

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 21-cr-618 (ABJ)
	:	
RILEY JUNE WILLIAMS,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**GOVERNMENT’S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT’S
SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR TRANSFER VENUE**

Defendant Riley June Williams, who is charged in connection with events at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, has supplemented her motion to transfer venue in this case to the Middle District of Pennsylvania. The government incorporates by reference its prior response to Williams’s motion to transfer venue and will only address the additional arguments put forth by Williams. *See* ECF No. 40.

Williams now contends that prejudice should be presumed in this district based on (1) the results of a survey conducted by Select Litigation and (2) the results of a media analysis conducted by News Exposure on behalf of Select Litigation. Williams continues to fail to establish that she “cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial” in this district, Fed. R. Crim. P. 21(a). Each of her arguments is without merit, and accordingly, this Court should deny Williams’s motion.¹

¹ Every judge on this Court to have ruled on a motion for change of venue in a January 6 prosecution has denied the motion. *See United States v. Alford*, 21-cr-263, ECF No. 46 (D.D.C. Apr. 18, 2022) (TSC); *United States v. Webster*, 21-cr-208, ECF No. 78 (D.D.C. Apr. 18, 2022) (APM); *United States v. Brooks*, No. 21-cr-503, ECF No. 31 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2022) (RCL); *United States v. Boche*, No. 21-cr-418-RDM, 2022 WL 123893 (D.D.C. Jan. 12, 2022) (RDM); *United States v. Fitzsimons*, No. 21-cr-158 (D.D.C. Dec. 14, 2021) (Minute Order) (RC); *United States v. Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32 (D.D.C. Oct. 15, 2021) (Minute Order) (DLF); *United States v. Caldwell*, 21-cr-28, ECF No. 415 (D.D.C. Sept. 14, 2021) (APM).

I. The Select Litigation Poll Does Not Support a Presumption of Prejudice.

Williams relies on a poll conducted by Select Litigation, a private litigation consulting firm, at the request of the Federal Public Defender for the District of Columbia. ECF No. 46. Select Litigation conducted a telephone poll of potential jurors in the District of Columbia and in the Atlanta Division of the Northern District of Georgia and contracted with a media research firm to analyze news media coverage of January 6 in both of those jurisdictions.

A. Courts have repeatedly declined to find a presumption of prejudice based on pretrial polling without conducting voir dire.

Williams argues that this Court should find a presumption of prejudice based on the results of the Select Litigation poll of prospective jurors. But “courts have commonly rejected such polls as unpersuasive in favor of effective voir dire as a preferable way to ferret out any bias.” *United States v. Causey*, 2005 WL 8160703, at *7 (S.D. Tex. 2005). As one circuit has observed, the Supreme Court’s emphasis on the important role of voir dire in addressing pretrial publicity “undercuts” the “argument that poll percentages . . . decide the question of a presumption of prejudice.” *In re Tsarnaev*, 780 F.3d 14, 23 (1st Cir. 2015) (per curiam); see *Mu’Min v. Virginia*, 500 U.S. 415, 427 (1991) (observing that, “[p]articularly with respect to pretrial publicity, . . . primary reliance on the judgment of the trial court makes good sense”).

Indeed, the D.C. Circuit has rejected a claim of presumed prejudice based on the results of a pre-voir dire survey. *United States v. Haldeman*, 559 F.2d 31, 64 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (en banc) (per curiam). In *Haldeman*, seven former Nixon administration officials (including the former Attorney General of the United States) were prosecuted for their role in the Watergate scandal. *Id.* at 51. According to a poll commissioned by the defense in that case, 93% of the Washington, D.C. population knew of the charges against the defendants and 61% had formed the opinion that they were guilty. *Id.* at 144, 178 n.2 (MacKinnon, J., concurring in part and dissenting in

part). Recognizing that the case had produced a “massive” amount of pretrial publicity, *id.* at 61, the D.C. Circuit nevertheless held that the district court “was correct” to deny the defendants’ “prevoir dire requests for . . . a change of venue,” *id.* at 63-64. The court observed that the district court “did not err in relying less heavily on a poll taken in private by private pollsters and paid for by one side than on a recorded, comprehensive voir dire examination conducted by the judge in the presence of all parties and their counsel.” *Id.* at 64 n.43.

Other circuits have similarly rejected attempts to elevate polling results over voir dire. In *United States v. Campa*, a pre-trial survey found that 69% of respondents were prejudiced against anyone charged with spying on behalf of Cuba, as the defendants were. *United States v. Campa*, 459 F.3d 1121, 1157 (11th Cir. 2006) (en banc) (Birch, J., dissenting). The en banc panel of the Eleventh Circuit affirmed the denial of a motion for change of venue, explaining that “[w]hen a defendant alleges that prejudicial pretrial publicity would prevent him from receiving a fair trial, it is within the district court’s broad discretion to proceed to voir dire to ascertain whether the prospective jurors have, in fact, been influenced by pretrial publicity.” *Id.* at 1146 (majority opinion).

Similarly, in *United States v. Rodriguez*, 581 F.3d 775 (8th Cir. 2009), a poll indicated that 99 % of respondents had heard about the brutal rape and murder with which the defendant was charged, nearly 88 % of those respondents believed he was guilty, and about 42% of respondents had a strongly held opinion of his guilt. *Id.* at 786; Brief for the Appellant, *United States v. Rodriguez*, No. 07-1316 (8th Cir.), 2008 WL 194877, at *19. Nonetheless, the Eighth Circuit found no presumption of prejudice, observing that a district court was not required “to consider public opinion polls when ruling on change-of-venue motions.” *Rodriguez*, 581 F.3d at 786. And the court held that, in any event, the poll did not “demonstrate widespread community prejudice”

because the “media coverage had not been inflammatory,” two years had passed since the murder, and “the district court concluded that special voir dire protocols would screen out prejudiced jurors.” *Id.*

There are good reasons to rely on voir dire, rather than public-opinion polls, when assessing whether prejudice should be presumed. First, polling lacks many of the safeguards of court-supervised voir dire, including the involvement of both parties in formulating the questions. Surveys that are not carefully worded and properly conducted can produce misleading results, such as by asking leading questions or providing the respondents with facts that will influence their responses. *See Campa*, 459 F.3d at 1146 (noting problems with “non-neutral” and “ambiguous” questions). Second, polling lacks the formality that attends in-court proceedings under oath, and it does not afford the court the “face-to-face opportunity to gauge demeanor and credibility.” *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. 358, 395 (2010). Third, polls ordinarily inform the court only the extent to which prospective jurors have heard about a case and formed an opinion about it. But that is not the ultimate question when picking a jury. A prospective juror is not disqualified simply because he has “formed some impression or opinion as to the merits of the case.” *Irvin v. Dowd*, 366 U.S. 717, 722 (1961). Instead, “[i]t is sufficient if the juror can lay aside his impression or opinion and render a verdict based on the evidence presented in court.” *Id.* at 723. But pre-trial surveys are poorly suited to answering that ultimate question, which is best asked in the context of face-to-face voir dire under oath. *See Rosales-Lopez v. United States*, 451 U.S. 182, 188 (1981) (observing that the trial judge’s function in voir dire “is not unlike that of the jurors later in the trial” because “[b]oth must reach conclusions as to impartiality and credibility by relying on their own evaluations of demeanor evidence and of responses to questions”).

In sum, federal courts have shown an overwhelming preference for assessing prejudice through court-supervised voir dire rather than through public opinion polls. And Williams has not offered any reason to depart from that usual practice here. Thus, this Court need not give substantial weight to the polling when considering whether to presume prejudice. But, as explained below, the Select Litigation poll does not support a presumption of prejudice in any event.

B. The Select Litigation poll does not demonstrate pervasive prejudice in the District of Columbia.

Contrary to the Williams’s contention, the Select Litigation poll does not support a presumption of prejudice in this District. As an initial matter, the Select Litigation poll selected only one comparator jurisdiction—the Atlanta Division of the Northern District of Georgia. The defendant has not requested a transfer to that district or division, but instead asks this Court for a transfer to the Middle District of Pennsylvania. The Select Litigation survey tells the Court nothing about the views or media exposure of prospective jurors in that district. The poll therefore cannot show that selecting an impartial jury would be any more difficult in the District of Columbia than in the defendant’s preferred district. *See United States v. Haldeman*, 559 F.2d 31, 64 n.43 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (en banc) (per curiam) (observing that a change of venue “would have been only of doubtful value” where the pretrial publicity was national in scope).

Furthermore, to the extent the poll is useful at a more general level in comparing the District of Columbia to other districts, the poll indicates that levels of media exposure to the events of January 6 are not significantly different in Atlanta than in Washington, D.C. The number of respondents who had seen “[a] lot” of coverage in each jurisdiction differed only by three percentage points (33% in D.C. versus 30% in Atlanta), which is within the margin of error. ECF No. 46-1 at 1-2, 14. The number of respondents who had seen “[s]ome” coverage was exactly the

same (25% in both jurisdictions), and the number who had seen “[q]uite a bit” of coverage was not significantly different (28% in D.C. versus 20% in Atlanta). *Id.* at 15. The total percentage of respondents who were exposed to “[a] lot,” “[q]uite a bit,” or “[s]ome” news coverage was 86% in Washington, D.C. and 75% in Atlanta. *Id.* This relatively small difference does not suggest that news coverage has made it impossible to pick an impartial jury in Washington, D.C.

Williams points out (ECF No. 46, at 3) that 71% of respondents in D.C. said they had formed the opinion January 6 arrestees were “guilty” of the charges brought against them. *See* ECF No. 46-1 at 15. The survey failed, however, to identify (much less define) any of the charges brought against the defendants. It also failed to provide respondents with the option of saying they were “unsure” about guilt, even though such an option is required by professional standards that apply in this area. *See* American Society of Trial Consultants, Professional Standards for Venue Surveys at 9, available at <https://www.astcweb.org/Resources/Pictures/Venue%2010-08.pdf> (“Respondents must be made aware that they can say they do not know or have no opinion.”). The survey instead gave respondents a binary choice between “guilty or not guilty.” ECF No. 46-1 at 15. Yet even without being provided the appropriate options, 26% of D.C. respondents voluntarily gave an answer of “Depends” or “Don’t know/Refused.” *Id.* This shows that, even in response to a poorly worded question, more than a quarter of the District’s residents realized the need to keep an open mind about guilt.

Understood in context, the Select Litigation poll does not indicate any higher degree of juror bias than in *Haldeman*, where the en banc D.C. Circuit found no presumption of prejudice. In *Haldeman*, 61% of respondents expressed a view that the defendants were guilty, as opposed to the 71% here. *See Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 144, 178 n.2 (MacKinnon, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). But the survey in *Haldeman* first asked respondents whether they had formed

an opinion about whether the indicted Nixon aides were guilty or innocent, giving options for both “No” (*i.e.* had not formed an opinion) and “Don’t Know/No Opinion.” *Id.* at 178 n.2. The survey then asked whether respondents thought the defendants were “guilty or innocent in the Watergate affair,” giving options for “Not Guilty Until Proven” and “No Opinion/Don’t Know.” *Id.* Only after (a) being prompted to consider whether they could actually form an opinion, and (b) being reminded of the presumption of innocence, did 61% of respondents say “guilty.” *Id.* Here, by contrast, respondents were not provided a “don’t know” option, were not reminded of the presumption of innocence, and were asked only whether they thought the “several hundred people” arrested in connection with January 6 were “guilty.” ECF No. 46-1 at 15 (Questions 3, 4).

When asked about guilt in the context of a criminal trial, however, respondents in the Select Litigation survey were far less likely to give an answer of “guilty.” Question 5 asked them to “[a]ssume [they] were on a jury for a defendant charged with crimes for his or her activities on January 6” and then asked whether they were “more likely to vote that the person is guilty or not guilty.” ECF No. 46-1, at 15. In response to this question, only 52% of D.C. respondents said “Guilty,” and fully 46% volunteered a response of “Depends” or “Don’t know/Refused.” *Id.* Thus, when asked to consider guilt or innocence in the context of a “defendant charged with crimes,” as opposed to the “several hundred people . . . arrested,” nearly half of D.C. residents were committed to keeping an open mind—even without being instructed on the presumption of innocence or being provided an option for “Do not know.” This indicates, if anything, a lower degree of prejudice than was present in *Haldeman*.

Williams points out (ECF No. 46, at 8) that, according to the Select Litigation poll, 84% of D.C. respondents had an “unfavorable” view of “people arrested for participating in the events at the U.S. Capitol on January 6.” ECF No. 46-1, at 15. Although that is higher than the 54% of

Atlantans with unfavorable views, it is quite similar to the results of a nationwide CBS poll, which found that 83% of respondents “[s]omewhat disapprove” or “[s]trongly disapprove” of the “actions taken by the people who forced their way into the U.S. Capitol on January 6.” *See* CBS News Poll, December 27-30, 2021, Question 2, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QNzK7xBJeWzKlTrHVobLgyFtId9Cgsq_/view. Williams has not asked to be tried in Atlanta and has not provided any information about the views in the requested venue. And, in any event, the fact that many D.C. residents have a generally “unfavorable” view of people “arrested” on January 6 does not mean that an impartial jury cannot be selected in this jurisdiction.

Williams also points out (ECF No. 46, at 8) that 62% of D.C. respondents (compared to 48% of Atlanta respondents) would describe “most of the people who were arrested for their involvement in the events on January 6th” as “criminals.” ECF No. 46-1, at 15 (Question 10). The answers to this question likely reflect the commonly held view that most people arrested for crimes are in fact guilty of those crimes. But the fact that 62% of D.C. respondents expressed this off-the-cuff view about “most” of the 700-plus January 6th arrestees does not demonstrate that all of those respondents would be unable to impartially find the facts in a specific case after being properly instructed by the Court. Moreover, the question demonstrates that fully 28% of D.C. respondents would *not* describe those arrestees as criminals, and 9% were unsure or refused to answer. ECF No. 46-1, at 15. And the 14% difference between D.C. and Atlanta—which could easily be explained by demographic differences such as age and education levels (*see Id.*)—would not justify the conclusion that this is an “extreme case” in which a change of venue is required. *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 381.

Nor should prejudice be presumed because a substantial numbers of respondents “would” describe “the people who forced their way into the U.S. Capitol” as “[t]rying to overturn the

election and keep Donald Trump in power” (85%), engaging in “[i]nsurrection” (76%), or “[t]rying to overthrow the U.S. government” (72%). ECF No. 46-1, at 16. For one thing, this question asked specifically about those who “forced their way into the U.S. Capitol,” which suggests a higher degree of culpability than simply entering the Capitol. For another, the poll did not provide an “undecided” option but asked only whether respondents “would” or “would not” use those descriptions. *Id.* Nor did the question define the offenses of “insurrection” or advocating the overthrow of government, *see* 18 U.S.C. §§ 2383, 2385, offenses with which no defendant has been charged in connection with January 6. And, most importantly, the poll did not answer the key question: whether a sufficient number of prospective jurors can “lay aside [their] impression[s] or opinion[s] and render a verdict based on the evidence presented in court.” *Irvin v. Dowd*, 366 U.S. 717, 723 (1961); *see Patton v. Yount*, 467 U.S. 1025, 1029 (1984) (no presumption of prejudice where nearly 99% of prospective jurors had heard of the case and 77% indicated on voir dire that “they would carry an opinion into the jury box”). In short, the Select Litigation poll does not come close to demonstrating that “12 impartial individuals could not be empaneled” in Washington, D.C. *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 382.

In any U.S. jurisdiction, most prospective jurors will have heard about the events of January 6, and many will have various disqualifying biases. But the appropriate way to identify and address those biases is through a careful voir dire, rather than a change of venue based solely on pretrial polling and media analyses. As in *Haldeman*, there is “no reason for concluding that the population of Washington, D. C. [i]s so aroused against [the defendant] and so unlikely to be able objectively to judge [his] guilt or innocence on the basis of the evidence presented at trial” that a change of venue is required. *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 62.

V. The Select Litigation Media Analysis Does Not Support a Presumption of Prejudice.

Williams also incorrectly contends that the media analysis conducted by News Exposure on behalf of Select Litigation supports a presumption of prejudice. ECF No. 46, at 10-11. The analysis shows that, in nine of the 13 months analyzed, the *Washington Post* ran more news stories about January 6 than did the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. ECF No. 46-1, at 10. Again, as with the Selection Litigation poll, this analysis does not focus on Williams's preferred venue, the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and therefore provides little insight into the media exposure of prospective jurors in that district.

Moreover, for several reasons, these numbers do not demonstrate that media exposure was significantly different in Atlanta than in Washington, D.C. First, the comparison fails to account for the comparative sizes and circulations of the two newspapers. It should not be surprising that a large national newspaper would print more articles on the same topic than a regional newspaper. Second, the analysis does not account for the fact that many Americans receive their news from national sources such as CNN or Fox News, often filtered through social media. Thus, prospective jurors in both Washington, D.C. and Atlanta are not limited to their local newspapers and television broadcast stations and may well have been exposed to much of the same media coverage. Third, simply counting the number of news articles in a given source is not a good way to measure prospective jurors' media exposure. Indeed, the Select Litigation poll shows comparatively small variations in media exposure between Washington, D.C. and Atlanta. According to that poll, 99% of D.C. respondents were aware of the January 6 demonstrations, compared to 93% in Atlanta, and 33% of D.C. respondents had seen "A lot" of coverage, compared to 30% in Atlanta. *Id.* at 14-15. Like the Watergate scandal at issue in *Haldeman*, the storming of the Capitol on January 6, 2021, was "not a local crime of peculiar interest to the residents of the District of Columbia" but one that

generated national interest. *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 64 n.43.

The Select Litigation analysis also concludes that “the number of hits from internet sites based in the District of Columbia area was four times higher than the comparable number of hits from sites based in the Atlanta area.” ECF No. 46-1, at 10. But the analysis includes no information about where these hits came from. Many of the hits on D.C.-based news sources likely came from readers outside the District itself, such as readers in the Northern Virginia and Maryland suburbs or readers from other parts of the country who were directed to D.C.-based news reporting on social media. A reader in California, for example, would be far more likely to read about January 6 on the Washington Post than on the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. Without additional information, this analysis of Internet hits is essentially meaningless.

The Select Litigation analysis is also unhelpful because it considered only the coverage of January 6 in general, as opposed to the coverage of Williams. Williams is one of more than 800 defendants charged in connection with January 6, and only a fraction of the media coverage has focused on her. Indeed, the coverage of Williams is less significant than in *Skilling*, where the *Houston Chronicle* “mentioned Enron in more than 4,000 articles during the 3-year period following the company’s December 2001 bankruptcy” with “[h]undreds of these articles discussing Skilling by name.” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 428 (Sotomayor, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).

Finally, the media analysis fails to support a presumption of prejudice because mere exposure to pretrial publicity does not disqualify a potential juror. “Prominence does not necessarily produce prejudice, and juror *impartiality* . . . does not require *ignorance*.” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 381. The Supreme Court has found no presumption of prejudice even when 98% of prospective jurors had heard of the case and 77% indicated on voir dire that “they would carry an

opinion into the jury box.” *Patton*, 467 U.S. at 1029. The mere fact that Washington, D.C. news outlets have run more stories about January 6 (and received more hits) than have Atlanta outlets does not suggest that an impartial jury cannot be selected in Washington D.C.

VI. Recent Trials in this District Do Not Support Defendant’s Request to Transfer

Defendant further argues that she is likely to be prejudiced because the recent January 6 trial in *United States v. Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32 (DLF), “garnered considerable media attention and resulted in verdicts of guilty on all counts.” ECF No. 46, at 17. Since Defendant filed her supplemental motion, two more defendants have been convicted after jury trials, *United States v. Robertson*, No. 1:21-CR-34; *United States v. Thompson*, No. 1:21-CR_161, and two other defendants have gone to bench trials, resulting in an acquittal, *United States v. Martin*, No. 21-CR-394, and a mixed verdict, *United States v. Griffin*, No. 21-cr-92. Although each of these cases generated media coverage, that coverage was not confined to the District of Columbia and was focused on the defendants in those cases, without mentioning Williams. Williams cannot show that jurors in this District, carefully selected after a thorough *voir dire* and properly instructed in the law, would be more likely to convict her simply because they were exposed to media coverage of other January 6 trials.

Additionally, as noted by Williams, her case is not set for trial yet. Therefore, even more time will have passed since the siege at the Capitol on January 6, 2021, and since these initial January 6 trials. And as more January 6 defendants go to trial, the level of media attention given to each particular trial is likely to diminish.

Defendant also argues that, by the time she goes to trial, “many other January 6 defendants likely will have gone to trial before her” and that these trials will also shrink the “already-small pool of even potentially eligible jurors.” ECF No. 46, at 17. But each trial will barely touch the

potential jury pool. Assuming (1) a jury pool of 500,000 out of nearly 700,000 residents, (2) approximately 80 people being summoned per trial, and (3) that no one even summoned for jury service in a January 6 case could be summoned again, over 60 trials will have to occur before *one percent* of the jury pool has been called. Accordingly, by the time Williams's case proceeds to trial, there will still be a substantial number of potential jurors, who have never been summoned to a January 6 trial, still available for *voir dire*.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons put forth in the Government's omnibus opposition (ECF No. 40, at 39-53), Williams's motion to transfer venue should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW M. GRAVES
United States Attorney
D.C. Bar No. 481052

By: /s/ Maria Y. Fedor
Maria Y. Fedor
Attorney, detailed to the
United States Attorney's Office for the
District of Columbia
D.C. Bar No. 985823
555 Fourth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 353-7366; Maria.Fedor@usdoj.gov

Mona Sedky
Special Assistant United States Attorney
D.C. Bar. Bar 447968
555 4th Street, N.W., Rm. 4842
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 262-7122; Mona.Sedky2@usdoj.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On this 25th day of April 2022, a copy of the foregoing was served upon all parties listed on the Electronic Case Filing (ECF) System.

By: /s/ Maria Y. Fedor
Maria Y. Fedor
Attorney, detailed to the
United States Attorney's Office for the
District of Columbia
D.C. Bar No. 985823
555 Fourth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 353-7366; Maria.Fedor@usdoj.gov