

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

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | |
| | : | CASE NO. 21 Cr. 447 (CJN) |
| JONATHAN DANIEL POLLOCK, | : | |
| JOSEPH DANIEL HUTCHINSON III, | : | |
| JOSHUA CHRISTOPHER DOOLIN, | : | |
| MICHAEL STEVEN PERKINS, and | : | |
| OLIVIA MICHELE POLLOCK, | : | |
| | : | |
| Defendants. | : | |

**UNITED STATES' MOTION TO
EXCLUDE TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT**

The United States of America hereby moves this Court to exclude from the time within which trial must commence under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 *et seq.*, the period of time from the date of this motion until July 28, 2021, the date of the next conference in this matter, on the basis that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to the factors described in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(i), (ii), and (iv). In support of its motion, the government states as follows:

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants are charged via indictment with offenses related to crimes that occurred at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. In brief, on that date, as a Joint Session of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate convened to certify the vote of the Electoral College of the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election, members of a large crowd that had gathered outside forced entry into the U.S. Capitol, including by breaking windows and by assaulting members of law enforcement, as others in the crowd encouraged and assisted those acts. Scores of individuals entered the U.S. Capitol without authority to be there. As a result, the Joint

Session and the entire official proceeding of the Congress was halted until the Capitol Police, the Metropolitan Police Department, and other law enforcement agencies from the city and surrounding region were able to clear the Capitol of hundreds of unlawful occupants and ensure the safety of elected officials. This event in its entirety is hereinafter referred to as the “Capitol Attack.”

As outlined in the United States’ Memorandum Regarding the Status of Discovery (Dkt. 26), the investigation and prosecution of the Capitol Attack will likely be one of the largest in American history, both in terms of the number of defendants prosecuted and the nature and volume of the evidence. Over 500 individuals have been charged in connection with the Capitol Attack. The investigation continues and the government expects that additional individuals will be charged. While most of the cases have been brought against individual defendants, the government is also investigating conspiratorial activity that occurred prior to and on January 6, 2021. The spectrum of crimes charged and under investigation in connection with the Capitol Attack includes (but is not limited to) trespass, engaging in disruptive or violent conduct in the Capitol or on Capitol grounds, destruction of government property, theft of government property, assaults on federal and local police officers, firearms offenses, civil disorder, obstruction of an official proceeding, possession and use of destructive devices, and conspiracy.

Defendants charged and under investigation come from throughout the United States, and a combined total of over 1,400 search warrants have been executed in almost all fifty states and the District of Columbia. Multiple law enforcement agencies were involved in the response to the Capitol Attack, which included officers and agents from U.S. Capitol Police, the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department

of Homeland Security, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the United States Secret Service, the United States Park Police, the Virginia State Police, the Arlington County Police Department, the Prince William County Police Department, the Maryland State Police, the Montgomery County Police Department, the Prince George's County Police Department, and the New Jersey State Police. Documents and evidence accumulated in the Capitol Attack investigation thus far include: (a) more than 15,000 hours of surveillance and body-worn camera footage from multiple law enforcement agencies; (b) approximately 2,000 electronic devices; (c) the results of hundreds of searches of electronic communication providers; (d) over 237,000 tips, of which a substantial portion include video, photo and social media; and (e) over 75,000 reports and 93,000 attachments related to law enforcement interviews of suspects and witnesses and other investigative steps. As the Capitol Attack investigation is still on-going, the number of defendants charged and the volume of potentially discoverable materials will only continue to grow. In short, even in cases involving a single defendant, the volume of discoverable materials is likely to be significant.

The United States is aware of and takes seriously its obligations pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16 and Local Criminal Rule 5.1(a), the provisions of *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963), *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150, 153-54 (1972), and the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3500. Accordingly, the government, in consultation with the Federal Public Defender, is developing a comprehensive plan for handling, tracking, processing, reviewing and producing discovery across the Capitol Attack cases. Under the plan, the discovery most directly and immediately related to pending charges in cases involving detained defendants has, in a number of cases, been provided, and will be provided in other cases on an ongoing basis. Cases

that do not involve detained defendants will follow thereafter. Such productions will also be supplemented on an on-going basis. In the longer term, the plan will include a system for storing, organizing, searching, producing and/or making available voluminous materials such as those described above in a manner that is workable for both the government and hundreds of defendants. To that end, on or about May 28, 2021, the government contracted Deloitte Financial Advisory Services, LLP (“Deloitte”), a litigation support vendor with extensive experience providing complex litigation technology services, to assist in document processing, review and production of materials related to the Capitol Attack and has already begun transferring a large volume of materials to Deloitte (as of July 7, 2021, over 200 disks of data and 34,000 USCP records), who is populating the database.

The Defendants in this case are charged with Assaulting, Resisting of Impeding Certain Officers Using a Dangerous Weapon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 111(a)(1) and (b); Assaulting, Resisting of Impeding Certain Officers, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 111(a)(1); Theft of Government Property, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 641; Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1); Disorderly and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1762(a)(2); Engaging in Physical Violence in a Restricted Building or Grounds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(4); and Engaging in an Act of Physical Violence in the Capitol Grounds or Buildings, in violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(F). Four of the defendants – JOSEPH HUTCHINSON, JOSHUA DOOLIN, MICHAEL PERKINS, and OLIVIA POLLOCK – were arrested on June 30, 2021 pursuant to a complaint. All five defendants were indicted on July 1, 2021. The four arrested defendants made their initial appearances in this District on July 8, 2021. Each has been released pending

trial, subject to conditions. *See* Dkts. 21, 22, 23, 27. The fifth defendant – JONATHAN POLLOCK – has not yet been arrested.

The government has circulated to defense counsel a proposed protective order that would govern the production of discovery in this case. Once such an order is agreed to and entered, the government will be able to produce a significant volume of video footage in short order.

ARGUMENT

Pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, an indictment charging an individual with the commission of an offense generally must be filed within thirty days from the date on which such individual was arrested or served with a summons in connection with such charges. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(a). Further, as a general matter, in any case in which a plea of not guilty is entered, a defendant charged in an information or indictment with the commission of an offense must commence within seventy days from the filing date (and making public) of the information or indictment, or from the date the defendant has appeared before a judicial officer of the court in which such charge is pending, whichever date last occurs. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(c)(1).

Section 3161(h) of the Speedy Trial Act sets forth certain periods of delay which the Court must exclude from the computation of time within which a trial must commence. As is relevant to this motion for a continuance, pursuant to subsection (h)(7)(A), the Court must exclude:

Any period of delay resulting from a continuance granted by any judge on his own motion or at the request of the defendant or his counsel or at the request of the attorney for the Government, if the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). This provision further requires the Court to set forth its reasons for finding that that any ends-of-justice continuance is warranted. *Id.* Subsection (h)(7)(B) sets

forth a non-exhaustive list factors that the Court must consider in determining whether to grant an ends-of-justice continuance, including:

- (i) Whether the failure to grant such a continuance in the proceeding would be likely to make a continuation of such proceeding impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice.
- (ii) Whether the case is so unusual or so complex, due to the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by this section.
...
- (iv) Whether the failure to grant such a continuance in a case which, taken as a whole, is not so unusual or so complex as to fall within clause (ii), would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, would unreasonably deny the defendant or the Government continuity of counsel, or would deny counsel for the defendant or the attorney for the Government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)(ii) and (iv). Importantly, “[i]n setting forth the statutory factors that justify a continuance under subsection (h)(7), Congress twice recognized the importance of adequate pretrial preparation time.” *Bloate v. United States*, 559 U.S. 196, 197 (2010) (citing §3161(h)(7)(B)(ii), (B)(iv)).

An interests of justice finding is within the discretion of the Court. *See, e.g., United States v. Rojas-Contreras*, 474 U.S. 231, 236 (1985); *United States v. Hernandez*, 862 F.2d 17, 24 n.3 (2d Cir. 1988). “The substantive balancing underlying the decision to grant such a continuance is entrusted to the district court’s sound discretion.” *United States v. Rice*, 746 F.3d 1074 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

In this case, an ends-of-justice continuance is warranted under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) based on the factors described in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)(ii) and (iv). As described above,

the Capitol Attack is likely the most complex investigation ever prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

Moreover, the hundreds of defendants who committed crimes on January 6, 2021, did so at one location: the U.S. Capitol building and its grounds. The same surveillance and body-worn camera footage is thus likely to capture multiple different defendants. A single defendant's cell phone or camera could likewise contain evidence relevant to multiple defendants. The mountain of evidence described above is overlapping across many different cases, and so the time required to process, review, and produce that evidence will impact the time necessary to prepare for trial in any single defendant's case. In addition, the investigation is reactive; the government is continually receiving massive quantities of new discovery, which it must continue to sift through while it reviews, processes, and produces its existing discovery.

While the government has begun the process of transferring a large volume of existing discovery materials to Deloitte, it will take time to load, process, search and review discovery materials, as well as to establish specific processing workflows and oversight. Further adding to production and review times, certain sensitive materials may require redaction or restrictions on dissemination, and other materials may need to be filtered for potentially privileged information before they can be reviewed by the prosecution.

The need for reasonable time to organize, produce, and review voluminous discovery is among multiple pretrial preparation grounds that Courts of Appeals have routinely held sufficient to grant continuances and exclude the time under the Speedy Trial Act. *See, e.g., United States v. Bikundi*, 926 F.3d 761, 777-78 (D.C. Cir. 2019)(Upholding ends-of-justice continuances totaling 18 months in two co-defendant health care fraud and money laundering conspiracy case, in part

because the District Court found a need to “permit defense counsel and the government time to both produce discovery and review discovery”); *United States v. Bell*, 925 F.3d 362, 374 (7th Cir. 2019)(Upholding two-month ends-of-justice continuance in firearm possession case, over defendant’s objection, where five days before trial a superseding indictment with four new counts was returned, “1,000 pages of new discovery materials and eight hours of recordings” were provided, and the government stated that “it needed more than five days to prepare to try [the defendant] on the new counts”); *United States v. Vernon*, 593 F. App’x 883, 886 (11th Cir. 2014) (District court did not abuse its broad discretion in case involving conspiracy to commit wire and mail fraud by granting two ends-of-justice continuances due to voluminous discovery); *United States v. Gordon*, 710 F.3d 1124, 1157-58 (10th Cir. 2013)(Upholding ends-of-justice continuance of ten months and twenty-four days in case involving violation of federal securities laws, where discovery included “documents detailing the hundreds financial transactions that formed the basis for the charges” and “hundreds and thousands of documents that needs to be catalogued and separated, so that the parties could identify the relevant ones”)(internal quotation marks omitted); *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1177-78 (9th Cir. 2010)(Upholding ninety-day ends-of-justice continuance in case involving international conspiracy to smuggle protected wildlife into the United States, where defendant’s case was joined with several co-defendants, and there were on-going investigations, voluminous discovery, a large number of counts, and potential witnesses from other countries); *United States v. O’Connor*, 656 F.3d 630, 640 (7th Cir. 2011)(Upholding ends-of-justice continuances totaling five months and twenty days in wire fraud case that began with eight charged defendants and ended with a single defendant exercising the right to trial, based on “the complexity of the case, the magnitude of the discovery, and the attorneys’ schedules”).

In sum, due to the number of individuals currently charged across the Capitol Attack investigation and the nature of those charges, the on-going investigation of many other individuals, the volume and nature of potentially discoverable materials, and the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation by all parties taking into account the exercise of due diligence, the failure to exclude the time from the date of this motion until July 28, 2021 from the time within which trial must commence under the Speedy Trial Act would be likely to make a continuation of this proceeding impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice. Accordingly, the ends of justice served by granting a request exclusion outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial.

Moreover, the ongoing COVID-19 public health crisis further demonstrates that a continuance here serves the ends of justice. On March 5, 2021, Chief Judge Howell issued Standing Order No. 21-10, which allows for a “limited” resumption of criminal jury trials under “stringent restrictions” required to protect the public health. *See In Re: Limited Resumption of Criminal Jury Trials in Light of Current Circumstances Relating to the COVID-19 Pandemic*, Standing Order No. 21-10 (BAH).

Standing Order 21-10 addresses the need to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act in light of these COVID-19-related restrictions. The Chief Judge notes that the time period from March 17, 2020 through March 15, 2021 had already been excluded under the Speedy Trial Act in all criminal cases. *Id.* at 5. The Court then notes that, while it anticipates a limited resumption of criminal trials, the Court’s plans permit “no more than one jury selection” to take place on “a given day, and no more than three trials . . . will take place within the courthouse at one time” before August 31, 2021. *Id.* at 4-5. The Court therefore plans to prioritize trials based on factors

such as length of detention, whether witnesses would be required to travel from out of town, and previously established trial dates. *Id.* at 4. Finally, noting the then-current statistics regarding COVID-19 case counts and other findings relating to the health and safety measures in this District that impact the ability of the Court to re-open safely for criminal trials, the Chief Judge finds that “for those cases that cannot be tried consistent with” the “health and safety protocols and limitations” set out by the Court’s continuity of operations and master trial plans described above, the “additional time period from March 15, 2021 through August 31, 2021” will be “excluded under the Speedy Trial Act as the ends of justice served by the continuances to protect public health and safety and the fair trial rights of a defendant outweigh the best interest of the public and any defendant’s right to a speedy trial, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3151(h)(7)(A).” *Id.*

Consistent with that Standing Order, this Court should also exclude time for the period until the July 28, 2021 conference. The defendants are not detained and have only recently been charged; no trial dates have been set. Under the prioritization factors the Standing Order articulates, they likely cannot receive a trial date in the near term, given the capacity limitations described in the Standing Order, which the Chief Judge has found are required to protect public health and safety. The Court should therefore exclude the period between the filing of this motion and the upcoming status conference, based on Standing Order 21-10’s findings that (1) failing to follow the health and safety protocols set forth in the order, which limit the number of jury trials, would endanger public health and safety, and (2) that the ends of justice served by a continuance to protect public health and safety and the fair trial rights of a defendant outweigh the best interest of the public and any defendant’s right to a speedy trial, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

Government counsel notified the defense of the filing of this motion on July 13, 2021. Counsel for MICHAEL PERKINS and OLIVIA POLLOCK do not object to this request. Counsel for JOSEPH HUTCHINSON and JOSHUA DOOLIN have not indicated their position.

WHEREFORE, the government respectfully requests that this Court exclude the period from the date of this motion through July 28, 2021 from the time within which the trial must commence under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 *et seq.*, on the basis that the ends of justice served by taking such actions outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to the factors described in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(i), (ii), and (iv).

Respectfully submitted,

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

By: /s/ Benet J. Kearney
BENET J. KEARNEY
Assistant United States Attorney
NY Bar No. 4474048
1 Saint Andrew's Plaza
New York, New York 10007
Benet.Kearney@usdoj.gov
(212) 637 2260