some of the difficulties with video.

18 U.S.C. Section 2. 18 U.S.C. Section 2 is the aiding and abetting statute. And that statute is cited in connection with 18 U.S.C. 1361.

I'm not saying there's a Section 1361(2). It's 18 U.S.C. 1361 and 18 U.S.C. Section 2.

MR. PLOFCHAN: I understand that the Court has drawn that.

I'll address it both ways. One is, I don't believe that that was actually charged, and, for certain, I don't know that it was arraigned that way.

But more importantly, $I$ don't even think, in terms of aiding and abetting of a destruction of property, the government hasn't identified any property that was destroyed by anyone who's alleged to have been in any kind of arrangement with Mr. Caldwell. They haven't alleged any -there's no specific property identified. Frankly, there's not even a specific agreement identified.

But one of the difficulties $I$ have is, I think it's a very imaginative and almost like a creative writing kind of indictment, because one of the -- and the goal that the government's going to have to overcome is that they have to overcome every reasonable theory of innocence, not just what story they want to tell.

Because the same language -- and I want the court to consider this in the context of whether my client's a danger and so forth. The same language about coordinating people to go to the Capitol to participate in what was called the Million MAGA March in November, that they called it an operation and that there was going to be help with maps, meaning that, hey, this is -- you drive down into the Capitol, this is where you can park, et cetera. It's the same language in November and December.

The government hasn't identified any language that actually says, you're going to go into the Capitol, you're going to go into the chambers, you're going to go on the ground whatsoever.

But I believe --

THE COURT: Counsel, can $I$ tell you what -- I'll just get to the heart of the issue and what really concerns me about your client's --

MR. PLOFCHAN: Sure --

THE COURT: -- conduct and his communications?

There's a text message on December 30th with Mr. Watkins in which he alludes to a conversation with somebody who's identified as Person Three, who he said is going to be a quick reaction force. So if the boys don't have to try and schlep weapons on the bus. Okay. He says that on December 30th of 2020.

Next day or two days later on January 1st, he sends out an email again or it's another -- he writes to someone else, I think it's Crowl, about another quick reaction force, refers to doing a pre-strike on the 5th, meaning we can do some night hunting. Person Three would have the goodies in case things go bad and we need to get heavy.

And then there's the text message with the person who's identified as the Three Percenter on January the 3rd. And your client proposes having a boat stationed across the Potomac River so that all the -- "If all went to shit," these are his words, "our guys load our weps and Blue Ridge militia weps and ferries them across."

So at least on three different occasions, he is discussing and planning to have sort of a quick strike force that's ready to incur the District limits and presumably move toward the target, which is words he used on the 4th, and bringing weapons into the District of Columbia, and bring weapons into this -- and for the purpose of -- or in
connection with counting of the electoral votes on January the 6th.

I mean, those are really terribly scary and frightening text messages. I guess not only is he planning but he's also helping to plan violence involving (audio disconnected).

MR. PLOFCHAN: One of the difficulties I have with this, Your Honor, is that the government obviously has his phone and the context of messages. And that's what $I$ was getting at. And $I$ know the Court is saying you want to address what you're concerned with.

But if you use the same language, people who are in logistics, people who have done logistics, they refer to operations.

And weapons and so forth, they didn't bring any weapons, and they've never brought weapons in.

And then what was their purpose?
So even if -- and I think that the government knows that there's context involved, and they haven't included all the context for a reason.

But $I$ do want to emphasize this point for

Your Honor --

THE COURT: Hang on.
MR. PLOFCHAN: -- is that the operation of Oath
Keepers, they're not a militant, from what I understand, and

I've never been able to find that Oath Keepers advocates any violence at all.

What Oath Keepers has done is that they have, as retired military or first responders -- and my guy is not a member of Oath Keepers -- but what they have done is they provided hurricane relief down in Florida and Georgia; they have provided security at schools; they have provided security at rallies.

And so the idea behind this is that's the nature of an operation.

THE COURT: Understood.

And if that's all it was, if the language was ambiguous, then I might -- well, I think you'd have something -- you'd have a good point.

But your client referred -- I can only assume that the word "weps," which appears at least twice in his text messages, and those are connected to this quick reaction force, refers to weapons.

He's planning to have weapons stationed outside the District of Columbia before January the 6th, in the event that things are going to get heavy, to bring in a quick reaction force to supply weapons. I mean, I don't see how anybody can read this in any other way.

MR. PLOFCHAN: What's a weapon, Your Honor?
I guess that's the question. And that's where I think that
the -- it's very difficult in this case, so you have to look at any history of Oath Keepers, you have to do that.

So does that mean that -- what did they carry on before? They had their arms and they had restraining devices or billy clubs. That's different. There's nothing that says "firearms." There is nothing that says "grenade launchers." There's nothing that says anything -- you know, anything along those lines.

And I have a concern that we don't have the ability to jail people for their rhetoric. And that was something that was used twice -- or three times was mentioned by the government was that, oh, we're concerned about this rhetoric.

Now, all of this goes to ultimately the issue, and I think my client believes that he is going to be -- and I agree with him -- that he's going to be exonerated completely in terms of the context of things.

But if the Court has a concern in terms of his release, make it a condition: He can't have any weapons. That's not an issue. And the Court can -- you know, he can have pretrial and he can have a condition that he can't be around any weapons, that someone can go and look to make sure he's not around weapons.

I don't have an issue with that. The problem is that based on their version of what $I$ think is, again, how
they wish to spin something, they're trying to say my client, who has never had any history of harming anyone, who has coordinated not just friends of the Oath Keepers -there were 2 million people or over -- depending on the numbers, there were at least several hundred thousand -- I don't want to exaggerate -- at the November rally, several hundred thousand in December, several hundred thousand. He helped a lot of people with, hey, where do you want to stay, where do you want to -- you know, here's a map, how do you get in and out of the city for parking, what's the best bridge and so forth. That's not an "operation" to overthrow the government or attack the House or the Senate.

He was with his wife the entire day that day. He spoke. And the government will have to concede that there's, like, 126 phone calls or text messages within the hour or so things are going down, and virtually all of them are to family and friends showing them at the fountain. And looking around and seeing masses of people, saying, this is great and we're peacefully protesting, et cetera, et cetera. There's nothing to indicate that he went anywhere.

I think Ms. Rakoczy, I think she was not really fully candid with the Court, because there's no evidence that that was a barrier that they went through. They actually went underneath the scaffolding, which was open after a choir left. So a choir was there singing for a
while, they leave, and then they walk up, and there's no barrier, there's nothing that says they couldn't go up and that. And they never go into the Capitol. They never participate.

And they don't have any agreement to destroy. And the government hasn't put on any evidence that there was any agreement with anyone to destroy any governmental property and do anything other than peacefully protest, to the extent that that sent a message to people in Congress.

There's -- as a matter of fact, contrary to what she says, it was open, the Capitol was open Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30.

THE COURT: Counsel, what do I do about -- what's your -- what do you have to say about the death-list document?

MR. PLOFCHAN: Well, we haven't seen it, so I'll tell Your Honor -- and I'll tell you two things that we know; one is, in terms of election officials, we know that Ms. Caldwell worked for the Clarke County election voter registration. We don't know whose document that is.

Secondly, we do know that my client, A, does genealogy and was working on things.

We also know that he has a list of people that he was trying to call about his father's death.

I don't know who the person is. He didn't know
who he was. He denies that he has a death list. If there's something -- my client says he's not even -- doesn't even recall the words "death" or "list" being on a piece of paper in his house. But he does know that his father died and that there are people that he was confirming, like, hey, do I let them know about the death or not.

And in terms of that, there's not a -- there's nothing to indicate that Mrs. Caldwell doesn't know the person who's this election official in her profession and it was her sheet of paper, because it's not a threat. There's no saying that we're going to kill this person. It's just --

THE COURT: Let me ask government counsel whether you've been able to ascertain whether the person listed on that document was someone associated with Mr. Caldwell's wife or was somebody from -- "I've disconnected with the Caldwell family."

MS. RAKOCZY: Your Honor, the person who's listed is not an election official in the state of Virginia.

I obviously don't have all the information about Mr. Caldwell's life connections to people from other states, but $I$ can definitively say that the person listed is not an election official in the state of Virginia.

THE COURT: And do you have any reason to believe --

MS. RAKOCZY: And I can send a copy of the note to Mr. Plofchan and to Mr. Douyon.

THE COURT: And do you have any reason to believe that the person is related -- is a family member of Mr. Caldwell?

MS. RAKOCZY: I do not, Your Honor. I have no reason to believe that that person is related to Mr. Caldwell.

THE DEFENDANT: You don't know that they're not.

MS. RAKOCZY: I cannot say that they are not. I don't know.

THE COURT: Hang on, everybody.

Mr. Plofchan, have you received a copy of the document?

MR. PLOFCHAN: I have, Your Honor. I'm taking a look at it right now.

My initial -- pulling it down now.

Your Honor, I think we're all going to be speculating, I'll just tell you that.

It appears that this person is somewhere multiple states away, who is rather famous in terms of a certain issue. But there's nothing that indicates that there's any death, direct threat against this person by my client, or that's not just reporting notes from a newscast or anything else.

And until I have a chance to talk to my client, I can't provide you anything else. But it certainly doesn't suggest that my -- and I will tell you that this person was arrested -- there were claims this person was arrested by the FBI for election fraud, et cetera, is what I'm seeing. But there's nothing that suggests that my client had -- knew she was, had access to who she was in those regards.

I can't tell you anything, based on what the government has told us, other than it doesn't really tell me anything, because, you know, someone's in national news and someone writes notes from an article or something along those lines, I don't think that that creates any -especially without a context, I don't think that creates any concern.

But I will say to the Court that in terms of the purpose for today, which is release, since that was multiple states over, as part of your condition, if you have a concern, don't let him travel to those states, don't let him talk to anyone in those states, don't let him have -- he can't make long-distance phone calls.

We just went out of the screen. Can you hear me, sir?

THE COURT: I can hear you.
MR. PLOFCHAN: All right. We don't have video, but if you can still hear me, I'll keep chatting.

You know, if you can make whatever conditions you want, if you have a concern about one person -- you know, that person or whatever...

But given the presumption of, $A$, innocence and the presumption in favor of release, if the Court has concerns for conditions, impose the conditions.

My client has just been sitting around since the 19th of January. He can't participate in his defense, we don't have discovery from the government, and I can't talk to him about anything to provide you any further information.

I will tell the Court that I asked the government to tell me and give me these documents and they -- you know, so that $I$ could be prepared for this hearing, and that didn't come forward. So I don't want to say I've been, not Shanghaied, but I think I'm at a little bit of a disadvantage on that specific question.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PLOFCHAN: I do want to just also let you know, Your Honor, that in terms of Oath Keepers, one of the things -- I just wanted the Court, to give you some context because $I$ don't know that $I$ put it in the motion, but Oath Keepers have also -- the organization aspires itself and uses as a model the Guardian Angels out of New York City, the guy with the red berets that were -- Curtis Sliwa. And
where they used to go hunting at night, which was to get on the subway and make sure -- as they said, make sure no pervs hit anyone or offended anyone.

The Oath Keepers has provided security at political rallies over the last four years, primarily for Republican causes. And most recently, they provided non-weaponinized, non-violent security for political rallies to make sure that Antifa or who -- what they classify as BLM protesters did not disrupt the rallies. I don't -- the hunting at night, $I$ believe, is a term of art within the community that talks about the security that they provide at the rallies. And any operation they refer to is security at the rallies, not violence.

And there's actually no indication that I've been able to find that Oath Keepers has been an advocate of violence or has participated in any destruction of property as a sanctioned act.

Now, my client is going to say that he's not a member of the Oath Keepers. There's no evidence he is; I think the government has conceded that.

And they've also conceded that they have no evidence that he was in the Capitol or that he participated in any destruction. And they haven't identified any agreement that there was supposed to be some destruction.

That's one of the things that the -- what is
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woefully missing and would be part of our ultimate motion to dismiss the indictment, is that the indictment is woeful -there's no agreement whatsoever.

There's claims of communication and then there's claims of events that happened afterwards. And then they draw wildly specious connections when they miss the entirety of the proper and legal activity that one gets to participate in a political rally. And if that's what you're coordinating, that's what you're coordinating. And there's no evidence of firearms or use of firearms, et cetera.

But I think that's all for trial. And I'm not trying to try the case right now, but there are plenty -many -- manifold defenses.

But the issue that I think that we have to -- the Court has to address, we're asking the Court to address is to allow my client to be released and he can go back to his home, because the issue is, does he form a danger to everyone in the world?

Other judges in the District have said, hey, look, we're going to release you, but you can't come back into the District.

If that's a condition, don't let him back in the District. Make him report three times a day to a Pretrial person so that they knew where he is at all times. You know, I'm not -- it becomes difficult in terms of $I$ don't
know what it means to not utilize the Internet, because people have to -- that's how they get their phone and so forth. It's called Voice over IP.

But if you say, you can't use a social media account, you can't use a Facebook or an Instagram or a LinkedIn or anything like that, that's a condition. You can't leave the state. You can't leave certain counties. You have to wear an ankle bracelet.

There are -- the --

THE COURT: Okay. I think --
MR. PLOFCHAN: -- position of the government that I find so frustrating in this particular case is they claim, oh, there's no reasonable basis to provide security.

And it's almost -- given the imagination that they've used to put together this indictment in their briefs, they didn't put any effort into kind of trying to be not necessarily imaginative but creative or pro-release based in terms of what kind of conditions should come forward, which, in my mind, means they don't really care what conditions you impose, if you decide to impose conditions.

THE COURT: Counsel, can you hear me?

MR. PLOFCHAN: I can hear you, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay.

I'm going to -- well, you know -- well,

I understand your position.

Let me turn back to government counsel and see if you've got thoughts on where we go from here.

MS. RAKOCZY: Your Honor, we're not trying to read anything into Mr. Caldwell's words other than what they actually said.

And as the Court noted earlier, there really is no other way to read the messages about having individuals stationed nearby with weapons, other than the fact that there were weapons available, serious weapons available in the event that the activities at the Capitol went badly.

And those activities at the Capitol were a planned and very well-coordinated attack on the United States Capitol --

THE DEFENDANT: Not true.

MS. RAKOCZY: -- to interrupt the congressional proceeding to certify the results of the Electoral College vote.

Mr. Caldwell know that that was the plan and actively assisted in making that plan. He wanted weapons to be nearby. He made statements that indicated he was prepared to assist in this effort to have violence be brought upon. This is effort if (audio disconnected).

And from the government's perspective, that presents a grave risk to the community that cannot be
satisfied by check-ins by phone or periodically going to his house to make sure he doesn't have weapons.

So from the government's perspective, we do believe that there are no conditions or combination of conditions that can assure the defendant's return to court and the safety of the community.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Your Honor, if I could just -there's no evidence of weapons anywhere. That's the concern I have.

There is, to use the government's words, rhetoric. But there's no evidence to support rhetoric or bravado or talk.

And every other person who was there seems to have been released on conditions that they can't have a firearm, they can't be -- you know, they can't leave, they can't travel, they can't come into the District, and I think we can use those conditions.

THE COURT: Actually, that's not true. And it's not true that everybody's been released.

You're right that some people have been released.
MR. PLOFCHAN: I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. Everyone is not, including the two individuals who've been presented before three different judges now and one of your client's co-defendants.

So three different magistrate judges looked at
this case, considered the evidence not only against your client but the other two co-defendants, and in each instance, they've held them.

And these magistrate judges are people who make detention decisions on a daily basis.

MR. PLOFCHAN: That's right.
THE COURT: So let's not overstate the case here, okay?

MR. PLOFCHAN: I apologize.

You're right, Your Honor. I'm guilty of rhetoric in that regard, that it was exaggeration, and I apologize.

But a large number of people are released with conditions. And I think -- and I'm not trying to make any case against somebody else, but the facts as admitted by the government are different with my client than they are with Watkins and Crowl, because my client wasn't in the Capitol. And my client, they know wasn't in the Capitol, was with his wife the whole day, has physical limitations, et cetera. And they don't have -- they haven't pointed to any agreement to go into the Capitol and do $X$. And they haven't pointed to any agreement to go beyond being at the rally.

And contrary to, they may want to draw that, they have had all the phones -- and they've all the phones and all of their communication for the last 90 days, their communication. They've had the phones for about -- since
the 19th of January. And no one's put out any evidence of yes, this is our agreement, we're going to do this at this day and do this. And we're going to go in and we're going to do -- go down this hall and all that. Nothing that involves my client.

THE COURT: I understand.

And you know as well as I do that that kind of specificity is not required to establish a conspiracy, but you know that as well as I do.

And the question before me is are there conditions that would satisfy me that your client doesn't present a risk to the community, and that's what I'm trying to weigh.

All right. I'm going to just take a couple minutes here; I want to reflect on what $I$ want to do next. So I'll ask everybody to just bear with me and I'll be back with you momentarily, okay?

MR. PLOFCHAN: Yes, sir.

MS. RAKOCZY: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Recess from 5:16 p.m. to 5:24 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay, everyone. Can everybody hear me okay?

MR. PLOFCHAN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Let me begin by saying that I've carefully considered all of the evidence before me, and I'm keenly aware of what the burdens are and the responsibility is here, where the burden lies and what the factors are I should consider.

Let me first acknowledge that Mr. Caldwell is, of course, presumed to be innocent. The indictment itself is not -- can you all see me now?

MR. PLOFCHAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How about now?

No?

MR. PLOFCHAN: No, Your Honor.

We haven't been able to see you for about 15 to 20 minutes, but we can hear you fine.

THE COURT: Okay.

Sorry about that.

This is --

All right. Well, everybody can hear me; is that right?

MR. PLOFCHAN: Yes, sir.

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

So, as I said, let me re-start: You know, Mr. Caldwell is presumed innocent, and the default presumption is release and not detention. The default
presumption is liberty and not pretrial incarceration. That said, the Bail Reform Act under 18 U.S.C. 3142 authorizes pretrial detention under certain conditions. The first condition that needs to be met is that the government has, under 3142(j), satisfied or met one of the criteria set forth -- excuse me, in 3142(f), not (j), 3142(f), to warrant a hearing.

And as the D.C. Circuit said in the Singleton case at 182 F.3d 7, unless one of the circumstances under 3142(f) is satisfied, "detention is not an option."

I do find here that the hearing and the satisfaction of holding the hearing, the condition to satisfy holding the hearing has been met here. At a minimum, it's been met under $3142(f)(2)(B)$; that Mr. Caldwell is a serious risk or presents a serious risk that he will obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice.

The government has identified evidence that, after January the 6th, as set forth in the detention memo, that Mr. Caldwell went about deleting communications on social media, deleting Facebook messages, including pictures from social media platforms, and inviting two of his alleged co-conspirators back to his home in Virginia from where they were in Ohio, after they had been identified publicly as having participated in the Capitol incursion. And, in fact, invited them that they can, in fact, "stash" -- "stash
evidence" at his property, and, in fact, inviting them or -excuse me, instructing them to make sure that they, I think, sort of drive by a couple of exits and then return to ensure that they're not being followed as they made their way to his home.

And so there is evidence that Mr. Caldwell made efforts to destroy the evidence against him and others after their and, arguably, his involvement in these events became public. And so I do think under 3142(f)(2)(B) that there is a basis to hold this hearing.

The question, then, becomes whether detention is warranted. And the question, then, is, are there conditions or a combination of conditions that would ensure the safety of the community and Mr. Caldwell's -- and/or Mr. Caldwell's return to court.

Let me just say at the outset, I'm not convinced that the government has met its burden even by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Caldwell is a flight risk. He is somebody who is 66 years old, has multiple medical conditions, is a longtime resident in Virginia, has no prior convictions. And even given the nature and circumstances of the offense here and even taking into account some of the obstructive behavior, I don't think he rises to the level of a flight risk to warrant his continued pretrial detention. At a minimum, there would be conditions
that could ensure his appearance back in court.
And, frankly, I've looked at the cases that the Circuit has considered for pretrial detention based on risk of flight, and they often involve people who have either articulated and demonstrated that they are, in fact, going to try and evade law enforcement or have sufficient ties abroad that the concern is that they will try and evade law enforcement and court orders. I don't have those concerns here; they simply aren't present.

The question, then, becomes whether the government has established by a clear and convincing evidence that there are no combination of conditions that would ensure the safety of the community.

In order to make that assessment, I'm supposed to weigh four factors: The nature and circumstances of the offense charged, the weight of the evidence against the defendant, the history and characteristics of the defendant, and the nature and seriousness of the danger posed by the defendant.

Let me start with the third factor, and that's Mr. Caldwell's history and characteristics.

All of those -- those factors, or that factor, I should say, does weigh against pretrial detention.

As defense counsel has laid out, he's now over 60 years old, has multiple health issues. Significantly,
has no prior convictions. He is a decorated member of the -- veteran. Has, in fact, worn multiple military medals, worked for the FBI once upon a time. Has held high-level national security clearances. And so his background and his characteristics do not favor detention.

There are, then, the nature and circumstances of the offenses charges. The offenses are laid out in the indictment. Let me emphasize, and I cannot say strongly enough, the nature and circumstances of the offenses could not be more serious.

What Mr. Caldwell is accused of is conspiring with others to plot an insurrection against the government of the United States, particularly the Congress of the United States, while it was attempting to certify the Electoral College vote.

That is an offense which cuts to the very heart of our democracy and the peaceful transition of power. And the fact that Mr. Plofchan [sic] has been found by a grand jury to have engaged in offenses relating to such conduct underscores the nature and circumstances of the offenses charged here are very serious and are of a nature that do favor detention.

The weight of the evidence against Mr. Plofchan [sic] I've considered in great detail, and let me just go over it a little bit here.

It's quite clear, based upon the proffer that the government has submitted, that Mr. Caldwell engaged in planning and communications with others, not just those who are identified in this conspiracy, this charge, with others, to plan a potential military-like incursion on the Capitol on January the 6th.

It started as early as November. There are emails and text messages, for example, in November 23rd, in which he said to Mr. Crowl, I believe we will have to get violent to stop this, we may have to fight next time. So

Mr. Caldwell already is contemplating violent conduct.
On November 26th, in a text message, he proposes a plan for the MAGA rally that was scheduled for December 12th. There would be "three four-man teams and two-man quick reaction force and two drivers/extractors to double as snipers/stallers and go hunting after dark for these cockroaches who prey on the weak." These are not words of somebody coming to Washington, D.C., simply to engage in peaceful protest but, rather, somebody who's contemplating, as I said, a military-style incursion or at least planning for a potential military action.

The evidence shows that in late December, there are contacts with other members of the Oath Keepers. Now whether Mr. Caldwell himself is a member or not, clearly the evidence shows that he communicated with them. And,
frankly, it's not really all that critical to my finding whether the Oath Keepers are a peaceful organization or not. What I'm focused here on is Mr. Caldwell's actual conduct and his communications in advance of January the 6th.

Notably, on December 30th of 2020, he sends a text message with Ms. Watkins in which he lays out plans for January 6th, but also notes that he spoke with somebody else, a person who's identified as Person Three, who would act as a quick reaction force. So that the boys -- I'll just quote his words -- "So the boys don't have to try to shove weps on the bus."

That "weps" clearly refers to the term "weapons" and that he's contemplating that somebody would stay in Virginia on January the 6th and be available to bring weapons into the District.

That wasn't the only time he contemplated that there would be a quick reaction force. On January 1st, he wrote Mr. Crowl, included the reference to the Person Three again being a quick reaction force, and notes that Person Three will have the goodies in case things go bad and we need to get heavy.

Later on in a communication on January the 3rd -and I found this to be quite astonishing -- he's communicating with somebody who the government identifies as a Three Percenter. Mr. Caldwell proposes that there be
somebody stationed by boat across the Potomac River, and that, "If all went to shit, my guys load our weps," again, using the term referring to weapons, "and the Blue Ridge militia weps," referring, apparently, to another group, their weapons, and carry them across the Potomac in case that is needed.

Then on January the 4 th, sends maps to the same person who's identified to be part of the quick reaction force, and advises that person to walk east from the hotel, the one that's in Virginia, in Northern Virginia, into D.C. "Toward the target," which, I think, is a reference to the Capitol.

He is at the Capitol on January the 6th. He's sending text messages with Watkins and others describing the events that have transpired.

Now, I recognize that there is no evidence before me that Mr. Caldwell, in fact, entered the Capitol; that he actually destroyed any actual evidence in the capitol or assaulted any police officer inside the Capitol.

But, nevertheless, although that factor and the weight of that evidence clears Mr. Caldwell in a sense, the real concern $I$ have about Mr. Caldwell, and the real danger Mr. Caldwell seems to present, is that he's engaged in active planning with others involving weapons.

It is true that there has been no evidence that -

Mr. Caldwell was -- seemed to have possessed weapons, or any weapon was found upon him. But I would note that as part of the search, there was the receipt for this weapon that was purchased by Mr. Caldwell seemingly online, the receipts that have been presented to me show a purchase on

November 22 nd, that is shortly in the aftermath of the election, would show him having online purchased a gun that appears to be in the shape of a cell phone that can neatly fit into someone's pocket.

There's also an invoice there of Mr. Caldwell having purchased at some point, although we don't know the date, ammunition for certain weapons.

So the concern with Mr. Caldwell is less what he specifically did on January 6th, like others, it doesn't look like he actually entered the Capitol building, didn't assault any police officers. But what he did prior to January the 6th is clearly engage in planning and preparation for conduct that others were engaged in and that others participated in, in the incursion that took place at the Capitol and the violence that followed.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --
THE COURT: I also -- Mr. Caldwell --
THE DEFENDANT: I know this is out of order, Your Honor.

And I beg your indulgence, sir. But my life hangs
in the balance.
MR. PLOFCHAN: Mr. Caldwell, I need you not to speak, okay?

I understand, and I ask you not to speak.
THE COURT: Mr. Caldwell, I understand --
I appreciate this is hard, but you also need to understand that your actions --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, these things are taken out of context.

These Oath Keepers thought they (audio disconnected) --

MR. PLOFCHAN: Mr. Caldwell --
THE COURT: Mr. Caldwell, I'm going to warn you again that, you know, anything you say on this record --

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
THE COURT: -- that's okay -- anything you say on this record can be used against you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And allow me to continue.
The evidence also shows that Mr. Caldwell, apparently, had no regrets about actually what happened on the 6th, even after witnessing firsthand and being present for what happened on the 6 th and knowing full well that this simply wasn't a peaceful protest and that it had been become an incursion on the Capitol and an attempt to disrupt what
proceeding were taking place at Congress.
Mr. Caldwell, instead of expressing any regret, seems to have relished in his role in these events, proclaiming that he "had a good time in storming the castle" in a text message or in a communication that was sent on January the 6th.

And then, I think, critically -- this is critically important in my finding that he presents a continued danger to the community: On January the 6th, this is ten days before he's arrested, in the immediate aftermath of this incursion of the Capitol, he sends Mr. Crowl a message that says, "We need to do this at the local level. Let's storm the Capitol in Ohio. Tell me when!"

THE DEFENDANT: I didn't send that.
THE COURT: No regret, but, rather, a
forward-looking statement in which he was ready to prepared to continue the kind of conduct that resulted in the death of one officer, injuries to many officers, and injuries to many others.

And then, of course, there's the conduct in which he recognizes what he's done wrong. He's deleting his Facebook posts and other material to cover up his own behavior. He's inviting back some of his co-conspirators to his farm, telling them to avoid being detected as they drive back and they can bring some of the things they wore and
they can be stored at his home.

I don't know quite what to make of this death-list document that's found with the name of an election official. It's very troubling to me that there is something like that there. But, nevertheless, frankly, even if $I$ put that to the side, all of the other evidence against Mr. Caldwell certainly suggests that he presents a real danger. And that danger, is, as $I$ said, not just to the community, but actually to fundamental fabrics of a democracy that we all cherish.

Mr. Caldwell has demonstrated that he's not simply just a peaceful protester, and that he's, rather, somebody who (audio disconnected), engaged in violent acts, and helped plan violent acts in order to upset valid democratic elections. And was, apparently, prepared, even after the violence on January the 6th, to continue engaging in that behavior going forward had he not been arrested.

Let me just say that notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Caldwell has no prior criminal convictions, I don't think there are any combination of conditions that will ensure the safety of the community.

Things like not having him travel in the District or limiting his travel or even keeping him on home confinement, while they may keep him at a particular physical location, the concern $I$ have about Mr. Caldwell is
that there's simply no way to monitor his communications full time.

Clearly, he's capable of using social media, both social media that's trackable publicly and messaging apps that are encrypted. So he has the ability and the capacity to know how to communicate with others through encrypted messaging apps that would be undetectable potentially by law enforcement if he continued to engage in this behavior.

That is obviously something that can't be monitored closely. And given the extensive planning, given the extensive degree of communications, $I$ don't have any confidence that Mr. Caldwell won't continue to engage in this kind of conduct and this behavior and planning with others if he were to be released.

And so for all of those reasons, $I$ do find by clear and convincing evidence that there are no combination of conditions that would ensure the safety of the community and that Mr. Caldwell does present and continues to present a dangerous to the community based upon the evidence that's been protected before me both by the defense and by the government and that $I$ have considered lesser conditions to -- conditions less than detention pretrial.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Your Honor, would the Court consider no Internet at the house? He's in home confinement with an ankle monitor; that he can't even use a phone and
that his wife would (audio disconnected) to that as well. THE COURT: Counsel, I just -- I think the short answer is: No.

As I said, he's demonstrated the ability to communicate with others, not only just publicly but through encrypted messaging.

I have -- we cannot monitor his communications 24 hours a day, seven days a week. And that is, frankly, the instrument of how he's engaged in the acts that he's accused of: It's through these communications with others. We don't have the resources and the means to have the ability to monitor every single thing he says.

And truth be told, his wife was there with him on the day of this insurrection. And I don't want to suggest that she did anything wrong, but she's now in an affidavit (audio disconnected) as his wife, and she would be prepared to do that and has done that. And so I don't have a lot of confidence that she's in a position to adequately monitor his communications either, okay?

Let's talk about next steps and where we go from here.

Why don't we set a control date on the calendar 30 days out.

Today is February 12th. Let's set a control date of -- is everybody available on March the 12th at 2:00 p.m.?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Sorry, I think we can only -- I'm just being told we can only schedule from 3:00 to 5:00.

So how about 3:00 p.m.?

MR. PLOFCHAN: On March the 12th at 3:00 p.m., yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay.

So March the 12th --

MS. RAKOCZY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- at 3:00 p.m. we'll reconvene.
The question to you, Mr. Plofchan, in terms of motions that you want to file, I guess you have a couple of options. You can either tell me a date by which you want to file them now or we can wait until we have the other two defendants and other two defense counsel before me and we can set a schedule on that date.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Your Honor, I would prefer not to commit to having a date on which $I$ have to file, only because $I$ just -- the reality of it is, when $I$ come back, the world will be -- and I'm fully aware of my obligations to Mr. Caldwell. It's just --

THE COURT: So, Mr. Plofchan, look, we've got a date on the calendar to come back in 30 days. My expectation is that we'll have Mr. Crowl and Ms. Watkins
before me by then. Ms. Watkins already is before this Court.

And so I think when we convene on March the 12th, we'll be in a position to set a schedule for at least initial motions.

Is that acceptable?

MR. PLOFCHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

And to the extent that, does that -- will that toll any time in the rules with respect to having to file any motion to oppose or write. That's my issue.

THE COURT: We don't have any -- our Local Rules don't have any, at least that I'm aware of --

MR. PLOFCHAN: Very well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- timing in terms of filing motion. So we'll just set a schedule. So I don't think you're going to -- running into trouble with that.

MR. PLOFCHAN: Very well.

THE COURT: The final issue is whether you've discussed with your client speedy trial and whether he's aware of his rights and whether he's prepared to waive those rights.

MR. PLOFCHAN: I have not had that discussion, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, is the government prepared to make a motion to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act?

MS. RAKOCZY: Yes, Your Honor. The government would make a motion to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act.

We would note that under the Chief Judge's order relating to the pandemic, that there is time excluded under the Speedy Trial Act through, I believe, March 8th. And so we would ask that the court adopt the findings of the Chief Judge with respect to that issue. And it does seem likely that that order may well be extended after the 8th, given the state of public health currently, but, obviously, we don't know that for sure.

The government also would note that we do have an extensive amount of discovery that we will begin providing tonight to defense counsel, and we do believe that it would be in the interests of justice to toll this time, for the limited time between now and the next hearing, for the purpose of defense counsel to begin reviewing those materials.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Plofchan, do you want to note an objection or are you --

MR. PLOFCHAN: I'll note an objection, Your Honor.
I understand the Court -- I understand the government's argument, but I'll note an objection for the record.

THE COURT: Okay.

So I will exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act between today and -- between tomorrow, excuse me, and our next day in court on March the 12th.

What that means, Mr. Caldwell, is that you have a right to a speedy trial, that means a trial within 70 days of first appearing in this court. But in terms of how we go about calculating those 70 days, Mr. Caldwell, we're going to exclude, that is, we're not going to include, count, the time between now and the next court date.

And the reason for that is twofold. I do find that it's in the interests of justice -- the interests of justice outweigh the interests of the government and the defendant -- excuse me, the public and the defendant in a speedy trial; and specifically, the exclusion of time is warranted in what $I$ suspect is a complex case and a fair amount of discovery that needs to be produced to the defendant and begin reviewing that discovery and prepare a defense, one.

Two, I'll adopt the findings of the Chief Judge's standing order that excludes time for reasons of the pandemic through, I believe, March the 15th, given the current circumstances of -- the public-health circumstances. The pandemic simply does not allow us to hold jury trials in a safe manner. So for those reasons stated in the Chief

Judge's standing order, I will exclude time through March the 15 th or through March the 12 th for those reasons.

Okay. With that, is there anything else, Counsel, anybody wants to raise before we adjourn?

MR. PLOFCHAN: No, Your Honor.
MS. RAKOCZY: Your Honor, I would just ask -Mr. Plofchan expressed some concern that his client was not arraigned on the aiding and abetting piece to the count to the indictment that charges 1361 -- 18 United States Code 1361.

We would just ask that it be clear for the record that Mr. Caldwell has been arraigned on that aiding-and-abetting act of that statute as well.

THE COURT: The record will certainly reflect that.

I mean, I think it's clear from the indictment that Count 3 charges destruction of property and that it is not just a substantive count of obstruction of property but also aiding and abetting.

Just to be safe, we can do it again. So I'll just ask Mr. Douyon to ask whether Mr. Plofchan would like a formal reading of that count; and if he'd like a formal reading, we can do that; otherwise, we can ask Mr. Caldwell to enter his plea as to Count 3 once more.

MR. PLOFCHAN: I don't need a formal reading,

Your Honor.
COURTROOM DEPUTY: And --

THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
All right. So we'll -- the record will be clear that Mr. Caldwell has been advised that Count 3 charges both destruction of government property and aiding and abetting in the destruction of government property; he's entered a plea of not guilty to that count.

Okay, ladies and gentlemen. Anything else?
MS. RAKOCZY: Thank you, Your Honor.
Nothing for the government, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, all, very much.
Mr. Plofchan, anything for you?
MR. PLOFCHAN: No, Your Honor. I understand the Court's rationale and decision. I have nothing further today.

THE COURT: All right.
THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Plofchan.
THE DEFENDANT: Can I speak to my counsel even with an open mic with you aware of what I'm about to say?

MR. PLOFCHAN: No.
THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Plofchan, enjoy your

```
vacation. I will see everybody in four weeks.
```

    MR. PLOFCHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
    (Proceedings concluded at 5:54 p.m.)
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\hline \(46 / 10\) 52／4 52／16 55
55／24 56／21 70／1 \& \& 30／21 3117 33／22 36 \& 69／15 \& along［4］12／13 13／15 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
55／24 56／21 70／1 70 \\
72／1 74／6 75／11
\end{tabular} \& 3142 ［11］22／23 22／24 \& 36／20 38／9 38／23 39 \& affiliate［1］25／20 \& 47／11 \\
\hline E COURT：［97］ \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
\& 23 / 935 / 457 / 357 / 5 \\
\& 57 / 657 / 757 / 957 / 14
\end{aligned}
\]} \&  \& affiliated［2］20／1 \& already［4］10／4 23 \\
\hline E DEFENDANT \& \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 44 \\
\& 48
\end{aligned}
\] \& 27／13 \& 61／11 71／1 \\
\hline ［15］3／13 4／23 5／20 \& \[
\begin{array}{|l|l|}
\hline 58 / 9 \\
32[1] \& 22 / 22
\end{array}
\] \& 56／10 56／13 56／16 \& affiliates［2］26／3 26 \& also［28］3／1 \\
\hline 46／9 52／15 64／21 64／23 \& 320［1］1／19 \& 57／19 63／22 65／2 \& affiliation \& 10／15 18／9 20／4 21／14 \\
\hline 65／8 65／15 65／18 66／14 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} \& 67／25 69／20 70／5 73 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
after［12］ \\
21／21 24／1
\end{tabular} \& 21／25 25／1 26／15 26／23
28／14 29／10 30／20 \\
\hline 75／19 75／21 75／2 \& \& 75／22 \&  \&  \\
\hline \& \& above［1］77／4 \& 67／15 72／9 \& 44／23 48／19 48／23 \\
\hline \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 354-3249[1] 2 / 7 \\
\& 355[1] 8 / 14
\end{aligned}
\] \& above－titled［1］ abroad［1］59／7 \& aftermath［2］64／6 \& 49／21 62／7 64／10 64／22 \\
\hline 1 \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
\& 371[1] 5 / 12 \\
\& 3: 00[4] \quad 70 / 4 \quad 70 / 570 / 6 \\
\& 70 / 11] \\
\& 3 \mathrm{rd} \text { [2] } 39 / 15 \text { 62/22 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \& absent［1］13／19 \& afternoon［8］3／2 3／10 \& although［3］17／24 \\
\hline 10 \& \& \& ／23 6／3 \& 64 \\
\hline 12 \& \& acceptable［1］71／6 \& 16／11 18／10 \({ }^{\text {afterwards［1］} 50 / 5}\) \& \[
\underset{27 / 17}{\operatorname{am}}[4] / 317 / 317 /
\] \\
\hline 12th［8］61／14 69／2 \& \& \[
2047{ }^{1}
\] \& 33／23 39 \& biguous［1］41／1 \\
\hline 25 70／6 70／9 71／3 \& 46175 ［1］1／18 \& account［5］22／7 23／22 \& \& \[
d[1] 9 / 13
\] \\
\hline \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned}
\& 4: 00[1] \\
\& 4: 30[1] \\
\& 4 / 6 / 12
\end{aligned}\right.
\]} \& 28／15 51／5 58／23 \& against［11］35／23 \& \[
\text { AMERICA [2] } 1 / 33
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 13 \text { [1] } 36 / 15 \\
\& 1361 \text { [11] } 5 / 1636 / 15
\end{aligned}
\] \& \& accounts［3］6／20 6／22 \& ／23 54／1 54／14 58 \& AMIT［1］1／10 \\
\hline 36／15 36／25 37／1 37／5 \& 4th［2］39／23 63／7 \& \& 疗 \& mmunition［3］31／5 \\
\hline 37／11 37／12 37／13 \& 5 \& sed［2］60／11 \& 63 65／17 \& \\
\hline 1 \& 555 ［1］1／14 \& ［2］ \& \[
\text { agree [6] } 9 / 2414 / 9
\] \& amoun 73／17 \\
\hline \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(5: 00[1]\)
\(5: 16\)［1］ \(70 / 4\)
\(55 / 19\)} \& acknowledge［1］56 \& 15／3 21／6 23／14 42／ \& Angels［1］48／24 \\
\hline \(14[1] ~\)
\(156 / 13\) \& \& ［6］19／12 20／12 \& \& nkle［2］51／868 \\
\hline 1512 ［1］5／14 \& \(5: 24[1] 55 / 19\)
\(5: 54\)

［1］
$76 / 3$ \& \& ［1 \& <br>

\hline 15th［2］73／22 74／2 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned}
& 5: 54[1] ~ 76 / 3 \\
& 5 \text { th [1] } 39 / 10
\end{aligned}\right.
$$} \& \& ent［13］ \& 32／13 39／8 39／9 63／4 <br>

\hline 16 ［1］11／10 \& \& \& 2 \& 22／16 69 <br>
\hline ［1］5／18 \& 6 \& \& \& <br>

\hline 18 ［5］5／14 35／16 37／9 74／9 77／10 \& \[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& 60 \text { years [1] 59/25 } \\
& 6503 \text { [1] 2/6 }
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& | ons［2］28／22 65／7 |
| :--- |
| ve［1］63／24 | \& agreements［1］15／15 \& <br>

\hline 18 U．S．C［15］5／11 5／16 5／18 36／15 36／15 36／22 36／25 36／25 37／1 37／5 \& 66 ［1］58／19 6928 ［1］1／15 6th［21］19／6 21／21 \& \[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { actively [2] } 27 / 13 \\
& 52 / 20 \\
& \text { activities [2] } 52 / 11
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& | ahead［1］8／23 |
| :--- |
| aided［1］2／10 |
| aiding［8］36／6 36／12 | \& | Antifa［3］30／13 30／15 49／8 |
| :--- |
| any［67］7／19 7／21 9／10 | <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

| A |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{cccc} \hline \text { any... }\left[\begin{array}{lll} 64] & 10 / 3 & 10 / 5 \\ 10 / 21 & 12 / 7 & 13 / 20 \\ 14 / 13 \end{array}\right. \end{array}$ | 61/17 61/23 62/2 65/8 | 69/16 authority [1] 25/2 | 56/1 72/13 | burdens [1] 56/3 <br> bus [2] 39/5 62/11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 16/18 16/20 17/11 |  |  |  | C |
|  |  |  | [5] | calculating [1] 73/8 |
| 17/21 21/2 21/2 22/12 |  | 69/2 | 6/23 67/17 68/8 68/13 |  |
| 22/16 31/8 31/9 32/1 |  |  |  | Caldwell's [13] 6/15 |
|  | arg |  | being [8] 13/19 45/3 | 9/3 20/3 20/14 |
|  | argument [2] 18/20 | aware [8] | 54/21 58/4 62/19 65/22 | 22/6 45/15 45 |
|  | 72/24 | 36/12 56/3 70/21 71/12 | 66/24 70/3 | 58/14 58/14 59/21 62/3 |
| 44/5 44/6 44/6 44/7 |  | 71/20 75/22 | belief [1] | ndar [2] 69/2 |
| 45/24 46/3 46/22 47/12 | ar | away [1] 46/ | believe [24] | 70/24 |
| 47/13 48/10 |  | B |  | [2] |
| 49/16 49/23 49/23 |  |  | 17 30/5 30/11 30/17 | called [8] 8/12 14/3 |
| 51/16 54/13 54/19 | 37/18 74/8 74/12 | back [18] 11/4 13/13 | 0 32/1 35/7 37/1 | 1 27/25 32/8 38/ |
| 54/21 55/1 63/18 63/19 | arraignment [5] 3/ | 4/2 14/19 15/21 23/2 | 38/20 45/25 46/3 46/7 | 8/11 51/3 |
| 64/1 64/16 66/2 67/20 | 3/21 4/4 17/1 17/2 | 31/3 50/16 50/20 50/22 | 49/10 53/4 61/9 72/6 | [2] 43/15 47/20 |
| 68/11 71/9 71/10 7 | arranged [1] |  | 72 | [7] |
| 71/12 | ent [1] 37 | /25 70 | ved [2] 20/10 29/8 | /11 19/23 21/21 |
| anybody | arrested [4] 47/4 47/4 | 70/2 | [2] $11 / 842 / 15$ | 37/3 |
| 16/20 41/23 74/4 |  |  | 10 |  |
| anyone [6] 37/22 43/2 | ar |  | tween [4] 72 | can't [27] 4/8 4/ |
| 44/7 47/19 49/3 49/3 | ar | badly [1] | een | /20 13/8 28/22 29/1 |
| anything [24] 6/6 7/4 | article [1] 4 | bail [5] 2 | beyond [3] | 29/22 35/14 42/19 |
| 10/4 14/24 15/13 16/19 | articulated [2] 7/22 | 24/11 57/2 | 54/21 | 2/21 47/2 47/8 47/20 |
| 32/2 36/20 42/7 42/8 | 59/5 | balance [1] | bill [1] 17/13 | 48/9 50/20 51/4 |
|  | as [78] | barrier [2] $43 / 23$ | billy [1] $42 / 5$ | 51/5 51/7 51/7 53/14 |
|  | ascertai | bars [1] 7/19 | bit [4] 12/24 31/7 48/16 | 53/15 53/15 53/15 |
|  | ask [14] 4/2 4/3 15/21 | based [8] | 60/25 | 53/16 68/9 68/25 |
|  | 4 45/13 55 | /1 | B | ] 43 |
| $53 / 8$ | 65/4 72/7 74/6 74/1 | 1 68/19 | B | idly [1] |
|  | 74/21 74/21 | basically [1] | boat [3] 20/13 39/16 | not [6] 22/12 |
|  |  | basis [6] 6/5 | - | /10 52/25 60/8 69/7 |
| 18/17 27/25 28 | as | 51/13 54/5 | b | pable [1] 68/3 |
|  | aspects [1] |  | 16/18 18/3 | acity [2] |
|  | aspires [1] | battle [1] | bond-review [4] 3/1 | apitol [44] 19/13 20/7 |
|  | assault [1] | be [88] | 16/18 18/3 | 5 26/8 27/2 |
|  | assaulted [2] | bear [1] | books [1] | 28/7 28/13 28/16 28/17 |
| 16/10 59/1 |  | became [1] 58 | both [11] 8/15 15/15 | 8/18 28/21 29/5 29/12 |
|  | asserted | because [22] 7/17 9/12 | 18/8 21/14 24/25 25/25 | 9/13 29/15 29/18 |
|  | assessment [1] 50/ | 10/14 11/12 12/23 | 29/2 37/16 68/3 68/2 | /14 35/19 35/2 |
|  | assist [1] 52/22 | /16 16/24 17/8 17/18 | 75/6 | 8/10 38/14 38/17 44/3 |
| appeared [3] | assisted [1] 52/20 | /1 24/5 37/2 38/3 | bottom [2] 12/9 3 | 4/11 49/22 52/11 |
|  | assisting [2] 11/8 | 38/7 43/22 45/10 47/10 | bounds [1] 29/6 | 2/12 52/14 54/16 |
| appears [5] 28 |  | /22 50/17 51/1 54/16 | boys [4] 29/9 39/4 62/9 | 4/17 54/20 57/24 61 |
|  | associated [2] 26/16 |  |  | 63/13 63 |
| $\text { ] } 1$ |  | become [2] | bracelet [1] 51/8 | 3/19 64 |
| $35 / 7$ |  |  | [1] 53/1 | 4/20 65/25 66/1 |
|  | assume [2] 18/8 41/15 | becomes [3] | [1] 28/20 | 66/13 |
| $65 / 6$ | assure [2] 21/12 53/5 |  | ing [1] 29/10 | [ |
| appropriate [2] | astonishing [1] 62/23 |  | eadth [1] | [1] 51 |
| 34/3 | ATF [1] 32/2 | 16/15 17/5 18/4 2 | dge [1] 43/1 | ully [ |
|  | attack [4] 21/25 | 25/6 25/6 37/22 41/1 |  | $y$ [2] $42 / 363$ |
|  | 43/12 52/13 | 14 48/7 48/15 4 | briefly [1] 9/16 | [22] $3 / 3$ 3/2 |
|  | at | 15 53/14 53/19 | /16 | 21 11/15 |
|  | 23/15 57/16 65/25 | 53/20 53/23 56/13 | [6] 16/21 39/25 | 2 21/16 23/20 35/ |
|  | attempting [1] 60/14 | 57/13 57/14 57/23 | 40/15 41/21 62/14 | 9/12 42/1 50/12 51/12 |
| 20/3 20/23 21/11 21/23 | attention [2] 16/21 | 60/18 63/25 64/5 65/24 | 66/25 | 4/1 54/7 54/14 57/8 |
| 24/8 25/19 25/23 25/25 | 16/22 | 67/17 68/20 74/12 75/6 | bringing [1] 39/24 | 63/5 73 |
| 26/3 26/19 26/19 28/5 | attorne | before [19] 1/10 3/18 | oader [2] 7/18 8/5 | 8/7 8/15 9/6 |
| 34/23 35/7 39/18 40/3 | ATTORNEY'S [1] 1 | 14/24 15/23 15/24 | [4] 16/21 | /2 |
| 40/12 41/17 41/21 | attorneys' [5] 13/6 | 41/20 42 | 35/23 40/16 52/23 | castle [1] 66/4 |
| 6 43/17 45/5 46/10 | 13/10 14/10 15/5 15 | /23 55/10 56/2 63/1 | building [8] 5/17 27/20 | cause [3] 17/12 21/8 |
| 4/4 | attorneys'-eyes-only | 66/10 68/20 70/16 71/1 | 27/22 28/23 28/25 29/5 | 23/18 |
| 15 54/15 |  | 71/1 74/4 | 29/18 64/15 | causes [1] 49/6 |
| 56/4 58/12 | audio [7] 35/5 40/5 | 1] 64/25 | burden [3] 8/16 56/4 | Il [6] 22/7 31/6 31/16 |


| C $\quad$ Case 1:21-cr |
| :--- |
| cell. 3 [31/21 $34 / 15$ | cell... [3] 31/21 34/15 64/8

central [1] 26/8 certain [11] 13/17 17/1 21/17 28/6 30/6 35/5 37/17 46/21 51/7 57/3 64/12
certainly [8] 12/6 12/7
27/12 29/19 34/7 47/2 67/7 74/14
certainty [1] 29/4 certification [1] 20/21 Certified [1] 2/4 certify [3] 52/17 60/14 77/2
cetera [7] 17/15 38/14 43/19 43/19 47/5 50/10 54/18
chambers [3] 32/20 34/9 38/18 chance [1] 47/1 characteristics [3]
59/17 59/21 60/5
charge [2] 36/12 61/4
charged [10] 5/9 19/3
19/4 35/10 36/6 36/11
36/11 37/17 59/16
60/21
charges [5] 35/23 60/7
74/9 74/17 75/6
chatting [1] 47/25 check [1] 53/1 check-ins [1] 53/1
cherish [1] 67/10
Chief [4] 72/4 72/7
73/20 73/25
choir [2] 43/25 43/25
chose [1] 9/8
Christine [2] 2/2 3/7
Circuit [4] 22/22 23/1
57/8 59/3
circumstances [9]
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cited [1] 37/10
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                            8
```

| D Case 1:21- |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| dangerous [1] 68/19 | designed [2] 31/14 | discussion [1] 71/22 | $71 / 1572 / 1174 / 25$ done [5] 40/13 41/3 | end [1] 17/18 enforcement [3] |
| dark [1] 61/16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { design } \\ & 31 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | disguised [1] 31/20 | $41 / 566 / 2169 / 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { enforceme } \\ & 59 / 8 \text { 68/8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { date [10] } 34 / 1564 \\ & 69 / 2269 / 2470 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | desire [2] 8/1 16/2 | dismiss [2] 17/14 50/2 | door [1] 24/12 | gage [5] |
| 70/17 70/19 70/24 | desk [1] 33/13 | disregard [1] 25/1 disrupt [2] 49/9 65/25 | doors [1] 26/9 double [1] 61/1 | /8 |
| 73/10 77/10 | $544 / 758 / 7$ | disrupting [1] 19/13 | 3] $4 / 54$ | en |
| day [11] 15/4 29/6 3 | destroyed [2] 37/21 | distance [1] 47/20 | 74/21 | engaging [2] 25/22 |
| $43 / 1343 / 13$ 50/23 $54 / 1855 / 369 / 869 / 14$ | 63/18 | DISTRICT [19] $1 / 11 / 1$ | down [10] 21/18 23/24 | 67/16 |
| 54/18 55/3 69/8 69/14 | destruction [10] 5/15 | 1/11 1/14 2/5 2/5 3/18 | 24/1 33/5 35/2 38/13 | njoy [1] 75/25 |
| [11] 14/9 1 | 36/7 36/11 37/20 49/16 | 18/24 18/24 23/12 | 41/6 43/16 46/175 | ough [1] 60/9 |
| 16/3 39/7 54/24 66/10 | 49/23 49/24 74/17 75/7 | 39/22 39/24 41/20 | drafted [2] 8/5 8/8 | ure [8] 8/18 24/14 |
| 69/8 69/23 70/24 73/6 |  | 50/19 50/21 50 | draw [2] 50/6 54/22 | 8/3 58/13 59/1 59 |
|  | detail [2] 32/17 60/24 | 53 | drawing [1] 6/13 | /21 68/1 |
| deadin | details [1] 16/20 | Dixon [1] 8/14 | drawn [1] 37/15 | er [1] 74/24 |
| death [10] 32/9 32/24 | detained [3] 16/5 18/23 | do [61] 4/21 4/23 4/24 | drive [4] $1 / 1838 / 1$ | tered [9] 5/22 |
| 44/14 44/24 45/1 45/3 |  | 5/19 8/14 15/17 15/19 |  |  |
| 45/6 46/23 66/17 67/2 |  |  |  |  |
| death-list [2] 44/14 | detention [33] 6/15 | 21/10 22/18 23/9 23/14 | drivers/extractors [1] | [2] $7 / 5$ 43/13 |
| 7/2 | 19/18 21/15 23/3 23/10 | 30/15 30/22 32/1 32/19 | driving [1] 7/15 |  |
| December [8] 26/25 | 24/12 24/13 24/18 | 34/5 34/15 39/11 40/21 | due [1] 11/6 | specially [1] 47/13 |
| 38/15 39/1 39/6 43/7 | 24/20 26/18 26/20 | 42/2 43/8 43/9 43/9 | dues [5] 25/17 25/19 | ssentially [6] 8/16 |
| 61/14 61/22 62/5 | 26/24 27/3 35/3 35/4 | 44/8 44/13 44/13 44/14 | 26/1 27/12 27/15 | 9 21/22 22/2 24/1 |
| December 12th [1] 61/14 | 35/6 35/16 54/5 56/25 | 44/2 | dues-paying [5] 25/17 | 28/12 |
| decide [1] 51/20 | 57/3 57/10 57/18 58/11 | 46/6 48/19 53/3 5 | 25/19 26/1 27/12 27/15 | tablish [4] 22/23 |
| decision [2] 8/13 75/16 | 58/25 59/3 59/23 60/5 $60 / 22$ 68/22 | 55/2 55/3 | during [3] 21/25 27/5 | 22/24 24 |
| decisions [1] 54/5 decorated [1] 60/4 |  | $/ 15$ |  | 17/15 38/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]} \\ & 5 / 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | did [16] 4/16 4/18 5/6 | 72/ | E | 19 43/19 47/5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { default [2] } 56 / 2456 / 2 \\ & \text { defendant [17] } 1 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | 9/19 13/25 16/6 16/11 | 72/20 73/11 74/2 | each [1] 54/2 | 54/18 |
| 1/17 3/6 3/8 5/22 11/7 | 18/19 24/4 33/18 33/22 | 74/23 | earlier [3] 12/ | cetera [7] 17/ |
| 11/12 11/23 11/25 24/3 | 42/3 49/9 64/14 64/16 | do you [3] 4/21 23/9 | early [1] $61 / 7$ | 43/1 |
| 25/7 59/17 59/17 59/19 | didn't [11] 10/18 17/10 | do you have [5] 32/1 | east [2] 26/8 63 | vade [2] 59/6 59/7 |
| 73/14 73/14 73/18 | 33/21 35/10 36/8 40/15 | 34/15 44/14 45/24 46/3 | easy [1] 20/6 | $\text { valuate [1] } 35 / 6$ |
| defendant's [2] 23/21 | 44/25 48/15 51/16 | ment [12] 32/8 | edification [1] 15/2 | aluation [1] 23/10 |
| endants [9] | 6 | 32/12 32/13 32/17 |  | sive |
| 6/23 10/11 21/20 22/9 | died [1] 45/4 | 32/19 34/6 36/19 44/15 | effect [1] 28/25 | [15] 14/16 37/19 |
| 6 53/24 54/2 70/16 | different [7] 10/8 19/23 | 44/20 45/15 46/14 67/3 | effectively [2] 7/19 | /25 40/18 45/2 45 |
| nts' [1] 6/20 | 39/20 42/5 53/23 53/25 | documents [2] 6/12 | 31/15 | 58/21 58/2 |
| defense [14] 6/11 7/9 | 54/15 | 48/13 | effort [3] 51/16 52/2 | 7/5 67/15 67 |
| 7/14 10/19 11/9 $12 / 7$ | difficult [3] 32/16 42/1 | does [19] 8/20 21/4 <br> 21/5 25/15 $27 / 18$ 28/21 | 52/23 <br> efforts [1] 58/7 | 68/25 75/21 |
| 14/21 48/8 59/24 68/20 |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 525 / 15 & 27 / 18 \\ 25 & 28 / 21 \\ 30 / 1 & 36 / 14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { efforts [1] 58/7 } \\ & \text { either [5] } 9 / 24 \text { 24/13 } \end{aligned}$ | event [3] 27/6 41/21 $52 / 11$ |
| 70/16 72/14 72/17 | 1 40/7 | 42/3 44/21 45/4 50/17 | 59/4 69/19 70/14 | ts [8] $21 / 2126$ |
| defenses [1] 50/13 | dity | 59/23 68/18 71/8 72 | election [14] 20/22 | 14 |
| defenses [1] deferred [1] $16 / 15$ | direct [1] | 73/24 | /13 33/4 33/7 33/16 | 15 66/3 |
| deferred [1] 16/15 definitively [1] $45 / 2$ | directly [1] 27/4 | doesn't [14] 10/1 14/20 | 33/17 44/18 44/19 45/9 | every [4] 14/18 38 |
| definitively [1] 45/22 degree [2] 26/21 68/11 | disadvantage [1] | 17/4 27/19 29/18 36/9 | 45/19 45/23 47/5 64/7 | 13 69/12 |
| degree [2] 26/21 68/11 delay [1] $12 / 25$ |  | 20 45/2 45/8 47/ | 67/3 | ybody [7] 15/12 |
| delay [1] $12 / 25$ deleted [1] 21/17 | disclose | 47/9 53/2 55/11 64/1 | elections [1] 67/15 |  |
| deleting [3] 57/19 | disclosed [2] 11/9 | doing [2] 8/4 39/10 | electoral [3] 40/1 52/ | 18 69/25 7 |
| deleting 66/21 | disconnected [8] 35/5 | don't [58] 7/7 8/19 9/22 |  | erybody's [1] 53/ |
| democracy [2] 60/17 | 40/6 45/16 52/23 65/11 | 10/5 10/18 13/13 14/13 | else [8] 16/19 39/9 | veryone [4] 30/8 |
|  | 67/13 69/1 69/16 | 14/16 15/13 29/19 32/4 | 46/25 47/2 54/14 62 | 50/18 53/22 55/20 |
| - | discovered [1] 31/13 | 34/2 34/2 34/17 37/16 |  | rything [1] 18/11 |
| demonstrated [3] 59/5 | discovery [8] 6/12 9/8 | 37/18 37/19 39/4 41/22 | [3] | ce [45] 21/16 |
| 1 69/4 | 48/9 | 42/9 42/24 43/6 |  | 21/18 23/20 23/20 |
| de |  | $46 / 1147 / 1247 / 1$ | emails [1] $61 / 7$ | 27/0 |
| depending [1] 43/4 |  | 47/18 47/18 47/19 | emphasize [2] 40/2 | 29/14 31/12 35/22 |
| Deputy [2] 4/3 4/13 | discussed [6] 12/13 | 47/24 48/9 48/15 48/2 | 60/8 | 5/24 43/22 44/6 49/1 |
| descend [1] 19/12 describe [2] 32/15 | 19/16 20/8 20/10 23/23 | 50/22 50/25 5 | encouraged [2] 22/1 | 22 |
|  | 71/19 | 54/19 58/23 59/8 62/10 | 21/3 | 55/1 56/2 |
| describ | discusses [2] 28/19 | - | enco | 58/1 58/6 58/7 |
|  | 30/9 | 69/11 69/1 | encrypted [3] 68/5 | (11 59/16 60/23 |
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63/21 63/25 65/20 67/6 68/16 68/19
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exhibits [2] 18/10 36/2
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existing [1] 32/22
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exonerated [1] 42/16
expectation [1] 70/25
explain [1] 21/14
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expressing [1] 66/2
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F.3d [2] 23/3 57/9
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13/18 14/11 48/10 75/16
furtherance [1] 12/6
G
gateway [1] 23/9
gear [1] 21/24
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68/10 72/9 73/22
gmail.com [1] 2/8
go [28] 7/6 8/2 8/23
11/2 20/2 30/12 30/21
30/22 38/10 38/17
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happened [4] 16/24
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hard [1] 65/6
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60/18 61/2 63/25 67/11
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73/23
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18/19 47/21 47/23
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| J Case 1:21- | 68022 + APM Docu knowing [1] 65/23 knows [1] 40/19 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| es... [2] 53/25 54/ |  | 39/22 | 72/6 73/4 73/22 74/1 | 19/18 21/15 27/3 |
| ture [1] 34/3 |  | lin |  | on [2] 29/19 |
| [3] 23/17 60/18 | L |  | 1] 26/7 |  |
|  | Iadi | Linkedln [1] 51/6 | arshals [1] 16/8 | [1] 2/3 |
| 5/2 6/10 8/7 8/19 | laid [3] 12/21 59/24 | list [7] 32/9 32/24 | masses [1] 43/18 | essage [12] 10/8 |
| /23 11/12 13/23 | 60/7 | 44/14 44/23 45/1 45/3 | material [16] 7/19 8/1 | 23/25 29/23 30/3 30 |
| 14/15 15/21 15/22 25/4 | language [6] 38/7 38/9 | 67/2 | 10/5 10/15 11/7 12/1 | 39/1 39/14 44/9 61/12 |
| 25/5 31/22 33/22 35/20 | 38/15 38/16 40/12 | listed [3] 45/14 45/18 | 12/4 12/16 12/18 12/19 | 62/6 66/5 66/12 |
| 36/11 38/5 38/22 43/3 | 41/12 | 45/22 | 12/22 13/1 13/7 15/5 | messages [24] 6/13 |
| 45/12 46/19 46/24 | large [1] | literal [1] 26/1 | 37/4 66/22 | 6/16 6/22 19/17 19/17 |
| 47/21 48/7 48/19 48/21 | largely [1] 22/5 | literally [1] 29/1 | materials [2] 7/9 72/18 | 20/14 20/20 21/17 |
| 53/7 55/13 55/15 58/16 | last [3] 34/13 49/5 | little [5] 12/24 18/17 | matter [7] 16/5 23/16 | 23/21 23/22 26/19 |
| 60/24 61/3 62/10 67/8 | 54/24 | 31/7 48/16 60/25 | 24/9 28/11 35/18 44/10 | 28/19 29/3 29/7 29/11 |
| 67/12 67/18 69/2 69/5 | late [1] 61/22 | load [2] 39/18 63/2 | 77/4 | 30/14 40/4 40/9 41/17 |
| 70/3 70/20 70/22 71/15 | later [2] 39/7 62/22 | local [2] 66/12 71/11 | may [10] 8/8 10/8 12/5 | 43/15 52/8 57/20 61/8 |
| 74/6 74/11 74/18 74/20 | launchers [1] 42/7 | location [3] 30/9 33/1 | 17/15 31/10 36/22 | 63/14 |
| 20 | law [4] 21/5 59/6 59 | 67/25 | 54/22 61/10 67/24 72/9 | messaging [4] 30/21 |
| ice [5] |  | logistics [2] 40/1 | maybe [5] 11/1 14/2 | 68/4 68/7 69 |
| 2/15 73/12 73/13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lawful [3] } \\ & 14 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |  | 15/8 30/22 37/7 <br> McFadden [1] 8/14 | met [6] 23/2 57/4 57/5 57/13 57/14 58/17 |
| justification [4] 11/13 | lays [1] 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { logo [1] } 26 / 12 \\ & \text { long [1] } 47 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | McFadden [1] 8/14 me [61] 3/12 5/1 5/1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57/13 57/14 58/17 } \\ & \text { mic [1] } 75 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/17 11/19 12/13 <br> justify [3] <br> $1 / 10$ <br> $8 / 17$ | lead [1] 17/9 | long-distance [ | 5/2 10/19 10/23 11/4 | might [7] 17/10 17/14 |
| $\underset{12 / 3}{\text { justify [3] } 8 / 108 / 17}$ | leader [3] 26/16 26/21 | 47/20 | 13/15 13/17 15/20 | 17/21 17/22 21/3 30/1 |
|  |  | longtime [1] 5 | 18/5 18/10 18/14 | 41/13 |
| K | least [17] 7/18 12/20 | look [10] 31/14 31/16 | 28/20 31/3 31/4 31/7 | militant [1] 40/25 |
| Kathr | 13/7 14/25 14/25 24/10 | 31/21 37/1 42/1 42/22 | 32/15 32/16 32/17 | military [5] 41/4 60/2 |
| Kathryn Rakoczy [1] | 25/6 27/15 27/17 27/19 | 46/16 50/19 64/15 | 33/11 33/15 36/16 | 61/5 61/20 61/21 |
|  | 34/3 39/20 41/16 43/5 | 70/23 | 38/23 45/13 47/9 47/21 | military-like [1] 61/5 |
| oczy [1] | 61/21 71/4 71/12 | looked [3] 35/21 53/25 | 47/25 48/13 48/13 | military-style [1] 61/20 |
|  | le |  | 51/22 52/2 55/10 55/1 | militia [3] 25/9 39/19 |
| keenly |  | looking [2] 43/18 | 55/15 55/20 56/1 56/2 | 63 |
| keep [2] 47/25 67/24 | Lee [1] 8/13 |  | 56/6 56/8 56/18 56/23 | million [2] 38/11 43/4 |
| Keepers [33] 25/9 |  | lookout [1] 30/12 | 57/6 58/2 58/16 59/20 | mind [3] 20/17 21/8 |
| 5/14 25/19 25/21 | [1] | looks [3] 13/22 31/6 |  |  |
| 25/22 25/23 25/25 26/1 | Leigh [1] |  | 8 | minimum [3] |
| 26/3 26/4 26/5 26/11 | less [2] 64/13 68/22 | lost [1] 13/2 | 68/20 70/14 70/16 71/1 | 57/14 58/25 |
| 14 26/17 27/1 | lesser [1] 6 | lot [2] 43/8 69/17 | 73/3 73/14 | tes [2] 55/1 |
| 27/7 27/11 35/19 40/25 |  | M | 17 |  |
| 41/1 41/3 41/5 | 11/11/4 15 |  | 1136 | ss [1] 50/6 |
| 3/3 48/20 48/23 49/4 | 18/5 18/14 31/3 45/6 | made [8] 13/19 25/5 | 36/5 40/3 41/22 42 | issing [1] 50/1 |
| 49/15 49/19 61/23 62/2 | 45/ | $31 / 1631 / 20$ 34/16 | /16 | ission [1] 21/8 |
| 65/10 | 47 | 8/6 | meaning [2] 38/13 | sspoke [1] 36/23 |
| epers' [1] 26/12 | 56/1 56/6 56/23 58/16 | MAGA [2] 38/11 61/13 | 39/11 | odel [1] 48/24 |
| keeping [1] 67/23 | 59/20 60/8 60/24 67/18 | ma | means [8] 20/18 28/23 | oment [2] 5/1 13/24 |
| kill [1] $45 / 11$ | let's [11] 3/20 6/1 $6 / 2$ | 15/24 53/25 54/4 | 51/1 | momentarily [1] 55/1 |
| kind [10] 10/3 14/24 | 13/23 15/4 17/17 18/3 | Magistrate Judge [1] | 73/5 73/6 | onday [1] 44/11 |
| 11 37/22 38/3 51/16 | 54/7 66/13 69/20 69/24 |  | [2] 28/1 30/2 | onitor [5] |
| /18 55/7 66/17 68/13 | level [4] 20/18 58/2 | judges | asures [1] | 6 |
| [4] 29/7 2 | 60/4 66/12 | /25 | eat [1] 8/19 | onitored [1] 68/10 |
| 47/6 50/24 | liberty [1] 57/1 | make [21] 5/2 6 | mechanical [1] 2/9 | ore [14] 4/14 6/6 7/1 |
| know [63] 4/7 6/4 7/22 | lies [1] 56/4 | 13/18 22/3 24/6 42/19 | medals [1] 60/3 | 7/12 10/10 15/8 29/21 |
| 8/11 11/5 11/25 12/6 | life [2] 45/21 64/25 | 42/22 47/20 48/1 49/2 | media [9] 21/18 22/7 | 29/24 31/7 31/23 35/15 |
| 12/15 13/4 13/20 14/16 | like [30] 6/6 6/24 7/9 | 49/2 49/8 50/23 53/2 | 29/23 33/23 51/4 57/20 | 37/19 60/10 74/24 |
| 15/22 15/23 15/23 17/4 | 13/3 13/22 14/21 15/12 | 54/4 54/13 58/2 59/14 | 57/21 68/3 68/4 | most [1] 49/6 |
| 10 23/5 23/6 23/17 | 18/6 26/4 26/14 31/6 | 67/2 71/25 72/2 | medical [1] 58/20 | motion [16] 3/19 3/22 |
| 25/14 28/5 | 31/14 31/16 31/21 32/2 | makes [2] 20/20 29/2 | MEHTA [1] 1/10 | 3/24 6/15 13/18 13/19 |
| /3 35/2 37/18 40 | 34/5 34/6 34/15 35/19 | making [2] 26/22 52/20 | member [11] 25/8 25/9 | 15/7 16/18 17/14 18/3 |
| 2/7 42/20 43/9 44/18 | 38/2 43/15 45/5 | man [2] 61/14 61/15 | 25/17 25/19 27/12 | 48/22 50/1 71/10 |
| 4/18 44/20 44/21 | 61/5 64/14 64/15 67/4 | [1] | 27/15 41/5 46/4 49/19 | 71/25 72/2 |
| 25 44/25 45/4 | 67/22 74/21 74/22 |  | 60/1 61/24 | motions [5] 17/8 |
| 45/6 45/8 46/9 46/11 | likely [1] 72/8 | many [3] 50/13 66/1 | members [12] 19/11 | 17/21 70/13 71/5 |
| 47/10 48/1 48/2 48/13 | limit [1] 12/2 | /19 | /22 25/15 25/25 26 | move [4] 14/24 15/1 |
| 48/20 48/22 50/25 51/1 | limitations [2] 54/18 | [1] 43/9 | 6/7 26/14 27/1 | 18/3 39/23 |
| 52/19 53/15 | 77 | [3] 20/4 38/1 | 30/13 30/15 61/23 | [5] 26/21 27/19 |
| 54/17 55/7 55/9 56/2 | limited |  | 26 | (24 27/25 52/19 |
| 64/11 64/23 65/14 67/2 | limiting [1] 67/23 | march [11] 27/5 38/11 | 26/24 27/10 57/18 | . [138] |

Mr. Caldwell [75] 3/11 3/17 4/1 4/8 4/17 4/21 5/8 5/25 6/18 6/25 18/23 19/3 19/8 19/10 20/4 20/8 21/15 22/11 23/15 25/18 25/24 26/13 26/15 26/20 26/24 28/1 28/4 28/5 28/11 28/14 29/15 29/23 30/2 30/5 37/23 46/5 46/8 56/6 56/24 57/15 57/19 58/6 58/18 60/11 61/2 61/11 61/24 62/25 63/17 63/21 63/22 63/23 64/1 64/4 64/10 64/13 64/22 65/2 65/5 65/12 65/13 65/20 66/2 67/6 67/11 67/19 67/25 68/12 68/18 70/22 73/5 73/8 74/12 74/23 75/6
Mr. Caldwell's [13] 6/15 9/3 20/3 20/14 21/1 22/6 45/15 45/21 52/5 58/14 58/14 59/21 62/3
Mr. Crowl [13] 15/25
16/2 17/24 21/20 22/2 26/10 26/15 27/8 30/6 61/9 62/18 66/11 70/25 Mr. Douyon [3] 4/5 46/2 74/21
Mr. Plofchan [31] 4/1 4/2 4/16 5/2 7/3 8/3 9/10 9/14 10/22 12/17 13/8 13/22 14/7 15/3 15/7 15/10 18/9 34/9 34/25 46/2 46/13 60/18 60/23 70/12 70/23
72/20 74/7 74/21 75/14 75/20 75/25
Mr. Watkins [3] 26/13 27/20 39/2
Mrs. [1] 45/8
Mrs. Caldwell [1] 45/8
Ms. [15] 10/10 15/23
16/11 16/15 21/20 22/2 26/2 26/10 26/14 27/7 43/21 44/19 62/6 70/25 71/1
Ms. Caldwell [1] 44/19
Ms. Rakoczy [2] 10/10 43/21
Ms. Watkins [12] 15/23 16/11 16/15 21/20 22/2 26/2 26/10 26/14 27/7 62/6 70/25 71/1 much [4] 7/17 8/5 31/12 75/13
multiple [7] 19/12 23/8 46/20 47/16 58/19 59/25 60/2
must [1] 21/9
mute [1] 13/8 my [51] 4/9 8/7 9/10 9/19 9/20 9/25 10/4 10/14 10/16 10/17
 14/20 15/22 16/7 16/21 75/15 75/23
obstruction [3] 5/13 24/9 74/18
obstructive [2] 24/19 58/23
obviously [6] 17/23
35/13 40/8 45/20 68/9 72/10
occasions [1] 39/20 occurred [2] 26/25 77/5
off [2] 29/6 29/6
off-limits [1] 29/6
name [10] 26/12 32/12 33/1 33/3 33/4 33/21 33/23 34/2 34/4 67/3
names [3] 6/17 33/6 33/7
narrating [1] 28/21 narrow [1] 15/8 narrower [2] 9/4 15/18 nation [2] 19/12 25/20 national [2] 47/10 60/4 nature [9] 35/9 41/9 58/21 59/15 59/18 60/6 60/9 60/20 60/21 nearby [2] 52/9 52/21 neat [1] 7/13
neatly [1] 64/8
necessarily [3] 14/20 36/9 51/17
need [14] 15/13 16/6 16/21 17/4 20/2 20/16 30/12 30/14 39/12 62/21 65/2 65/6 66/12 74/25
needed [1] 63/6
needing [1] $7 / 23$
needs [5] 8/10 11/9 12/3 57/4 73/17
negotiate [2] 12/25 15/18
never [5] 40/16 41/1 43/2 44/3 44/3
nevertheless [3] 18/1 63/20 67/5
New [1] 48/24
New York [1] 48/24
news [1] 47/10
newscast [1] 46/24
next [11] 6/1 16/15
17/19 17/20 39/7 55/14 61/10 69/20 72/16 73/4 73/10
next-steps [1] 17/19 night [6] 29/25 30/10 30/22 39/11 49/1 49/10 no [49] $1 / 43 / 34 / 23$ 4/23 9/1 11/11 24/13 35/17 35/22 35/24 37/5 37/6 37/6 37/6 37/24 43/22 44/1 45/11 46/6 49/2 49/14 49/19 49/21 50/3 50/10 51/13 52/7 53/4 53/8 53/11 55/1 56/9 56/11 56/12 58/21 59/12 60/1 63/16 63/25 65/21 66/15 67/19 68/1

No. [1] 5/9
No. 21-28-1 [1] 5/9 non [2] 49/7 49/7 non-violent [1] 49/7 non-weaponinized [1] 49/7
normally [1] 7/6
Northern [2] 19/20 63/10
not [105] Notably [1] 62/5
note [9] 21/14 46/1
64/2 72/4 72/12 72/20
72/22 72/24 77/5
noted [1] 52/7
notepad [1] 32/23
notes [4] 46/24 47/11
62/7 62/19
nothing [12] 36/20
42/5 42/6 42/7 43/20 44/2 45/8 46/22 47/6 55/4 75/12 75/16 notification [1] 16/9 notion [1] 11/20 notwithstanding [1] 67/18
November [9] 26/25 27/5 38/11 38/15 43/6 61/7 61/8 61/12 64/6
November 2020 [1] 27/5
November 22nd [1] 64/6
now [24] 4/17 9/22
10/10 12/4 14/4 15/23
16/4 27/17 28/25 42/14 46/16 46/17 49/18
50/12 53/24 56/8 56/10
59/24 61/23 63/16 69/15 70/15 72/16 73/10
number [8] 3/16 6/13 6/22 10/16 10/17 19/4 19/19 54/12
numbers [2] 6/17 43/5
numerous [1] 25/20
NW [2] 1/14 $2 / 6$

## 0

Oath [34] 25/8 25/14 25/19 25/21 25/22 25/23 25/25 26/1 26/3 26/4 26/5 26/11 26/12 26/14 26/17 27/1 27/5 27/7 27/11 35/19 40/24 41/1 41/3 41/5 42/2 43/3 48/20 48/22 49/4 49/15 49/19 61/23 62/2 65/10
objected [1] 10/7
objection [3] 72/20 72/22 72/24
obligations [1] 70/21 observing [1] 29/8
obstruct [6] 19/5 23/15 23/15 23/19 57/16
offended [1] 49/3
offense [5] 22/15 35/10 58/22 59/16 60/16 offenses [6] 19/4 60/7 60/7 60/9 60/19 60/20
offered [1] 21/22 office [3] 1/13 17/9 33/14
officer [3] 2/2 63/19 66/18
officers [2] 64/16 66/18
official [10] 2/4 5/13
32/13 33/4 33/8 33/16
45/9 45/19 45/23 67/3
officials [1] 44/18
often [1] 59/4
oh [4] 10/11 28/1 42/12 51/13
Ohio [3] 16/3 57/23 66/13
okay [48] 3/10 3/12 3/14 4/19 4/20 4/25 5/7 5/23 10/25 14/22 15/11 16/12 16/16 18/18 25/3 27/16 29/20 30/16 31/1 31/19 31/25 32/6 33/10 34/12 34/20 34/22 39/5 48/18 51/10 51/24 54/8 55/16 55/20 55/21
55/23 56/15 56/22 65/3 65/16 69/19 70/2 70/8
72/19 73/1 74/3 75/4
75/10 75/24
old [2] 58/19 59/25
once [3] 29/24 60/3 74/24
one [29] 5/1 10/6 22/23 23/2 26/2 26/18 27/15 29/22 31/9 32/7 34/13 35/9 35/10 37/3 37/16 38/1 38/3 40/7 44/18 48/2 48/20 49/25 50/7 53/24 57/5 57/9 63/10 66/18 73/19
one's [1] 55/1
ongoing [1] 21/8 online [3] 34/14 64/4 64/7
only [19] $8 / 17$ 13/6 13/10 14/10 15/6 15/17 16/24 19/16 33/21 35/3 35/7 40/4 41/15 54/1 62/16 69/5 70/3 70/4 70/19

44/11 44/11 75/22
opens [1] 24/11
operation [5] 38/12 40/24 41/10 43/11 49/12
operations [1] 40/14
opportunity [2] 7/1 7/5
oppose [1] 71/10
opposed [1] 28/24
opposes [1] 9/10
opposition [4] 3/24 6/3 6/8 6/14
option [2] 23/3 57/10
options [1] 70/14
order [38] 3/20 3/23
6/2 6/5 7/7 7/11 7/12
7/15 7/17 7/18 7/23
7/24 8/10 8/17 8/18
8/20 9/3 9/5 9/11 9/12
10/4 12/21 13/14 15/7
15/13 15/18 19/23
20/19 22/24 22/24
24/18 59/14 64/23
67/14 72/4 72/9 73/21 74/1
ordered [2] 16/5 18/23
orders [4] 8/9 21/13 22/13 59/8
organization [8] 25/10
25/10 25/15 26/22 27/13 29/9 48/23 62/2
originally [1] 13/17
other [24] 7/21 12/7
14/21 16/18 16/20 20/8
22/9 28/22 30/24 41/23
44/8 45/21 47/9 50/19
52/5 52/8 52/9 53/13
54/2 61/23 66/22 67/6 70/15 70/16
others [14] 58/7 60/12 61/3 61/4 63/14 63/24 64/14 64/18 64/19 66/19 68/6 68/14 69/5 69/10
otherwise [3] 12/23 17/3 74/23
ought [1] 16/18 our [19] 6/14 6/14 7/6 9/6 9/12 19/18 21/15 26/18 27/3 27/10 30/25 39/18 39/18 50/1 55/2 60/17 63/2 71/11 73/3 out [21] $7 / 48 / 112 / 18$ 12/21 14/4 15/8 16/7 24/5 29/6 34/18 39/8 43/10 47/21 48/24 55/1 59/24 60/7 62/6 64/23 65/9 69/23
outset [1] 58/16 outside [2] 28/24 41/19 outweigh [1] 73/13 over [11] 13/4 15/16 16/8 18/10 34/25 43/4 47/17 49/5 51/3 59/24 60/25
overcome [2] 38/4 38/5

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2] 13 |  | 2/13 [2/21 50/23 57/ |  |
|  |  |  | /25 59/3 59/23 | purpose [7] 13/20 |
|  |  | 34/25 46/2 46/13 60/18 | 8/ | 4 |
| /6 | 3 | 60 |  | 40/17 47/16 72/17 |
| /11 31/10 66/22 |  | 75 |  | purposes [3] 3/16 7/21 |
| owns [1] 32/2 | 45/11 45/14 45/18 |  | primarily [1] |  |
| P |  |  |  |  |
| p.m [8] 1/6 55/19 55/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48/3 50/24 53/13 62/8 } \\ & 62 / 862 / 1862 / 1963 / 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| $69 / 2570$ |  | 40/21 41/14 64 |  | pushing [1] 12/17 |
|  | 63/9 | 2] |  | [9] |
| page [4] 15/13 23/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { person's [2] 24/15 } \\ & 33 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |  | probable [1] 23/18 | 2 |
| pa |  | points [1] 33/5 <br> police [3] 29/10 63/19 | problem [1] 42/24 <br> proceeding [3] 5/1 | $\text { ting [1] } 3$ |
| pandemic [4] | 7/20 11/3 17/4 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { personally [6] 11/12 } \\ & 11 / 1411 / 1711 / 21 \\ & 11 / 22 ~ 12 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | political [3] 49/5 49/7 |  |  |
| papers [1] 18/9 |  |  |  |  |
| aphernalia [1] |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 21 / 1052 / 2453 / 3 \\ & \text { pervs [1] } 49 / 2 \\ & \text { phone [12] } 6 / 17 \text { 22/7 } \end{aligned}$ |  | proclaiming [1] 66/4 | 36/5 41 |
|  |  | n [5] | duced [2] 2/10 | 10 58 |
| 50/1 63/8 64/2 |  |  |  | 59/10 70/12 |
| ipate [4] 38/10 | $31 / 631 / 2134 / 1540 / 9$ |  |  | questions [6] 18/6 |
| 4 48/8 50/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43/15 47/20 51/2 53/1 } \\ & 64 / 868 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 22/16 22/18 25/5 29/21 |
| 5] |  | [4] 7 | prohibited [1] 29/15 | 34/23 |
| 6 49/22 57/24 | phones [8] 9/20 9/21 |  |  | 19/25 20/5 20/6 39/4 |
| 64/19 | $\begin{aligned} & 9 / 2310 / 231 / 1654 / 23 \\ & 54 / 2354 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |  | 36/8 | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \text { 20/5 } 20 \\ & 939 / 214 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 54/23 54/25 <br> photo [1] 29/17 <br> photograph [2] 28/9 | 1] | $\begin{aligned} & 6 / 7364 \\ & 7 / 2444 \end{aligned}$ | /15 62/9 62/17 |
|  |  | 4] | /1 74/17 74/18 75 | 63/8 |
|  | $32 / 19$ | 24/12 61/5 61/21 |  | quick-reaction [1] 20/5 |
| particularly [2] | photographic [2]27/19 29/2 | potentially [2] | propose [1] 13/ | ckly [6] |
|  |  |  | proposed [1] | 12/22 1 |
|  | photographs [4] 21/18 |  | [3] | [3] 61/1 62/2 |
|  | $24 / 128 / 1428 / 16$ |  |  |  |
|  | phrase [1] 29/25 <br> physical [2] 54/18 |  |  |  |
| ] |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $67 / 25$ |  |  | R |
|  | physically [1] 35/18 pictures [1] 57/20 piece [2] 45/3 74/8 pistol [1] 31/14 place [6] 8/16 14/25 33/2 35/14 64/19 66/1 |  |  |  |
| 1] 35 |  |  |  |  |
| [1] 13 |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  | rallies [7] 26/25 41/8 |
|  |  | [2] | protester [1] 67/12 | 49/7 49/9 |
|  | Plaintiff [1] 1/4 plan [6] 40/5 52/19 52/20 61/5 61/13 67/14 |  | protesters [1] 49/9 | /13 |
|  |  |  | [1] | 50 |
| peacefully [2] |  | prepared [10] 13/2 | 29/9 | 54/21 61/13 |
|  | planned [2] 27/13 | 13/3 17/22 48/14 52/22 | ] | rather [6] 13/4 17/7 |
|  | 52/12 <br> planning [10] 26/15 | 69/ | 5 9/7 12/2 15 | 61/19 |
| 18] |  |  | 32/20 33/19 33/24 34/2 | 67/12 |
| 38/10 40/12 | $39 / 2140 / 441 / 1961 / 3$ | rance | 48/10 | - |
| 42/10 43/4 43/8 43 | $\begin{aligned} & 61 / 2163 / 2464 / 17 \\ & 68 / 1068 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | 58/18 | 51/1 |  |
| /23 45/5 45/21 |  |  | de | 1] $56 / 23$ |
| 51/2 53/20 54/4 54/12 | plans [3] 19/16 26/22 | 63/23 65 | 41/7 49/4 49/6 | tart [1] |
|  | $62 / 6$ <br> platform [1] 28/8 | 68/18 68/18 | providing [1] 72/13 | h [3] $8 / 3$ 9/1 |
|  |  | [3] 18/2 | 58/9 72/10 |  |
| center [2] 3 | platforms [1] 57/21 <br> played [4] 19/8 19/10 |  | 73/14 73/23 |  |
| 62/25 |  |  | health [1] 73 |  |
|  | $19 / 1422 / 15$plea 「3] 5/21 74/24 | 4] | ty [1] 33/17 | 20/5 |
|  |  | 57/15 66/8 67/7 | [4] 34/4 57/23 | 41/17 41/22 61/15 62/9 |
| performed [1] 31 | 75/9 <br> plead [1] 5/19 <br> please [2] 18/21 77/5 <br> plenty [1] 50/12 <br> Plofchan [33] 1/17 3/6 |  |  | 62 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| pernap |  | ed [3] 14/1 | [2] | 2/20 24/10 35/12 |
| period [3] 13/17 15/4 |  |  |  | /23 52/4 52/8 |
| $17$ |  |  | $d[3] 64 /$ | 5/4 5/6 74/22 74/23 |


| R Case 1:21-cr |  | msest[3258/24iled |  | Side [7] 26/8 28/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reading... [1] 74/25 | relating [2] 60/19 72/5 relative [2] 33/6 33/7 | risk [11] 19/2 22/13 23/14 24/8 52/25 55/12 | scuffle [1] 29/10 <br> search [5] 9/19 31/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 28 / 15 \\ & 67 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| ready [2] 39/22 66/16 | release [6] 42/19 47/16 | 57/15 57/15 58/19 | 31/9 31/11 64/3 | eline [1] 35/20 |
| '/7 | 48/5 50/20 51/17 56/25 | 58/24 59/3 | Secondly [1] 44/21 | gnificant [1] 19/4 |
| reality [1] | released [6] 50/16 | River [3] 20/13 39/ | Section [13] 5/12 5/16 | ntly [1] 59/25 |
| ally [11] | 54/12 68/14 | RMR [2] 77/2 77/11 | 36/22 36/25 37/5 37/9 | 61/18 65/24 67/11 68/1 |
| 8/16 17/25 38/22 40/3 | relevant [1] 11/8 | role [7] 19/4 19/8 19 | 37/9 37/12 37/13 | 3/24 |
| 43/21 $47 / 9$ 51/19 $62 / 1$ | relief [1] $41 / 6$ | 19/14 19/25 22/14 66/3 | Section 1361 [1] 36/15 | since [4] |
| Realtime [1] $2 / 4$ | relished [1] 66 |  | security [8] 41/7 4 | 25 |
| reason [15] 4/7 7/22 | rely [1] 10/19 |  | 49/7 49/11 49/1 | ging [1] 43 |
| 23 | relying | rotunda [1] 26/9 | 51/13 60/4 | ngle [1] 69/12 |
| $14 / 431 / 932 / 133 / 21$ $40 / 2045 / 2446 / 346 / 7$ | remember [1] 29/ remotely [1] 77/7 | rule [2] 11/10 rules [4] 11/5 17/2 71/9 | see [15] 4/9 4/9 4/10 | 57/8 |
|  | repeatedly [1] 20/15 | 71/11 | 23/6 24/22 34/6 41/22 | sir [9] 3/12 4/23 47/ |
| reasonable [2] 38/5 | report [3] 8/4 13/4 | running [2] 17/2 71/16 | /8 5 | 1/23 55/17 55/22 |
| 13 |  |  | seeing [2] 43/18 47/5 | 620 $64 / 25$ |
| reasons [4] 68/15 |  | S | 2] 20/1 72/8 | itting [1] 48/7 liwa [1] 48/25 |
| 73/21 73/25 74/2 recall [2] 27/2 45/3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\text { receipt [3] } 31 / 2234$ |  | safe [2] 73/25 74/20 |  | stallers [1] |
|  | Republican [1] 49/6 request [3] 7/15 17/13 | safety [6] 24/14 53 58/13 59/13 67/21 | $\underset{66 / 3}{\text { seems }[3] 53 / 1363 / 2}$ | 61/16 so [87] |
|  |  | 68/17 | [2] | think |
| $\text { received [3] } 16 / 933 / 16$ |  | said [14] | Senate [1] 43/12 | social [8] 21/18 22/7 |
| $46 / 13$ | re |  | 4 | 29/23 51/4 57/19 57/2 |
| recent [1] 31/5 | res |  |  | 68/3 68/4 |
| recently [2] 8/8 49/6 | resources [2] 14/2 | 61/9 61/20 67/8 69/4 | ding [1] 63/14 | me [27] 4/7 8/3 10/7 |
| Recess [1] 55/19 | respect [3] 21/5 | [7] $15 / 12$ 19/19 | sends [4] 39 63/7 66/11 | /1 12/12 12/22 /25 17/7 18/6 |
| recognize [1] 63/16 | respe | 63/7 | sense [1] 63/21 | 18 25/4 26/1 |
| recognizes [1] 66/21 | re | sam | sent [3] 20/4 44/9 66 | 30/22 33/16 37/7 39/11 |
| reconsider [1] 6/15 reconvene [1] $70 / 11$ | response [2] 6/7 35/15 | sanctioned [1] 49/17 | separate [2] 12/5 20/11 | 48/21 49/24 53/20 |
| reconvene [1] 70/11 record [8] 9/7 65/14 | responsibility [1] 56/3 | satisfaction [1] 57/12 | serious [7] 19/4 23/14 | 4/11 66/2 |
| record [8] 9/7 65/14 $65 / 1772 / 2574 / 11$ | responsible [1] 35/20 | satisfied [3] 53/1 57/5 | 52/ | 66/25 74/7 |
| $74 / 14$ | restraining [1] 42/4 | /10 | 60/10 60/21 | body [13] 23/2 |
| recorded [1] 2/9 | restricted [2] 5/17 | satisfy | seriousness [1] 59/1 | 39/3 45/16 54/ |
| records [7] 6/19 6/24 | 28/24 | say [27] 10/20 12/10 | serve [2] 19/23 20/5 | 19 61/18 61 |
| 7/13 22/8 22/8 22/9 | restriction [4] 13/12 | 2 | Services [1] 3/7 | 2463 |
|  | 3/19 14/12 14/15 | 28/25 29/3 29/11 29/18 | set [10] 8/15 21/3 28/7 | someone [5] 33/3 39 |
|  | trictions [1] 12/21 | 33/5 35/17 43/1 44/1 | 57/6 57/18 69/22 69/24 | 42/22 45/15 47/11 |
| recove $33 / 13$ | ulted [1] 66/17 | 45/22 46/10 47/15 | 70/17 71/4 71/15 | someone's [2] 47/10 |
|  | results [2] 20/21 52/17 | 48/15 49/18 51/4 58/16 | seven [1] 69/8 | 64 |
| redact [4] 7/7 | retired [1] 41/4 | 59/23 60/8 65/14 65/16 | several [5] 22/10 27/1 | something [16] 9/7 |
| $10 / 2012 / 12$ | return [7] 21/13 22/13 | 67/18 75/22 | 43/5 43/6 43/7 | 10/18 11/11 11/20 |
| ting [1] 8/2 | 4/15 24/25 53/5 58/3 | saying [10] 9/22 11/15 | Shanghaied [1] 48/16 | 13/2 13/15 14/ |
| refer [2] 40/13 49/12 | /15 | 14/8 24/18 30/5 37/ | shape [2] 10/21 64/8 | 19 41/14 42/11 |
| reference [4] 26/23 | review [6] 3/19 3/2 | 43/18 45/11 56/1 | share [1] 10/23 | 11 67/4 68/9 |
| 62/18 63/11 |  | 20 | 47/7 $69 / 15$ |  |
| referenced [1] 34/14 | reviewed [2] | 42/6 42/6 42/7 |  | somewhat [1] 35/17 |
| references [1] 26/21 | wing [2] | 6/1 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{s}[4] \\ & 569 / \end{aligned}$ |  |
| referred [3] 21/22 26/17 41/15 |  | 69/12 | sheet [1] 45/10 | sooner [1] 13/4 |
|  | rhetoric [7] 20/14 21/4 | scaffolding [2] 28/13 | shirts [1] 26/12 | sorry [9] 13/25 14/2 |
| referring [3] 30/11 63/3 | 42/10 42/13 53/10 | 43/24 | t[2] 39/17 63/2 | 18/16 20/25 26/13 37 |
|  | 10 | [1] | ort [1] 69/2 | 1665/15 70/3 |
| $\begin{array}{\|r\|l\|} \text { refers } \\ 62 / 12 \end{array}$ | Ridge [2] 39/18 63 | 40/3 | ortly [1] 64/6 | sort [10] 8/9 8/18 10/ |
| reflect [2] 55/14 74/14 | right [28] 3/15 4/2 6/1 | schedule [4] 70/4 | should [6] 4/14 17/2 | 12/20 13/5 22/23 23 |
| Reform [3] 23/6 2 | 10/10 14/6 15/2 | 17 71/4 71/15 | 8/1 51/18 56/5 59/2 | $939 / 21$ 58/3 |
| /2 | 5/20 16/13 16/17 | d [1] 61 | ove [1] 62/1 | unded [1] 18/17 |
| regard [4] 10/6 17/13 | 30/19 34/23 46/16 | scheduling [1] 17/18 | ow [6] 8/10 10/1 | unds [2] 13/3 15/ |
| 36/19 54/11 | 47/24 50/12 53/20 | schlep [1] 39/5 | /11 28/11 64/5 64 | urce [1] 6/12 |
| regards [1] 47/7 | 53/22 54/6 54/10 55/13 | schools [1] 41/7 | ed [1] 23/2 | speak [3] 65/3 65/4 |
| Registered [1] $2 / 3$ | 55/25 56/18 56/19 | Schuck [2] $2 / 23 / 7$ | [1] 43/17 | 75/21 |
| istration [1] 44/20 | 75/5 75/13 75/18 75/25 | scope [2] 8/4 8/9 |  | specific [4] 14/11 |
| regret [2] 66/2 66/15 <br> regrets [1] 65/21 | rights [2] 71/20 71/21 rise [1] 20/18 | screen [3] 4/8 4/13 $47 / 21$ | 27/9 61/22 61/25 65/20 sic [2] 60/18 60/24 | 37/24 37/25 48/17 specifically [3] 35/17 |


| S Case 1:21-c |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2] $64 / 14$ | subject [2] 15/14 77/6 | terribly [1] 40/3 | 49/24 50/12 51/9 52/7 | 23/22 34/16 34/23 40/3 |
|  | submit [2] 9/6 15/9 | text [14] 10/18 19/16 | 52/10 53/4 53/10 53/13 | 1/17 42/8 47/7 47/12 |
| cificity [1] 55/8 | submitted [3] 18/11 | 23/25 29/23 39/1 39/1 | 55/10 58/6 58/9 58/12 | 47/18 47/19 52/12 |
| specious [1] 50/6 | 25/8 61/2 | 40/4 41/16 43/15 61/8 | 58/25 59/12 60/6 61/7 | 53/17 59/8 59/22 59 |
| eculating [1] 46/19 | subsection [1] | 61/12 62/5 63/14 66/5 | 61/14 61/22 62/17 | 61/3 68/15 71/20 72/17 |
| speedy [9] 17/23 18/1 | substantive [1] 74/18 | than [11] $7 / 187 / 218$ | 62/25 63/16 63/25 | 73/25 74 |
| 71/19 71/25 72/3 72/6 |  |  |  | ught [2] 36/4 65/10 |
| 73/6 73/15 |  |  |  | 1] 52/3 |
| Speedy Trial Act [3] | $1] 56$ |  | there's [56] 3/17 3/19 | sand |
| /3 72/6 73/2 | 29/7 47/3 69/14 | 22/18 28/3 34/24 35 | 10/13 11/13 | threat [3] 11/18 4 |
| spend [1] 14/21 | suggested [1] 25/6 | 55/18 70/10 75/11 | 11/16 11/18 12/1 12/16 | 46/23 |
| ke [2] 43/14 6 | suggestion [2] 31/3 | 75/13 75/20 76/2 | 14/25 23/7 30/13 30/20 | ee [16] 20/11 35/7 |
| ck [1] $35 / 18$ |  | Thank you [9] 18/13 | 31/3 31/4 35/5 35/24 | 35/23 39/3 39/11 39 |
| allers [1] 61/16 | suggests [5] 21/4 | 18/22 34/24 35/1 55/18 | 36/20 37/12 37/24 | /20 42/11 50/23 |
| ndard [2] 9/5 9/12 | 25/11 30/8 47/6 67/7 | 70/10 75/11 75/20 76/2 | 37/24 39/1 39/14 40/19 | 53/23 53/25 61/14 6 |
| ndards [1] 8/16 | Sunday [1] 17/5 | that [544] | 42/5 42/7 43/15 43/20 | /18 62/20 62/25 |
| standing [2] 73/21 | supplemental [1] | that'll [1] 4/10 | 43/22 44/1 44/2 44/10 | threshold [1] 23/10 |
|  | supply [1] 41/22 | that's [49] 6/10 7/1 | 45/1 45/7 45/7 45/10 | through [18] 7/6 8/2 |
| [6] 3/21 6/2 13/7 | sup | 10/17 10/19 | 46/22 46/22 47/6 49/1 | 25/16 26/8 28 |
| 56/2 |  | 11/24 | 49/19 50/3 50/4 50/4 | 28/12 28/12 30/13 |
| started [3] 17/25 37/3 | supposed [2] 49/24 | 16/16 18/4 18/1 | 9 51/13 5 | 43/23 44/11 68/6 69/5 |
|  |  | 7 30/22 30/25 | 64/10 66/20 68/1 | 69/10 72/6 73/22 74/1 |
| lash [4] 21/22 24/3 | sure [16] 5/3 9/14 9/17 | 31 | therefore [4] 9/20 | $74 / 2$ 2 |
| 57/25 57/25 | 11/24 22/3 24/6 28/23 | 39/ | 11/21 12/11 77/6 | oughout [1] 25/20 |
| tashed [1] 21 | 4/1 38/24 42/23 49/2 | 41/25 41/25 42/5 42/20 | these [15] 6/24 7/13 | [1] 59 |
| ate [8] 19/23 32/13 | 49/8 53/2 58/2 | 43 | 19/1 | time [33] 7/8 9/11 |
| 3/2 36/14 45/19 45/23 | 72/ | 50/9 50/11 50/22 51/ | 39 | 12/24 13/18 14/12 |
| /7 72/10 | suspect [1] 73/16 | 51/6 53/8 53/18 54/6 | 61/17 61/17 65/8 65/10 | 14/18 17/8 17/12 17 |
|  | system [1] 25/22 | 55/12 59/20 63/10 | 66/3 69/10 | 28/8 28/19 29/18 |
| statement [1] 66/16 | T | 65/16 67/3 68/4 68/19 | they [93] | $1131 / 831 / 11$ 32/5 |
| tements [3] 6/13 |  | $71 / 10$ | they're [5] 10/3 40/25 | 60/3 61/10 62/16 66/4 |
| //25 52/21 |  | their [13] | 43/1 46/9 58 | 1/9 7 |
| states [16] 1/1 1/3 1/1 |  | 40 | they've [8] 36/6 36/10 | 72/5 72/15 72/16 73/2 |
| 8/14 |  |  |  | 73/10 73/15 73/2174/1 |
| 45/21 46/21 47/17 | 55/13 | 58/4 58/8 63/5 | 54/ | 42/11 50/ |
| 47/18 47/19 52/13 | n [5] 7/4 21/16 | them [21] 7/4 8/10 | thick [1] 7/23 |  |
| /13 60/14 74/9 | 1/17 23/19 65/8 | 10/20 17/22 21/6 26 | thing [4] 10/8 11/ | timing [3] |
| stationed [4] 39/16 | taking [4] 24/1 46/1 | 26/11 26/12 30/9 39/19 | 20/17 69/12 |  |
| 41/19 52/9 63/1 | 8/22 66/1 | 43/16 43/17 45/6 54/3 | things [17] 10/7 20/2 | titled [1] 77/4 |
| tus [5] 3/22 | talk [10] 3/22 17/18 | 7/25 58/1 58/2 61/2 | 24/23 26/4 35/10 39/1 | today [5] 16/24 47/16 |
|  | 17/21 17/23 18/1 47/1 | /24 7 | 41/21 42/17 43/16 | 69/24 73/3 75/17 |
| 1 | 8/9 53/12 69/20 | theme [1] 30/13 | 44/17 44/22 48/21 | day's [1] 17/3 |
| /10 37/10 74/13 | Iked | themselves [1] 6/23 | 62/20 65/8 6 | gether [1] 51/1 |
| tute's [1] 22/21 | talks [4] 8/9 20/15 21/7 | then [49] 3/21 3/24 | 67/22 | [3] 47/9 69/13 |
| stay [4] 19/19 21/21 |  | 0/1 | think [52] 8/19 10/5 | I[2] 71/9 72/1 |
| 8 62/13 | target [2] 39/23 63/1 | 10/24 11/16 12/2 12/4 | 12/12 13/3 14/24 15/2 | norrow [1] 73/3 |
| ys [1] 30/8 | teams [1] | 13/10 13/17 13/19 | 15/3 15/4 15/13 15/1 | tonight [1] 72/14 |
| nography [1] 2/9 |  | 14/10 14/12 15/6 15/9 | 22/21 27/3 29/22 29/24 | took [3] 9/19 23/24 |
| steps [5] 17/19 17/20 |  | 1 | 30/7 30/8 30/23 31/2 |  |
| 1/16 23/19 69/20 | tell [15] 31/7 33/11 | 18/9 22/1 22/8 | 6 34/5 35/2 37/19 |  |
| still [1] 47/25 | 33/15 38/6 38/21 44/17 | 23/21 24/12 25/4 28/16 | 38/1 39/9 40/18 41/13 | [2] 39/23 63 |
| stop [3] 20/19 20/21 | 44/17 46/19 47/3 47/8 | 32/25 33/1 33/3 33/5 | 41/25 42/15 42/25 | han [1] 1/21 |
| 61/10 | 47/9 48/12 48/13 66/13 | 33/6 39/14 40/17 41/13 | 43/21 43/21 46/18 | ckable [1] 68/4 |
| stopping | /14 | 44/1 50/4 50/5 58/3 | 47/12 47/13 48/16 | ranscript [3] 1/9 2/ |
| stored [1] 67/1 | ing | 58/11 58/12 59/10 60/6 | 49/20 50/11 50/14 | 7/3 |
| rm [1] 66/13 | ten [2] 16/3 66/10 | 20 71/1 | /10 53/16 54/13 58/7 | nscription [1] 2/10 |
| stormed [2] 29/13 | tentatively [1] 12/20 | theory [1] 38/5 | 58/9 58/23 63/11 66/7 | 11 |
| 35/19 | term [4] 30/3 | $\begin{aligned} & 6] \text { 6/3 10/7 } \\ & 1 / 1912 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $157$ | 1] 60/17 <br> [1] 63/15 |
| orming [1] 66/4 | terms [22] | 13/12 15/21 16/7 16/18 | third [2] 10/7 59/20 | $\text { ] } 16 / 8$ |
| ory [1] 38/6 | 11/3 12/4 15/8 15/22 | 0/16 | third-party [1] 10/7 | /12 |
| treet [1] 1/14 <br> rike [2] 39/10 39/21 | 19/24 24/12 31/2 37/19 | /11 23/14 25/1 | this [126] | vel [4] 47/18 53/4 |
| strong [3] 22/14 27/11 | 42/17 42/18 44/18 45/7 | 26/19 30/3 30/4 30/1 | THOMAS [4] 1/6 1/17 | 22 67/23 |
| 29/14 | 46/21 47/15 48/20 | 31/17 31/18 32/25 33/1 | 3/4 3/6 | [1] |
| ongly [2] 27 | 50/25 51/18 70/12 | 3/3 36/24 37/4 37/5 | se [32] 6/ | al [11] 17/24 18/1 |
| struggling [1] 27/2 | 71/14 73/7 | 38/12 42/6 43/4 43/5 | 8/15 13/11 13/15 17/21 | $171 / 1971 / 2572 / 3$ |


| T $\quad$ Case 1:21-cr |  |  |  | 90/11 40/17 40/25 41/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| trial... [5] 72/6 73/2 | 8/14 52/13 60/13 74/9 | 58/20 62/14 63/10 | weapons [31] 20/2 | 2/3 42/25 |
| 3/6 73/6 73/15 | United States of [1] | 63/10 | 20/9 20/12 20/18 31/8 | 44/13 44/14 47/5 47/8 |
| Is [1] 73/24 |  | virtually [1] 43/ | 31/10 39/5 39/24 39/25 | 49/8 49/25 50/8 50/9 |
| ed [1] 23/23 | unless [5] 10/1 11/1 | virtue [2] 24/19 25/21 | 40/15 40/16 40/16 | 51/1 51/18 51/20 52/5 |
| ggering [1] 17/7 | 17/2 23/2 57/9 | Voice [1] 51/3 | 41/18 41/19 41/22 | 55/12 55/14 56/3 56/4 |
| uble [1] 71/16 | Unlike [1] 14/18 | volume [1] 12 | 42/19 42/22 42/23 | 60/11 62 |
| ubling [1] 67/4 | ted [1] 6/25 | vote [2] 52 |  | 65/ |
| e[5] 35/21 52/15 | [2] 21/17 23/20 | voter [1] 44/19 |  | 66/21 67/2 73/5 73/16 |
| 5/18 53/19 63/25 |  | votes [1] 401 vs [1] $1 / 5$ |  | 75/22 |
| [1] 4/10 |  |  |  |  |
| d [1] 22 | 16/19 23/21 25/4 26/7 | W | 26M1 | hatever [2] |
| [7] 7/12 12/22 | 28/8 31/3 44/1 44/2 | wait [1] 70/15 | [1] $25 / 16$ | r [4] 9/11 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 77] \\ 12 & 7 / 12 \\ 12 / 2 \\ 12 / 6 \\ 59 / 7 \end{array}$ | 66/22 | ve [2] $4 / 2171 / 20$ | 6/15 | 10/5 38/19 50/3 |
| ing [10] | up | 5/4 5/5 | 69/8 | when [9] 17/22 18/24 |
| 37/2 43/1 44/24 50/12 | 60/3 61/1 64/2 68/19 | walk [2] 44/1 63/9 | weeks [3] 17/6 17/11 | 21/20 34/16 37/1 50/6 |
| /16 52/4 54/13 55/12 | upset [1] 67/14 | want [34] 3/21 7/4 | 76/1 | 66/13 70/20 71/3 |
| tunnel [1] 28/12 | urge [1] 12/19 |  | weigh [3] 55/12 59/15 | where [19] 4/8 14/25 |
| turn [7] 3/24 6/1 13/4 | us [5] 9/18 18/1 | 10/21 13/13 13/16 | 59/23 | 15/5 22/10 26/20 28/1 |
| 15/20 16/17 34/25 52/2 | 47/9 73/24 | 13/18 14/8 14/11 14/13 | weight [3] 59/16 60/23 | 0/5 33/1 |
| turned [2] 15/16 16/7 | usdoj.gov [1] | 14/23 18/19 34/2 38/6 |  | 41/25 43/8 43/9 49/1 |
| twice [2] 41/16 42/11 | use [14] 7/19 9/23 9/ | 40/10 40/21 43 | well [34] | 50/24 52/3 56/4 57/22 |
| two [14] 17/6 17/8 | 0/20 13/15 13/20 | 43/8 43/9 48/2 48/15 | 6/3 9/25 10/11 10/13 | 69/2 |
| 17/11 31/9 39/7 44/17 | 40/12 50/10 5 | 48/19 54/22 55/14 | 10/14 14/23 15/12 | whether [19] 7/20 |
| 53/23 54/2 57/21 61/15 | 51/5 53/10 53/17 68/25 | 55/14 69/14 70/13 | 15/20 16/16 17/17 20/9 | 10/15 10/16 31/4 31/8 |
| 61/15 70/15 70/16 | used [9] 10/16 12/4 | 70/14 72/20 | 27/7 27/22 31/3 34/21 | 31/9 32/2 33/15 38/8 |
| 73/20 | 12/6 12/7 39/23 42/11 | wanted [3] 6/10 48/21 | 35/21 41/13 44/16 | 45/13 45/14 |
|  | 565 | 52/20 | 51/25 51/25 52/13 55/7 | 59/10 61/24 62/2 71/18 |
|  | 21/4 29/1 | wants [4] 14/10 16/19 | 55/9 56/18 65/23 69/1 | 71/19 71/20 74/2 |
|  | 29/24 48/24 | 16/20 74/4 | 71/13 71/17 71/24 72/9 | which [31] 6/12 13/14 |
| type [1] 20/17 | using [4] 14/19 20/18 | /13 | 74/13 | 13/18 20/1 21/23 22/5 |
| typically [1] 23/6 |  | 9/19 | well-coordinated [ | 23 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |
| U |  | warranted [2] | went [9] | 31/13 35/7 39/2 39/23 |
| U.S [3] | V |  |  | 41/16 43/24 47/16 49/1 |
| , ${ }^{\text {5/18 }}$ 36/15 36/15 |  | Washington [4] 1/5 | weps [7] 39/18 39/19 | 63/11 66/16 |
| 16 5/18 36/15 36/15 | vacation [2] 17/6 76/1 | 1/15 2/7 61/18 | 41/16 62/11 62/12 63/ | 70/14 70/1 |
|  | valid [1] 67/14 | was | 63 | while [3] 44/1 60/14 |
| 37/9 37/11 37/13 37/13 | various [1] 19/11 | 4/17 62/16 | were [23] | 67/24 |
|  | version [1] 42/25 | Watkins [19] 15/23 | 22/4 23/22 26/10 26/11 | who [27] 19/11 19/22 |
|  | versus [3] 3/4 8/12 | 16/11 16/15 21/20 22/2 | 31/8 31/15 31/17 31/18 | 20/4 25/20 25/25 26/3 |
|  | 23/1 | 26/2 26/10 26/13 26/14 | 31/24 33/22 34/16 43/4 | 29/8 33/16 39/3 40/12 |
|  | very [17] 3/14 4/15 5/7 | 27/7 27/20 27/25 28/2 | 43/5 47/4 48/25 52/10 | 40/13 43/2 43/2 44/25 |
|  | 5/23 9/16 12/22 14/19 | 39/2 54/16 62/6 63/14 | 52/12 57/23 64/18 66/1 | 45/1 46/21 47/7 49/8 |
|  | 29/5 38/2 42/1 52/13 | 70/25 71/1 | 68/14 | 53/13 54/4 58/19 59/4 |
| 11/9 22/22 22/24 23/5 | 60/16 60/21 67/4 71/13 | way [8] 10/21 19/3 | weren't [3] 24/6 31/1 | 61/3 61/17 62/8 62/2 |
| 23/9 23/13 35/3 57/2 | 71/17 75/13 | 20/6 37/18 41/23 52 | 32/3 | 67/13 |
| 57/3 57/5 57/9 57/14 | veteran [1] 60/2 | 58/4 68/1 | west [6] 28/7 28/13 | who's [10] 20/10 26/17 |
| 58/9 71/25 72/2 72/4 | via [2] 1/10 $3 / 8$ | ways [1] 37/16 | 28/15 28/16 28/18 29/4 | 37/22 39/3 39/15 45/9 |
| 72/5 73/2 | victim [1] 11/16 | we [125] | western [4] 3/18 18/2 | 45/18 61/19 62/8 6 |
| underneath [2] 32/25 | video [5] 14/4 27/19 | we believe [2] 22/13 | 23/12 28/17 | who've [1] 53/23 |
| 43/24 | 29/17 37/8 47/24 | 28/17 | WESTLAKE [2] 1/18 | whole [1] 54/18 |
| derscores [1] | videoconference [2] | we will [1] 72/13 |  | whom [2] 6/18 6/21 |
| understand [14] | 1/10 3/8 | we'll [8] 3/21 3/24 | westlakelegal.com [1] | whose [1] 44/20 |
| 7/25 16/14 16/25 37/14 | view [3] 7/1 12/10 | 15/14 70/11 70/25 | 1/21 | why [3] 10/6 30/7 |
| 40/25 52/1 55/6 65/4 |  | 71/15 75/5 | what [77] 6/11 8/10 9 | 69/22 |
| 5/6 72/23 72/23 | views [1] 10/24 | we're [20] 3/15 5/5 | 9/12 11/9 12/2 12/13 | wife [7] 25/8 43/13 |
| /15 | violation [5] 5/11 5/14 | 7/11 9/2 9/12 12/11 | 12/15 12/18 12/24 | 45/16 54/18 69/1 69/13 |
| derstanding [5] | 5/16 5/18 36/25 | 17/5 35/4 42/12 43/19 | 13/14 15/4 15/4 15/14 | 69/16 |
| 9/10 16/7 24/22 30/1 | violence [9] 20/16 23/7 | 45/11 46/18 50/15 | 15/17 15/25 17/2 | wildly [1] 50/6 |
| 31/17 | 40/5 41/2 49/13 49/16 | 50/20 52/4 55/2 55/3 | 9/23 20/20 21/22 23/1 | will [27] 5/22 9/14 11/7 |
| derstood [1] 41/11 | 52/22 64/20 67/16 | 55/3 73/8 73/9 | 23/5 23/17 23/17 23/2 | 14/17 15/16 15/17 |
| undetectable [1] 68/7 | violent [6] 20/18 49/7 | we've [2] 14/24 70/23 | 24/17 25/11 27/9 27/1 | 17/25 21/5 24/14 30/14 |
| UNITED [10] $1 / 11 / 3$ | 61/9 61/11 67/13 67/14 | weak [1] 61/17 | 28/22 30/2 30/22 31/13 | 43/14 47/3 47/15 |
| 1/11 3/4 8/12 8/14 | Virginia [11] 3/19 | weapon [6] 31/5 31/14 | 31/13 35/16 36/13 38/ | 57/16 59/7 61/9 62/2 |
| 52/13 60/13 60/13 74/9 | 18/24 19/20 23/13 | 31/20 41/24 64/2 64/3 | 38/10 38/21 38/22 40 | 67/21 70/21 71/8 72/13 |



