

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :
 : **Case No. 1:21-cr-00239 (RDM)**
 v. :
 :
 NICHOLAS REIMLER, :
 :
 Defendant. :

GOVERNMENT’S SENTENCING MEMORANDUM

The United States of America, by and through its attorney, the Acting United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, respectfully submits this sentencing memorandum in connection with the above-captioned matter. For the reasons set forth herein, the government requests that this Court sentence Nicholas Reimler to two months of home detention as part of a probationary term of three years, 60 hours of community service, and \$500 in restitution.

I. Introduction

The defendant, Nicholas Reimler, participated in the January 6, 2021 attack on the United States Capitol—a violent attack that forced an interruption of the certification of the 2020 Electoral College vote count, threatened the peaceful transfer of power after the 2020 Presidential election, injured more than one hundred law enforcement officers, and resulted in more than one million dollars’ of property damage.

Reimler pleaded guilty to one count of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G), Parading, Demonstrating, or Picketing in the Capitol Building. As explained herein, a substantial period of probation, including two months of home detention is appropriate in this case because Reimler illegally entered the Capitol building and posted videos from inside the Capitol building to Snapchat with a banner stating, “TOP OF THE US CAPITOL DOME” and a caption stating, “Lol what’s going on.”

The Court must also consider that the defendant's conduct on January 6, like the conduct of scores of other defendants, took place in the context of a large and violent riot that relied on numbers to overwhelm law enforcement, breach the Capitol, and disrupt the proceedings. But for his actions alongside so many others, the riot likely would have failed. *See United States v. Matthew Mazocco*, 1:21-cr-00054 (TSC), Tr. 10/4/2021 at 25 (“A mob isn't a mob without the numbers. The people who were committing those violent acts did so because they had the safety of numbers.”) (statement of Judge Chutkan). Here, the defendant's participation in a riot that actually succeeded in halting the Congressional certification and his willingness to advertise his participation on social media warrant a significant period of probation that includes two months of home detention.

II. Factual and Procedural Background

The January 6, 2021 Attack on the Capitol


To avoid exposition, the government refers to the general summary of the attack on the U.S. Capitol. *See* ECF 26 (Statement of Offense), at 1-7. As this Court knows, a riot cannot occur without rioters, and each rioter's actions – from the most mundane to the most violent – contributed, directly and indirectly, to the violence and destruction of that day. With that backdrop we turn to the defendant's conduct and behavior on January 6.

Nicholas Reimler's Role in the January 6, 2021 Attack on the Capitol

On December 30, 2020, Reimler re-posted a post from Donald J. Trump's Facebook page stating, “JANUARY SIXTH, SEE YOU IN DC!” In the comments below the post, someone asked Reimler, “You going??” and Reimler responded, “maybe.” Reimler further stated that he was driving to the rally with two individuals from his work. Below is a screenshot of the Facebook post:



On January 6, 2021, Reimler entered the Capitol building through the Senate wing door at approximately 3:07 PM, walked down a hallway, and subsequently entered the Crypt at approximately 3:10 PM. These areas were all restricted to the public. While inside the Capitol building, Reimler posted videos to his Snapchat account depicting other individuals who also appear to have illegally entered the Capitol building. Below are screenshots of Reimler's Snapchat videos:



Reimler remained in the Crypt for several minutes and, at approximately 3:26 PM, was captured on CCTV leaving the Capitol building of his own accord. The CCTV video appears to show Reimler exiting through a window next to the Senate wing door he had used to enter the building. Based on a review of CCTV footage, it does not appear that Reimler was present for any violence or destruction of property in the Capitol building, nor was he present for any clashes with law enforcement. There is also no evidence that he advocated or encouraged anyone to engage in acts of violence or destruction of property.

Following his arrest in this matter, Reimler waived his *Miranda* rights and admitted that he drove to Washington, DC, with two other individuals. He admitted to entering the Capitol building, but stated that he believed that area of the building was normally open to the public. He further stated that when he made entry into the building, people were freely walking in and out of the building and metal barricades appeared to be knocked down or pushed off to the side.

The Charges and Plea Agreement

On February 5, 2021, Nicholas Reimler was charged by complaint with violating 18 U.S.C. §§ 1752(a)(1) and 1752(a)(2) and 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G). On February 18, 2021, he was arrested in Missouri. Reimler waived his *Miranda* rights following his arrest and agreed to be interviewed by law enforcement. Reimler also consented to a search of his cell phone. On March 23, 2021, Reimler was charged by three-count Information with 18 U.S.C. §§ 1752(a)(1) and (2) and 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G). On September 17, 2021, he pleaded guilty to Count Three of the Information, charging him with a violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G), Parading, Demonstrating, or Picketing in the Capitol Building. By plea agreement, Nicholas Reimler agreed to pay \$500 in restitution to the Department of the Treasury.

III. Statutory Penalties

The defendant now faces a sentencing on a single count of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G). As noted by the plea agreement and the U.S. Probation Office, the defendant faces up to six months of imprisonment and a fine of up to \$5,000.¹ The defendant must also pay restitution under the terms of his or his plea agreement. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3663(a)(3); *United States v. Anderson*, 545 F.3d 1072, 1078-79 (D.C. Cir. 2008). As this offense is a Class B Misdemeanor, the Sentencing Guidelines do not apply to it. 18 U.S.C. § 3559; U.S.S.G. §1B1.9.

IV. Sentencing Factors Under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)

In this misdemeanor case, sentencing is guided by 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), which identifies the factors a court must consider in formulating the sentence. Some of those factors include: the

¹ Because the defendant has pled guilty to a petty offense, a term of supervised release is not authorized. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(b)(3).

nature and circumstances of the offense, § 3553(a)(1); the history and characteristics of the defendant, *id.*; the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense and promote respect for the law, § 3553(a)(2)(A); the need for the sentence to afford adequate deterrence, § 3553(a)(2)(B); and the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct. § 3553(a)(6). In this case, as described below, all of the Section 3553(a) factors weigh in favor of a lengthy period of probation and two months of home detention.

A. The Nature and Circumstances of the Offense

The attack on the U.S. Capitol, on January 6, 2021 is a criminal offense unparalleled in American history. It represented a grave threat to our democratic norms; indeed, it was the one of the only times in our history when the building was literally occupied by hostile participants. By its very nature, the attack defies comparison to other events.

While each defendant should be sentenced based on their individual conduct, as we now discuss, this Court should note that each person who entered the Capitol on January 6 without authorization did so under the most extreme of circumstances. As they entered the Capitol, they would—at a minimum—have crossed through numerous barriers and barricades and heard the throes of a mob. Depending on the timing and location of their approach, they also may have observed extensive fighting with law enforcement officials and smelled chemical irritants in the air. No rioter was a mere tourist that day.

Additionally, while looking at the defendant's individual conduct, we must assess such conduct on a spectrum. This Court, in determining a fair and just sentence on this spectrum, should look to a number of critical factors, to include: (1) whether, when, how the defendant entered the Capitol building; (2) whether the defendant encouraged violence; (3) whether the defendant

encouraged property destruction; (4) the defendant's reaction to acts of violence or destruction; (5) whether during or after the riot, the defendant destroyed evidence; (6) the length of the defendant's time inside of the building, and exactly where the defendant traveled; (7) the defendant's statements in person or on social media; (8) whether the defendant cooperated with, or ignored commands from law enforcement officials; and (9) whether the defendant demonstrated sincere remorse or contrition. While these factors are not exhaustive nor dispositive, they help to place each defendant on a spectrum as to their fair and just punishment. Had the defendant personally engaged in violence or destruction, he or she would be facing additional charges and/or penalties associated with that conduct. The absence of violent or destructive acts on the part of the defendant is therefore not a mitigating factor in misdemeanor cases.

Reimler entered the Capitol building illegally through the Senate wing door and walked through the Crypt, taking videos on his phone of other rioters in the area. Reimler then posted these videos to Snapchat with a caption that read, "Lol what's going on?" This indicates that he believed at the time that the breach of the United States Capitol building was, at least in part, a laughing matter and Reimler was advertising his participation in the Capitol breach to his social media followers. Reimler remained in the building for approximately fifteen minutes. When he left, he exited through what appears to be a broken window next to the Senate wing door, which should have clearly indicated to him that some destruction of property occurred prior to his entry into the building.

Accordingly, the nature and the circumstances of this offense establish that probation is appropriate in this matter.

B. The History and Characteristics of the Defendant

As set forth in the PSR, Reimler's criminal history consists of one citation for operating a vehicle while intoxicated in 2014. ECF 30 ¶ 29. Reimler is employed in the quality control department of a construction material supply company. He has been compliant with his conditions of his release in this matter.

Reimler's history and characteristics show that he had several stability factors present in his life at the time of his offense. He was employed, was financially stable, and had family support. In spite of these stability factors, he still made the decision to participate in a breach of the United States Capitol. Therefore, a lengthy period of probation combined with a period of home detention is warranted to ensure that he is supervised while in the community and that he does not engage in the type of conduct that brought him before this Court in this case.

C. The Need for the Sentence Imposed to Reflect the Seriousness of the Offense and Promote Respect for the Law

The attack on the U.S. Capitol building and grounds was an attack on the rule of law. "The violence and destruction of property at the U.S. Capitol on January 6 showed a blatant and appalling disregard for our institutions of government and the orderly administration of the democratic process."² As with the nature and circumstances of the offense, this factor supports a sentence of incarceration, as it will in most cases, including misdemeanor cases, arising out of the January 6 riot. *See United States v. Joshua Bustle and Jessica Bustle*, 21-cr-238-TFH, Tr. 08/24/21 at 3 ("As to probation, I don't think anyone should start off in these cases with any presumption of probation. I think the presumption should be that these offenses were an attack on our democracy and that jail time is usually -- should be expected") (statement of Judge Hogan).

² Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Christopher Wray, Statement before the House Oversight and Reform Committee (June 15, 2021), available at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/Wray%20Testimony.pdf>

D. The Need for the Sentence to Afford Adequate Deterrence

Deterrence encompasses two goals: general deterrence, or the need to deter crime generally, and specific deterrence, or the need to protect the public from further crimes by this defendant. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(B-C), *United States v. Russell*, 600 F.3d 631, 637 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

General Deterrence

The violence at the Capitol on January 6 was cultivated to interfere, and did interfere, with one of the most important democratic processes we have: the peaceful transfer of power to a newly elected President. As noted by this Court during sentencing in *United States v. Paul Hodgkins*, 21-cr-188-RDM:

[D]emocracy requires the cooperation of the governed. When a mob is prepared to attack the Capitol to prevent our elected officials from both parties from performing their constitutional and statutory duty, democracy is in trouble. The damage that [the defendant] and others caused that day goes way beyond the several-hour delay in the certification. It is a damage that will persist in this country for decades.

Tr. at 69-70. Indeed, the attack on the Capitol means “that it will be harder today than it was seven months ago for the United States and our diplomats to convince other nations to pursue democracy. It means that it will be harder for all of us to convince our children and our grandchildren that democracy stands as the immutable foundation of this nation.” *Id.* at 70; *see United States v. Thomas Gallagher*, 1:21-CR-00041 Tr. 10/13/2021 at 37 (“As other judges on this court have recognized, democracy requires the cooperation of the citizenry. Protesting in the Capitol, in a manner that delays the certification of the election, throws our entire system of government into disarray, and it undermines the stability of our society. Future would-be rioters must be deterred.”) (statement of Judge Nichols at sentencing).

The gravity of these offenses demands deterrence. This was not a protest. *See United States v. Paul Hodgkins*, 21-cr-188-RDM, Tr. at 46 This Court noting that there is not “any plausible argument can be made defending what happened in the Capitol on January 6th as the exercise of First Amendment rights”). And it is important to convey to future potential rioters—especially those who intend to improperly influence the democratic process—that their actions will have consequences. There is possibly no greater factor that this Court must consider.

Specific Deterrence

Reimler’s conduct in this matter demonstrates the need for a lengthy period of probation and two months of home confinement. Reimler entered the Crypt, the center of the United States Capitol, during the course of a breach of the Capitol Building while a mob was attempted to prevent the certification of the presidential election. He recorded videos of other rioters in the Crypt and subsequently posted those videos on Snapchat, appearing to make light of the Capitol breach and advertise his participation in it. Sentencing Reimler to a lengthy period of probation and home detention will deter him from engaging in similar conduct in the future.

E. The Need to Avoid Unwarranted Sentencing Disparities

As the Court is aware, the government has charged hundreds of individuals for their roles in this one-of-a-kind assault on the Capitol, ranging from unlawful entry misdemeanors, such as in this case, to assault on law enforcement officers, to conspiracy to corruptly interfere with Congress.³ Each offender must be sentenced based on their individual circumstances, but with the backdrop of the January 6 riot in mind. Moreover, each offender’s case will exist on a spectrum that ranges from conduct meriting a probationary sentence to crimes necessitating years of

³ Attached to this sentencing memorandum is a table providing additional information about the sentences imposed on other Capitol breach defendants. That table also shows that the requested sentence here would not result in unwarranted sentencing disparities.

imprisonment. The misdemeanor defendants will generally fall on the lower end of that spectrum, but misdemeanor breaches of the Capitol on January 6, 2021 were not minor crimes. A probationary sentence should not necessarily become the default.⁴ Indeed, the government invites the Court to join Judge Lamberth's admonition that "I don't want to create the impression that probation is the automatic outcome here because it's not going to be." *United States v. Anna Morgan-Lloyd*, 1:21-cr-00164 (RCL), Tr. 6/23/2021 at 19; *see also United States v. Valerie Ehrke*, 1:21-cr-00097 (PFF), Tr. 9/17/2021 at 13 ("Judge Lamberth said something to the effect . . . 'I don't want to create the impression that probation is the automatic outcome here, because it's not going to be.' And I agree with that. Judge Hogan said something similar.") (statement of Judge Friedman).

While the number of sentenced defendants is low, the government and the sentencing courts have already begun to make meaningful distinctions between offenders. Those who engaged in felonious conduct are generally more dangerous, and thus, treated more severely in terms of their conduct and subsequent punishment. Those who trespassed, but engaged in aggravating factors, merit serious consideration of institutional incarceration. Those who trespassed, but engaged in less serious aggravating factors, deserve a sentence more in line with minor incarceration or home detention.

⁴ Early in this investigation, the Government made a very limited number of plea offers in misdemeanor cases that included an agreement to recommend probation, including in *United States v. Anna Morgan-Lloyd*, 1:21-cr-00164(RCL); *United States v. Valerie Elaine Ehrke*, 1:21-cr-00097(PFF); and *United States v. Donna Sue Bissey*, 1:21-cr-00165(TSC). The government is abiding by its agreements in those cases, but has made no such agreement in this case. *Cf. United States v. Rosales-Gonzales*, 801 F.3d 1177, 1183 (9th Cir. 2015) (no unwarranted sentencing disparities under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(6) between defendants who plead guilty under a "fast-track" program and those who do not given the "benefits gained by the government when defendants plead guilty early in criminal proceedings") (citation omitted).

The defendant has pleaded guilty to Count Three of the Information, charging him with Parading, Picketing, or Picketing in the Capitol Building, a violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G). This offense is a Class B misdemeanor. 18 U.S.C. § 3559. Certain Class B and C misdemeanors and infractions are “petty offenses,” 18 U.S.C. § 19, to which the Sentencing Guidelines do not apply, U.S.S.G. 1B1.9. The sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), including “the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct,” 18 U.S.C.A. § 3553(6), do apply, however.

As described above, although all the other defendants discussed below participated in the Capitol breach on January 6, 2021, many salient differences—including, but not limited to, how a defendant entered the Capitol, how long he remained inside, the nature of any statements he made (on social media or otherwise), whether he destroyed evidence of his participation in the breach, etc.—help explain the differing recommendations and sentences. And as that discussion illustrates, avoiding unwarranted disparities requires the courts to consider not only a defendant’s “records” and “conduct” but other relevant sentencing criteria, such as a defendant’s expression of remorse or cooperation with law enforcement. *See United States v. Hemphill*, 514 F.3d 1350, 1365 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (no unwarranted disparity regarding lower sentence of codefendant who, unlike defendant, pleaded guilty and cooperated with the government).

Moreover, assessing disparities, and whether they are unwarranted, requires a sufficient pool of comparators. In considering disparity, a judge cannot “consider all of the sentences not yet imposed.” *United States v. Godines*, 433 F.3d 68, 69–71 (D.C. Cir. 2006). “The most a judge can do is consider those other sentences that do exist,” and “[t]he comparable sentences will be much smaller in the early days of any sentencing regime than in the later.” *Id.*; *see generally United States v. Accardi*, 669 F.3d 340, 346 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (“Without more, two allegedly similar cases

constitute too small a sample size to support a finding of an ‘unwarranted disparity’ in sentences.”). In cases for which the Sentencing Guidelines apply, “[t]he best way to curtail ‘unwarranted’ disparities is to follow the Guidelines, which are designed to treat similar offenses and offenders similarly.” *United States v. Bartlett*, 567 F.3d 901, 908 (7th Cir. 2009). *See id.* (“A sentence within a Guideline range ‘necessarily’ complies with § 3553(a)(6).”). Because the Sentencing Guidelines do not apply here, the sentencing court cannot readily conduct a disparity analysis against a nationwide sample of cases captured by the Sentencing Guidelines.

Even in Guidelines cases, sentencing courts are permitted to consider sentences imposed on co-defendants in assessing disparity. *E.g.*, *United States v. Knight*, 824 F.3d 1105, 1111 (D.C. Cir. 2016); *United States v. Mejia*, 597 F.3d 1329, 1343-44 (D.C. Cir. 2010); *United States v. Bras*, 483 F.3d 103, 114 (D.C. Cir. 2007). The Capitol breach was *sui generis*: a mass crime with significant distinguishing features, including the historic assault on the seat of legislative branch of federal government, the vast size of the mob, the goal of impeding if not preventing the peaceful transfer of Presidential power, the use of violence by a substantial number of rioters against law enforcement officials, and large number of victims. Thus, even though many of the defendants were not charged as conspirators or as codefendants, the sentences handed down for Capitol breach offenses is an appropriate group for purposes of measuring disparity of any future sentence.

As the number of sentences in the Capitol breach misdemeanor cases increase and the pool of comparators grows, the effect on sentences of obviously aggravating considerations should become more apparent. The same is true for obviously mitigating factors, such as a defendant’s efforts to prevent assaults on police.

While no previously sentenced case contains the specific blend of aggravating and mitigating factors present here, the Court may also consider the sentence imposed on Jessica Bustle

by Judge Hogan for reference. There are substantial similarities between Reimler's conduct on January 6 and Bustle's conduct on that day. Bustle illegally entered the Capitol, remained inside for approximately 20 minutes, and, like Reimler, did not engage in or encourage any violence or destruction of property. Unlike Reimler, following the riot, Bustle made a series of social media posts calling former Vice President Pence a traitor, bragging about having participated in the riot, and reiterating her belief that the 2020 election was stolen. Reimler, however, actively posted to social media while inside of the Capitol, promoting his participation in and appearing to make light of the ongoing breach. Both Reimler and Bustler were cooperative with law enforcement following their arrest and took very early responsibility for their criminal conduct by pleading guilty at one of their first opportunities. Bustle was sentenced to 60 days of home detention and 24 months of probation, along with an order to pay \$500 in restitution. Because Jessica Bustle's overall conduct, both on January 6 and in the aftermath, is so similar to Reimler's, the government believes a similar sentence is appropriate in this case.

In any event, the goal of minimizing unwarranted sentencing disparities in § 3553(a)(6) is “only one of several factors that must be weighted and balanced,” and the degree of weight is “firmly committed to the discretion of the sentencing judge.” *United States v. Coppola*, 671 F.3d 220, 254 (2d Cir. 2012). The § 3553(a) factors that this Court assesses are “open-ended,” with the result that “different district courts may have distinct sentencing philosophies and may emphasize and weigh the individual § 3553(a) factors differently; and every sentencing decision involves its own set of facts and circumstances regarding the offense and the offender.” *United States v. Gardellini*, 545 F.3d 1089, 1093 (D.C. Cir. 2008). “[D]ifferent district courts can and will sentence differently—differently from the Sentencing Guidelines range, differently from the sentence an

appellate court might have imposed, and differently from how other district courts might have sentenced that defendant.” *Id.* at 1095.

V. Conclusion

Sentencing requires the Court to carefully balance the § 3553(a) factors. As explained herein, the sentencing factors, on balance, weigh in favor of a period of probation. Balancing these factors, the government recommends that this Court sentence Nicholas Reimler to three years’ probation, two months of home confinement, and \$500 in restitution. Such a sentence protects the community, promotes respect for the law, and deters future crime by imposing restrictions on his liberty as a consequence of his behavior, while recognizing his early acceptance of responsibility.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW GRAVES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: /s/Janani Iyengar
JANANI J. IYENGAR
NY Bar No. 5225990
Assistant United States Attorney
U.S. Attorney’s Office
555 4th Street, N.W., Room 4237
Washington, D.C. 20530
Office: 202-870-4487
Janani.iyengar@usdoj.gov

