

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

No. 1:21-cr-214 (JDB)

JOSEPH LINO PADILLA
Also known as “Jose Padilla,”

Defendant.

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

The parties submit the attached Proposed Jury Instructions, using brackets to indicate options for the Court. All instructions are from Criminal Jury Instructions for the District of Columbia (Fifth Edition, 2022 Release) (the “Redbook”), unless otherwise noted. The parties respectfully request leave of Court to submit supplemental proposed jury instructions as may be necessary to conform to the evidence introduced at trial.

Respectfully Submitted,
MATTHEW M. GRAVES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
D.C. Bar No. 481 052

/s/ Douglas B. Brasher
DOUGLAS B. BRASHER
Assistant United States Attorney
Texas State Bar No. 24077601
1100 Commerce Street, Third Floor
Dallas, Texas 75242-1699
douglas.brasher@usdoj.gov
Telephone: 214-659-8604

/s/ Andrew S. Haag
ANDREW S. HAAG
Assistant United States Attorney
MA Bar No. 705425
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 252-7755
Andrew.Haag@usdoj.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. 102 Preliminary Instruction Before Trial.....	1
2.100 Furnishing the Jury with a Copy of the Instructions.....	10
2.101 Function of the Court.....	11
2.102 Function of the Jury	12
2.103 Jury’s Recollection Controls.....	13
2.104 Evidence in the Case—Judicial Notice & Stipulations.....	14
2.105 Statements of Counsel.....	15
2.106 Indictment Not Evidence	16
2.107 Burden of Proof—Presumption of Innocence.....	17
2.108 Reasonable Doubt.....	18
2.109 Direct and Circumstantial Evidence	19
2.110 Nature of Charges Not to Be Considered	20
2.112 Inadmissible and Stricken Evidence	21
2.200 Credibility of Witnesses.....	22
2.207 Police Officer’s Testimony	24
2.208 Right of Defendant Not to Testify	25
2.209 Defendant as Witness.....	26
2.210 False or Inconsistent Statements by Defendant	27
2.310 Transcripts of Recordings	28
2.402 Multiple Counts—One Defendant	29
2.405 Unanimity	30
Counts One, Three, and Five Assault, Resisting, or Impeding Certain Officers (Violations of 18 U.S.C. § 111(a)(1) and (b)).....	31
Counts Two, Four, and Six Civil Disorder (Violations of 18 U.S.C. § 231(a)(3)).....	35

Count Seven Obstruction of an Official Proceeding and Aiding and Abetting (Violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1512(c)(2) and 2).....	38
Count Eight Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon (Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1) and (b)(1)(A))	41
Count Nine Disorderly Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds With a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon (Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2) and (b)(1)(A))	43
Count Ten Engaging in Physical Violence in a Restricted Building or Grounds (Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(4) and (b)(1)(A)).....	45
Count Eleven Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building (Violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D))	46
Count Twelve Act of Physical Violence in the Capitol Grounds or Building (Violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(F)).....	48
2.407 Verdict Form Explanation.....	49
2.500 Redacted Exhibits	50
2.501 Exhibits During Deliberations	51
2.502 Selection of Foreperson	52
2.505 Possible Punishment Not Relevant	53
2.508 Cautionary Instruction on Publicity, Communication, and Research.....	54
2.509 Communication Between Court and Jury During Jury’s Deliberations	55
2.510 Communication Between Court and Jury During Jury’s Deliberations	56
2.511 Excusing Alternate Jurors	57
Verdict Form.....	End of Document

1.102

Preliminary Instruction Before Trial

Introduction

Before we begin the trial, I want to explain some of the legal rules that will be important in this trial. I want to emphasize that these remarks are not meant to be a substitute for the detailed instructions that I will give at the end of the trial just before you start your deliberations. These preliminary instructions are intended to give you a sense of what will be going on in the courtroom and what your responsibilities as jurors will be.

Notetaking¹

When you took your seats, you probably noticed that each of you had a notebook and pencil waiting for you. That is because I permit jurors to take notes during trial if they wish. Whether you take notes or not is entirely up to you. Many people find that taking notes helps them remember testimony and evidence; others find it distracts them from listening to the witnesses.

You will be permitted to take your notebooks back with you into the jury room during deliberations. You should remember, however, that your notes are only an aid to your memory. They are not evidence in the case, and they should not replace your own memory of the evidence. Those jurors who do not take notes should rely on their own memory of the evidence and should not be influenced by another juror's notes.

Other than during your deliberations, the notebooks will remain locked in the courtroom during recesses and overnight. You will not be able to take the notebooks with you as you come and go and you will not be permitted to take them home with you overnight. At the end of the trial, when you come back to the courtroom to deliver your verdict, your notebooks will be collected,

¹ Redbook 1.105

and the pages torn out and destroyed. No one, including myself, will ever look at any notes you have taken, so you may feel free to write whatever you wish.

Identity of Alternates²

You have probably noticed that there are [fourteen (14)] of you sitting in the jury box. Only twelve (12) of you will retire to deliberate in this matter. Before any of you even entered the courtroom, we randomly selected the alternates' seats. I will not disclose who the alternate jurors are until the end of my final instructions just before you begin your deliberations. As any seat might turn out to be an alternate's seat, it is important that each of you think of yourselves as regular jurors during this trial, and that all of you give this case your fullest and most serious attention.

Now let me explain briefly some of the procedures we will follow and some of the rules of law that will be important in this case. This is a criminal case that began when the grand jury returned an indictment.

The defendant in this case, Joseph Lino Padilla, is charged with 12 crimes relating to his conduct on the grounds of the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. Counts One, Three, and Five charge the defendant with three separate assaults on law enforcement officers, two of which involved a dangerous weapon. Counts Two, Four, and Six charge the defendant with obstructing, impeding, and interfering with law enforcement officers from the United States Capitol Police or District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department, during a civil disorder. Count Seven charges the defendant with obstruction of an official proceeding, that is, Congress's meeting at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, to certify the Electoral College vote for president. Counts Seven through Twelve charge the defendant with crimes related to his presence and conduct on the

² Redbook 1.107

Capitol grounds including, acts of physical violence, disorderly and disruptive conduct, and entering and remaining in a restricted area. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to all charges.

You should understand clearly that the indictment that I just summarized is not evidence. The indictment is just a formal way of charging a person with a crime in order to bring him to trial. You must not think of the indictment as any evidence of the guilt of the defendant, or draw any conclusion about the guilt of the defendant just because he has been indicted.

At the end of the trial, you will have to decide whether or not the evidence presented has convinced you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed the offenses with which he has been charged. For each offense, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of that offense. These elements will be explained to you at the end of the trial.

Every defendant in a criminal case is presumed to be innocent. This presumption of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the trial unless and until he is proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden is on the government to prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and that burden of proof never shifts throughout the trial. The law does not require a defendant to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence. If you find that the government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt every element of a particular offense with which the defendant is charged, it is your duty to find him guilty of that offense. On the other hand, if you find that the government has failed to prove any element of a particular offense beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

As I explain how the trial will proceed, I will refer to the “government” and to the “defense” or the “defendant.” When I mention the “government,” I am referring to Assistant United States Attorneys Douglas Brasher and Andrew Haag. When I mention the defendant or the defense, I am referring either to the defendant Mr. Padilla or to his attorney, Michael Cronkright.

As the first step in this trial, the government and the defendant will have an opportunity to make opening statements. The defendant may make an opening statement immediately after the government's opening statement or he may wait until the beginning of the defendant's case, or he may choose not to make an opening statement at all. You should understand that the opening statements are not evidence. They are only intended to help you understand the evidence that the lawyers expect will be introduced.

After the opening statement or statements, the government will put on what is called its case-in-chief. This means that the government will call witnesses to the witness stand and ask them questions. This is called direct examination. When the government is finished, the defense may ask questions. This is called cross-examination. When the defense is finished, the government may have brief re-direct examination. After the government presents its evidence, the defendant may present evidence, but he is not required to do so. The law does not require a defendant to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence. If the defense does put on evidence, Mr. Cronkright will call witnesses to the stand and ask questions on direct examination, the government will cross-examine, and Mr. Cronkright may have brief re-direct examination. When the defense is finished, the government may offer a rebuttal case, which would operate along the same lines as its case-in-chief.

At the end of all the evidence, I will instruct you once more on the rules of law that you are to apply in your deliberations when you retire to consider your verdict in this case. Then each side will have a chance to present closing arguments in support of its case. The statements of the lawyers in their closing arguments, just as in their questions and in their opening statements, are not evidence in this case. They are intended only to help you understand the evidence and what

each side claims the evidence shows. Finally, at the end of the closing arguments, I will have a few additional instructions for you before you begin your deliberations.

I want to briefly describe my responsibilities as the judge and your responsibilities as the jury. My responsibility is to conduct this trial in an orderly, fair, and efficient manner, to rule on legal questions that come up in the course of the trial, and to instruct you about the law that applies to this case. It is your sworn duty as jurors to accept and apply the law as I state it to you.

Your responsibility as jurors is to determine the facts in the case. You—and only you—are the judges of the facts. You alone determine the weight, the effect, and the value of the evidence, as well as the credibility or believability of the witnesses. You must consider and weigh the testimony of all witnesses who appear before you. You alone must decide the extent to which you believe any witness.

You must pay very careful attention to the testimony of all of the witnesses because you will not have any transcripts or summaries of the testimony available to you during your deliberations. You will have to rely entirely on your memory and your notes if you choose to take any.

As human beings, we all have personal likes and dislikes, opinions, prejudices, and biases. Generally, we are aware of these things, but you also should consider the possibility that you have implicit biases, that is, biases of which you may not be consciously aware. Personal prejudices, preferences, or biases have no place in a courtroom, where the goal is to arrive at a just and impartial verdict. All people deserve fair treatment in the legal system regardless of race, national or ethnic origin, religion, age, disability, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, education, income level, or any other personal characteristic. You should determine the facts solely from a fair consideration of the evidence.

During this trial, I may rule on motions and objections by the lawyers, make comments to lawyers, question the witnesses, and instruct you on the law. You should not take any of my statements or actions as any indication of my opinion about how you should decide the facts. If you think that somehow I have expressed or even hinted at any opinion as to the facts in this case, you should disregard it. The verdict in this case is your sole and exclusive responsibility.

You may consider only the evidence properly admitted in this case. That evidence includes the sworn testimony of witnesses and the exhibits admitted into evidence. Sometimes a lawyer's question suggests the existence of a fact, but the lawyer's question alone is not evidence. If the evidence includes anything other than testimony and exhibits, I will instruct you about these other types of evidence when they are admitted during the trial.

During the trial, if the court or a lawyer makes a statement or asks a question that refers to evidence that you remember differently, you should rely on your memory of the evidence during your deliberations.

The lawyers may object when the other side asks a question, makes an argument, or offers evidence that the objecting lawyer believes is not properly admissible. You must not hold such objections against the lawyer who makes them or the party s/he represents. It is the lawyer's responsibility to object to evidence that they believe is not admissible.

If I sustain an objection to a question asked by a lawyer, the question must be withdrawn, and you must not guess or speculate what the answer to the question would have been. If a question is asked and answered, and I then rule that the answer should be stricken from the record, you must disregard both the question and the answer in your deliberations. You should follow this same rule if any of the exhibits are stricken.

You are not permitted to discuss this case with anyone until this case is submitted to you for your decision at the end of my final instructions. This means that, until the case is submitted to you, you may not talk about it even with your fellow jurors. This is because we don't want you making decisions until you've heard all the evidence and the instructions of law. In addition, you may not talk about the case with anyone else. It should go without saying that you also may not write about the case electronically through any blog, posting, or other communication, including "social networking" sites such as Facebook or Twitter until you have delivered your verdict and the case is over. This is because you must decide the case based on what happens here in the courtroom, not on what someone may or may not tell you outside the courtroom. I'm sure that, when we take our first recess, you will call home or work and tell them you have been selected for a jury. They will undoubtedly ask what kind of case you're sitting on. You may tell them it is a criminal case, but nothing else. Now, when the case is over, you may discuss any part of it with anyone you wish, but until then, you may not do so.

Although it is a natural human tendency to talk with people with whom you may come into contact, you must not talk to any of the parties, their attorneys, or any witnesses in this case during the time you serve on this jury. If you encounter anyone connected with the case outside the courtroom, you should avoid having any conversation with them, overhearing their conversation, or having any contact with them at all. For example, if you find yourself in a courthouse corridor, elevator, or any other location where the case is being discussed by attorneys, parties, witnesses, or anyone else, you should immediately leave the area to avoid hearing such discussions. If you do overhear a discussion about the case, you should report that to me as soon as you can. Finally, if you see any of the attorneys or witnesses involved in the case and they turn and walk away from you, they are not being rude; they are merely following the same instruction that I gave to them.

It is very unlikely, but if someone tries to talk to you about the case, you should refuse to do so and immediately let me know by telling the clerk or the marshal. Don't tell the other jurors; just let me know, and I'll bring you in to discuss it. Between now and when you are discharged from jury duty, you must not provide to or receive from anyone, including friends, co-workers, and family members, any information about your jury service. You may tell those who need to know where you are, that you have been picked for a jury, and how long the case may take. However, you must not give anyone any information about the case itself or the people involved in the case. You must also warn people not to try to say anything to you or write to you about your jury service or the case. This includes face-to-face, phone, or computer communications.

In this age of electronic communication, I want to stress that you must not use electronic devices or computers to talk about this case, including tweeting, texting, blogging, e-mailing, posting information on a website or chat room, or any other means at all. Do not send or accept messages, including email and text messages, about your jury service. You must not disclose your thoughts about your jury service or ask for advice on how to decide any case.

You must decide the facts based on the evidence presented in court and according to the legal principles about which I will instruct you. You are not permitted, during the course of the trial, to conduct any independent investigation or research about the case. That means, for example, you cannot use the Internet to do research about the facts or the law or the people involved in the case. Research includes something even as simple or seemingly harmless as using the Internet to look up a legal term or view a satellite photo of the scene of the alleged crime.

I want to explain the reasons why you should not conduct your own investigation. All parties have a right to have the case decided only on evidence and legal rules that they know about and that they have a chance to respond to. Relying on information you get outside this courtroom

is unfair because the parties would not have a chance to refute, correct, or explain it. Unfortunately, information that we get over the Internet or from other sources may be incomplete or misleading or just plain wrong. It is up to you to decide whether to credit any evidence presented in court and only the evidence presented in court may be considered. If evidence or legal information has not been presented in court, you cannot rely on it.

Moreover, if any of you do your own research about the facts or the law, this may result in different jurors basing their decisions on different information. Each juror must make his or her decision based on the same evidence and under the same rules.

In some cases, there may be reports in the newspaper or on the radio, Internet, or television concerning the case while the trial is ongoing. If there should be such media coverage in this case, you may be tempted to read, listen to, or watch it. You must not read, listen to, or watch such reports because you must decide this case solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom. If any publicity about this trial inadvertently comes to your attention during trial, do not discuss it with other jurors or anyone else. Just let me or my clerk know as soon after it happens as you can, and I will then briefly discuss it with you.

After I submit the case to you, you may discuss it only when I instruct you to do so, and only in the jury room and only in the presence of all your fellow jurors. It is important that you keep an open mind and not decide any issue in the case until after I submit the entire case to you with my final instructions.

See Redbook 1.102.

2.100

Furnishing the Jury with a Copy of the Instructions

I will provide you with a copy of my instructions. During your deliberations, you may, if you want, refer to these instructions. While you may refer to any particular portion of the instructions, you are to consider the instructions as a whole and you may not follow some and ignore others. If you have any questions about the instructions, you should feel free to send me a note. Please return your instructions to me when your verdict is rendered.

2.101

Function of the Court

My function is to conduct this trial in an orderly, fair, and efficient manner; to rule on questions of law; and to instruct you on the law that applies in this case.

It is your duty to accept the law as I instruct you. You should consider all the instructions as a whole. You may not ignore or refuse to follow any of them.

2.102

Function of the Jury

Your function, as the jury, is to determine what the facts are in this case. You are the sole judges of the facts. While it is my responsibility to decide what is admitted as evidence during the trial, you alone decide what weight, if any, to give to that evidence. You alone decide the credibility or believability of the witnesses.

As I explained earlier, as human beings, we all have personal likes and dislikes, opinions, prejudices, and biases. Generally, we are aware of these things, but you also should consider the possibility that you have implicit biases, that is, biases of which you may not be consciously aware. Personal prejudices, preferences, or biases have no place in a courtroom, where the goal is to arrive at a just and impartial verdict. All people deserve fair treatment in the legal system regardless of any personal characteristic, such as race, national or ethnic origin, religion, age, disability, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, education, or income level, or any other personal characteristic. You should determine the facts solely from a fair consideration of the evidence.

You may not take anything I may have said or done as indicating how I think you should decide this case. If you believe that I have expressed or indicated any such opinion, you should ignore it. The verdict in this case is your sole and exclusive responsibility.

2.103

Jury's Recollection Controls

If any reference by me or the attorneys to the evidence is different from your own memory of the evidence, it is your memory that should control during your deliberations.

2.104

Evidence in the Case—Judicial Notice & Stipulations

During your deliberations, you may consider only the evidence properly admitted in this trial. The evidence in this case consists of the sworn testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits that were admitted into evidence, the facts of which I took judicial notice, and the facts and testimony stipulated to by the parties. I may take what is called “judicial notice” of public acts, places, facts, and events that I consider to be matters of common knowledge or matters that can be determined easily through undisputed sources. In this case, I took judicial notice of [describe fact of which the court took judicial notice]. When I take judicial notice of a particular fact, you may regard that fact as proven evidence. During the trial, you were told that the parties had stipulated—that is, agreed—to certain facts. You should consider any stipulation of fact to be undisputed evidence. During the trial, you were told that the parties had stipulated—that is, agreed—to what testimony certain witnesses would have given if they had testified in this case. You should consider this stipulated testimony to be exactly what they would have said had they testified here.

When you consider the evidence, you are permitted to draw, from the facts that you find have been proven, such reasonable inferences as you feel are justified in the light of your experience. You should give any evidence such weight as in your judgment it is fairly entitled to receive.

2.105

Statements of Counsel

The statements and arguments of the lawyers are not evidence. They are only intended to assist you in understanding the evidence. Similarly, the questions of the lawyers are not evidence.

2.106

Indictment Not Evidence

The indictment is merely the formal way of accusing a person of a crime. You must not consider the indictment as evidence of any kind—you may not consider it as any evidence of Joseph Padilla’s guilt or draw any inference of guilt from it.

2.107

Burden of Proof—Presumption of Innocence

Every defendant in a criminal case is presumed to be innocent. This presumption of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the trial unless and until the government has proven he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts throughout the trial. The law does not require Joseph Padilla to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence at all. If you find that the government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt every element of a particular offense with which Joseph Padilla is charged, it is your duty to find him guilty of that offense. On the other hand, if you find the government has failed to prove any element of a particular offense beyond a reasonable doubt, it is your duty to find Joseph Padilla not guilty of that offense.

2.108

Reasonable Doubt

The government has the burden of proving Joseph Padilla guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. In civil cases, it is only necessary to prove that a fact is more likely true than not, or, in some cases, that its truth is highly probable. In criminal cases such as this one, the government's proof must be more powerful than that. It must be beyond a reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt, as the name implies, is a doubt based on reason—a doubt for which you have a reason based upon the evidence or lack of evidence in the case. If, after careful, honest, and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you cannot say that you are firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt, then you have a reasonable doubt.

Reasonable doubt is the kind of doubt that would cause a reasonable person, after careful and thoughtful reflection, to hesitate to act in the graver or more important matters in life. However, it is not an imaginary doubt, nor a doubt based on speculation or guesswork; it is a doubt based on reason. The government is not required to prove guilt beyond all doubt, or to a mathematical or scientific certainty. Its burden is to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

2.109

Direct and Circumstantial Evidence

There are two types of evidence from which you may determine what the facts are in this case—direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. When a witness, such as an eyewitness, asserts actual knowledge of a fact, that witness’s testimony is direct evidence. On the other hand, evidence of facts and circumstances from which reasonable inferences may be drawn is circumstantial evidence.

Let me give you an example. Assume a person looked out a window and saw that snow was falling. If he later testified in court about what he had seen, his testimony would be direct evidence that snow was falling at the time he saw it happen. Assume, however, that he looked out a window and saw no snow on the ground, and then went to sleep and saw snow on the ground after he woke up. His testimony about what he had seen would be circumstantial evidence that it had snowed while he was asleep.

The law says that both direct and circumstantial evidence are acceptable as a means of proving a fact. The law does not favor one form of evidence over another. It is for you to decide how much weight to give to any particular evidence, whether it is direct or circumstantial. You are permitted to give equal weight to both. Circumstantial evidence does not require a greater degree of certainty than direct evidence. In reaching a verdict in this case, you should consider all of the evidence presented, both direct and circumstantial.

2.110

Nature of Charges Not to Be Considered

One of the questions you were asked when we were selecting this jury was whether the nature of the charges itself would affect your ability to reach a fair and impartial verdict. We asked you that question because you must not allow the nature of a charge to affect your verdict. You must consider only the evidence that has been presented in this case in reaching a fair and impartial verdict.

2.112

Inadmissible and Stricken Evidence

The lawyers in this case sometimes objected when the other side asked a question, made an argument, or offered evidence that the objecting lawyer believed was not proper. You must not hold such objections against the lawyer who made them or the party he represents. It is the lawyers' responsibility to object to evidence that they believe is not admissible.

If, during the course of the trial, I sustained an objection to a lawyer's question, you should ignore the question, and you must not speculate as to what the answer would have been. If, after a witness answered a question, I ruled that the answer should be stricken, you should ignore both the question and the answer and they should play no part in your deliberations. Likewise, exhibits as to which I have sustained an objection or that I ordered stricken are not evidence, and you must not consider them in your deliberations.

2.200

Credibility of Witnesses

In determining whether the government has proved the charges against the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, you must consider the testimony of all the witnesses who have testified.

You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses. You alone determine whether to believe any witness and the extent to which a witness should be believed. Judging a witness's credibility means evaluating whether the witness has testified truthfully and also whether the witness accurately observed, recalled, and described the matters about which the witness testified.

As I instructed you at the beginning of trial and again just now, you should evaluate the credibility of witnesses free from prejudices and biases.

You may consider anything else that in your judgment affects the credibility of any witness. For example, you may consider the demeanor and the behavior of the witness on the witness stand; the witness's manner of testifying; whether the witness impresses you as having an accurate memory; whether the witness has any reason for not telling the truth; whether the witness had a meaningful opportunity to observe the matters about which he or she has testified; whether the witness has any interest in the outcome of this case, stands to gain anything by testifying, or has friendship or hostility toward other people concerned with this case.

In evaluating the accuracy of a witness's memory, you may consider the circumstances surrounding the event, including the time that elapsed between the event and any later recollections of the event, and the circumstances under which the witness was asked to recall details of the event.

You may consider whether there are any consistencies or inconsistencies in a witness's testimony or between the witness's testimony and any previous statements made by the witness. You may also consider any consistencies or inconsistencies between the witness's testimony and

any other evidence that you credit. You may consider whether any inconsistencies are the result of lapses in memory, mistake, misunderstanding, intentional falsehood, or differences in perception.

You may consider the reasonableness or unreasonableness, the probability or improbability, of the testimony of a witness in determining whether to accept it as true and accurate. You may consider whether the witness has been contradicted or supported by other evidence that you credit.

If you believe that any witness has shown him or herself to be biased or prejudiced, for or against either side in this trial, or motivated by self-interest, you may consider and determine whether such bias or prejudice has colored the testimony of the witness so as to affect the desire and capability of that witness to tell the truth.

You should give the testimony of each witness such weight as in your judgment it is fairly entitled to receive.

2.207

Police Officer's Testimony

A police officer's testimony should be evaluated by you just as any other evidence in the case. In evaluating the officer's credibility, you should use the same guidelines that you apply to the testimony of any witness. In no event should you give either greater or lesser weight to the testimony of any witness merely because he or she is a police officer.

2.208

Right of Defendant Not to Testify

Every defendant in a criminal case has an absolute right not to testify. Joseph Padilla has chosen to exercise this right. You must not hold this decision against him, and it would be improper for you to speculate as to the reason or reasons for his decision. You must not assume the defendant is guilty because he chose not to testify.

2.209

Defendant as Witness

A defendant has a right to become a witness in his own behalf. His testimony should not be disbelieved merely because he is the defendant. In evaluating his testimony, however, you may consider the fact that the defendant has a vital interest in the outcome of this trial. As with the testimony of any other witness, you should give the defendant's testimony as much weight as in your judgment it deserves.

2.210

False or Inconsistent Statements by Defendant

You have heard evidence that Joseph Padilla made statements in explanation of his actions that may have been false or inconsistent. It is up to you to decide whether he made the statements, and whether they were, in fact, false or inconsistent. If you find he did make such statements and that they were false or inconsistent, you may consider such evidence as tending to show his feelings of guilt, which you may, in turn, consider as tending to show actual guilt. On the other hand, you may also consider that he may have given such statements for reasons consistent with his innocence.

If you find that Joseph Padilla made a false or inconsistent statement in explanation of his actions, you should give the testimony as much weight as in your judgment it deserves.

2.310

Transcripts of Recordings

Recordings of conversations identified by witnesses have been received in evidence. Transcripts of these recorded conversations are being furnished for your convenience and guidance as you listen to the recordings to clarify portions of recordings which are difficult to hear and to help you identify speakers. The recordings, however, are the evidence in the case; the transcripts are not. If you notice any difference between the transcripts and the recordings, you must rely only on the recordings and not the transcripts. In addition, if you cannot determine from the recording that particular words were spoken, you must disregard the transcripts as far as those words are concerned.

See Redbook 2.310.

2.402

Multiple Counts—One Defendant

Each count of the indictment charges a separate offense. You should consider each offense, and the evidence which applies to it, separately, and you should return separate verdicts as to each count. The fact that you may find the defendant guilty or not guilty on any one count of the indictment should not influence your verdict with respect to any other count of the indictment.

2.405
Unanimity

A verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror, and in order to return a verdict, each juror must agree on the verdict. In other words, your verdict on each count must be unanimous.

**Counts One, Three, and Five
Assault, Resisting, or Impeding Certain Officers
(Violations of 18 U.S.C. § 111(a)(1) and (b))**

In Counts One, Three, and Five, the defendant is charged with forcibly assaulting, resisting, opposing, impeding, intimidating, or interfering with an officer or an employee of the United States who was then engaged in the performance of his official duties and any person assisting officers of the United States who are engaged in the performance of their official duties, which is a violation of federal law. Count One of the indictment relates to the defendant's actions from 1:37 p.m. to 1:39 p.m. involving the bike rack, Count Three relates to the defendant's actions from 1:39 p.m. to 1:41 p.m. involving the large metal sign, and Count Five relates to the defendant's actions involving the flagpole from 4:47 p.m. to 4:49 p.m.

Elements

To find the defendant guilty of these crimes, you must be convinced that the government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

- First:* the defendant assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with an officer from the Metropolitan Police Department or United States Capitol Police.
- Second:* the defendant did such act forcibly.
- Third:* the defendant did such act intentionally.
- Fourth:* the person assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with was an officer or an employee of the United States who was then engaged in the performance of his official duties, or any person assisting such an officer or employee in the performance of that officer's duties.

For Count One only, you will be asked if the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt the following fifth element:

Fifth: the defendant made physical contact with a person who was an officer or an employee of the United States who was then engaged in the performance of his official duties or assisting officers of the United States who were then engaged in the performance of their official duties, or acted with the intent to commit another felony. For purposes of this element, “another felony” refers to offenses charged in Counts Two and Seven.

For Counts Three and Five only, you will be asked if the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt the following fifth element:

Fifth: in doing such acts, the defendant used a deadly or dangerous weapon.

Definitions

The defendant acted “forcibly” if he used force, attempted to use force, or threatened to use force against the officer. Physical force or contact is sufficient but actual physical contact is not required. You may also find that a person who has the present ability to inflict bodily harm upon another and who threatens or attempts to inflict bodily harm upon that person acts forcibly. In such case, the threat must be a present one.³

The term “assault” means any intentional attempt or threat to inflict injury upon someone else, when coupled with an apparent present ability to do so. To find that the defendant committed an “assault,” you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant intended to inflict or to threaten injury. Injury means any physical injury, however small, including a touching offensive to a person of reasonable sensibility.⁴

³ *United States v. Taylor*, 848 F.3d 476, 493 (1st Cir. 2017) (The element of ‘forcible’ action can be met by a showing of either physical contact with the federal agent, or by such a threat or display of physical aggression toward the officer as to inspire fear of pain, bodily harm, or death.”) (quotation marks omitted) (citing cases).

⁴ *United States v. Watts*, 798 F.3d 650, 654 (7th Cir. 2015) (“an assault may also be committed by a person who intends to threaten or attempt to make offensive rather than injurious physical contact with the victim”); *United States v. Acosta-Sierra*, 690 F.3d 1111, 1117 (9th Cir. 2012) (“Because

The terms “resist,” “oppose,” “impede,” “intimidate,” and “interfere with” carry their everyday, ordinary meanings.

An object may be a “deadly or dangerous weapon” in one of two ways. First, an object is a deadly or dangerous weapon if it is inherently or obviously dangerous or deadly. Such inherently dangerous weapons include guns, knives, and the like. Second, if the object is not inherently or obviously dangerous or deadly, an object is a deadly or dangerous weapon if the object is capable of causing serious bodily injury or death to another person and the defendant used it in that manner. In determining whether the object is a “deadly or dangerous weapon,” you may consider both the physical capabilities of the object used and the manner in which the defendant used it.⁵

The term “serious bodily injury” means bodily injury which involves a substantial risk of death; extreme physical pain; medical intervention such as surgery, hospitalization, or physical

Section 111 does not define assault, we have adopted the common law definition of assault as either (1) a willful attempt to inflict injury upon the person of another, or (2) a threat to inflict injury upon the person of another which, when coupled with an apparent present ability, causes a reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm.”) (quotation marks omitted); *Comber v. United States*, 584 A.2d 26, 50 (D.C. 1990) (en banc) (explaining that the crime of simple assault “is designed to protect not only against physical injury, but against all forms of offensive touching, . . . and even the mere threat of such touching”); Criminal Jury Instructions for the District of Columbia, No. 4.100 (2022 ed.) (“Injury means any physical injury, however small, including a touching offensive to a person of reasonable sensibility.”).

⁵ *United States v. Arrington*, 309 F.3d 40, 44 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (“For an object that is not inherently deadly . . . the following additional element is required: (4) the object must be capable of causing serious bodily injury or death to another person *and* the defendant must use it in that manner.”); *United States v. Smith*, 561 F.3d 934, 939 (9th Cir. 2009) (“An object is a dangerous weapon . . . if it is either inherently dangerous or otherwise used in a manner likely to endanger life or inflict great bodily harm. . . . Inherently dangerous weapons . . . are obviously dangerous objects such as guns, knives, and the like.”) (quotation marks omitted); *United States v. Guilbert*, 692 F.2d 1340, 1343 (11th Cir. 1982) (“Thus, the term ‘dangerous weapon’ is not restricted to such obviously dangerous weapons as guns, knives, and the like, but can include virtually any object given appropriate circumstances.”).

rehabilitation; protracted and obvious disfigurement; or protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.⁶

You are instructed that Officers J.C. and O.A. are federal officers, and that it was a part of the official duty of such officers to protect the U.S. Capitol complex on January 6, 2021, and to detain individuals who lacked authorization to enter the restricted area around the complex.

It is not necessary to show that the defendant knew the person being forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with was, at that time, a federal officer carrying out an official duty so long as it is established beyond a reasonable doubt that the victim was, in fact, a federal officer acting in the course of his duty and that the defendant intentionally forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with that officer.

⁶ 18 U.S.C. §§ 831(g)(4), 1864(d)(1), & 1365(h)(3); U.S.S.G. § 1B1.1 n.1(M). This definition need not be proposed even when a case involves a deadly or dangerous weapon—that decision is up to the individual AUSA.

Counts Two, Four, and Six
Civil Disorder
(Violations of 18 U.S.C. § 231(a)(3))

Counts Two, Four, and Six of the indictment charge the defendant with committing or attempting to commit an act to obstruct, impede, or interfere with law enforcement officers lawfully carrying out their official duties incident to a civil disorder, which is a violation of federal law. Count Two of the indictment relates to the defendant's actions from 1:37 p.m. to 1:39 p.m. involving the bike rack, Count Four relates to the defendant's actions from 1:39 p.m. to 1:41 p.m. involving the large metal sign, and Count Six relates to the defendant's actions involving the flagpole from 4:47 p.m. to 4:49 p.m.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of these offenses, you must find the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- First:* the defendant knowingly committed an act or attempted to commit an act with the intended purpose of obstructing, impeding, or interfering with one or more law enforcement officers.
- Second:* at the time of the defendant's actual or attempted act, the law enforcement officer or officers were engaged in the lawful performance of their official duties incident to and during a civil disorder.
- Third:* the civil disorder in any way or degree obstructed, delayed, or adversely affected either commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce or the conduct or performance of any federally protected function.

Definitions

A person acts “knowingly” if he realizes what he is doing and is aware of the nature of his conduct, and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. In deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly, you may consider all of the evidence, including what the defendant did or said.

The term “civil disorder” means any public disturbance involving acts of violence by groups of three or more persons, which (a) causes an immediate danger of injury to another individual, (b) causes an immediate danger of damage to another individual’s property, (c) results in injury to another individual, or (d) results in damage to another individual’s property.

The term “commerce” means commerce or travel between one state, including the District of Columbia, and any other state, including the District of Columbia. It also means commerce wholly within the District of Columbia.

The term “federally protected function” means any function, operation, or action carried out, under the laws of the United States, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or by an officer or employee thereof.

The term “department” includes executive departments. The Department of Homeland Security, which includes the United States Secret Service, is an executive department.

The term “agency” includes any department, independent establishment, commission, administration, authority, board, or bureau of the United States.

For the U.S. Capitol Police and Metropolitan Police Departments, the term “official duties,” means policing the U.S. Capitol Building and Grounds, and enforcing federal law and D.C. law in those areas.

Attempt

In Count Two, Four, and Six, the defendant is also charged with attempt to commit the crime of civil disorder. An attempt to commit civil disorder is a crime even if the defendant did not actually complete the crime of civil disorder.

In order to find the defendant guilty of attempt to commit civil disorder, you must find that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following two elements:

- First:* that the defendant intended to commit the crime of civil disorder, as I have defined that offense above.
- Second:* that the defendant took a substantial step toward committing civil disorder which strongly corroborates or confirms that the defendant intended to commit that crime.

With respect to the first element of attempt, you may not find the defendant guilty of attempt to commit civil disorder merely because he thought about it. You must find that the evidence proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's mental state passed beyond the stage of thinking about the crime to actually intending to commit it.

With respect to the substantial step element, you may not find the defendant guilty of attempt to commit civil disorder merely because he made some plans to or some preparation for committing that crime. Instead, you must find that the defendant took some firm, clear, undeniable action to accomplish his intent to commit civil disorder. However, the substantial step element does not require the government to prove that the defendant did everything except the last act necessary to complete the crime

(18 U.S.C. § 231(a)(3); *United States v. Pugh*, 20-cr-73 (S.D. Ala. May 19, 2021); *United States v. Rupert*, No. 20-cr-104 (D. Minn. Mar. 12, 2021) (ECF No. 81)).

Count Seven
Obstruction of an Official Proceeding and Aiding and Abetting
(Violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1512(c)(2) and 2)

Count Seven of the indictment charges the defendant with corruptly obstructing an official proceeding, which is a violation of the law. Count Seven also charges the defendant with attempt to obstruct or impede an official proceeding and aiding and abetting others to commit that offense. The Court will first explain the elements of the substantive offense, along with its associated definitions. The same definition of attempt that applies to Counts Two, Four, and Six applies here. The Court will then explain how to determine whether the defendant aided or abetted the offense.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of corruptly obstructing an official proceeding, you must find that the government proved each of the following four elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- First:* the defendant attempted to or did obstruct or impede an official proceeding.
- Second:* the defendant intended to obstruct or impede the official proceeding.
- Third:* the defendant acted knowingly, with awareness that the natural and probable effect of his conduct would be to obstruct or impede the official proceeding.
- Fourth:* the defendant acted corruptly.

Definitions

The term “official proceeding” includes a proceeding before the Congress. The official proceeding need not be pending or about to be instituted at the time of the offense. If the official proceeding was not pending or about to be instituted, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the official proceeding was reasonably foreseeable to the defendant. As used

in Count Three, the term “official proceeding” means Congress’s Joint Session to certify the Electoral College vote.

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts One and Two.

To act “corruptly,” the defendant must use unlawful means or have a wrongful or an unlawful purpose, or both. The defendant must also act with “consciousness of wrongdoing.” “Consciousness of wrongdoing” means with an understanding or awareness that what the person is doing is wrong or unlawful.

Not all attempts to obstruct or impede an official proceeding involve acting corruptly. For example, a witness in a court proceeding may refuse to testify by invoking his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, thereby obstructing or impeding the proceeding, but he does not act corruptly. In contrast, an individual who obstructs or impedes a court proceeding by bribing a witness to refuse to testify in that proceeding, or by engaging in other independently unlawful conduct, does act corruptly.

Aiding and Abetting

You may find Joseph Padilla guilty of Count Seven without finding that he personally committed each of the acts that make up the crime or that he was present while the crime was being committed. Any person who in some way intentionally participates in the commission of a crime can be found guilty either as an aider and abettor or as a principal offender. It makes no difference which label you attach. The person is as guilty of the crime as he would be if he had personally committed each of the acts that make up the crime.

To find that a defendant aided and abetted in committing a crime, you must find that the defendant knowingly associated himself with the commission of the crime, that he participated in

the crime as something he wished to bring about, and that he intended by his actions to make it succeed.

Some affirmative conduct by the defendant in planning or carrying out the crime is necessary. Mere physical presence by Joseph Padilla at the place and time the crime is committed is not by itself sufficient to establish his guilt. However, mere physical presence is enough if it is intended to help in the commission of the crime.

The government is not required to prove that anyone discussed or agreed upon a specific time or method of committing the crime. The government is not required to prove that the crime was committed in the particular way planned or agreed upon. Nor need the government prove that the principal offender and the person alleged to be the aider and abettor directly communicated with each other.

With respect to the charge of Obstruction of an Official Proceeding in Count Seven, regardless of whether Joseph Padilla is an aider and abettor or a principal offender, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Joseph Padilla personally acted knowingly and corruptly.

It is not necessary that all the people who committed the crime be caught or identified. It is sufficient if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed by someone and that the defendant knowingly and intentionally aided and abetted in committing the crime.

Count Eight
Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds
with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon
(Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1) and (b)(1)(A))

Count Eight of the indictment charges the defendant with entering or remaining in a restricted building or grounds with a deadly or dangerous weapon, which is a violation of federal law.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First: that the defendant entered or remained in a restricted building or grounds without lawful authority to do so.

Second: that the defendant did so knowingly.

For Count Eight, you will also be asked if the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt the following third element:

Third: that the defendant carried a deadly or dangerous weapon during or in relation to this offense.

Definitions

The term “restricted building or grounds” means any posted, cordoned off, or otherwise restricted area of a building or grounds where a person protected by the Secret Service is or will be temporarily visiting.⁷

⁷ 18 U.S.C. § 1752(c)(1).

The term “person protected by the Secret Service” includes the Vice President and the immediate family of the Vice President.⁸

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Two, Four, and Six.

The term “deadly or dangerous weapon” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Three and Five.

⁸ 18 U.S.C. §§ 1752(c)(2), 3056.

Count Nine
Disorderly Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds
With a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon
(Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2) and (b)(1)(A))

Count Nine of the indictment charges the defendant with disorderly or disruptive conduct in a restricted building or grounds with a deadly or dangerous weapon, which is a violation of federal law.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First: that the defendant engaged in disorderly or disruptive conduct in, or in proximity to, any restricted building or grounds.

Second: that the defendant did so knowingly, and with the intent to impede or disrupt the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions.

Third: that the defendant's conduct occurred when, or so that, his conduct in fact impeded or disrupted the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions.

For Count Nine, you will also be asked if the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt the following fourth element:

Fourth: that the defendant carried a deadly or dangerous weapon during or in relation to this offense.

Definitions

“Disorderly conduct” occurs when a person is unreasonably loud and disruptive under the circumstances, or interferes with another person by jostling against or unnecessarily crowding that

person. “Disruptive conduct” is a disturbance that interrupts an event, activity, or the normal course of a process.

The term “restricted building or grounds” has the same meanings as described in the instructions for Count Eight.

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Two, Four, and Six.

The term “deadly or dangerous weapon” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Three and Five.

Count Ten
Engaging in Physical Violence in a Restricted Building or Grounds
(Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(4) and (b)(1)(A))

Count Ten of the indictment charges the defendant with engaging in an act of physical violence in a restricted building or grounds with a deadly or dangerous weapon, which is a violation of federal law.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First: that the defendant engaged in any act of physical violence against any person in any restricted building or grounds.

Second: that the defendant did so knowingly.

For Count Ten, you will also be asked if the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt the following third element:

Third: that the defendant carried a deadly or dangerous weapon during or in relation to this offense.

Definitions

The term “restricted building or grounds” has the same meanings as described in the instructions for Count Eight.

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Two, Four, and Six.

The term “deadly or dangerous weapon” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Three and Five.

Count Eleven
Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building
(Violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D))

Count Eleven of the indictment charges the defendant with disorderly conduct in a Capitol Building or Grounds, which is a violation of federal law.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First: that the defendant engaged in disorderly or disruptive conduct in any of the United States Capitol Buildings or Grounds.

Second: that the defendant did so with the intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of a session of Congress or either House of Congress.

Third: that the defendant acted willfully and knowingly.

Definitions

The term “United States Capitol Buildings or Grounds” includes the United States Capitol located at First Street, Southeast, in Washington, D.C. and its grounds, which includes all squares, reservations, streets, roadways, walks, and other areas as defined on a map entitled “Map showing areas comprising United States Capitol Grounds,” dated June 25, 1946, approved by the Architect of the Capitol, and recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 127, page 8.⁹ You are instructed that the West Front of the United States Capitol, including the Lower West Terrace, is part of the “United States Capitol Building or Grounds” for purposes of this count.

⁹ 40 U.S.C. § 5102(a).

The term “disorderly or disruptive conduct” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Count Nine defining “disorderly conduct” and “disruptive conduct.”

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Two, Four, and Six.

A person acts “willfully” if he acts with the intent to do something that the law forbids, that is, to disobey or disregard the law. “Willfully” does not, however, require proof that the defendant be aware of the specific law or rule that his conduct may be violating.

Count Twelve
Act of Physical Violence in the Capitol Grounds or Building
(Violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(F))

Count Twelve of the indictment charges the defendant with engaging in an act of physical violence in the Capitol Building or Grounds, which is a violation of federal law.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First: that the defendant engaged in any act of physical violence in any of the United States Capitol Buildings or Grounds.

Second: that the defendant acted willfully and knowingly.

Definitions

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Counts Two, Four, and Six.

The term “willfully” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Count Eleven.

The term “act of physical violence means any act involving an assault or other infliction or threat of infliction of death or bodily harm on an individual; or damage to, or destruction of, real or personal property.

The term “United States Capitol Buildings or Grounds” has the same meaning as described in Count Eleven.

2.407

Verdict Form Explanation

You will be provided with a Verdict Form for use when you have concluded your deliberations. The form is not evidence in this case, and nothing in it should be taken to suggest or convey any opinion by me as to what the verdict should be. Nothing in the form replaces the instructions of law I have already given you, and nothing in it replaces or modifies the instructions about the elements which the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt. The form is meant only to assist you in recording your verdict.

2.500

Redacted Exhibits

During the course of this trial, a number of exhibits were admitted in evidence. Sometimes only portions of an exhibit were admitted, such as portions of a longer video, a document with some words or pictures blacked out or otherwise removed, or a video played without audio. There are a variety of reasons why only a portion of an exhibit is admitted, including that the other portions are inadmissible or implicate an individual's privacy. As you examine the exhibits, and you see or hear portions where there appear to be omissions, you should consider only the portions that were admitted. You should not guess as to what has been taken out or why, and you should not hold it against either party. You are to decide the facts only from the evidence that is before you.

2.501

Exhibits During Deliberations

I will be sending into the jury room with you the exhibits that have been admitted into evidence. You may examine any or all of them as you consider your verdict. Please keep in mind that exhibits that were only marked for identification but were not admitted into evidence will not be given to you to examine or consider in reaching your verdict.

You will also be provided with a laptop to view the recordings which I have admitted into evidence. You should not use the laptop for any other purpose.

2.502

Selection of Foreperson

When you return to the jury room, you should first select a foreperson to preside over your deliberations and to be your spokesperson here in court. There are no specific rules regarding how you should select a foreperson. That is up to you. However, as you go about the task, be mindful of your mission—to reach a fair and just verdict based on the evidence. Consider selecting a foreperson who will be able to facilitate your discussions, who can help you organize the evidence, who will encourage civility and mutual respect among all of you, who will invite each juror to speak up regarding his or her views about the evidence, and who will promote a full and fair consideration of that evidence.

2.505

Possible Punishment Not Relevant

The question of possible punishment of the defendant in the event of a conviction is not a concern of yours and should not enter into or influence your deliberations in any way. The duty of imposing sentence in the event of a conviction rests exclusively with me. Your verdict should be based solely on the evidence in this case, and you should not consider the matter of punishment at all.

2.508

Cautionary Instruction on Publicity, Communication, and Research

I would like to remind you that, in some cases, although not necessarily this one, there may be reports in the newspaper or on the radio, internet, or television concerning this case. If there should be such media coverage in this case, you may be tempted to read, listen to, or watch it. You must not read, listen to, or watch such reports because you must decide this case solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom. If any publicity about this trial inadvertently comes to your attention, do not discuss it with other jurors or anyone else. Just let me or my clerk know as soon after it happens as you can, and I will then briefly discuss it with you.

As you retire to the jury room to deliberate, I also wish to remind you of an instruction I gave you at the beginning of the trial. During deliberations, you may not communicate with anyone not on the jury about this case. This includes any electronic communication such as email or text or any blogging about the case. In addition, you may not conduct any independent investigation during deliberations. This means you may not conduct any research in person or electronically via the internet or in another way.

2.509

Communication Between Court and Jury During Jury's Deliberations

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with me, you may send a note by the clerk or marshal, signed by your foreperson or by one or more members of the jury. No member of the jury should try to communicate with me except by such a signed note, and I will never communicate with any member of the jury on any matter concerning the merits of this case, except in writing or orally here in open court.

Bear in mind also that you are never, under any circumstances, to reveal to any person—not the clerk, the marshal or me—how jurors are voting until after you have reached a unanimous verdict. This means that you should never tell me, in writing or in open court, how the jury is divided on any matter—for example, 6-6 or 7-5 or 11-1, or in any other fashion—whether the vote is for conviction or acquittal or on any other issue in the case.

2.510

Communication Between Court and Jury During Jury's Deliberations

The attitude and conduct of jurors at the beginning of their deliberations are matters of considerable importance. It may not be useful for a juror, upon entering the jury room, to voice a strong expression of an opinion on the case or to announce a determination to stand for a certain verdict. When one does that at the outset, a sense of pride may cause that juror to hesitate to back away from an announced position after a discussion of the case. Furthermore, many juries find it useful to avoid an initial vote upon retiring to the jury room. Calmly reviewing and discussing the case at the beginning of deliberations is often a more useful way to proceed. Remember that you are not partisans or advocates in this matter, but you are judges of the facts.

2.511

Excusing Alternate Jurors

The last thing I must do before you begin your deliberations is to excuse the alternate jurors. As I told you before, the selection of alternates was an entirely random process; it's nothing personal. We selected four seats to be the alternate seats before any of you entered the courtroom. Since the rest of you have remained healthy and attentive, I can now excuse those jurors in seats [insert seat numbers].

Before you four leave, I am going to ask you to tear out a page from your notebook, and to write down your name and daytime phone number and hand this to the clerk. I do this because it is possible, though unlikely, that we will need to summon you back to rejoin the jury in case something happens to a regular juror. Since that possibility exists, I am also going to instruct you not to discuss the case with anyone until we call you. My earlier instruction on use of the Internet still applies; do not research this case or communicate about it on the Internet. In all likelihood, we will be calling you to tell you there has been a verdict and you are now free to discuss the case; there is, however, the small chance that we will need to bring you back on to the jury. Thank you very much for your service, and please report back to the jury office to turn in your badge on your way out.

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

No. 1:21-cr-214 (JDB)

JOSEPH LINO PADILLA
Also known as “Jose Padilla,”

Defendant.

VERDICT OF THE JURY

We, the members of the jury, find defendant **JOSEPH LINO PADILLA**:

_____	of the offense charged in Count 1 of the indictment (Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding Certain Officers)
“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”	
_____	of the offense charged in Count 2 of the indictment (Civil Disorder)
“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”	
_____	of the offense charged in Count 3 of the indictment (Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding Certain Officers with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon)
“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”	
_____	of the offense charged in Count 4 of the indictment (Civil Disorder)
“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”	
_____	of the offense charged in Count 5 of the indictment (Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding Certain Officers with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon)
“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”	
_____	of the offense charged in Count 6 of the indictment (Civil Disorder)
“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”	
_____	of the offense charged in Count 7 of the indictment (Obstruction of an Official Proceeding and Aiding and Abetting)
“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”	

“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”

of the offense charged in Count 8 of the indictment
(Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or
Grounds with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon)

“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”

of the offense charged in Count 9 of the Indictment
(Disorderly and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted
Building or Grounds)

“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”

of the offense charged in Count 10 of the Indictment
(Engaging in Physical Violence in a Restricted Building
or Grounds with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon)

“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”

of the offense charged in Count 11 of the Indictment
(Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building or Grounds)

“Guilty” or “Not Guilty”

of the offense charged in Count 12 of the Indictment
(Act of Physical Violence in the Capitol Buildings or
Grounds)

Signed this ____ day of May, 2023.

Presiding Juror