

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Columbia

United States of America

v.

Edward Francisco Rodriguez

) Case: 1:21-mj-00518

) Assigned To : Faruqui, Zia M.

) Assign. Date : 7/8/2021

) Description: COMPLAINT W/ ARREST WARRANT

Defendant

ARREST WARRANT

To: Any authorized law enforcement officer

YOU ARE COMMANDED to arrest and bring before a United States magistrate judge without unnecessary delay

(name of person to be arrested) Edward Francisco Rodriguez


who is accused of an offense or violation based on the following document filed with the court:

- Indictment Superseding Indictment Information Superseding Information Complaint
- Probation Violation Petition Supervised Release Violation Petition Violation Notice Order of the Court

This offense is briefly described as follows:

- 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1) (Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2) (Disorderly and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(4) (Engaging in Physical Violence in a Restricted Building or Grounds);
- 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D) (Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building);
- 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(F) (Engaging in Physical Violence in the Ground or Capitol Building);
- 18 U.S.C. § 111(a)(1) (Assaulting, Resisting or Impeding Certain Officers);

Date: 07/09/2021



Issuing officer's signature

City and state: Washington, D.C.


Zia M. Faruqui, U.S. Magistrate Judge

Printed name and title

Return

This warrant was received on (date) 07-09-2021, and the person was arrested on (date) 07-07-2021
at (city and state) Queens, NY

Date: 07-16-2021



Arresting officer's signature

Kyle Johnson / FBI Special Agent

Printed name and title

AB:DAS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
----- X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

- against -

EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ,

Defendant.

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT
OF REMOVAL TO THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Fed. R. Crim. P. 5)

Case No. 21 MJ 804

----- X

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, SS:

KYLE JOHNSON, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he is a Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, duly appointed according to law and acting as such.

On or about July 9, 2021, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia issued an arrest warrant commanding the arrest of the defendant EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ for violations of: (i) Title 18, United States Code, Section 1752(a)(1), (2) and (4) (entering and remaining in a restricted building or grounds, disorderly and disruptive conduct in a restricted building or grounds and engaging in physical violence in a restricted building or grounds); (ii) Title 40, United States Code, Section 5104(e)(2)(D) and (F) (disorderly conduct in a Capitol building and engaging in physical violence in the grounds or Capitol building); and (iii) Title 18, United States Code, Section 111(a)(1) (assaulting, resisting or impeding certain officers).

The source of your deponent's information and the grounds for his belief are as follows¹:

1. On or about July 9, 2021, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia signed a criminal complaint (the "Complaint") charging the defendant EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ with violating: (i) Title 18, United States Code, Section 1752(a)(1), (2) and (4) (entering and remaining in a restricted building or grounds, disorderly and disruptive conduct in a restricted building or grounds and engaging in physical violence in a restricted building or grounds); (ii) Title 40, United States Code, Section 5104(e)(2)(D) and (F) (disorderly conduct in a Capitol building and engaging in physical violence in the grounds or Capitol building); and (iii) Title 18, United States Code, Section 111(a)(1) (assaulting, resisting or impeding certain officers). On that same date, an arrest warrant was issued for the defendant's arrest. True and correct copies of the Complaint and arrest warrant are attached as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

2. On or about July 6, 2021, law enforcement received information that EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ would be on Delta Airlines Flight 1854, which was scheduled to arrive at John F. Kennedy International Airport ("JFK Airport") in Queens, New York, from San Juan, Puerto Rico, at approximately 11:50 a.m. on July 9, 2021.

3. At approximately 12:00 p.m. on July 9, 2021, EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ arrived at JFK Airport, and law enforcement officers met him at the terminal and placed him under arrest. While speaking with law enforcement, EDWARD

¹ Because the purpose of this affidavit is to set forth only those facts necessary to establish probable cause for removal, I have not described all of the relevant facts and circumstances of which I am aware. This affidavit is based on first-hand knowledge as well as information learned from other law enforcement agents.

FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ verified his name, date of birth and social security number, which is the name, date of birth, and social security number of the EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ wanted in the District of Columbia. The defendant's appearance also matched the photographs of EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ from the Complaint.

4. The defendant waived his Miranda rights and agreed to speak to law enforcement officers without an attorney present. The defendant acknowledged that he was present at the Capitol on January 6, 2021. The defendant also identified himself in photographs taken at the Capitol on January 6, 2021, including one of the photographs included in the Complaint.

5. At the time of his arrest, EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ had in his possession, among other things, a New York State non-driver ID card, a Social Security card and a Bank of America card, all of which listed a name matching that of the defendant EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ. The date of birth listed in the non-driver ID card matched the date of birth of the EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ wanted in the District of Columbia. In addition, the number on the Social Security card matched the social security number of the EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ wanted in the District of Columbia.


6. Based on the foregoing, I submit that there is probable cause to believe that the defendant is the EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ wanted in the District of Columbia.

WHEREFORE, your deponent respectfully requests that the defendant EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ be removed to the District of Columbia so that he may be dealt with according to law.



KYLE JOHNSON
Special Agent
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Sworn to before me via telephone
this 12 day of July, 2021



THE HONORABLE ROBERT M. LEVY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Exhibit A

AO 91 (Rev. 11/11) Criminal Complaint

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
District of Columbia

United States of America
v.
Edward Francisco Rodriguez, (DOB: XXXXXXXXXX)

Case: 1:21-mj-00518
Assigned To : Faruqui, Zia M.
Assign. Date : 7/8/2021
Description: COMPLAINT W/ ARREST WARRANT

Defendant(s)

CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

I, the complainant in this case, state that the following is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

On or about the date(s) of January 6, 2021 in the county of in the
in the District of Columbia, the defendant(s) violated:

Table with 2 columns: Code Section, Offense Description. Lists various U.S.C. sections related to restricted buildings and physical violence.

This criminal complaint is based on these facts:
See attached statement of facts.

Continued on the attached sheet.

Handwritten signature of Kyle Johnson

Complainant's signature

Kyle Johnson, Special Agent
Printed name and title

Attested to by the applicant in accordance with the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 4.1
by telephone.

Date: 07/09/2021

Handwritten signature of Zia M. Faruqui

Judge's signature

City and state: Washington, D.C.

Zia M. Faruqui, U.S. Magistrate Judge
Printed name and title

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Your affiant, Kyle Johnson, is a Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In my duties as a special agent, I investigate various violations of federal law, including: transnational organized crime, international terrorism, and domestic terrorism. I have training and experience in terrorism investigations, cellular telephone analysis, interview and interrogation, and evidence recovery. Currently, I am tasked with investigating criminal activity in and around the Capitol grounds on January 6, 2021. As a Special Agent, I am authorized by law or by a Government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of a violation of Federal criminal laws.

Background

The U.S. Capitol is secured 24 hours a day by U.S. Capitol Police. Restrictions around the U.S. Capitol include permanent and temporary security barriers and posts manned by U.S. Capitol Police. Only authorized people with appropriate identification were allowed access inside the U.S. Capitol. On January 6, 2021, the exterior plaza of the U.S. Capitol was also closed to members of the public.

On January 6, 2021, a joint session of the United States Congress convened at the United States Capitol, which is located at First Street, SE, in Washington, D.C. During the joint session, elected members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate were meeting in separate chambers of the United States Capitol to certify the vote count of the Electoral College of the 2020 Presidential Election, which had taken place on November 3, 2020. The joint session began at approximately 1:00 p.m. Shortly thereafter, by approximately 1:30 p.m., the House and Senate adjourned to separate chambers to resolve a particular objection. Vice President Mike Pence was present and presiding, first in the joint session, and then in the Senate chamber.

As the proceedings continued in both the House and the Senate, and with Vice President Mike Pence present and presiding over the Senate, a large crowd gathered outside the U.S. Capitol. As noted above, temporary and permanent barricades were in place around the exterior of the U.S. Capitol building, and U.S. Capitol Police were present and attempting to keep the crowd away from the Capitol building and the proceedings underway inside.

At such time, the certification proceedings were still underway and the exterior doors and windows of the U.S. Capitol were locked or otherwise secured. Members of the U.S. Capitol Police attempted to maintain order and keep the crowd from entering the Capitol; however, around 2:00 p.m., individuals in the crowd forced entry into the U.S. Capitol, including by breaking windows and by assaulting members of the U.S. Capitol Police, as others in the crowd encouraged and assisted those acts.

Shortly thereafter, at approximately 2:20 p.m. members of the United States House of Representatives and United States Senate, including the President of the Senate, Vice President Mike Pence, were instructed to—and did—evacuate the chambers. Accordingly, the joint session of the United States Congress was effectively suspended until shortly after 8:00 p.m. Vice

President Pence remained in the United States Capitol from the time he was evacuated from the Senate Chamber until the sessions resumed.

During national news coverage of the aforementioned events, video footage which appeared to be captured on mobile devices of persons present on the scene depicted evidence of violations of local and federal law, including scores of individuals inside the U.S. Capitol building without authority to be there.

Conduct of Edward Francisco Rodriguez on January 6, 2021

During this investigation, your Affiant was made aware of a video on Reddit.com subpage “r/CapitolConsequences” that showed an unknown individual referred to as “#SUITMACER” by social media users. The Reddit video was titled, “#SuitMacer unmasked. He sprayed some kind of pepper spray on many police officers,” and it appeared to splice together two videos taken before and during the riots outside the U.S. Capitol Building on January 6, 2021. In the first half of the video, the unknown individual, referred to as #SUITMACER, is wearing a dark colored suit, white shirt, light colored patterned tie, red colored “TRUMP” hat, and a red colored face mask. The individual is also carrying a white colored sign with the words “STOP THE STEAL” in red lettering. The individual referred to as #SUITMACER can be seen among a crowd of protesters in a location recognized as the lower-level terrace of the west side of the US Capitol. #SUITMACER proceeds to point a black colored canister at visibly marked law enforcement officers manning a barricade on the terrace and sprays the officers with a chemical irritant before retreating back into the crowd. *See* Exhibit 1A. The second half of the video is of an unknown individual being interviewed by an independent media reporter earlier on January 6, 2021 at an unknown location in Washington DC. The individual being interviewed in the video is wearing the same or similar clothing to that of the individual referred to as #SUITMACER in the first half of the video, however, the individual is not wearing a face mask and his face is visible to the camera. *See* Exhibit 1B. The makers of the video imply that both of these people are the same individual.

Exhibit 1A



Exhibit 1B



During the interview depicted in Exhibit 1B, the individual referred to as #SUITMACER states, "Here in America, we fight back. We will never surrender to dictatorship, corruption, communism, or socialism. We the people will never put up with their bullshit. . . ."

Separately, the FBI received a tip that the individual referred to as #SUITMACER had been identified as EDWARD F. RODRIGUEZ of Brooklyn, New York using open source public records. The tipsters provided a driver's license photo, police mug shots, and a screen shot from RODRIGUEZ's Century 21 Real Estate Profile. Based on my comparison of those photos and the video described above, I believe EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ to be the individual referred to as #SUITMACER.

On or about May 07, 2021 your Affiant viewed a video on Twitter where the individual known as #SUITMACER was being interviewed by an independent reporter. The interview appeared to have taken place on January 6, 2021 near the location of the U.S. Capitol Building, at some point during the course of the riot. #SUITMACER states words to the effect that he is very happy to be there and that, "We made it all the way through." The individual identified as #SUITMACER tells the interviewer that he is from Brooklyn, New York. In the video, the individual referred to as #SUITMACER is wearing the same or similar identifying garments and holding the same sign as in the previous videos. See Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2



On or about May 20, 2021 law enforcement interviewed a former co-worker of RODRIGUEZ who stated that he/she would be in a position to identify him from photos or videos. During the interview, the individual was shown a video of the individual referred to as #SUITMACER giving the interview referenced above in Exhibit 2. The individual positively identified RODRIGUEZ from the video and affirmed that RODRIGUEZ was the individual known as #SUITMACER.

On or about June 17, 2021 law enforcement interviewed another former co-worker of RODRIGUEZ who stated that he/she would be in a position to identify him from photos or videos. During the interview, the individual was shown a video of the individual referred to as #SUITMACER giving the interviews referenced above in Exhibits 1B and 2. The individual

positively identified RODRIGUEZ from the videos and affirmed that RODRIGUEZ was the individual known as #SUITMACER. The individual was shown the video of the individual referred to as #SUITMACER spraying police officers with a chemical irritant referenced above in Exhibit 1A. The individual was able to identify #SUITMACER as RODRIGUEZ even though #SUITMACER's face is covered in the described video. The individual stated he/she could identify RODRIGUEZ without observing his face through the profile and body type of #SUITMACER.

I have reviewed Body Worn Camera ("BWC") footage from Metropolitan Police officers present on the Capitol grounds during the January 6, 2021. In the BWC footage of multiple officers, I have identified an individual I believe to be RODRIGUEZ based on his clothes, appearance, and sign, spraying an unknown chemical spray at Metropolitan Police officers and United States Capitol Police officers stationed at the West front barrier of the Capitol grounds. *See* Exhibits 3A and 3B. During portions of these videos, RODRIGUEZ wears a red mask, but for brief moments, he pulls the mask down below his face.

Exhibit 3A



Exhibit 3B



Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, your affiant submits that there is probable cause to believe that EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ violated 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1), (2) and (4), which makes it a crime to (1) knowingly enter or remain in any restricted building or grounds without lawful authority to do; and (2) knowingly, and with intent to impede or disrupt the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions, engage in disorderly or disruptive conduct in, or within such proximity to, any restricted building or grounds when, or so that, such conduct, in fact, impedes or disrupts the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions; (4) knowingly engage in any act of physical violence against any person or property in any restricted building or grounds; or attempts or conspires to do so. For purposes of Section 1752 of Title 18, a “restricted building” includes a posted, cordoned off, or otherwise restricted area of a building or grounds where the President or other person protected by the Secret Service, including the Vice President, is or will be temporarily visiting; or any building or grounds so restricted in conjunction with an event designated as a special event of national significance.

Your affiant submits there is also probable cause to believe that EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ violated 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D) and (F), which makes it a crime to willfully and knowingly (D) utter loud, threatening, or abusive language, or engage in disorderly or disruptive conduct, at any place in the Grounds or in any of the Capitol Buildings with the intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of a session of Congress or either House of Congress, or the orderly conduct in that building of a hearing before, or any deliberations of, a committee of Congress or either House of Congress; and (F) engage in an act of physical violence in the Grounds or any of the Capitol Buildings.

Finally, your affiant submits there is probable cause to believe that EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ violated 18 U.S.C. § 111(a)(1), which makes it unlawful to forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, and interfere with, an officer and employee of the United States, and of any branch of the United States Government (including any member of the uniformed services), and any person assisting such an officer and employee, while such officer or employee was engaged in or on account of the performance of official duties, and where the acts in violation of this section involve physical contact with the victim and the intent to commit another felony.



Kyle Johnson
Special Agent
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Attested to by the applicant in accordance with the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 4.1
by telephone, this 9th day of July 2021.



ZIA M. FARUQUI
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
District of Columbia

United States of America
v.
Edward Francisco Rodriguez

Defendant

Case: 1:21-mj-00518
Assigned To : Faruqui, Zia M.
Assign. Date : 7/8/2021
Description: COMPLAINT W/ ARREST WARRANT

ARREST WARRANT

To: Any authorized law enforcement officer

YOU ARE COMMANDED to arrest and bring before a United States magistrate judge without unnecessary delay
(name of person to be arrested) Edward Francisco Rodriguez,
who is accused of an offense or violation based on the following document filed with the court:

- Indictment, Superseding Indictment, Information, Superseding Information, Complaint, Probation Violation Petition, Supervised Release Violation Petition, Violation Notice, Order of the Court

This offense is briefly described as follows:

- 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1) (Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds);
18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2) (Disorderly and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds);
18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(4) (Engaging in Physical Violence in a Restricted Building or Grounds);
40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D) (Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building);
40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(F) (Engaging in Physical Violence in the Ground or Capitol Building);
18 U.S.C. § 111(a)(1) (Assaulting, Resisting or Impeding Certain Officers);

Date: 07/09/2021

Issuing officer's signature

City and state: Washington, D.C.

Zia M. Faruqui, U.S. Magistrate Judge
Printed name and title

Return
This warrant was received on (date) , and the person was arrested on (date)
at (city and state) .
Date:
Arresting officer's signature
Printed name and title

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
__Eastern _ DISTRICT OF __New York _

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

-v-

__EDWARD FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ__,
Defendant(s).

21-MJ-804

ORDER

__Robert M. Levy __, United States District/Magistrate Judge:

This Order is entered, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(f) and the Due Process Protections Act, Pub. L. No 116–182, 134 Stat. 894 (Oct. 21, 2020), to confirm the Government’s disclosure obligations under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and its progeny, and to summarize the possible consequences of violating those obligations.

The Government must disclose to the defense all information “favorable to an accused” that is “material either to guilt or to punishment” and that is known to the Government. *Id.* at 87. This obligation applies regardless of whether the defendant requests this information or whether the information would itself constitute admissible evidence. The Government shall disclose such information to the defense promptly after its existence becomes known to the Government so that the defense may make effective use of the information in the preparation of its case.

As part of these obligations, the Government must disclose any information that can be used to impeach the trial testimony of a Government witness within the meaning of *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), and its progeny. Such information must be disclosed sufficiently in advance of trial in order for the defendant to make effective use of it at trial or at such other time as the Court may order.¹

¹ This Order does not purport to set forth an exhaustive list of the Government’s disclosure obligations.

The foregoing obligations are continuing ones and apply to materials that become known to the Government in the future. These obligations also apply to information that is otherwise subject to disclosure regardless of whether the Government credits it.

In the event the Government believes that a disclosure under this Order would compromise witness safety, victim rights, national security, a sensitive law-enforcement technique, or any other substantial government interest, it may apply to the Court for a modification of its obligations, which may include in camera review or withholding or subjecting to a protective order all or part of the information otherwise subject to disclosure.²

For purposes of this Order, the Government has an affirmative obligation to seek all information subject to disclosure under this Order from all current or former federal, state, and local prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and other officers who have participated in the prosecution, or investigation that led to the prosecution, of the offense or offenses with which the defendant is charged.

If the Government fails to comply with this Order, the Court, in addition to ordering production of the information, may:

- (1) specify the terms and conditions of such production;
- (2) grant a continuance;
- (3) impose evidentiary sanctions;
- (4) impose contempt or other sanctions on any lawyer responsible for violations of the Government's disclosure obligations, or refer the matter to disciplinary authorities;
- (5) dismiss charges before trial or vacate a conviction after trial or a guilty plea; or
- (6) enter any other order that is just under the circumstances.

² The Classified Information Procedures Act sets forth separate procedures to be followed in the event that the Government believes matters relating to classified information may arise in connection with the prosecution. *See* 18 U.S.C. app. 3 §§ 1 *et seq.*

SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7-9-2021

Robert M. Levy
United States District/Magistrate Judge

CLOSED

**U.S. District Court
Eastern District of New York (Brooklyn)
CRIMINAL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:21-mj-00804-RML All Defendants**

Case title: USA v. FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ

Date Filed: 07/09/2021

Date Terminated: 07/09/2021

Assigned to: Magistrate Judge Robert M. Levy

Defendant (1)

Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ
TERMINATED: 07/09/2021

represented by **Jan Alison Rostal**
Federal Defenders of New York, Inc.
One Pierrepont Plaza, 16th Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 330-1207
Fax: (718) 855-0760
Email: Jan_Rostal@fd.org
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Designation: Public Defender or
Community Defender Appointment

Pending Counts

None

Disposition

Highest Offense Level (Opening)

None

Terminated Counts

None

Disposition

Highest Offense Level (Terminated)

None

Complaints

18:1752.P

Disposition

Plaintiff

USA

represented by **Dylan Alexander Stern**
 Department of Justice
 US Attorney's Office - EDNY
 271 Cadman Plaza East
 Brooklyn, NY 11201
 718-254-6213
 Email: Dylan.Stern@usdoj.gov
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Designation: Government Attorney

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
07/09/2021	1	RULE 40 AFFIDAVIT by USA as to Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ by Affiant KYLE JOHNSON (Sica, Michele) (Entered: 07/12/2021)
07/09/2021		Arrest (Rule 40) of Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ (Sica, Michele) (Entered: 07/12/2021)
07/09/2021		Minute Entry for proceedings held before Magistrate Judge Robert M. Levy: For a Removal Hearing to the District of Columbia. Arraignment as to Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ (1) Count Complaint held on 7/9/2021, Attorney Appointment Hearing as to Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ held on 7/9/2021, Initial Appearance in Rule 5(c)(3) Proceedings as to Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ held on 7/9/2021. AUSA Dylan Stern; Federal Defender Jan Rostal, Pretrial Officer Shavoy Atkinson. Waiver of Rule 5 hearing waived. Rule 5f Brady act ordered on the record. Defense presented a bail package; Bond was set at \$25,000. with conditions. 2 Sureties were sworn and advised of bond conditions and signed the bond; The defendant was sworn and advised of bond obligations and signed the bond. Defendant was released. (FTR Log #6:00-7:05.) (Sica, Michele) (Entered: 07/12/2021)
07/09/2021	2	CJA 23 Financial Affidavit by Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ (Sica, Michele) (Entered: 07/12/2021)
07/09/2021	3	ORDER: This order is entered pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(f) to confirm the prosecution's disclosure obligations under Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and its progeny, and to summarize the possible consequences of violating those obligations. as to Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ. Ordered by Magistrate Judge Robert M. Levy on 7/09/2021. (Sica, Michele) (Entered: 07/12/2021)
07/09/2021	4	ORDER Setting Conditions of Release as to Edward FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ (1) 25,000. Ordered by Magistrate Judge Robert M. Levy on 7/09/2021. (Sica, Michele) (Entered: 07/12/2021)