

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	Case No. 21-cr-589 (TFH)
v.	:	
	:	
JOSEPH IRWIN,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT’S
MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT ONE OF THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT**

MATTHEW M. GRAVES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
D.C. Bar No. 481052

ASHLEY AKERS
Trial Attorney
Capitol Siege Section
MO Bar No. 69601
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
202-353-0521
Ashley.Akers@usdoj.gov

Dated: August 9, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	i
FACTUAL BACKGROUND	2
PROCEDURAL HISTORY	3
LEGAL STANDARD.....	3
ARGUMENT	5
I. The Certification Of The Electoral College Vote Is An Official Proceeding	5
A. The Plain Text Of The Statute Establishes That The Joint Session To Certify The Electoral Collect Vote Is A “Proceeding” Before The Congress Under Section 1515(a)(1)(B) And, Therefore, And Official Proceeding Under Section 1512(c)(2)	3
B. Congress’s Certification Of The Electoral College Vote Would Qualify As An Adjudicatory Proceeding.....	9
C. The Attempt To Further Restrict The Term “Proceeding Before Congress” Is Unsupported And Misconstrues Congress’ Certification Of The Electoral College Vote	9
II. Section 1512(c)(2)’s Text, Structure, And History Confirm That Its Prohibition On Obstructive Conduct Covers The Defendant’s Actions On January 6, 2021...13	13
A. The Plain Text And Structure Of Section 1512(c)(2) Encompasses The Defendant’s Conduct	14
B. The Court Need Not Rely On Legislative History But, Even If It Does, The Legislative History Does Not Support Defendant’s Argument	20
C. The Defendant’s Conduct Falls Squarely Within The Scope Of The Statute, Despite The Ruling In United States v. Garrett Miller	25
CONCLUSION	39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Babb v. Wilkie</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1168 (2020).....	7, 12
<i>Begay v. United States</i> , 553 U.S. 137 (2008).....	passim
<i>Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co.</i> , 331 U.S. 519 (1947).....	24
<i>Catrino v. United States</i> , 176 F.2d 884 (9th Cir. 1949)	35
<i>Chamber of Commerce of U.S. v. Whiting</i> , 563 U.S. 582 (2011).....	20
<i>Collazos v. United States</i> , 368 F.3d 190 (2d Cir. 2004).....	16
<i>Connecticut Nat’l Bank v. Germain</i> , 503 U.S. 249 (1992).....	19
<i>Dean v. United States</i> , 556 U.S. 568 (2009).....	19, 20, 30
<i>Freytag v. Comm’r</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991).....	37
<i>Gooch v. United States</i> , 297 U.S. 124 (1936).....	15
<i>Hubbard v. United States</i> , 514 U.S. 695 (1995).....	17
<i>Hughes Aircraft Co. v. Jacobson</i> , 525 U.S. 432 (1999).....	20
<i>Iselin v. United States</i> , 270 U.S. 245 (1926).....	passim
<i>Johnson v. United States</i> , 576 U.S. 591 (2015).....	33

<i>Lawson v. FMR LLC</i> , 571 U.S. 429 (2014).....	14
<i>Loughrin v. United States</i> , 573 U.S. 351 (2014).....	30
<i>Marinello v. United States</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1101 (2018).....	14
<i>Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.</i> , 568 U.S. 371 (2013).....	6, 18, 36
<i>National Ass’n of Mfrs. v. Department of Defense</i> , 138 S. Ct. 617 (2018).....	14
<i>Pasquantino v. United States</i> , 544 U.S. 349 (2005).....	19, 30
<i>Republic of Iraq v. Beaty</i> , 556 U.S. 848 (2009).....	19, 20, 30
<i>Thompson v. Carter</i> , 284 F.3d 411 (2d Cir. 2002).....	passim
<i>United States v. Aguilar</i> , 515 U.S. 593 (1995).....	passim
<i>United States v. Ahrensfield</i> , 698 F.3d 1310 (10th Cir. 2012)	17
<i>United States v. Andries</i> , 2022 WL 768684 (D.D.C. Mar. 14, 2022).....	2, 13
<i>United States v. Bailey</i> , 444 U.S. 394 (1980).....	4
<i>United States v. Bingert</i> , 2022 WL 1698063 (D.D. C. May 25, 2022).....	passim
<i>United States v. Bozell</i> , 2022 WL 474144 (D.D.C. Feb. 16, 2022)	1
<i>United States v. Brown</i> , 688 F.2d 596 (9th Cir. 1982)	19

<i>United States v. Burge</i> , 711 F.3d 803 (7th Cir. 2013)	passim
<i>United States v. Caceras</i> , 440 U.S. 741 (1979).....	21
<i>United States v. Carson</i> , 560 F.3d 566 (6th Cir. 2009)	16
<i>United States v. Caldwell</i> , 2021 WL 6062718 (D.D.C. Dec. 20, 2021).....	passim
<i>United States v. Cervantes</i> , 2021 WL 2666684 (9th Cir. June 29, 2021)	17
<i>United States v. Dawkins</i> , 999 F.3d 767 (2d Cir. 2021).....	passim
<i>United States v. De Bruhl-Daniels</i> , 491 F. Supp. 3d 237 (S.D. Tex. 2020)	20
<i>United States v. Ermoian</i> , 752 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2013)	passim
<i>United States v. Fischer</i> , 2022 WL 782413 (D.D.C. Mar. 15, 2022).....	2
<i>United States v. Fitzsimmons</i> , 2022 WL 1698063 (D.D. C. May 26, 2022).....	1
<i>United States v. Frank</i> , 354 F.3d 910 (8th Cir. 2004)	19
<i>United States v. Goodwin</i> , 57 F.3d 815 (9th Cir. 1995)	21
<i>United States v. Grider</i> , 2022 WL 392307 (D.D.C. Feb. 9, 2022)	2, 13, 28
<i>United States v. Hale-Cusanelli</i> , 21-cr-37 (TNM) (D.D.C. May 6, 2022).....	1, 29
<i>United States v. Hite</i> , 769 F.3d 1154 (D.C. Cir. 2014)	36

<i>United States v. Howard</i> , 569 F.2d 1331 (5th Cir. 1978)	16, 19
<i>United States v. Hutcherson</i> , 2006 WL 270019 (W.D. Va. Feb. 3, 2006)	17, 33
<i>United States v. Knowles</i> , 197 F. Supp. 3d 143 (D.D.C. 2016)	4
<i>United States v. Lefkowitz</i> , 125 F.3d 608 (8th Cir. 1997)	19
<i>United States v. Lester</i> , 749 F.2d 1288 (9th Cir. 1984)	19
<i>United States v. Martinez</i> , 862 F.3d 223 (2d Cir. 2017), 139 S. Ct. 2772 (2019)	17
<i>United States v. McHugh</i> , 2022 WL 1302880 (D.D.C. May 2, 2022)	passim
<i>United States v. Miller</i> , 2022 WL 823070 (D.D.C. March 7, 2022)	passim
<i>United States v. Montgomery</i> , 2021 WL 6134591 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021)	passim
<i>United States v. Mostofsky</i> , 2021 WL 6049891 (D.D.C. Dec. 21, 2021)	passim
<i>United States v. Nordean</i> , 2021 WL 6134595 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021)	passim
<i>United States v. Oseguera Gonzalez</i> , 2020 WL 6342940 (D.D.C. Oct. 29, 2020)	4
<i>United States v. Petruk</i> , 781 F.3d 438 (8th Cir. 2015)	passim
<i>United States v. Phillips</i> , 583 F.3d 1261 (10th Cir. 2009)	16
<i>United States v. Poindexter</i> , 951 F.2d 369 (D.C. Cir. 1991)	18
<i>United States v. Pope</i> , 613 F.3d 1255 (10th Cir. 2010)	4

<i>United States v. Puma</i> , 2022 WL 823079 (D.D.C. Mar. 19, 2022).....	1, 13, 28, 31
<i>United States v. Reffitt</i> , 2022 WL 1404247 (D.D.C. May 4, 2022).....	28, 38
<i>United States v. Ring</i> , 628 F. Supp. 2d 195 (D.D.C. 2009).....	15
<i>United States v. Puma</i> , 2022 WL 823079 (D.D.C. Mar. 19, 2022).....	1, 13, 28, 31
<i>United States v. Sandlin</i> , 2021 WL 5865006 (D.D.C. Dec. 10, 2021).....	2, 26
<i>United States v. Singleton</i> , 2006 WL 1984467 (S.D. Tex. July 14, 2006).....	17, 33
<i>United States v. Sunia</i> , 643 F. Supp. 2d 51 (D.D.C. 2009).....	5
<i>United States v. Sussman</i> , 709 F.3d 155 (3d Cir. 2013).....	19
<i>United States v. Volpendesto</i> , 746 F.3d 273 (7th Cir. 2014)	16, 35
<i>United States v. Watt</i> , 911 F. Supp. 538 (D.D.C. 1995).....	11
<i>United States v. Williamson</i> , 903 F.3d 124 (D.C. Cir. 2018).....	11
<i>United States v. X-Citement Video, Inc.</i> , 513 U.S. 64 (1994).....	38
<i>United States v. Yakou</i> , 428 F.3d 241 (D.C. Cir. 2005).....	4
<i>West Va. Univ. Hosps., Inc. v. Casey</i> , 499 U.S. 83 (1991).....	12
<i>Wooden v. United States</i> , 142 S. Ct. 1063 (2022).....	31

<i>Yates v. United States</i> , 574 U.S. 541 (2015).....	passim
---	--------

OTHER AUTHORITIES

S. Rep. No. 107-146 (2002).....	passim
148 Cong. Rec. S6550 (daily ed. July 10, 2002)	23, 24
148 Cong. Rec. H4683-84 (daily ed. July 16, 2002)	22

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	Case No. 21-cr-589 (TFH)
	:	
JOSEPH IRWIN,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT’S
MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT ONE OF THE 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 Joseph Irwin’s Motion to Dismiss Count One of the Superseding Indictment, ECF No. 26, which charges the defendant with obstruction of an official proceeding in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2). In his motion to dismiss, the defendant incorrect asserts that the conduct alleged in Count One—*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) applies only to congressional hearings that are related to the “administration of justice,” which, the defendant asserts, does not include a Joint Session of Congress.

The defendant’s contentions lack merit. Most judges in this District have rejected the challenges that the defendant raises in his motion. *See United States v. Fitzsimons*, 21-cr-158 (RC), 2022 WL 1698063 (D.D.C. May 26, 2022); *United States v. Bingert*, 21-cr-91 (RCL), 2022 WL 1698063 (D.D.C. May 25, 2022); *United States v. Hale-Cusanelli*, 21-cr-37 (TNM) (D.D.C. May 6, 2022); *United States v. McHugh*, 21-cr-453 (JDB), 2022 WL 1302880 (D.D.C. May 2, 2022); *United States v. Puma*, 21-cr-454 (PLF), 2022 WL 823079 (D.D.C. Mar. 19, 2022); *United States v. Bozell*, 21-cr-216 (JDB), 2022 WL 474144 (D.D.C. Feb. 16, 2022); *United States v.*

Grider, 21-cr-22 (CBK), 2022 WL 392307 (D.D.C. Feb. 9, 2022); *United States v. Andries*, 21-cr-93 (RC), 2022 WL 768684 (D.D.C. Mar. 14, 2022); *United States v. Nordean*, 21-cr-175 (TJK), 2021 WL 6134595 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021); *United States v. Montgomery*, 21-cr-46 (RDM), 2021 WL 6134591 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021); *United States v. Mostofsky*, 21-cr-138 (JEB), 2021 WL 6049891 (D.D.C. Dec. 21, 2021); *United States v. Caldwell*, 21-cr-28 (APM), 2021 WL 6062718 (D.D.C. Dec. 20, 2021); *United States v. Sandlin*, 21-cr-88 (DLF), 2021 WL 5865006 (D.D.C. Dec. 10, 2021).¹ There is no reason for this Court to differ here. The Court should adhere to the well-reasoned view of the overwhelming majority of district judges to have considered the issues raised by the defendant, and deny the motion.

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

¹ *But see United States v. Miller*, 21-cr-119 (CJN), 2022 WL 823070 (D.D.C. March 7, 2022) (granting motion to dismiss obstruction count). The government gives fulsome discussion, *infra*, to how this opinion, and its adoption in *United States v. Fischer*, 21-CR-234 (CJN), 2022 WL 782413, at *4 (D.D.C. Mar. 15, 2022), is an incorrect interpretation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2) that this Court need not follow here.

Representatives and the United States Senate, including the President of the Senate, Vice President 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 the restricted areas of the Capitol grounds, where he made his way through the Capitol building. He eventually made his way onto the Senate Floor.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On May 6, 2022, a Grand Jury returned a five-count Superseding Indictment charging the defendant for multiple offenses arises from his conduct on January 6, 2021. ECF No. 26. The offenses include Obstruction of an Official Proceeding and Aiding and Abetting, 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2), (2); Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds, 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1); Disorder and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds, 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1); Disorderly Conduct on Capitol Grounds, 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D); and Parading, Demonstrating, or Picketing in any of the Capitol Buildings, 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G).

On July 26, 2022, the defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss Count One of the Superseding Indictment. ECF No. 30.

LEGAL STANDARD

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). 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) (explaining 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 (noting that 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 Certification Of The Electoral College Vote Is An Official Proceeding

Count One of the 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 One states:

On or about January 6, 2021, within the District of Columbia and elsewhere, JOSEPH IRWIN, 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.

ECF 26.

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 two 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); and (2) that § 1512(c)(2) applies only to corrupt acts involving “records, documents, and tangible objects” and, thus, the defendant’s actions do not fall within the scope of the statute. 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). 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.

A. The Plain Text Of The Statute Establishes That The 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)

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

B. 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, Mot. at 8-12, 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; *Nordean*, 2021 WL 6134595, at *6; *McHugh*, 2022 WL 296304, at *9.

C. 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 contends, Mot 8-12), 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 investigation[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].” *United States v. Williamson*, 903 F.3d 124, 131 (D.C. Cir. 2018). 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.²

² 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).

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.

II. Section 1512(c)(2)’s Text, Structure, And History Confirm That Its Prohibition On Obstructive Conduct Covers The Defendant’s Actions On January 6, 2021

The defendant argues that the text, structure, and history of Section 1512(c)(2) supports a narrow construction of the statute, and thus, because he never “took some action” with respect to a “document, record, or other object in order to corruptly obstruct, impede, or influence Congress’s certification of the electoral vote,” the Superseding Indictment should be dismissed. Mot. at 1-2, 4-8, 16. Contrary to the defendant’s argument, the acts alleged in the Superseding Indictment fall

squarely within the conduct prohibited by Section 1512(c)(2), and the text, structure, and history of the statute confirm that it is not read as narrowly as the defendant suggests.

A. The Plain Text And Structure Of Section 1512(c)(2) Encompasses The Defendant's Conduct

In Section 1512(c)(2), Congress comprehensively prohibited conduct that intentionally and wrongfully obstructs official proceedings. The ordinary meaning of “obstruct[], influence[], or impede[]” encompasses a wide range of conduct designed to frustrate an official proceeding. That conduct can include lying to a grand jury or in civil proceedings, exposing the identity of an undercover agent, and burning a building to conceal the bodies of murder victims. It also includes storming into the Capitol to derail a congressional proceeding. A defendant who, acting with the necessary *mens rea*, obstructs (or attempts to obstruct) Congress’s certification of the Electoral College vote, commits a crime under Section 1512(c)(2).

Section 1512(c)(2)’s text and structure demonstrate that it serves as a comprehensive prohibition on corrupt conduct that intentionally obstructs or impedes an official proceeding. When interpreting a statute, courts look first to the statutory language, “giving the words used their ordinary meaning.” *Lawson v. FMR LLC*, 571 U.S. 429, 440 (2014) (internal quotation marks omitted). If the statutory language is plain and unambiguous, this Court’s “inquiry begins with the statutory text, and ends there as well.” *National Ass’n of Mfrs. v. Department of Defense*, 138 S. Ct. 617, 631 (2018) (internal quotation marks omitted). Here, the meaning of “obstruct[], influence[], or impede[]” is controlled by the ordinary meaning of those words.

The verbs Congress selected in Section 1512(c)(2) reach broadly. For example, the words “obstruct” and “impede” can “refer to anything that ‘blocks,’ ‘makes difficult,’ or ‘hinders.’” *Marinello v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1101, 1106 (2018) (brackets omitted) (citing dictionaries). Similarly, “influence” includes “affect[ing] the condition of” or “hav[ing] an effect on.” *Influence*,

Oxford English Dictionary, *available at* <http://www.oed.com>. By their plain meaning, therefore, the string of verbs in Section 1512(c)(2) are properly viewed as “expansive” in their coverage. *See United States v. Burge*, 711 F.3d 803, 809 (7th Cir. 2013).

Section 1512(c)’s structure confirms that straightforward interpretation. Section 1512(c) consists of two provisions, which both require the defendant to act “corruptly.” First, Section 1512(c)(1) criminalizes “alter[ing], destroy[ing], mutilat[ing], or conceal[ing] a record, document, or other object . . . with the intent to impair the object’s integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding.” Section 1512(c)(2), by contrast, applies more generally to any acts that “otherwise obstruct[], influence[], or impede[]” an official proceeding. The term “otherwise,” consistent with its ordinary meaning, conveys that Section 1512(c)(2) encompasses misconduct that threatens an official proceeding “beyond [the] simple document destruction” that Section 1512(c)(1) proscribes. *Burge*, 711 F.3d at 809; *United States v. Petruk*, 781 F.3d 438, 446-47 (8th Cir. 2015) (noting that “otherwise” in Section 1512(c)(2), understood to mean “in another manner” or “differently,” implies that the obstruction prohibition in that statute applies “without regard to whether the action relates to documents or records”) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also United States v. Ring*, 628 F. Supp. 2d 195, 224 n.17 (D.D.C. 2009) (noting that Section 1512(c)(2) is “plainly separate and independent of” Section 1512(c)(1), and declining to read “otherwise” in Section 1512(c)(2) “as limited by § 1512(c)(1)’s separate and independent prohibition on evidence-tampering”); *Otherwise*, Oxford English Dictionary, *available at* <http://www.oed.com> (defining otherwise as “in another way” or “in any other way”); *see also Gooch v. United States*, 297 U.S. 124, 127-28 (1936) (characterizing “otherwise” as a “broad term” and holding that a statutory prohibition on kidnapping “for ransom or reward or otherwise” is not limited by the words “ransom” and “reward” to kidnappings for pecuniary benefit); *Collazos v. United States*,

368 F.3d 190, 200 (2d Cir. 2004) (construing “otherwise” in 28 U.S.C. § 2466(1)(C) to reach beyond the “specific examples” listed in prior subsections, thereby covering the “myriad means that human ingenuity might devise to permit a person to avoid the jurisdiction of a court”).

In this way, Section 1512(c)(2) criminalizes the same *result* prohibited by Section 1512(c)(1)—obstruction of an official proceeding—when that result is accomplished by a different *means*, *i.e.*, by conduct other than destruction of a document, record, or other object. *Cf. United States v. Howard*, 569 F.2d 1331, 1333 (5th Cir. 1978) (explaining that 18 U.S.C. § 1503, which criminalizes the result of obstructing the due administration of justice, provides specific means of accomplishing that result and then a separate catch-all clause designed to capture other means). Section 1512(c)(2), in other words, “operates as a catch-all to cover otherwise obstructive behavior that might not constitute a more specific” obstruction offense involving documents or records under Section 1512(c)(1). *Petruk*, 781 F.3d at 447 (quoting *United States v. Volpendesto*, 746 F.3d 273, 286 (7th Cir. 2014)); *cf. United States v. Aguilar*, 515 U.S. 593, 598 (1995) (describing similar “[o]mnibus” clause in 18 U.S.C. § 1503 as a catchall that is “far more general in scope than the earlier clauses of the statute”).

Consistent with that interpretation, courts have upheld convictions under Section 1512(c)(2) for defendants who attempted to secure a false alibi witness while in jail for having stolen a vehicle, *Petruk*, 781 F.3d at 440, 447; disclosed the identity of an undercover federal agent to thwart a grand jury investigation, *United States v. Phillips*, 583 F.3d 1261, 1265 (10th Cir. 2009); lied in written responses to civil interrogatory questions about past misconduct while a police officer, *Burge*, 711 F.3d at 808-09; testified falsely before a grand jury, *United States v. Carson*, 560 F.3d 566, 584 (6th Cir. 2009); solicited information about a grand jury investigation from corrupt “local police officers,” *Volpendesto*, 746 F.3d at 286; and burned an apartment to

conceal the bodies of two murder victims, *United States v. Cervantes*, No. 16-10508, 2021 WL 2666684, at *6 (9th Cir. June 29, 2021) (unpublished); *see also United States v. Martinez*, 862 F.3d 223, 238 (2d Cir. 2017) (police officer tipped off suspects before issuance or execution of search warrants), *vacated on other grounds*, 139 S. Ct. 2772 (2019); *United States v. Ahrensfield*, 698 F.3d 1310, 1324-26 (10th Cir. 2012) (law enforcement officer disclosed existence of undercover investigation to target).

Section 1512(c)(2) also applies to the defendant's alleged conduct, which involved trespassing into the restricted Capitol area and penetrating onto the Floor of the Senate Chamber to prevent a Joint Session of Congress from certifying the results of the 2020 Presidential election. In so doing, the defendant hindered and delayed the certification of the Electoral College vote, an "official proceeding" as that term is defined in the obstruction statute. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 1515(a)(1)(B); *see infra*. Because construing Section 1512(c)(2) to reach that conduct would neither "frustrate Congress's clear intention" nor "yield patent absurdity," this Court's "obligation is to apply the statute as Congress wrote it." *Hubbard v. United States*, 514 U.S. 695, 703 (1995) (internal quotation marks omitted).

In contrast, adopting the defendant's argument and reading Section 1512(c)(2) as limited only to obstructive acts akin to the document destruction or evidence tampering captured in Section 1512(c)(1) suffers at least three flaws. *First*, it would give rise to unnecessarily complex questions about what sort of conduct qualifies as "similar to but different from" the proscribed conduct "described in [Section 1512](c)(1)." *United States v. Singleton*, No. 06-CR-80, 2006 WL 1984467, at *3 (S.D. Tex. July 14, 2006) (concluding that Section 1512(c)(2) "require[s] some nexus to tangible evidence, though not necessarily tangible evidence already in existence"); *see also United States v. Hutcherson*, No. 05-CR-39, 2006 WL 270019, at *2 (W.D. Va. Feb. 3, 2006)

(unpublished) (concluding that a violation of Section 1512(c)(2) requires proof that “an individual corruptly obstructs an official proceedings [*sic*] through his conduct in relation to a tangible object”). So construed, for example, Section 1512(c)(2) may not encompass false statements made to obstruct a proceeding—though courts have widely upheld convictions for such conduct. *See Petruk*, 781 F.3d at 447 (collecting cases).

Second, limiting Section 1512(c)(2) in that way would effectively render that provision superfluous in light of the comprehensive prohibitions against document and evidence destruction in both Sections 1512(c)(1) and 1519. *See Yates*, 574 U.S. at 541 n.4 (plurality opinion) (Section 1512(c)(1) provides a “broad ban on evidence-spoliation”). By contrast, the straightforward interpretation that treats Section 1512(c)(2) as a catch-all for corrupt obstructive conduct not covered by Section 1512(c)(1) would “give effect to every clause and word” of Section 1512(c). *Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S. 371, 385 (2013); *cf. United States v. Poindexter*, 951 F.2d 369, 385 (D.C. Cir. 1991) (explaining that limiting the catch-all provision in Section 1503’s omnibus clause to obstructive acts “directed against individuals” would render that catch-all superfluous because “earlier, specific[] prohibitions” in Section 1503 “pretty well exhaust such possibilities”) (internal quotation marks omitted); *United States v. Watt*, 911 F. Supp. 538, 546 (D.D.C. 1995) (rejecting interpretation of the Section 1503 omnibus clause that would “serve no other purpose than to prohibit acts already prohibited in the first part of the statute” because that reading would “reduce[] the omnibus clause to mere redundancy”).

Nor does the fact that Congress adopted a more general catch-all in Section 1512(c)(2) render superfluous other obstruction prohibitions found in Chapter 73, the criminal code’s chapter on obstruction of justice. *See Mot.* at 11. Instead, the catch-all in Section 1512(c)(2) serves to capture “known unknowns.” *See Yates*, 574 U.S. at 551 (Alito, J., concurring) (quoting *Republic*

of *Iraq v. Beaty*, 556 U.S. 848, 860 (2009)). Indeed, “the whole value of a generally phrased residual clause . . . is that it serves as a catchall” to ensure that the full range of conduct Congress sought to regulate comes within the statute, including “matters not specifically contemplated” by more specific provisions. *Beaty*, 556 U.S. at 860. In any event, “[r]edundancies across statutes are not unusual events in drafting,” *Connecticut Nat’l Bank v. Germain*, 503 U.S. 249, 253 (1992), and the “rule[] of thumb” that statutes should be interpreted to avoid superfluity necessarily yields to the “cardinal canon” that Congress “says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there,” *id.* at 253-54.

Judicial treatment of the nearby omnibus clause in Section 1503, which prohibits “corruptly . . . influenc[ing], obstruct[ing], or impeded[ing], or endeavor[ing] to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice,” 18 U.S.C. § 1503, is instructive. Drafted in “very broad language,” the omnibus clause or “catchall provision,” *see Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 599, principally operates to criminalize obstructive conduct that falls outside the narrower prohibitions within Section 1503 and neighboring provisions. *See, e.g., United States v. Sussman*, 709 F.3d 155, 168-70 (3d Cir. 2013) (removing gold coins from safe-deposit box); *United States v. Frank*, 354 F.3d 910, 916-19 (8th Cir. 2004) (removing car to avoid seizure); *United States v. Lefkowitz*, 125 F.3d 608, 619-20 (8th Cir. 1997) (instructing employee to remove documents from a house); *United States v. Lester*, 749 F.2d 1288, 1295 (9th Cir. 1984) (hiding a witness); *United States v. Brown*, 688 F.2d 596, 597-98 (9th Cir. 1982) (warning suspect about impending search warrant to prevent discovery of heroin); *Howard*, 569 F.2d at 1333-34 (attempting to sell grand jury transcripts). No court, however, has held that the omnibus clause’s broad language should be given an artificially narrow scope to avoid any overlap with Section 1503’s other, more specific provisions. *Cf. Pasquantino v. United States*, 544 U.S. 349, 358 n.4 (2005) (“The mere fact that two federal

criminal statutes criminalize similar conduct says little about the scope of either.”). The same is true for the catch-all provision in Section 1512(c)(2).

Third, importing into Section 1512(c)(2) a nexus-to-tangible-evidence-or-documents requirement as the defendant argues would require inserting an extratextual gloss that would render the verbs in Section 1512(c)(2) nonsensical. *See Dean v. United States*, 556 U.S. 568, 572 (2009) (courts “ordinarily resist reading words or elements into a statute that do not appear on its face”) (internal quotation marks omitted). The *actus reus* that those verbs encompass is obstructing, influencing, and impeding; a defendant cannot “obstruct” a document or “impede” a financial record. *Cf. Yates*, 574 U.S. at 551 (Alito, J., concurring) (rejecting interpretation of “tangible object” in Section 1519 that would include a fish in part because of a mismatch between that potential object and the statutory verbs: “How does one make a false entry in a fish?”); *id.* at 544 (plurality opinion) (“It would be unnatural, for example, to describe a killer’s act of wiping his fingerprints from a gun as ‘falsifying’ the murder weapon.”).

B. The Court Need Not Rely On Legislative History But, Even If It Does, The Legislative History Does Not Support Defendant’s Argument

Because “the statutory language provides a clear answer,” the construction of Section 1512(c)(2) “ends there” and, contrary to the defendant’s argument, Mot. at 12, resort to legislative history is unnecessary. *Hughes Aircraft Co. v. Jacobson*, 525 U.S. 432, 438 (1999); *see Chamber of Commerce of U.S. v. Whiting*, 563 U.S. 582, 599 (2011) (“Congress’s authoritative statement is the statutory text, not the legislative history.”) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also United States v. De Bruhl-Daniels*, 491 F. Supp. 3d 237, 251-52 (S.D. Tex. 2020) (declining to consider Section 1512’s legislative history in rejecting the claim that the statute was limited to document

destruction).³ Indeed, the defendant offers no rationale for looking past the statute’s plain text to reach for other interpretive tools. *See McHugh*, 2022 WL 296304, at *8 (declining to use “vague notions of a statute’s basic purpose” or Congress’s “expectations” to impose an “extra-textual limitation” on the actual text of Section 1515 and 1512(c)(2)). Regardless, the legislative history of Section 1512(c)(2)—particularly when considered alongside the history of Section 1512 more generally—provides no support for a contrary conclusion as the defendant contends, Mot. at 12-15.

When Congress in 1982 originally enacted Section 1512, that legislation did not include what is now Section 1512(c). *See* Victim and Witness Protection Act of 1982 (VWPA), Pub. L. No. 97-291, § 4(a), 96 Stat. 1248, 1249-50. Its title then, as now, was “Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant.” *Id.*; 18 U.S.C. § 1512. As that title suggested, Section 1512 as originally enacted targeted conduct such as using intimidation, threats, or corrupt persuasion to prevent testimony or hinder, delay, or prevent communication of information to law enforcement or the courts as well as intentionally harassing another person to hinder, delay, or prevent that person from taking certain actions. *See* Pub. L. No. 97-291, § 4(a) (now codified as Section 1512(b) and Section 1512(d)). For example, Section 1512 as enacted in 1982 included a prohibition on using intimidation, physical force, or threats, with the intent to “cause or induce any person to . . . alter, destroy, mutilate, or conceal an object with intent to impair that object’s integrity or availability

³ Additionally, the defendant’s invocation of the “Criminal Resources Manual,” Mot. at 7, in attempt to support his argument that the term “otherwise” limits the application of the statute, similarly has no bearing on the Court’s analysis. The Justice Manual “is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any rights, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any matter civil or criminal.” *United States v. Goodwin*, 57 F.3d 815, 818 (9th Cir. 1995) (quoting USAM §1-1.100); *cf. United States v. Caceras*, 440 U.S. 741, 754 (1979) (IRS manual does not confer any substantive rights on taxpayers but is instead only an internal statement of penalty policy and philosophy).

for use in an official proceeding.” *Id.* § 4(a) (originally § 1512(a)(2)(B); now codified at § 1512(b)(2)(B)).

Twenty years later, following the collapse of the Enron Corporation, Congress passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. Pub. L. No. 107-204, 116 Stat. 745; *see Yates*, 574 U.S. at 535 (plurality opinion). That legislation, which principally aimed to “prevent and punish corporate fraud, protect the victims of such fraud, preserve evidence of such fraud, and hold wrongdoers accountable for their actions,” S. Rep. No. 107-146, at 2 (2002), included several different provisions, *id.* at 11 (describing different components of the law); *see also* 148 Cong. Rec. H4683-84 (daily ed. July 16, 2002) (outlining new provisions). Foremost among them were two new criminal statutes, 18 U.S.C. § 1519 and 18 U.S.C. § 1520, which were intended to “clarify and close loopholes in the existing criminal laws relating to the destruction or fabrication of evidence and the preservation of financial and audit records.” S. Rep. No. 107-146, at 14. The Senate Judiciary Committee Report on the Sarbanes-Oxley Act discussed those two provisions in detail. *See id.* at 14-16.

By contrast, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act’s legislative history provides limited explanation of Congress’s objective in enacting Section 1512(c). *See Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *15 (observing that “[b]ecause Section 1512(c)(2) did not originate in a committee, there is little legislative history that sheds light on the purposes of that particular provision. And what little history exists should not be given much weight”). The only discussion of Section 1512 in the Senate Judiciary Committee Report, for example, noted that the pre-existing prohibition in Section 1512(b) made it a crime to induce “another person to destroy documents, but not a crime for a person to destroy the same documents personally”—a limitation that “forced” prosecutors to “proceed under the legal fiction that the defendants [in then-pending *United States v. Arthur*

Andersen] are being prosecuted for telling other people to shred documents, not simply for destroying evidence themselves.” S. Rep. No. 107-146, at 6-7. Similarly, Senator Hatch observed that the legislation “broaden[ed]” Section 1512 by permitting prosecution of “an individual who acts alone in destroying evidence.” 148 Cong. Rec. S6550 (daily ed. July 10, 2002) (statement of Sen. Hatch). At a minimum, nothing in these passing references casts doubt on the plain meaning of Section 1512(c)(2), which is reflected in the interpretation described above.

Section 1512(c) also differed from the newly enacted Sections 1519 and 1520 in that Congress added the former to an existing statutory section: Section 1512. *See Yates*, 574 U.S. at 541 (plurality opinion) (noting that, unlike Section 1519, Section 1512(c)(2) was placed among the “broad proscriptions” in the “pre-existing” Section 1512).⁴ Moreover, although Section 1512(c) as enacted in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act recognized two distinct prohibitions, *see* Pub. L. No. 107-204, § 1102, 116 Stat. 807 (“Tampering with a record *or* otherwise impeding an official proceeding”) (emphasis added; capitalization altered), Congress did not amend Section 1512’s title. That title, “Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant,” § 1512, thus encompassed the pre-existing provisions aimed at a defendant’s obstructive conduct directed toward another person,⁵ but did not reflect the newly enacted prohibitions in Section 1512(c) that criminalized a defendant’s own obstructive act, either through destroying documents (§ 1512(c)(1)) or otherwise

⁴ As Judges Mehta and Moss have recently explained, the contextual features, including legislative history, that influenced the *Yates* plurality to narrow Section 1519, are absent in Section 1512(c)(2). *See Caldwell*, 2021 WL 6062718, at *15-*18; *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *13-*18.

⁵ *See* § 1512(a) (applies to killing, attempting to kill, or using physical force or the threat of physical force against a person to prevent testimony or induce a witness to withhold information); § 1512(b) (applies to using intimidation, threats, or corrupt persuasion against a person to prevent testimony or hinder, delay, or prevent communication of information to law enforcement or the courts); § 1512(d) (applies to intentionally harassing another person to hinder, delay, or prevent that person from taking certain actions).

impeding a proceeding (§ 1512(c)(2)). *See Yates*, 574 U.S. at 541 n.4 (plurality opinion) (noting that Congress added Section 1512(c)(1), which covered evidence-spoliation, to Section 1512 “even though § 1512’s preexisting title and provisions all related to witness-tampering”).

Section 1512(c)’s legislative and statutory history thus offers two reasons to interpret Section 1512(c)(2) consistently with its plain text and structure. First, Section 1512(c) aimed at closing a “loophole” in Section 1512: the existing prohibitions did not adequately criminalize a defendant’s *personal* obstructive conduct *not* aimed at another person. *See* 148 Cong. Rec. S6550 (daily ed. July 10, 2002) (statement of Sen. Hatch). Read together in this light, Section 1512(c)(1) criminalizes a defendant’s firsthand destruction of evidence (without having to prove that the defendant induced another person to destroy evidence) in relation to an official proceeding, and Section 1512(c)(2) criminalizes a defendant’s firsthand obstructive conduct that *otherwise* impedes or influences an official proceeding (though not necessarily through another person). *See Burge*, 711 F.3d at 809-10.

Second, contrary to the defendant’s argument, Mot. at 10-11, no substantive inference is reasonably drawn from the fact that the title of Section 1512 does not precisely match the “broad proscription” it in fact contains, given that the Sarbanes-Oxley Act unequivocally and broadly entitled the new provisions now codified in Section 1512(c), “Tampering with a record *or* otherwise impeding an official proceeding.” Pub. L. No. 107-204, § 1102, 116 Stat. 807 (emphasis added; capitalization altered). Section 1512’s title is more limited simply because Congress did not amend the pre-existing title when it added the two prohibitions in Section 1512(c) in 2002. *Cf. Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co.*, 331 U.S. 519, 528-29 (1947) (describing “the wise rule that the title of a statute and the heading of a section cannot limit the plain meaning of the text”).

Finally, while Section 1512(c) may have been enacted due to concerns over document destruction and corporate malfeasance, “[s]tatutes often reach beyond the principal evil that animated them.” *Sandlin*, 2021 WL 5865006, at *9 (finding that Section 1512(c)(2) may apply to defendants who attempted to stop the certification of the Electoral College on January 6, 2021); *see also Mostofsky*, 2021 WL 6049891 at *11 (rejecting defendant’s argument that Section 1512 only applies to conduct similar to document destruction and explaining that the defendant’s position “would have the Court ignore the plain meaning of the words contained in (c)(2)—to wit, ‘obstructs, influences, or impedes’—which cannot be read so narrowly. The use of ‘otherwise’ is better understood as ‘clarif[ying] that the latter prohibits obstruction by means *other than* document destruction.’”) (emphasis in original); *Caldwell*, 2021 WL 6062718 at * 14 (“The natural reading of the two sections is that section 1512(c)(2) ‘operates as a catch-all to cover otherwise obstructive behavior that might not constitute a more specific offense like document destruction’”).

C. The Defendant’s Conduct Falls Squarely Within The Scope Of The Statute, Despite The Ruling In *United States v. Garrett Miller*

As explained above, the defendant argues that 18 U.S.C. 1512(c)(2) proscribes discrete conduct, and his conduct falls outside the scope of the statute—a cursory argument based on Judge Nichols’s holding in *United States v. Miller*, 21-cr-119 (CJN), 2022 WL 823070 (D.D.C. March 7, 2022). Mot. at 16 (arguing for the adoption of Judge Nichol’s reasoning and opinion as applied in this case). This argument must fail.

Focusing on the word “otherwise” in Section 1512(c)(2), Judge Nichols identified “three possible readings” of Section 1512(c)(2)’s scope. 2022 WL 823070, at *6. First, Section 1512(c)(2) could serve as a “clean break” from Section 1512(c)(1), *id.* at 11-12, a reading that “certain courts of appeals have adopted,” *id.* at 14. Judge Nichols, however, identified multiple “problems” with that interpretation, all focused on the interpretation of the term “otherwise.”

Judge Nichols reasoned that reading “otherwise” in Section 1512(c)(2) to mean “in a different way or manner” is “inconsistent” with the Supreme Court’s decision in *Begay v. United States*, 553 U.S. 137 (2008), which considered whether driving under the influence qualified as a “violent felony” under the now-defunct residual clause of the Armed Career Criminal Act (ACCA), 18 U.S.C. § 924(e)(1). 2022 WL 823070, at *7. Judge Nichols accordingly rejected the first interpretation. *Id.* at *7.

Second, in Judge Nichols’s view, Section 1512(c)(1) could “provide[] examples of conduct that violates” Section 1512(c)(2). *Id.* at *8. Third, Section 1512(c)(2) could be interpreted as a “residual clause” for Section 1512(c)(1), such that both provisions are linked by the document-destruction and evidence-tampering “conduct pr[o]scribed by” Section 1512(c)(1). *Id.* at *9. After considering Section 1512(c)’s structure, “historical development,” and legislative history, Judge Nichols found “serious ambiguity” as to which of the two “plausible” readings—the second and third readings identified above—Congress intended. Applying what Judge Nichols described as principles of “restraint,” he then interpreted Section 1512(c)(2) to mean that a defendant violates the statute only when he or she “take[s] some action with respect to a document, record, or other object in order to corruptly obstruct, impede, or influence an official proceeding” (the third reading). *Id.* at 28. Because, in Judge Nichols’s view, the indictment did not encompass an allegation that Miller took any such action, Judge Nichols dismissed Count Three. *Id.* at 29.

Both before and after the ruling in the *Miller* case, judges on this Court have consistently rejected a document-focused interpretation of Section 1512(c)(2). In *United States v. Sandlin*, No. 21-cr-88, 2021 WL 5865006 (D.D.C. Dec. 10, 2021), Judge Friedrich found that Section 1512(c)(2)’s terms are “expansive and seemingly encompass all sorts of actions that affect or interfere with official proceedings” and determined that the use of the word “otherwise” in Section

1512(c)(2) “clarifies” that it “prohibits obstruction by means *other than* document destruction.” *Id.* at *5-*6. She did not view the Supreme Court’s decision in *Begay* as altering that conclusion, because *Begay* rested on the ACCA’s different statutory language and history. *Id.* at *6. Judge Friedrich also rejected the defendant’s reliance on *Yates v. United States*, 574 U.S. 528 (2015) (plurality opinion). *Sandlin*, 2021 WL 5865006, at *6-*8. Finally, Judge Friedrich concluded that, although a plain-text construction of Section 1512(c)(2) creates “substantial overlap” with other provisions in Section 1512 and Chapter 73, it does not create “intolerable overlap.” *Id.* at *7-*8 (citing *United States v. Aguilar*, 515 U.S. 593, 616 (1995) (Scalia, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part)) (emphasis omitted).

Decisions from other judges on this Court before *Miller* followed suit. For example, in *United States v. Caldwell*, No. 21-cr-28, 2021 WL 6062718 (D.D.C. Dec. 20, 2021), Judge Mehta concluded that Section 1512(c)(2) is not “limited” to conduct “affecting the integrity or availability of evidence in a proceeding.” *Id.* at *11 (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted); *see id.* at *11-*19 (addressing Section 1512(c)(2)’s text and structure, *Begay*, and *Yates*). In *United States v. Mostofsky*, No. 21-cr-138, 2021 WL 6049891 (Dec. 21, 2021), Judge Boasberg found persuasive the analysis in *Sandlin* and *Caldwell*. *See id.* at *11. In *United States v. Nordean*, 21-cr-175, 2021 WL 6134595 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021), Judge Kelly reasoned that an interpretation of Section 1512(c)(2) limiting it to “impairment of evidence” could not “be squared with” Section 1512(c)(2)’s “statutory text or structure.” *Id.* at *6; *see id.* at *6-*9 (addressing *Yates* and superfluity concerns). And in *United States v. Montgomery*, 21-cr-46, 2021 WL 6134591 (D.D.C. Dec. 28, 2021), Judge Moss reached the same conclusion following an extended discussion of Section 1512(c)’s text, structure, and legislative history, as well as the *Begay* and *Yates* decisions. *Id.* at *10-*18; *see also United States v. Bozell*, 21-cr-216, 2022 WL 474144, at *5 (D.D.C. Feb.

16, 2022) (Bates, J.) (reaching the same conclusion on the scope of Section 1512(c)(2)); *United States v. Grider*, 21-cr-22, 2022 WL 392307, at *5-*6 (D.D.C. Feb. 9, 2022) (Kollar-Kotelly, J.) (same).

Following Judge Nichols’s decision in *Miller*, at least five judges on this Court have disagreed with the *Miller* analysis. In denying a defendant’s post-trial motion for acquittal under Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Judge Friedrich indicated that she was “not inclined to reconsider” her ruling in *Sandlin* and described her points of disagreement with *Miller*; the Court subsequently wrote on the matter, holding that it did not find *Miller* persuasive. *United States v. Reffitt*, 21-CR-32 (DLF), 2022 WL 1404247, at *5 (D.D.C. May 4, 2022). In *United States v. Puma*, 21-cr-454, 2022 WL 823079 (D.D.C. Mar 19, 2022), Judge Friedman concluded that the word “otherwise” in Section 1512(c)(2) “clarifies” that a defendant violates that section “through ‘obstruction by means *other than* document destruction.’” *Id.* at *12 (quoting *Mostofsky*, 2022 WL 6049891, at *11). In reaching that conclusion, Judge Friedman rejected *Miller*’s “premise that any ‘genuine ambiguity persist[s],’” *id.* at *12 n.4 (quoting Mem. Op. at 7), and therefore found the rule of lenity “inapplicable.” *Id.* In *United States v. McHugh*, 21-cr-453 (JDB), 2022 WL 1302880, (D.D.C. May 2, 2022), Judge Bates was not persuaded by Judge Nichols’ narrow reading of § 1512(c), holding that “[n]othing about § 1512(c)(2)’s context or purpose justifies departing from the provision’s ordinary meaning; on the contrary, the context, structure, and legislative history of § 1512 bolster the Court’s conclusion that § 1512(c)(2) is a broad prohibition on all forms of corrupt obstruction.” *Id.* at *8. Recently, in *United States v. Bingert*, 21-cr-91 (RCL), ECF No. 67 (D.D.C. May 25, 2022), Judge Lamberth held that the narrow interpretation of the statute in *Miller* “strains the statute beyond its ordinary meaning,” and that the Supreme Court decision in *Begay* does not compel the defendant’s requested reading of the

word “otherwise.” *Id.* at 14. Finally, in *United States v. Hale-Cusanelli*, 21-cr-37 (TNM) (D.D.C. May 6, 2022), Judge McFadden held that the plain reading of the statute “to say that (c)(1) is about interfering with the evidence used in an official proceeding, and (c)(2) is about interfering with the proceeding itself” is proper, and “avoids many of the superfluidity concerns raised by the defendant and by Judge Nichols in his opinion in *United States vs. Miller*.”

The government agrees with these Courts and believes the ruling in *Miller* is flawed. Relevant here, Judge Nichols was mistaken in concluding that the interpretation of “otherwise” in the statute either “ignores” that “otherwise” is defined with reference to “something else,” namely Section 1512(c)(1), or fails to “give meaning” to the term “otherwise.” *Miller*, 2022 WL 823070, at *6. Far from suggesting that Section 1512(c)(2) is “wholly untethered to” Section 1512(c)(1), *id.*, “otherwise” as used in Section 1512(c)(2) indicates that Section 1512(c)(2) targets obstructive conduct in a manner “other” than the evidence tampering or document destruction that is covered in Section 1512(c)(1). *See Miller Supp. Br.* at 8. That understanding of “otherwise” is both fully consistent with each definition Judge Nichols surveys, *see* 2022 WL 823070, at *7 (noting that “otherwise” in Section 1512(c)(2) may plausibly be read as “in a different way or manner; differently”; “in different circumstances: under other conditions”; or “in other respects”) (internal quotation marks omitted), and ensures that the term is not rendered “pure surplusage,” *id.* at *7. In sum, “otherwise” makes clear that Section 1512(c)(1)’s scope encompasses document destruction or evidence tampering that corruptly obstructs an official proceeding, while Section 1512(c)(2)’s ambit includes “other” conduct that corruptly obstructs an official proceeding.

The fact that some cases “could be brought under either or both prongs of Section 1512(c),” *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *12, does not imply that Section 1512(c)(2) “would have the same scope and effect . . . if Congress had instead omitted the word ‘otherwise,’” 2022 WL 823070,

at *7. For one thing—and as noted in the government’s supplemental brief in *Miller*, *see Miller* Supp. Br. at 11-13—overlap is “not uncommon in criminal statutes,” *Loughrin v. United States*, 573 U.S. 351, 358 n.4 (2014), and Section 1512(c)(2)’s broader language effectuates its design as a backstop in the same way that a “generally phrased residual clause . . . serves as a catchall for matters not specifically contemplated.” *Republic of Iraq v. Beaty*, 556 U.S. 848, 860 (2009).

Moreover, interpreting the interplay of Sections 1512(c)(1) and 1512(c)(2) in this way does not foreclose a defendant from arguing that his conduct falls outside Section 1512(c)(2)’s scope because his document destruction or evidence concealment is prohibited and punishable only under Section 1512(c)(1). To be sure, practical considerations may militate against seeking such a potentially Pyrrhic victory—where success leads to reindictment under Section 1512(c)(1)—but those practical considerations provide no reason to reject the straightforward interpretation of Section 1512(c) as divided between a provision that targets evidence destruction (Section 1512(c)(1)) and a provision that applies to “otherwise” obstructive conduct (Section 1512(c)(2)). And, in any event, the “mere fact that two federal criminal statutes criminalize similar conduct says little about the scope of either.” *Pasquantino v. United States*, 544 U.S. 349, 358 n.4 (2005).

Judge Nichols further concluded that interpreting “otherwise” in the manner described above is “inconsistent” with *Begay*, where, in the Court’s view, analysis of what “‘otherwise’ meant” was “[c]rucial” to the Supreme Court’s analysis. 2022 WL 823070, at *7. That conclusion is flawed in several respects. First, in considering whether driving under the influence was a “violent felony” for purposes of the ACCA’s residual clause, which defines a “violent felony” as a felony that “is burglary, arson, or extortion, involves use of explosives, or otherwise involves conduct that presents a serious potential risk of physical injury,” 18 U.S.C. § 924(e)(2)(B)(ii), the Supreme Court in *Begay* addressed a statutory provision that has an entirely different structure

than Section 1512(c)(2). *See Sandlin*, 2021 WL 5865006, at *6 (distinguishing *Begay* on the ground that, unlike the ACCA residual clause, the “otherwise” in Section 1512(c)(2) is “set off by both a semicolon and a line break”); *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *11 (“*Begay*’s discussion of the word ‘otherwise’ is remarkably agnostic. The Supreme Court merely observed that ‘the word ‘otherwise’ can (we do not say must) refer to a crime that is similar to the listed examples in some respects but different in others.’”); *Puma*, 2022 WL 823079, at *12, n. 4 (disagreeing with Judge Nichols’ application of *Begay* to Section 1512, and agreeing with Judge Moss who has previously rejected this same argument); *see also, United States v. Ring*, 628 F.Supp.2d 195, 224 n.17 (D.D.C. 2009). Unlike in the ACCA residual clause, the “otherwise” phrase in Section 1512(c)(2) “stands alone, unaccompanied by any limiting examples.”⁶ *Ring*, 628 F.Supp.2d at 224 n.17. In other words, the “key feature” in Section 924(e)(2)(B)(ii) at issue in *Begay*, “namely, the four example crimes,” 553 U.S. at 147, is “absent” in Section 1512(c)(2). *Caldwell*, 2021 WL 6062718, at *14. Although Judge Nichols recognized the structural difference between the ACCA residual clause and Section 1512(c)(2), 2022 WL 823070, at *9, he offered no reason to import *Begay*’s interpretation of “otherwise” to Section 1512(c)(2)’s differently structured provision.

Second, describing the Supreme Court’s interpretation of “what ‘otherwise’ meant” as “[c]rucial” to that Court’s decision in *Begay* is an inaccurate description of *Begay*’s analysis. The majority in *Begay* noted first that the “listed examples” in Section 924(e)(2)(B)(ii)—burglary, arson, extortion, or crimes involving explosives—indicated that the ACCA residual clause covered

⁶ The Court suggested (2022 WL 823070, at *8) that “[t]he government also presents an alternative reading” that Section 1512(c)(1) “provides examples of conduct that violates” Section 1512(c)(2). *Id.* at *8. That is incorrect. Neither the government nor Miller nor (to the government’s knowledge) any court has proposed or adopted that construction of Section 1512(c)(2). Considering an interpretation that no party advocates and no court has adopted injects the kind of “front-end ambiguity” that “lead[s] to significant inconsistency, unpredictability, and unfairness in application.” *Wooden*, 142 S. Ct. at 1076 (Kavanaugh, J., concurring).

only similar crimes. *Begay*, 553 U.S. at 142. Those examples, the majority reasoned, demonstrated that Section 924(e)(2)(B)(ii) was not designed “to be all encompassing,” but instead to cover only “crimes that are roughly similar, in kind as well as in degree of risk posed, to the examples themselves.” *Id.* at 142-43. The majority next drew support for its conclusion from Section 924(e)(2)(B)(ii)’s history, which showed that Congress both opted for the specific examples in lieu of a “broad proposal” that would have covered offenses involving the substantial use of physical force and described Section 924(e)(2)(B)(ii) as intending to encompass crimes “similar” to the examples. *Id.* at 143-44. In the final paragraph of that section of the opinion, the majority addressed “otherwise,” noting that the majority “[could] not agree” with the government’s argument that “otherwise” is “*sufficient* to demonstrate that the examples do not limit the scope of the clause” because “the word ‘otherwise’ *can* (we do not say *must*, cf. *post* at [150-52] (Scalia, J. concurring in judgment)) refer to a crime that is similar to the listed examples in some respects but different in others.” *Id.* at 144.

A tertiary rationale responding to a party’s argument where the majority refrains from adopting a definitive view of “otherwise” cannot be described as “crucial.” The majority’s “remarkably agnostic” discussion of “otherwise” in *Begay* explicitly noted that the word may carry a different meaning where (as here) the statutory text and context suggests otherwise. *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *11; see *Caldwell*, 2021 WL 6062718, at *14 (declining to depart from the “natural reading” of “otherwise” as “‘in a different way or manner’” based on the discussion in *Begay*). In short, the majority in *Begay* “placed little or no weight on the word ‘otherwise’ in resolving the case.” *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *11.

Third, whatever the significance of the majority’s interpretation of “otherwise” in *Begay*, *Begay*’s ultimate holding demonstrates why no court should embark on imposing an extra-textual

requirement within Section 1512(c)(2). The Supreme Court held in *Begay* that Section 924(e)(2)(B)(ii) encompasses only crimes that, similar to the listed examples, involve “purposeful, violent, and aggressive conduct.” 553 U.S. at 144-45. But “*Begay* did not succeed in bringing clarity to the meaning of the residual clause.” *Johnson v. United States*, 576 U.S. 591, 600 (2015). Just as the *Begay* majority “engraft[ed]” the “purposeful, violent, and aggressive conduct” requirement onto the ACCA’s residual clause, 553 U.S. at 150 (Scalia, J., concurring in judgment) (internal quotation marks omitted), so too Judge Nichols engrafted onto Section 1512(c)(2) the requirement that a defendant “have taken some action with respect to a document, record, or other object” to obstruct an official proceeding, 2022 WL 823070, at *10. In the nearly 20 years since Congress enacted Section 1512(c)(2), no reported cases have adopted Judge Nichols’s interpretation, and for good reason. That interpretation would give rise to unnecessarily complex questions about what sort of conduct qualifies as “taking some action with respect to a document” in order to obstruct an official proceeding. *Cf. United States v. Singleton*, No. 06-cr-80, 2006 WL 1984467, at *3 (S.D. Tex. July 14, 2006) (unpublished) (concluding that Section 1512(c)(2) “require[s] some nexus to tangible evidence, though not necessarily tangible evidence already in existence”); *see also United States v. Hutcherson*, No. 05-cr-39, 2006 WL 270019, at *2 (W.D. Va. Feb. 3, 2006) (unpublished) (concluding that a violation of Section 1512(c)(2) requires proof that “an individual corruptly obstructs an official proceedings [*sic*] through his conduct in relation to a tangible object”).⁷ In brief, Judge Nichols’s interpretation is likely to give rise to the very ambiguity it purports to avoid.

⁷ Judge Nichols’s interpretation of Section 1512(c)(2) resembles the reading given in *Singleton* and *Hutcherson*, both of which are unpublished and neither of which the Miller ruling cites. As noted in the main text, no other court, at least in a reported opinion, appears to have adopted the nexus-to-tangible-evidence-or-a-tangible-object standard articulated in *Singleton* and *Hutcherson*. *See United States v. De Bruhl-Daniels*, 491 F.Supp.3d 237, 250-51 (S.D. Tex. 2020) (identifying

Judge Nichols’s observation that only “certain courts of appeals,” 2022 WL 823070, at *7, have interpreted Section 1512(c)(2) to reach conduct that obstructs an official proceeding other than document destruction significantly understates the case law. Every reported case—both in the courts of appeals and in district courts—has interpreted Section 1512(c)(2) in that manner. *See Miller* Supp. Br. at 7-9 (discussing cases). Moreover, the Court’s effort to distinguish one of those cases, *United States v. Petruk*, 781 F.3d 438, 447 (8th Cir. 2015), misses the mark. That *Petruk* did not cite or discuss *Begay*, 2022 WL 823070, at *7-*8, says nothing about the logic of its analysis, particularly given how “remarkably agnostic” *Begay*’s discussion of “otherwise” is. *See Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *11. The Court likewise faulted *Petruk* for misreading the Supreme Court’s decision in *United States v. Aguilar*, 515 U.S. 593 (1995), where the Supreme Court interpreted the omnibus clause in 18 U.S.C. § 1503 to require a “relationship in time, causation, or logic,” *id.* at 599, between the obstructive conduct and the proceeding—a grand jury investigation—at issue in the defendant’s case. But the restraint the Supreme Court exercised by interpreting Section 1503 to require that “nexus” is paralleled by interpreting the same nexus requirement to apply to Section 1512(c)(2)—as other judges on this Court have done, *see Miller* Supp. Br. at 20-22 (explaining that the nexus requirement applies to Section 1512(c)(2)); *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *20-*21—and not by imposing an additional, atextual requirement that a defendant must “have taken some action with respect to a document” for his conduct to fall within the scope of Section 1512(c)(2).⁸

Singleton and *Hutcherson* as outliers from the “most popular—and increasingly prevalent—interpretation of § 1512(c)(2) [as] an unlimited prohibition on obstructive behavior that extends beyond merely tampering with tangible items”); *Ring*, 628 F.Supp.2d at 225 n.18 (disagreeing with *Singleton* and *Hutcherson* but finding that the alleged conduct at issue in that case involved “some nexus to documents”). No court of appeals has cited either case.

⁸ Judge Nichols’s similar criticism of *United States v. Burge*, 711 F.3d 803 (7th Cir. 2013), 2022 WL 823070, at *8, n.7, fails for the same reason. And Judge Nichols’s related criticism that *United*

Because Section 1512(c)(2)’s text and context make clear that it reaches conduct that obstructs, influences, or impedes an official proceeding in a manner other than document destruction or evidence tampering, resorting to other tools of statutory interpretation is not necessary. In any event, those tools reinforce that straightforward interpretation of Section 1512(c)(2)’s scope. *See Miller* Supp. Br. at 9-17. In reaching a contrary conclusion, Judge Nichols erred in several respects.

First, Judge Nichols suggested that reading Section 1512(c)(2) consistently with its plain language and structure as described above would “introduce something of an internal inconsistency” because Section 1512(c)(2) would have greater breadth than neighboring provisions in Section 1512. 2022 WL 823070, at *12; *see id.* (describing Section 1512(c)(2) as an “elephant[] in [a] mousehole[]”). That reasoning is inconsistent with *Yates*, where a plurality of the Supreme Court recognized that Section 1512 consisted of “broad proscriptions,” not “specialized provisions expressly aimed at corporate fraud and financial audits.” 574 U.S. at 541 (plurality opinion). Moreover, the narrowing construction Judge Nichols imposed on Section 1512(c)(2) fails to consider that Section 1512(c)(2) reaches more broadly precisely because other provisions within Section 1512 leave gaps that Section 1512(c)(2) fills. *Cf. Catrino v. United States*, 176 F.2d 884, 887 (9th Cir. 1949) (“The obstruction of justice statute is an outgrowth of Congressional recognition of the variety of corrupt methods by which the proper administration of

States v. Volpendesto, 746 F.3d 273 (7th Cir. 2014), which relied in part on *Burge*, “did not even involve a prosecution under § 1503, let alone § 1512(c)(2),” 2022 WL 823070, at *8, n.7, falls short. The defendants in *Volpendesto* were prosecuted for, among other things, conspiracy to obstruct an official proceeding, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(k), and the jury was instructed on the elements of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(2). *See United States v. Volpendesto*, 08-cr-115, Dkt. No. 518, at 88-95 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 22, 2010).

justice may be impeded or thwarted, a variety limited only by the imagination of the criminally inclined.”).

Second, Judge Nichols worried that a reading of Section 1512(c)(2) that encompasses obstructive conduct unrelated to documents or records would give rise to “substantial superfluity problems.” 2022 WL 823070, at *12. But even a “broad interpretation of § 1512(c)(2) does not entirely subsume numerous provisions within the chapter,” and any overlap with other provisions in Section 1512 is “hardly remarkable.” *Sandlin*, 2021 WL 5865006, at *8; *see also*, Exhibit 1, Tr. 5-12-23; *accord Nordean*, 2021 WL 6134595, at *8. More troubling, by interpreting Section 1512(c)(2) to require “some action with respect to a document,” 2022 WL 823070, at *15, Judge Nichols risks rendering Section 1512(c)(2) itself superfluous in light of the “broad ban on evidence-spoliation” in Section 1512(c)(1), *Yates*, 574 U.S. at 541 n.4 (plurality opinion) (internal quotation marks omitted). Moreover, because Section 1512(c)(1) includes both completed and *attempted* evidence tampering, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1) (reaching “[w]hoever corruptly . . . alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, *or attempts to do so*) (emphasis added), it is unlikely that a defendant who “take[s] some action with respect to a document, record, or other object,” 2022 WL 823070, at *15, has not also taken a “substantial step” toward altering, destroying, mutilating, or concealing that document sufficient to fall within the scope of Section 1512(c)(1). *See United States v. Hite*, 769 F.3d 1154, 1162 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (explaining that the “general meaning of ‘attempt’ in federal criminal law” is “an action constituting a ‘substantial step’ towards commission of a crime and performed with the requisite criminal intent”).

The canon against superfluity, which is “strongest when an interpretation would render superfluous another part of the same statutory scheme,” *Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.*, 568 U.S.

371, 386 (2013), is even stronger when it renders superfluous “other provisions in the *same enactment*.” *Freytag v. Comm’r*, 501 U.S. 868, 877 (1991) (emphasis added; internal quotation marks omitted); *cf. Yates*, 574 U.S. at 543 (plurality opinion) (“We resist a reading of § 1519 that would render superfluous an entire provision passed . . . as part of the same Act.”). That principle comes into play here because Sections 1512(c)(1) and 1512(c)(2) were enacted together as part of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. *See Miller Supp. Br.* at 15-16.

Third, Judge Nichols’s discussion of statutory and legislative history, 2022 WL 823070, at *11- *14, provides no sound reason to deviate from the straightforward interpretation of Section 1512(c)(2) described above. For example, Judge Nichols suggested that Congress would have had no reason to add Section 1512(a)(2)(B) three months after enacting Section 1512(c)(2) if the latter provision were construed broadly. 2022 WL 823070, at *13. Section 1512(a)(2)(B) prohibits the use or threatened use of physical force against “any person” with the intent to “cause or induce any person” to take one of four actions, including “alter[ing], destroy[ing], mutilat[ing], or conceal[ing] an object with intent to impair the integrity or availability of the object for use in an official proceeding.” 18 U.S.C. § 1512(a)(2)(B)(ii). But as Judge Nichols noted, 2022 WL 823070, at *12, n. 10, unlike Section 1512(a)(2)(B), Section 1512(c) aimed generally to impose “direct” liability for obstructive conduct that was not directed at intimidating or influencing another person, *see Miller Supp. Br.* at 16.⁹ Understood in that light, Section 1512(a)(2)(B)

⁹ Judge Nichols suggested (2022 WL 823070, at *12, n.10) that Section 1512(c)(2) could be read as “creating ‘direct’ liability for the other types of conduct covered by § 1512—that is, that it makes criminal an individual doing directly those things for which the rest of § 1512 requires action directed at another person.” Although the government’s supplemental brief described Section 1512(c)(2) in those terms, *see Miller Supp. Br.* at 16 (“Section 1512(c) aimed at closing a ‘loophole’ in Section 1512: the existing prohibitions did not adequately criminalize a defendant’s *personal* obstructive conduct *not* aimed at another person.”), Judge Nichols decided (2022 WL 823070, at *12 n.10) “not [to] address” the interpretation “further” because “[n]either party presses this argument (or anything like it).”

operates harmoniously with both subsections in Section 1512(c): Section 1512(a)(2)(B)(ii) reaches a defendant's use of force or threatened use of force at *another person* in order to cause that person to destroy documents in connection with an official proceeding; Section 1512(c)(1) reaches a defendant's direct destruction of documents in connection with an official proceeding; and Section 1512(c)(2) reaches a defendant's non-document-related conduct that obstructs or impedes an official proceeding. And while the legislators who enacted Section 1512(c) in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act undoubtedly had document shredding foremost in mind, *see* 2022 WL 823070, at *13- *14; *accord Miller* Supp. Br. at 15 (noting floor statements addressing concern about document shredding in the *Arthur Andersen* prosecution), "it is unlikely that Congress was concerned with only the type of document destruction at issue in the *Arthur Andersen* case." *Montgomery*, 2021 WL 6134591, at *16. In other words, "there is no reason to believe that Congress intended to fix that problem only with respect to 'the availability or integrity of evidence.'" *Id.*

Finally, an interpretation of Section 1512(c)(2) that imposes criminal liability only when an individual takes direct action "with respect to a document, record, or other object" to obstruct a qualifying proceeding leads to absurd results. *See United States v. X-Citement Video, Inc.*, 513 U.S. 64, 69 (1994) (rejecting interpretation of a criminal statute that would "produce results that were not merely odd, but positively absurd"). That interpretation would appear, for example, not to encompass an individual who seeks to "obstruct[], influence[], or impede[]" a congressional proceeding by explicitly stating that he intends to stop the legislators from performing their constitutional and statutory duties to certify Electoral College vote results by "drag[ging] lawmakers out of the Capitol by their heels with their heads hitting every step," *United States v. Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32, Trial Tr. 1502, carrying a gun onto Capitol grounds, *id.* at 1499, and then leading a "mob and encourag[ing] it to charge toward federal officers, pushing them aside to break

into the Capitol,” *id.* at 1501-02, unless he also picked up a “document or record” related to the proceeding during that violent assault. The statutory text does not require such a counterintuitive result.

CONCLUSION

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

Dated: August 9, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW M. GRAVES
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
D.C. Bar No. 481052

BY: /s/
ASHLEY AKERS
Trial Attorney
Capitol Siege Section
MO Bar No. 69601
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
202-353-0521
Ashley.Akers@usdoj.gov