

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

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>No. 1:21-cr-28-12 (APM)</b>
	)	
<b>JOSHUA JAMES,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	

**GOVERNMENT’S SUPPLEMENT TO ITS OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR REVOCATION OF DETENTION ORDER**

The United States respectfully files this supplement to its memorandum in opposition to Defendant Joshua James’s request for pretrial release (ECF No. 146). As noted in the government’s opposition memorandum, the government is engaged in an ongoing review of the forensic examination of Defendant James’ phones. Earlier today, undersigned counsel learned of several communications Defendant James made via the Signal application that are relevant to the question of whether Defendant James presents a danger to the community. Accordingly, the government is supplementing the record with information about these communications.

1. First, on January 1, 2021, Defendant James engaged in a private Signal message exchange with an individual using a call-sign that will be referred to herein as “Call Sign One.” Call Sign One also appears in the “DC OP Jan 6 21” Signal group thread referenced in the government’s opposition memorandum. In that thread, “Call Sign One” is referred to as part of Defendant James’s “unit” for the January 6 operation. In the January 1 private Signal thread, between Defendant James and Call Sign One, the following messages are exchanged:

Call Sign One:	Hey we told to bring guns and maybe stage them in VA?? But you are showing hotels in DC for Alabama. Are we bring guns or no if so how will that work?
----------------	--

Defendant James: Were working on a Farm location Some are bringing long rifles some sidearms... I'm bringing sidearm.

2. The government has also observed Signal conversations in which Defendant James informed others to not bring firearms, because the “QRF” or “quick reaction force” would have weapons. For example, on January 2, 2021, Defendant James engaged in a conversation with another individual who, based on the government’s investigation to date, was in Washington, D.C. on January 6 and stormed the Capitol. That conversation is below:

Individual: So, I guess I am taking full gear less weapons? Just reading through all the posts. Would rather have it and not need it.

James: Yeah full gear... QRF will have weapons Just leave em home.


3. These messages provide additional evidence that, in the days leading up to January 6, 2021, the defendant discussed with several different coconspirators their plans to bring firearms to Washington, D.C.—and that the defendant himself at least contemplated bringing his own firearm with him to the operation—and/or to have a QRF standing by with firearms, in the event that firearms would be needed to carry out the goals of the conspiracy. These messages further show that Defendant James is among those Capitol Attack defendants “who aided, conspired with, planned, or coordinated such actions,” such that he is “in a different category of dangerousness than those who cheered on the violence or entered the Capitol after others cleared the way.” *United States v. Munchel*, No. 21-3010, 2021 WL 1149196, at \*8 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 26, 2021).

WHEREFORE, the government respectfully requests that Defendant James' motion for pretrial release be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

CHANNING D. PHILLIPS  
ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Troy A. Edwards, Jr.  
Assistant United States Attorney  
D.C. Bar No. 978296  
Ahmed M. Baset  
Jeffrey S. Nestler  
Kathryn Rakoczy  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
555 4th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530

*/s/ Alexandra Hughes*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alexandra Hughes  
Justin Sher  
Trial Attorneys  
National Security Division  
United States Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue  
NW Washington, D.C. 20004