

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	Case No. 21-00513 RBW
	:	
WILLIAM WRIGHT WATSON,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**UNITED STATES' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CONTINUE AND
TO EXCLUDE TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT**

The United States of America hereby moves this Court to vacate its current status conference set for May 24, 2022 and for a 60-day continuance of the above-captioned proceeding, and further to exclude the time within which an indictment must be filed under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 *et seq.*, on the basis that the ends of justice served by taking such actions outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to the factors described in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(i), (ii), and (iv). In support of its motion, the government states as follows:

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant is charged via indictment with felony and misdemeanor offenses related to crimes that occurred at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. In brief, on that date, as a Joint Session of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate convened to certify the vote of the Electoral College of the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election, members of a large crowd that had gathered outside forced entry into the U.S. Capitol, including by breaking windows and by assaulting members of law enforcement, as others in the crowd encouraged and assisted those acts. Scores of individuals entered the U.S. Capitol without authority to be there. As a result, the Joint Session and the entire official proceeding of the Congress was halted until

the Capitol Police, the Metropolitan Police Department, and other law enforcement agencies from the city and surrounding region were able to clear the Capitol of hundreds of unlawful occupants and ensure the safety of elected officials. This event in its entirety is hereinafter referred to as the “Capitol Breach.”

The Government seeks a continuance in this case for the following reasons: (1) the United States has provided individualized discovery to Defendant, but continues to provide global discovery generated from other sources; (2) Defendant and his counsel have now reviewed much of the discovery and have requested that the Government provide a plea offer for Defendant to consider in an attempt to resolve this matter pretrial; and (3) failing successful plea negotiations and taking into account the exercise of due diligence, Defendant and the Government will need reasonable time necessary to prepare for trial and will likely request a trial date.

As referenced, the Government has provided a substantial portion of the most relevant individualized discovery to counsel. The Government is also continuing to provide global discovery in the form of evidence from other charged defendants’ devices, social media accounts, and other sources which has not yet been identified or examined. The fifteenth global discovery disclosure occurred on May 10, 2022. Finally, Defendant and his counsel have continued to review and evaluate the discovery. As indicated in the Government’s previous motion, defense counsel and Defendant have required additional time to review and consider the global discovery as Defendant views the discovery at his attorney’s office which is approximately an hour away from his residence. Along with his employment, it has been difficult for Defendant to find the time to review the significant discovery that has been produced. At this time, however, defense counsel is

prepared to discuss a potential plea with Defendant and has requested a plea offer from the Government that could result in an agreeable plea that would preserve judicial resources.

ARGUMENT

Section 3161(h) of the Speedy Trial Act sets forth certain periods of delay which the Court must exclude from the computation of time within which a trial must commence. As is relevant to this motion for a continuance, pursuant to subsection (h)(7)(A), the Court must exclude:

Any period of delay resulting from a continuance granted by any judge on his own motion or at the request of the defendant or his counsel or at the request of the attorney for the Government, if the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). This provision further requires the Court to set forth its reasons for finding that that any ends-of-justice continuance is warranted. *Id.* Subsection (h)(7)(B) sets forth a non-exhaustive list factors that the Court must consider in determining whether to grant an ends-of-justice continuance, including:

- (i) Whether the failure to grant such a continuance in the proceeding would be likely to make a continuation of such proceeding impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice.
- (ii) Whether the case is so unusual or so complex, due to the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by this section.
...
- (iv) Whether the failure to grant such a continuance in a case which, taken as a whole, is not so unusual or so complex as to fall within clause (ii), would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, would unreasonably deny the defendant or the Government continuity of counsel, or would deny counsel for the defendant or the attorney for the Government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)(ii) and (iv). Importantly, “[i]n setting forth the statutory factors that justify a continuance under subsection (h)(7), Congress twice recognized the importance of adequate pretrial preparation time.” *Bloate v. United States*, 559 U.S. 196, 197 (2010) (citing §3161(h)(7)(B)(ii), (B)(iv)). Finally, an interests-of-justice finding is within the discretion of the Court. *See, e.g., United States v. Rojas-Contreras*, 474 U.S. 231, 236 (1985); *United States v. Hernandez*, 862 F.2d 17, 24 n.3 (2d Cir. 1988).

In this case, an ends-of-justice continuance is warranted under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) based on the factors described in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)(ii) and (iv). The need for a reasonable time to organize, produce, and review voluminous discovery is among multiple pretrial preparation grounds that Courts of Appeals have routinely held sufficient to grant continuances and exclude the time under the Speedy Trial Act. *See, e.g., United States v. Bikundi*, 926 F.3d 761, 777-78 (D.C. Cir. 2019). Now that much of the discovery has been reviewed, the parties would also like to engage in plea negotiations and request additional time to engage in those discussions. Accordingly, the ends of justice served by granting a request for a continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial.

Government counsel notified Defendant’s counsel of the filing of this motion, and they consent on behalf of their client to the motion.

WHEREFORE, the Government respectfully requests that this Court grant the motion to continue the Status Hearing set for May 24, 2022 and for an additional 60 days from the date this Court enters an Order on this motion through and including the date of the next hearing, and that the Court exclude the time within which the trial must commence under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 *et seq.*, on the basis that the ends of justice served by taking such actions

outweigh the best interest of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to the factors described in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(i), (ii), and (iv).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW M. GRAVES

United States Attorney

DC Bar No. 481052

By: /s/ Jennifer M. Rozzoni

JENNIFER M. ROZZONI

NM Bar No. 14703

Assistant United States Attorney - Detailee

United States Attorney's Office

203 3rd Street, Suite 900

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Tel. No. 505-350-6818

Email: jennifer.m.rozzoni@usdoj.gov