

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

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>	:	
	:	<b>CASE NO. 21-cr-498-CJN</b>
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>ANDREW QUENTIN TAAKE,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant.</b>	:	

---

**GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO  
DISMISS COUNT TWO OF THE FIRST SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT**

---

The United States of America, by and through its attorney, the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, respectfully submits that this Court should deny defendant Taake’s motion (ECF 29) seeking dismissal of Count Two of the First Superseding Indictment. Count Two charges the defendant with obstruction of an official proceeding and aiding and abetting in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1512(c)(2) and 2. In his motion the defendant incorrectly asserts that the conduct alleged in Count Two – *i.e.*, his corrupt obstruction, influencing, and impeding of Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote on January 6, 2021 – falls outside the scope of Section 1512(c)(2) and protests further that Section 1512(c)(2) is unconstitutionally vague.

The defendant’s contentions lack merit. Most judges in this District have rejected most of the challenges that defendant raises in his motion. *See, e.g., United States v. Fitzsimons*, 21-cr-158, 2022 WL 1698063, at \*6-\*12 (D.D.C. May 26, 2022) (Contreras, J.); *United States v. Bingert*, 21-cr-91, 2022 WL 1659163, at \*7-\*11 (D.D.C. May 25, 2022) (Lamberth, J.); *United States v. Hale-Cusanelli*, No. 21-cr-37 (D.D.C. May 6, 2022) (McFadden, J.) (motion to dismiss hearing at pp. 4-8); *United States v. McHugh (McHugh II)*, No. 21-cr-453, 2022 WL 1302880, at \*2-\*13 (D.D.C. May 2, 2022) (Bates, J.); *United States v. Puma*, 21-cr-454, 2022 WL 823079, at \*12 n.4

(D.D.C. Mar. 19, 2022) (Friedman, J.); *United States v. Bozell*, 21-cr-216, 2022 WL 474144, at \*5 (D.D.C. Feb. 16, 2022) (Bates, J.); *United States v. Grider*, 21-cr-22, 2022 WL 392307, at \*5-\*6 (D.D.C. Feb. 9, 2022) (Kollar-Kotelly, J.); *United States v. Nordean*, 21-cr-175, 2021 WL 6134595, at \*6-\*8 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021) (Kelly, J.); *United States v. Montgomery*, 21-cr-46, 2021 WL 6134591, at \*10-18 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021) (Moss, J.); *United States v. Mostofsky*, No. 21-cr-138, 2021 WL 6049891, at \*11 (Dec. 21, 2021) (Boasberg, J.); *United States v. Caldwell*, No. 21-cr-28, 2021 WL 6062718, at \*11-\*21 (D.D.C. Dec. 20, 2021) (Mehta, J.); *United States v. Sandlin*, No. 21-cr-88, 2021 WL 5865006, at \*5-\*9 (D.D.C. Dec. 10, 2021) (Friedrich, J.). Although this Court has disagreed on one these of issues, see *United States v. Miller*, 21-cr-119 (CJN), ---F.Supp.3d---, 2022 WL 823070 (D.D.C. Mar. 7, 2022). This Court should adhere to its well-reasoned view and that of the overwhelming majority of district judges to have considered the issues raised by the defendant and deny his motion to dismiss.

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

At 1:00 p.m., on January 6, 2021, a Joint Session of the United States Congress convened in the United States Capitol building. The Joint Session assembled to debate and certify the vote of the Electoral College of the 2020 Presidential Election. With the Joint Session underway and with Vice President Mike Pence presiding, a large crowd gathered outside the U.S. Capitol. As early as 12:50 p.m., certain individuals in the crowd forced their way through, up, and over erected barricades. The crowd, having breached police officer lines, advanced to the exterior façade of the building. Members of the U.S. Capitol Police attempted to maintain order and keep the crowd from entering the Capitol; however, shortly after 2:00 p.m., individuals in the crowd forced entry into the U.S. Capitol. At approximately 2:20 p.m., members of the United States House of

Representatives and United States Senate, including the President of the Senate, Vice President Mike Pence, were instructed to – and did – evacuate the chambers.

An affidavit supporting the criminal complaint against the defendant partially describes his role in the January 6, 2021, attack on the Capitol. ECF 1-1. Among other facts, the affidavit describes the defendant’s unauthorized presence in restricted areas of the Capitol grounds, where he confronts police officers and sprays them with a chemical irritant spray while holding a metal whip in his hands.

### **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On October 29, 2021, the Grand Jury returned an eleven-count First Superseding Indictment charging the defendant with multiple offenses arising from his conduct on January 6, 2021. ECF 34. These offenses include Civil Disorder, 18 U.S.C. § 231(a)(3), Obstruction of Official Proceeding, 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2), 2, Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding Certain Officers Using a Dangerous Weapon, 18 U.S.C. § 111(a)(1) and (b), Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon, 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1) & (b)(1)(A), Disorderly and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon, 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2) & (b)(1)(A), Engaging in Physical Violence in a Restricted Building or Grounds with a Deadly or Dangerous Weapon, 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(4) & (b)(1)(A), Disorderly Conduct in the Capitol Grounds or Building, 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D), and Act of Physical Violence in the Capitol Grounds or Buildings, 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(F).

Following a July 7, 2022, status conference wherein counsel for the defendant represented his intention to challenge Count Two, this Court issued a Minute Entry directing that any such motion be filed on or before July 15, 2022. On July 15, 2022, the defendant filed a Motion to

Dismiss Count Two of the First Superseding Indictment. ECF 29. On July 25, 2022, the defendant filed a Supplement to the previously filed Motion. ECF 31.

### **LEGAL STANDARD**

An indictment is sufficient under the Constitution and Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure if it “contains the elements of the offense charged and fairly informs a defendant of the charge against which he must defend,” *Hamling v. United States*, 418 U.S. 87, 117 (1974), which may be accomplished, as it is here, by “echo[ing] the operative statutory text while also specifying the time and place of the offense.” *United States v. Williamson*, 903 F.3d 124, 130 (D.C. Cir. 2018). “[T]he validity of an indictment ‘is not a question of whether it could have been more definite and certain.’” *United States v. Verrusio*, 762 F.3d 1, 13 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (quoting *United States v. Debrow*, 346 U.S. 374, 378 (1953)). And an indictment need not inform a defendant “as to every means by which the prosecution hopes to prove that the crime was committed.” *United States v. Haldeman*, 559 F.2d 31, 124 (D.C. Cir. 1976).

Rule 12 permits a party to raise in a pretrial motion “any defense, objection, or request that the court can determine *without a trial on the merits*.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b)(1) (emphasis added). It follows that Rule 12 “does not explicitly authorize the pretrial dismissal of an indictment on sufficiency-of-the-evidence grounds” unless the government “has made a *full* proffer of evidence” or the parties have agreed to a “stipulated record,” *United States v. Yakou*, 428 F.3d 241, 246-47 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (emphasis added)—neither of which has occurred here.

Indeed, “[i]f contested facts surrounding the commission of the offense would be of *any* assistance in determining the validity of the motion, Rule 12 doesn’t authorize its disposition before trial.” *United States v. Pope*, 613 F.3d 1255, 1259 (10th Cir. 2010) (Gorsuch, J.). Criminal cases have no mechanism equivalent to the civil rule for summary judgment. *United States v.*

*Bailey*, 444 U.S. 394, 413, n.9 (1980) (motions for summary judgment are creatures of civil, not criminal trials); *Yakou*, 428 F.2d at 246-47 (“There is no federal criminal procedural mechanism that resembles a motion for summary judgment in the civil context”); *United States v. Oseguera Gonzalez*, No. 20-cr-40-BAH at \*5, 2020 WL 6342940 (D.D.C. Oct. 29, 2020) (collecting cases explaining that there is no summary judgment procedure in criminal cases or one that permits pretrial determination of the sufficiency of the evidence). Accordingly, dismissal of a charge does not depend on forecasts of what the government can prove. Instead, a criminal defendant may move for dismissal based on a defect in the indictment, such as a failure to state an offense. *United States v. Knowles*, 197 F. Supp. 3d 143, 148 (D.D.C. 2016). Whether an indictment fails to state an offense because an essential element is absent calls for a legal determination.

Thus, when ruling on a motion to dismiss for failure to state an offense, a district court is limited to reviewing the face of the indictment and more specifically, the language used to charge the crimes. *Bingert*, 21-cr-93 (RCL) (ECF 67:5) (a motion to dismiss challenges the adequacy of an indictment on its face and the relevant inquiry is whether its allegations permit a jury to find that the crimes charged were committed); *McHugh*, 2022 WL 1302880 at \*2 (a motion to dismiss involves the Court’s determination of the legal sufficiency of the indictment, not the sufficiency of the evidence); *United States v. Puma*, No. 21-cr-454 (PLF), 2020 WL 823079 at \*4 (D.D.C. Mar. 19, 2022) (quoting *United States v. Sunia*, 643 F.Supp. 2d 51, 60 (D.D.C. 2009)).

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. The Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Count Two of the First Superseding Indictment, Alleging a Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2), Lacks Merit.**

Count Two of the First Superseding Indictment charges the defendant with corruptly obstructing, influencing, or impeding an “official proceeding,” – *i.e.*, Congress’s certification of

the Electoral College vote on January 6, 2021 – in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2). Count Two states:

On or about January 6, 2021, within the District of Columbia and elsewhere, **ANDREW QUENTIN TAAKE** attempted to, and did, corruptly obstruct, influence, and impede an official proceeding, that is, a proceeding before Congress, specifically, Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote as set out in the Twelfth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States and 3 U.S.C. §§ 15-18.

**(Obstruction of an Official Proceeding and Aiding and Abetting**, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1512(c)(2) and 2)

ECF 17.

In 2002, Congress enacted Section 1512(c)’s prohibition on “[t]ampering with a record or otherwise impeding an official proceeding” as part of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, Pub. L. No. 107-204, 116 Stat. 745, 807. Section 1512(c)’s prohibition applies to:

[w]hoever corruptly--

(1) alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the object’s integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding; or

(2) *otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so.*

18 U.S.C. § 1512(c) (emphasis added). Section 1515(a)(1), in turn, defines the phrase “official proceeding” to include “a proceeding before the Congress.” 18 U.S.C. § 1515(a)(1)(B). By the statute’s plain terms, then, a person violates Section 1512(c)(2) when, acting with the requisite *mens rea*, he engages in conduct that obstructs a specific congressional proceeding, including, as here, Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote.

Notwithstanding the plain terms of the offense, the defendant advances three arguments for the notion that Section 1512(c)(2) does not reach the conduct alleged in the indictment: (1) that Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote is not an “official proceeding” for purposes

of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2), ECF 29:6-12; (2) that the statute is unconstitutionally vague as applied to the defendant, ECF 29:12-20; and (3) that the conduct the defendant committed cannot qualify as conduct that “otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes” the official proceeding as Section 1512(c)(2) is limited by Section 1512(c)(1), ECF 31. The defendant’s claims lack merit.

With respect to his statutory challenges, at least 10 district judges of this Court have considered, in other cases arising out of the events at the Capitol on January 6, 2021, one or more of the arguments the defendant raises. *See, e.g., Bingert*, 2022 WL 1659163 at \*2 n.3. Every district judge to have reached the issue has concluded that Congress’s certification of the Electoral College is an “official proceeding” within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 1512(c)(2) and that Section 1512(c)(2) is not unconstitutionally vague. In addition, every reported court of appeals decision to have considered the scope of Section 1512(c)(2), and all but one of the judges of this Court to have considered the issue in cases involving January 6, 2021, have concluded that Section 1512(c)(2) prohibits obstruction regardless of its connection to documentary or tangible evidence. And, in any event, even if a nexus to documentary or tangible evidence were required, the allegations in the First Superseding Indictment, which track the statutory language, adequately inform the defendant about the charge against him; nothing more is required. *See, e.g., United States v. Williamson*, 903 F.3d 124, 130-131 (D.C. Cir. 2018). The defendant’s claim that Section 1512(c)(2) is unconstitutionally vague is also meritless.

**A. Congress’s Joint Session to Certify the Electoral College Vote Is a “Proceeding Before the Congress” under Section 1515(a)(1)(B) And, Therefore, an “Official Proceeding” under Section 1512(c)(2)**

**1. The plain text of the statute established that the Joint Session is an “official proceeding.”**

To determine the meaning of a statute, a court “look[s] first to its language, giving the words used their ordinary meaning.” *Levin v. United States*, 568 U.S. 503, 513 (2013) (internal

quotation omitted). Section 1515(a)(1)(B), as noted, defines “official proceeding” as a “proceeding before the Congress.” In ordinary parlance, a gathering of the full Congress to certify the Electoral College vote is a congressional proceeding, or “a proceeding before the Congress.” Because Section 1515(a)(1)(B)’s words “are unambiguous, the judicial inquiry is complete.” *Babb v. Wilkie*, 140 S. Ct. 1168, 1177 (2020) (internal quotation omitted); *Bingert*, 2022 WL 1659163 at \*4.

Congress’s Joint Session to certify the Electoral College vote constitutes a “proceeding” under any interpretation of that term. In its broadest and most “general sense,” a “proceeding” refers to “[t]he carrying on of an action or series of actions; action, course of action; conduct, behavior.” *United States v. Ermoian*, 752 F.3d 1165, 1169 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Proceeding*, Oxford English Dictionary, available at <http://www.oed.com>). The defendant cannot meaningfully contend that Congress’s Joint Session to certify the Electoral College vote, which involves a detailed “series of actions” outlining how the vote is opened, counted, potentially objected to, and ultimately certified, is not a proceeding – and indeed an official proceeding – under that broad definition.

A narrower definition of the term “proceeding” would look to the “legal – rather than the lay – understanding” of the term. *Ermoian*, 752 F.3d at 1170. This narrower definition includes the “business conducted by a court or other official body; a hearing.” Black’s Law Dictionary, “Proceeding” (11th ed. 2019). Taken with its modifier “official,” the term “proceeding” thus “connotes some type of formal hearing.” *Ermoian*, 752 F.3d at 1170. But even under this narrower definition, Congress’s Joint Session to certify the Electoral College vote – business conducted by an official body, in a formal session – would easily qualify.

The formality involved in the certification of the Electoral College vote places it well within the category of an official proceeding, even under the narrower legal definition of the term “proceeding.” Few events are as solemn and formal as a Joint Session of the Congress. That is particularly true for Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote, which is expressly mandated under the Constitution and federal statute. Required by law to begin at 1:00 pm on the January 6 following a presidential election, Congress’s meeting to certify the Electoral College vote is both a “hearing” and “business conducted by ... [an] official body.” *See* Black’s Law Dictionary, “Proceeding.” The Vice President, as the President of the Senate, serves as the “presiding officer” over a proceeding that counts votes cast by Electors throughout the country in presidential election. 3 U.S.C. § 15. As in a courtroom, Members may object, which in turn causes the Senate and House of Representatives to “withdraw” to their respective chambers so each House can render “its decision” on the objection. *Id.* And just as the judge and parties occupy specific locations in a courtroom, so too do the Members within the “Hall.” *See* 3 U.S.C. § 16 (President of the Senate is in the Speaker’s chair; the Speaker “immediately upon his left”; the Senators “in the body of the Hall” to the right of the “presiding officer”; the Representatives “in the body of the Hall not provided for the Senators”; various other individuals “at the Clerk’s desk,” “in front of the Clerk’s desk,” or “upon each side of the Speaker’s platform”). Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote, moreover, must terminate with a decision: Congress may not recess until “the count of electoral votes” is “completed,” and the “result declared.” *Id.*

Under the plain meaning of Sections 1512(c)(2) and 1515(a)(1)(B), Congress’s Joint Session to certify the Electoral College vote is a “proceeding before the Congress.” That alone disposes of the defendants’ contentions. *See Bingert*, 2022 WL 6159163 at \*4 (extensive

procedural requirements of the Electoral College certification delineated in 3 U.S.C. § 15 qualify the certification as a proceeding before Congress).

**2. Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote would qualify as an adjudicatory proceeding.**

Even if the statute required the “administration of justice” gloss urged by the defendant, Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote as set out in the Electoral Count Act of 1887 would satisfy it. The certification of the Electoral College vote involves the convening of a Joint Session of Congress, a deliberative body over which a government officer, the Vice President as President of the Senate, “presid[es].” 3 U.S.C. § 15. That Joint Session renders judgment on whether to certify the votes cast by Electors in the presidential election. Under the Constitution, the Electors create “lists” of the presidential and vice-presidential candidates, which they “sign” and “certify” before sending to Congress. U.S. Const. amend. XII. Congress then decides whether to count those certified lists, or certificates in conformity with the Electoral Count Act. 3 U.S.C. § 15. As in an adjudicative setting, parties may lodge objections to the certification, and if any such objection is lodged, each House must consider the objection and make a “decision” whether to overrule or sustain it. 3 U.S.C. § 15. And just as a jury does not (barring a mistrial) recess until it has reached a verdict, the Joint Session cannot “be dissolved” until it has “declared” a “result.” 3 U.S.C. § 16. Even under the defendant’s theories, Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote possesses sufficient “tribunal-like” characteristics to qualify as an “official proceeding,” as several judges of this Court have already concluded. *See Caldwell*, 2021 WL 6062718, at \*11 (Mehta, J.); *Nordean*, 2021 WL 6134595, at \*6; *McHugh*, 2022 WL 296304, at \*9.

**3. The attempt to further restrict the term “proceeding before Congress” is unsupported and misconstrues Congress’ certification of the Electoral College vote**

The defendant nevertheless argues for a narrow definition of “official proceeding” in Section 1512. But this narrow reading of the statute finds no textual support when applied to Section 1515(a)(1)(B), which speaks broadly of a proceeding “before the Congress.” Had Congress wanted to impose a definition that more closely resembled a quasi-adjudicative setting (as the defendant effectively contends by demanding investigation and evidence as prerequisites for a proceeding), it needed to look only a few provisions away to 18 U.S.C. § 1505, which criminalizes, among other things, the obstruction of (i) “the due and proper administration of the law under which any pending proceeding is being had” by a federal department or agency; and (ii) “the due and proper exercise of the power of inquiry under which any inquiry or investigation [that] is being had by” Congress, including by congressional committees and subcommittees. 18 U.S.C. § 1505; *see United States v. Bowser*, 964 F.3d 26, 31 (D.C. Cir. 2020). If Congress wished to similarly limit the obstruction prohibition under § 1512(c)(2) to congressional investigations and the like, it could have enacted language similar to Section 1505. Instead, Congress chose different terms, with different meanings. *See Russello v. United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23 (1983) (“We refrain from concluding here that the differing language in the two subsections has the same meaning in each. We would not presume to ascribe this difference to a simple mistake in draftsmanship.”). Congress enacted broader language (“a proceeding before the Congress”) that covers a broader range of proceedings than only the “inquir[ies] and investigat[i]on[s]” envisioned in Section 1505. That broader definition includes the Electoral College vote certification that defendants obstructed on January 6, 2021.

None of the defendant's contrary arguments have merit. His effort to revise the definition of proceeding relies on the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Ermoian*, 752 F.3d 1165. But *Ermoian* involved a different statutory definition, 18 U.S.C. § 1515(a)(1)(C), and an entirely different issue: whether an FBI investigation counts as "a proceeding before a Federal Government agency which is authorized by law" under Section 1515(a)(1)(C). In *Ermoian*, the Ninth Circuit reasoned at the outset that the term "proceeding" did not "conclusively resolve whether an FBI investigation qualifies" because narrower definitions of the term "would exclude criminal investigations in the field." 752 F.3d at 1170. This case, which involves a proceeding before Congress and implicates Section 1515(a)(1)(B) (and not (C)), presents no such question. Judge Moss, and other judges in this district citing *Montgomery*, were free to find *Ermoian*'s analysis unpersuasive or inapplicable given its different facts and interpretation of a different provision under Section 1515 that does not involve Congress. And, in any event, the Joint Session of Congress to certify the Electoral College vote would satisfy even the narrower formulations of "proceeding" cited in *Ermoian*. The Joint Session plainly constitutes "*business conducted by a court or other official body; a hearing,*" or "[a] legal ... process." *Id.* at 1169 (emphasis added). And there can be no serious dispute that the Joint Session is a "proceeding ... authorized *by law*" or that it has the "sense of formality" that the Ninth Circuit found absent from mere criminal investigations. *Id.* at 1170 (emphasis added).

The defendant also contends that other provisions in Chapter 73 demonstrate that "proceedings before Congress" specifically relates to tribunals and the administration of justice. This contention is also unpersuasive. If anything, the neighboring provisions of Chapter 73 (such as 18 U.S.C. §§ 1503, 1504, 1507, 1521) – which criminalize obstruction of other types of investigations and protect judges, jurors, witnesses and the like – underscore how robustly Congress sought to penalize obstructive conduct across a vast range of settings. That Congress

wished to penalize efforts to obstruct everything from a federal audit to a bankruptcy case to an examination by an insurance regulatory official only crystallizes that it is more the acts of obstructing, influencing, or impeding – than the particular type of hearing – that lie at “‘the very core of criminality’ under the statute[s].” *Williamson*, 903 F.3d at 131. Moreover, the defendant’s perception of what other statutes contemplate is no basis for this Court to reject its own reasoning in *Bingert* or the similar reasoning of other judges in this district. Even putting aside that the “best evidence of [a statute’s purpose] is the statutory text adopted by both Houses of Congress and submitted to the President,” *West Va. Univ. Hosps., Inc. v. Casey*, 499 U.S. 83, 98 (1991), the obstruction statute’s legislative history confirms that Congress intended “official proceeding” to reach broadly. Although Congress enacted Section 1512(c) as part of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Section 1512(c) adopted – but did not modify – the pre-existing definition of “official proceeding” in Section 1515(a)(1), which had been in place since 1982. *See* Victim and Witness Protection Act of 1982 (“VWPA”), Pub. Law 97-291, § 4(a), 96 Stat. 1252. And, tellingly, in considering the VWPA in 2002, the Senate Judiciary Committee urged the inclusion of a “broad residual clause” – in a provision that was ultimately omitted from the 1982 enactment, but that resembles the current iteration of Section 1512(c)(2) – precisely because the “purpose of preventing an obstruction or miscarriage of justice cannot be fully carried out by a simple enumeration of the commonly prosecuted obstruction offenses. There must also be protection against the rare type of conduct that is the product of the inventive criminal mind and which also thwarts justice.” S. Rep. 97-532, at 18 (1982). The upshot is clear: when it enacted the operative definition of “official proceeding,” Congress intended that term to be construed broadly, not narrowly. And this case underscores Congress’s foresight in doing so: the defendant sought to

thwart justice in an unprecedented and inventive manner, by literally driving Congress out of the chamber.<sup>1</sup>

Since the events of January 6, 2021, at least 12 judges on this Court have considered whether Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote constitutes an “official proceeding” for purposes of Section 1512(c)(2). They have all ruled that it does, largely adopting the government’s rationale and rejecting the arguments that the defendant presses in this case. *See, e.g., United States v. Sandlin*, 21-cr-88 (DLF), ---F.Supp.3d---, 2021 WL 5865006, at \*4 (D.D.C. Dec. 10, 2021); (Friedrich, J.); *United States v. Caldwell*, No. 21-cr-28 (AHM), ---F.Supp.3d---, 2021 WL 6062718, at \*7 (D.D.C. Dec. 10, 2021) (Mehta, J.); *United States v. Mostofsky*, No. 21-cr-138 (JEB), ---F.Supp.3d---2021 WL 6049891, at \*10 (D.D.C. Dec. 21, 2021)(Boasberg, J.); *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at \*4-10 (Moss, J.); *United States v. Nordean*, No. 21-cr-175 (TJK), ---F.Supp.3d---, 2021 WL 6134595, at \*4-6 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021) (Kelly, J.); *McHugh*, 2022 WL 296304, at \*5-9 (Bates, J.); *United States v. Grider*, No. 21-cr-22 (CKK), ---F.Supp.3d---, 2022 WL 392307 (D.D.C. Feb. 9, 2022) (Kollar-Kotelly, J.); *United States v. Miller*, 21-cr-119 (CJN), ---F.Supp.3d---, 2022 WL 823070, at \*5 (D.D.C. Mar. 7, 2022) (Nichols, J.); *United States v. Andries*, No. 21-cr-093 (RC), 2022 WL 768684, at \*3-7 (D.D.C. Mar. 14, 2022) (Contreras, J.); *Puma*, 2022 WL 823079, at \*4-9 (Friedman, J.). Nothing in the defendant’s briefing warrants departing from that well-reasoned line of decisions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Even if the defendant were correct that the obstruction statute’s application to the Electoral College vote certification proceeding was not expressly anticipated by Congress at the time of enactment, that alone “does not demonstrate ambiguity; instead, it simply demonstrates the breadth of a legislative command.” *Bostock v. Clayton Cnty., Georgia*, 140 S. Ct. 1731, 1749 (2020) (internal quotation and alterations omitted). A statute’s application may “reach[] beyond the principal evil legislators may have intended or expected to address.” *Id.* (internal quotation omitted); *cf., Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at \*15-17 (rejecting a narrow understanding of Section 1512(c) based on its legislative history).

**B. Section 1512(c)(2) Is Not Unconstitutionally Vague.**

Next, the defendant contends that Section 1512(c)(2) is unconstitutionally vague. As every judge on this Court to have considered the issue has concluded, the defendant is incorrect.

The Due Process Clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments prohibit the government from depriving any person of “life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” U.S. Const. amends. V, XIV. An outgrowth of the Due Process Clause, the “void for vagueness” doctrine prevents the enforcement of a criminal statute that is “so vague that it fails to give ordinary people fair notice of the conduct it punishes” or is “so standardless that it invites arbitrary enforcement.” *Johnson v. United States*, 576 U.S. 591, 595 (2015). To ensure fair notice, “[g]enerally, a legislature need do nothing more than enact and publish the law and afford the citizenry a reasonable opportunity to familiarize itself with its terms and to comply.” *United States v. Bronstein*, 849 F.3d 1101, 1107 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (quoting *Texaco, Inc. v. Short*, 454 U.S. 516, 532 (1982)). To avoid arbitrary enforcement, the law must not “vest[] virtually complete discretion” in the government “to determine whether the suspect has [violated] the statute.” *Kolender v. Lawson*, 461 U.S. 352, 358 (1983).

A statute is not unconstitutionally vague simply because its applicability is unclear at the margins, *United States v. Williams*, 553 U.S. 285, 306 (2008), or because a reasonable jurist might disagree on where to draw the line between lawful and unlawful conduct in particular circumstances, *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. 358, 403 (2010). “Even trained lawyers may find it necessary to consult legal dictionaries, treatises, and judicial opinions before they may say with any certainty what some statutes may compel or forbid.” *Bronstein*, 849 F.3d at 1107 (quoting *Rose v. Locke*, 423 U.S. 48, 50 (1975) (per curiam)). A provision is impermissibly vague only if it requires proof of an “incriminating fact” that is so indeterminate as to invite arbitrary and “wholly subjective” application. *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 306; see *Smith v. Goguen*, 415 U.S. 566,

578 (1974). The “touchstone” of vagueness analysis “is whether the statute, either standing alone or as construed, made it reasonably clear at the relevant time that the defendant’s conduct was criminal.” *United States v. Lanier*, 520 U.S. 259, 267 (1997).

The defendant fails to overcome the “strong presumpti[on]” that Section 1512(c)(2) is constitutional. *See United States v. Nat’l Dairy Products Corp.*, 372 U.S. 29, 32 (1963). Section 1512(c)(2) does not tie criminal culpability to “wholly subjective” terms such as “annoying” or “indecent” that are bereft of “narrowing context” or “settled legal meanings,” *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 306, nor does it require application of a legal standard to an “idealized ordinary case of the crime,” *Johnson*, 576 U.S. at 604. Section 1512(c)(2)’s prohibition on “corruptly ... obstruct[ing], influenc[ing], or imped[ing]” an “official proceeding” gives rise to “no such indeterminacy.” *Williams*, 553 U.S. at 306. The statute requires that a defendant, acting with consciousness of wrongdoing and intent to obstruct, attempts to or does undermine or interfere with a statutorily defined official proceeding. While “it may be difficult in some cases to determine whether these clear requirements have been met,” “‘courts and juries every day pass upon knowledge, belief and intent – the state of men’s minds – having before them no more than evidence of their words and conduct, from which, in ordinary human experience, mental condition may be inferred.’” *Id.* (quoting *American Communications Ass’n, CIO v. Douds*, 339 U.S. 382, 411 (1950)).

The defendant’s claim that the word “corruptly” in Section 1512(c)(2) is unconstitutionally vague is incorrect. As Judge Friedman recently observed, “[j]udges in this district have construed ‘corruptly’ to require ‘a showing of “dishonesty” or an ‘improper purpose’[;], ‘consciousness of wrongdoing’[;] or conduct that is ‘independently criminal,’ ‘inherently malign, and committed with the intent to obstruct an official proceeding.’” *Puma*, 2022 WL 823079, at \*10 (quoting *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at \*19; *Bozell*, 2022 WL 474144, at \*6; *Caldwell*, 2021 WL

6062718, at \*11; and *Sandlin*, 2021 WL 5865006, at \*13) (alterations omitted). Under any of these common-sense constructions, the term “corruptly” “not only clearly identifies the conduct it punishes; it also ‘acts to shield those who engage in lawful, innocent conduct – even when done with the intent to obstruct, impede, or influence the official proceeding.’” *Id.* (quoting *Sandlin*, 2021 WL 5865006, at \*13). It presents no vagueness concern.

Nor does *United States v. Poindexter*, 951 F.2d 369 (D.C. Cir. 1991), support defendants’ attacks on the word “corruptly,” for at least three reasons. First, the D.C. Circuit narrowly confined *Poindexter*’s analysis to Section 1505’s use of “corruptly,” and expressly declined to hold “that term unconstitutionally vague as applied to all conduct.” 951 F.2d at 385. Five years later, in *United States v. Morrison*, 98 F.3d 619 (D.C. Cir. 1996), the D.C. Circuit rejected a *Poindexter*-based vagueness challenge to 18 U.S.C. § 1512(b) and affirmed the conviction of a defendant for “corruptly” influencing the testimony of a potential witness at trial. *Id.* at 629-30. Other courts have similarly recognized “the narrow reasoning used in *Poindexter*” and “cabined that vagueness holding to its unusual circumstances.” *United States v. Edwards*, 869 F.3d 490, 502 (7th Cir. 2017); *see also, e.g., United States v. Kelly*, 147 F.3d 172, 176 (2d Cir. 1998) (rejecting vagueness challenge to “corruptly” in 26 U.S.C. § 7212(a)); *United States v. Shotts*, 145 F.3d 1289, 1300 (11th Cir. 1998) (same for 18 U.S.C. § 1512(b)); *United States v. Brenson*, 104 F.3d 1267, 1280 (11th Cir. 1997) (same for 18 U.S.C. § 1503). The defendants’ invocation of *Poindexter* accordingly fails to establish that Section 1512(c) suffers the same constitutional indeterminacy.

Second, *Poindexter* predated the Supreme Court’s decision in *Arthur Andersen LLP v. United States*, 544 U.S. 696 (2005). There, the Court explained the terms “[c]orrupt” and ‘corruptly’ are normally associated with wrongful, immoral, depraved, or evil.” *Id.* at 705 (citation omitted). In doing so, the Court “did not imply that the term was too vague.” *Edwards*, 869 F.3d

at 502. Third, and as noted above, courts have encountered little difficulty when addressing “corruptly” in Section 1512(c)(2) following *Arthur Andersen*. See *Puma*, 2022 WL 823079, at \*10 (quoting *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at \*19; *Bozell*, 2022 WL 474144, at \*6; *Caldwell*, 2021 WL 6062718, at \*11; and *Sandlin*, 2021 WL 5865006, at \*13) (alterations omitted). Such efforts demonstrate that the statute’s “corruptly” element does not invite arbitrary or wholly subjective application by either courts or juries.

The defendant provides no controlling authority to support his claim of vagueness, relying instead on dissents from majority opinions that never addressed whether the term “corruptly” was vague. ECF 64:38-41 (discussing *United States v. Aguilar*, 515 U.S. 593, 616 (1995)(Scalia, J. dissenting) and *Marinello v. United States*, 138 S.Ct. 1101, 1114 (2018)(Thomas, J. dissenting)) . Judge Scalia’s dissenting opinion commenting on the phrase “corruptly . . . endeavors to influence, to obstruct or impede” from 18 U.S.C. § 1503 cannot override the unanimous view (including that of Justices Scalia and Thomas) that the term “corruptly” as used in Section 1512 had a “natural meaning” that was “clear,” 515 U.S. at 705; see also *Puma*, 2022 WL 823079 at \*9 (judges in this district have construed corruptly to require a showing of dishonesty or improper purpose, collecting cases); *Bingert*, 2022 WL 1659163 at \*6 (corruptly requires proof that the defendant intended to obstruct and had consciousness of wrongdoing).

Rather than showing that the term corruptly is vague, the defendant lifts comments out of context from dissenting opinions in what is actually not an argument for vagueness, but instead, another effort to redefine the meaning of a statutory provision. The defense’s desire to adopt a different definition, however, is not a demonstration of vagueness, and absent such a demonstration, any vagueness challenge fails.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the government respectfully submits that the defendant's motion should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

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

By: /s/ BARRY K. DISNEY  
Barry K. Disney  
Trial Attorney - Detailee  
Kansas Bar No. 13284  
U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
601 D. Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
202-305-4367 (office)  
202-924-4861 (cell)  
[Barry.Disney@usdoj.gov](mailto:Barry.Disney@usdoj.gov)