

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 22-CR-38 (CKK)
	:	
JOLENE EICHER,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

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

Defendant Jolene Eicher, who is charged in connection with events at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, has moved to transfer venue in this case to the Western District of Virginia. The defendant fails to establish that she “cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial” in this district, Fed. R. Crim. P. 21(a), and this Court should deny her motion.¹

BACKGROUND

On January 6, 2021, 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. While the certification process was proceeding, a large crowd gathered

¹ Every judge on this Court to have ruled on a motion for change of venue in a January 6 prosecution has denied the motion. *See United States v. Williams*, 21-cr-618, ECF No. 63 (D.D.C. August 12, 2022) (ABJ); *United States v. Garcia*, No. 21-cr-129, ECF No. 83 (D.D.C. July 22, 2022) (ABJ); *United States v. Bledsoe*, No. 21-cr-204 (July 15, 2022) (Minute Order) (BAH); *United States v. Rhodes, et al.*, 22-cr-15, ECF No. 176 (D.D.C. June 28, 2022) (APM); *United States v. Williams*, No. 21-cr-377 (June 10, 2022) (Minute Entry) (BAH); *United States v. McHugh*, No. 21-cr-453 (May 4, 2022) (Minute Entry) (JDB); *United States v. Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, ECF No. 78 (D.D.C. Apr. 18, 2022) (APM); *United States v. Alford*, 21-cr-263, ECF No. 46 (D.D.C. Apr. 18, 2022) (TSC); *United States v. Brooks*, No. 21-cr-503, ECF No. 31 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2022) (RCL); *United States v. Boche*, No. 21-cr-418-RDM, 2022 WL 123893 (D.D.C. Jan. 12, 2022) (RDM); *United States v. Fitzsimons*, No. 21-cr-158 (D.D.C. Dec. 14, 2021) (Minute Order) (RC); *United States v. Reffitt*, No. 21-cr-32 (D.D.C. Oct. 15, 2021) (Minute Order) (DLF); *United States v. Caldwell*, 21-cr-28, ECF No. 415 (D.D.C. Sept. 14, 2021) (APM).

outside the United States Capitol, entered the restricted grounds, and forced entry into the Capitol building. As a result, the Joint Session and the entire official proceeding of the Congress was halted until law enforcement was able to clear the Capitol of hundreds of unlawful occupants and ensure the safety of elected officials.

On January 6, 2021, the defendant was present on the restricted Capitol grounds on the West Front. She climbed under scaffolding to the Northwest Stairs and up to the Upper West Terrace where she entered the Capitol at approximately 3:22 p.m. through a broken window next to the Senate Wing Door. She was inside the vestibule area by that door for approximately nine minutes before climbing through the broken window to leave the building.

Based on her actions on January 6, 2021, the defendant was charged with by Information with violating 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1) (Entering and Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds); 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2) (Disorderly and Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds); 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D) (Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building); and 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G) (Parading, Demonstrating, or Picketing in a Capitol Building).

The defendant now moves for a change of venue. ECF No. 31, Motion to Transfer Venue. She contends that prejudice should be presumed in this district for two reasons: (1) the pretrial publicity surrounding the events of January 6 and (2) the impact of the events of January 6 on the D.C. community. *Id.* at 3-5. The defendant's arguments lack merit, and the motion should be denied.

ARGUMENT

The Constitution provides that “[t]he trial of all Crimes . . . shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed.” U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2, cl. 3. The Sixth Amendment similarly guarantees the right to be tried “by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the

crime shall have been committed.” U.S. Const. amend. VI. These provisions provide “a safeguard against the unfairness and hardship involved when an accused is prosecuted in a remote place.” *United States v. Cores*, 356 U.S. 405, 407 (1958). Transfer to another venue is constitutionally required only where “extraordinary local prejudice will prevent a fair trial.” *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. 358, 378 (2010); *see* Fed. R. Crim. P. 21(a) (requiring transfer to another district if “so great a prejudice against the defendant exists in the transferring district that the defendant cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial there”).

The primary safeguard of the right to an impartial jury is “an adequate voir dire to identify unqualified jurors.” *Morgan v. Illinois*, 504 U.S. 719, 729 (1992) (italics omitted). Thus, the best course when faced with a pretrial publicity claim is ordinarily “to proceed to voir dire to ascertain whether the prospective jurors have, in fact, been influenced by pretrial publicity.” *United States v. Campa*, 459 F.3d 1121, 1146 (11th Cir. 2006) (en banc). “[I]f an impartial jury actually cannot be selected, that fact should become evident at the voir dire.” *United States v. Haldeman*, 559 F.2d 31, 63 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (en banc) (per curiam). And, after voir dire, “it may be found that, despite earlier prognostications, removal of the trial is unnecessary.” *Jones v. Gasch*, 404 F.2d 1231, 1238 (D.C. Cir. 1967).

I. The Pretrial Publicity Related to January 6 Does Not Support a Presumption of Prejudice in This District.

The defendant contends that a change of venue is warranted based on prior and continuing coverage of the events of January 6, including “sensational journalism” covering arrests, charges, and congressional hearing. ECF 31 at 3. “The mere existence of intense pretrial publicity is not enough to make a trial unfair, nor is the fact that potential jurors have been exposed to this publicity.” *United States v. Childress*, 58 F.3d 693, 706 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *see* *Murphy v. Florida*, 421 U.S. 794, 799 (1975) (juror exposure to “news accounts of the crime with which [a defendant]

is charged” does not “alone presumptively deprive[] the defendant of due process”). Indeed, “every case of public interest is almost, as a matter of necessity, brought to the attention of all the intelligent people in the vicinity, and scarcely any one can be found among those best fitted for jurors who has not read or heard of it, and who has not some impression or some opinion in respect to its merits.” *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145, 155-56 (1878). Thus, the “mere existence of any preconceived notion as to the guilt or innocence of an accused, without more,” is insufficient to establish prejudice. *Irvin*, 366 U.S. at 723. “It is sufficient if the juror can lay aside his impression or opinion and render a verdict based on the evidence presented in court.” *Id.*

The Supreme Court has recognized only a narrow category of cases in which prejudice is presumed to exist without regard to prospective jurors’ answers during voir dire. *See Rideau v. Louisiana*, 373 U.S. 723 (1963). In *Rideau*, the defendant’s confession—obtained while he was in jail and without an attorney present—was broadcast three times shortly before trial on a local television station to audiences ranging from 24,000 to 53,000 individuals in a parish of approximately 150,000 people. *Id.* at 724 (majority opinion), 728-29 (Clark, J., dissenting). The Court concluded that, “to the tens of thousands of people who saw and heard it,” the televised confession “in a very real sense *was* Rideau’s trial—at which he pleaded guilty to murder.” *Rideau*, 373 U.S. at 726. Thus, the Court “d[id] not hesitate to hold, without pausing to examine a particularized transcript of the voir dire,” that these “kangaroo court proceedings” violated due process. *Id.* at 726-27.

Since *Rideau*, the Supreme Court has emphasized that a “presumption of prejudice . . . attends only the extreme case,” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 381, and the Court has repeatedly “held in other cases that trials have been fair in spite of widespread publicity,” *Nebraska Press Ass’n v. Stuart*, 427 U.S. 539, 554 (1976). In the half century since *Rideau*, the Supreme Court has never

presumed prejudice based on pretrial publicity. *But see Estes v. Texas*, 381 U.S. 532 (1965) (presuming prejudice based on media interference with courtroom proceedings); *Sheppard v. Maxwell*, 384 U.S. 333 (1966) (same). In fact, courts have declined to transfer venue in some of the most high-profile prosecutions in recent American history. *See In re Tsarnaev*, 780 F.3d 14, 15 (1st Cir. 2015) (per curiam) (capital prosecution of Boston Marathon bomber); *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 399 (fraud trial of CEO of Enron Corporation); *United States v. Yousef*, 327 F.3d 56, 155 (2d Cir. 2003) (trial of participant in 1993 World Trade Center bombing); *United States v. Moussaoui*, 43 F. App'x 612, 613 (4th Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (unpublished) (terrorism prosecution for conspirator in September 11, 2001 attacks); *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 70 (Watergate prosecution of former Attorney General John Mitchell and other Nixon aides).

In *Skilling*, the Supreme Court considered several factors in determining that prejudice should not be presumed where former Enron executive Jeffrey Skilling was tried in Houston, where Enron was based. *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 382-83. First, the Court considered the “size and characteristics of the community.” *Id.* at 382. Unlike *Rideau*, where the murder “was committed in a parish of only 150,000 residents,” Houston was home to more than 4.5 million people eligible for jury service. *Id.* at 382. Second, “although news stories about Skilling were not kind, they contained no confession or other blatantly prejudicial information of the type readers or viewers could not reasonably be expected to shut from sight.” *Id.* Third, “over four years elapsed between Enron’s bankruptcy and Skilling’s trial,” and “the decibel level of media attention diminished somewhat in the years following Enron’s collapse.” *Id.* at 383. “Finally, and of prime significance, Skilling’s jury acquitted him of nine insider-trading counts,” which undermined any “supposition of juror bias.” *Id.*

Although these *Skilling* factors are not exhaustive, courts have found them useful when considering claims of presumptive prejudice based on pretrial publicity. *See, e.g., In re Tsarnaev*, 780 F.3d at 21-22; *United States v. Petters*, 663 F.3d 375, 385 (8th Cir. 2011). And contrary to the defendant's contention, those factors do not support a presumption of prejudice in this case.

A. Size and Characteristics of the community

The District of Columbia has a population of nearly 700,000. *See* United States Census Bureau, QuickFacts, District of Columbia, available at <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/DC>. Although this District may be smaller than most other federal judicial districts, it has a larger population than two states (Wyoming and Vermont), and more than four times as many people as the parish in *Rideau*. The relevant question is not whether the District of Columbia is as populous as the Southern District of Texas in *Skilling*, but whether it is large enough that an impartial jury can be found. In *Mu'Min v. Virginia*, 500 U.S. 415, 429 (1991), the Court cited a county population of 182,537 as supporting the view that an impartial jury could be selected. And *Skilling* approvingly cited a state case in which there was “a reduced likelihood of prejudice” because the “venire was drawn from a pool of over 600,000 individuals.” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 382 (quoting *Gentile v. State Bar of Nev.*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1044 (1991)). There is simply no reason to believe that, out of an eligible jury pool of nearly half a million, “12 impartial individuals could not be empaneled.” *Id.*

The defendant's reliance (ECF No. 31 at 3-5) on the Oklahoma City bombing case, *United States v. McVeigh*, 918 F. Supp. 1467 (W.D. Okla. 1996), is unavailing. That case involved the mass murder of “168 identified men, women and children,” as well as “injuries to hundreds of other people, the complete destruction of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Office Building and collateral damage to other buildings, including the United States Courthouse.” *Id.* at 1469. “A

damage assessment . . . estimated the total incident cost at \$651,594,000.” *Id.* And the prosecution resulted in the recusal of Oklahoma’s federal district judges. *Nichols v. Alley*, 71 F.3d 347, 349 (10th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). Additionally, the jury in *McVeigh* was required, after a finding of guilt, to decide whether to impose the death penalty on the defendant. *McVeigh*, 918 F. Supp. at 1474. This case is unlike *McVeigh*. Although the attack on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, was an extremely serious crime, the impact that it had on this District was unlike that of the Oklahoma City bombing on that venue. The defendant’s charged conduct in this case is not comparable to a death-eligible mass murder; indeed, she has not even been charged with a felony. In short, the justifications for transferring venue in *McVeigh* do not apply in the present case.

B. Nature of the pretrial publicity

Nor does this case involve a “confession or other blatantly prejudicial information of the type readers or viewers could not reasonably be expected to shut from sight.” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 382. The defendant contends that she has been prejudiced by “sensational journalism.” ECF No. 31 at 3. But even news stories that are “not kind,” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 382, or are “hostile in tone and accusatory in content,” *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 61, do not alone raise a presumption of prejudice. As in *Skilling* and *Haldeman*, the news coverage of Eicher is “neither as inherently prejudicial nor as unforgettable as the spectacle of Rideau’s dramatically staged and broadcast confession.” *Id.* Indeed, although any media characterizations of Eicher would be inadmissible, the photos and videos of Eicher that have been disseminated would be both admissible and highly relevant at trial. *Compare Sheppard*, 384 U.S. at 360 (noting that information reported by the media was “clearly inadmissible” and that “[t]he exclusion of such evidence in court is rendered meaningless when news media make it available to the public”), *with Murray v. Schriro*, 882 F.3d 778, 805 (9th Cir. 2018) (“There was no inflammatory barrage of information that would be

inadmissible at trial. Rather, the news reports focused on relaying mainly evidence presented at trial.”); *Henderson v. Dugger*, 925 F.2d 1309, 1314 (11th Cir. 1991) (“[B]ecause we have found [the defendant’s] confessions were admissible, the damage if any from the [pretrial] publicity is negligible.”).

The defendant also asserts that a fair trial cannot be had in D.C. based on the “wall-to-wall coverage,” and she asserts that “citizens of this city are under constant media assault on a daily basis.” ECF 31 at 3, 5. But even “massive” news coverage of a crime does not require prejudice to be presumed. *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 61. Very little of the news coverage of January 6 has focused on Jolene Eicher herself. Unlike most cases involving pretrial publicity, where the news coverage focuses on the responsibility of a single defendant (as in *Rideau* or *Tsarnaev*) or small number of co-defendants (as in *Skilling* and *Haldeman*), the events of January 6 involved thousands of participants and have so far resulted in charges against more than 800 people. The Court can guard against any spillover prejudice from the broader coverage of January 6 by conducting a careful voir dire and properly instructing the jury about the need to determine a defendant’s individual guilt. And, in any event, any threat of such spillover prejudice is not limited to Washington, D.C. because much of the news coverage of January 6 has been national in scope. *See Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 64 n.43.

The defendant makes a passing reference to the prejudicial effect of “congressional hearings,” ECF No. 31 at 3, presumably referring to hearings by the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (Select Committee). Those hearings, however, have not focused on Eicher’s conduct or even mentioned her name. Moreover, the media coverage of the hearings was not limited to D.C. Instead, the hearings were carried on national networks across the country. In similar circumstances, the D.C.

Circuit affirmed the denial of a change of venue where the defendants—who were high-ranking members of the Nixon administration—complained that they were prejudiced by news coverage of the Watergate-related hearings. *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 62-64 & nn.35, 43. The court of appeals observed that “a change of venue would have been of only doubtful value” where the “network news programs and legislative hearings” related to Watergate were “national in their reach.” *Id.* at n.43. There is no reason to believe that coverage of the hearings will create in D.C. such a degree of bias against this particular defendant that an impartial jury cannot be selected.

Additionally, a careful voir dire—rather than a change of venue—is the appropriate way to address potential prejudice from the Select Committee hearings. “[V]oir dire has long been recognized as an effective method of routing out [publicity-based] bias, especially when conducted in a careful and thoroughgoing manner.” *In re Nat’l Broadcasting Co.*, 653 F.2d 609, 617 (D.C. Cir. 1981). After a careful voir dire, this Court can select a jury from those residents who either did not watch the hearings or who, despite having watched the hearing, give adequate assurances of their impartiality. *See Haldeman*, 559 F.3d at 62 n.35 (rejecting claim of prejudice even though “several jurors” had “seen portions of the televised Senate hearings” related to Watergate). The nature and extent of the pretrial publicity does not support a change of venue.

C. Passage of time before trial

In *Skilling*, the Court considered the fact that “over four years elapsed between Enron’s bankruptcy and Skilling’s trial.” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 383. In this case, 19 months have already elapsed since the events of January 6, and more time will elapse before trial. This is far more than in *Rideau*, where the defendant’s trial came two months after his televised confession. *Rideau*, 373 U.S. at 724. Although January 6 continues to be in the news, the “decibel level of media attention [has] diminished somewhat,” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 383. Moreover, few if any recent

stories have mentioned the defendant and much of the reporting has been national in scope, rather than limited to Washington, D.C.

D. The jury verdict

Because Jolene Eicher has not yet gone to trial, the final *Skilling* factor—whether the “jury’s verdict . . . undermine[s] in any way the supposition of juror bias,” *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 383—does not directly apply. But the fact that *Skilling* considered this factor to be “of prime significance,” *id.*, underscores how unusual it is to presume prejudice before trial. Ordinarily, a case should proceed to trial in the district where the crime was committed, and courts can examine after trial whether the record supports a finding of actual or presumed prejudice. In short, none of the *Skilling* factors supports the defendant’s contention that the Court should presume prejudice and order a transfer of venue without even conducting voir dire.

II. The impact of January 6 on Washington D.C. does not support a change of venue.

The defendant contends that a D.C. jury could not be impartial because January 6 was “so impactful on the psyche of District residents,” pointing to the deployment of the National Guard, the mayor’s declaration of a state of emergency, road closures, and a curfew.² ECF No. 31 at 3. But January 6 is now more than a year in the past. Many D.C. residents do not live or work near the Capitol where the roads were closed and the National Guard was deployed. There is no reason to believe that the District’s entire population of nearly 700,000 people was so affected by these events that the Court cannot seat an impartial jury here.

² The defendant asserts that the curfew lasted “for weeks,” Doc. 31 at 3, but that is incorrect. Although the state of emergency lasted 15 days, the curfew lasted only for 12 hours. *Compare* Press Release, Mayor Bowser Orders Citywide Curfew Beginning at 6pm Today (Jan. 6, 2021), <https://mayor.dc.gov/release/mayor-bowser-orders-citywide-curfew-beginning-6pm-today>, *with* Press Release, Mayor Bowser Issues Mayor’s Order Extending Today’s Public Emergency for 15 Days (Jan 6, 2021), <https://mayor.dc.gov/release/mayor-bowser-issues-mayor%E2%80%99s-order-extending-today%E2%80%99s-public-emergency-15-days-a1>.

Indeed, courts routinely conclude that defendants can receive a fair trial in the location where they committed their crimes, despite the fact that some members of the community were victimized. *See In re Tsarnaev*, 780 F.3d 14, 15 (1st Cir. 2015) (Boston Marathon bombing); *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 399 (Enron collapse); *United States v. Yousef*, 327 F.3d 56, 155 (2d Cir. 2003) (1993 World Trade Center bombing); *United States v. Moussaoui*, 43 F. App'x 612, 613 (4th Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (unpublished) (September 11, 2001 attacks, including on the Pentagon). In *Skilling*, the Supreme Court rejected the contention that Enron's "sheer number of victims" in the Houston area "trigger[ed] a presumption of prejudice." *Skilling*, 561 U.S. at 384 (quotation omitted). "Although the widespread community impact necessitated careful identification and inspection of prospective jurors' connections to Enron," the voir dire was "well suited to that task." *Id.* In this case too, voir dire can adequately identify those D.C. residents who were so affected by January 6 that they cannot impartially serve as jurors. There is no reason to believe those in the Western District of Virginia would be more impartial than D.C. residents. *See United States v. Awadallah*, 457 F. Supp. 2nd 246, 253 (S.D.N.Y. 2006)(transfer of venue was denied). Thus, there is no reason to presume prejudice.

III. The January 6-Related Jury Trials That Have Already Occurred Have Demonstrated the Availability of a Significant Number of Fair, Impartial Jurors in the D.C. Venire.

At this point, multiple January 6 cases have proceeded to jury trials, and the Court in each of those cases has been able to select a jury without undue expenditure of time or effort. *See Murphy*, 421 U.S. at 802-03 ("The length to which the trial court must go to select jurors who appear to be impartial is another factor relevant in evaluating those jurors' assurances of impartiality."); *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 63 (observing that "if an impartial jury actually cannot be selected, that fact should become evident at the voir dire"). Instead, the judges presiding over those trials were able to select a jury in one or two days. *See United States v. Reffitt*, 21-cr-32,

Minute Entries (Feb. 28 and Mar. 1, 2022); *United States v. Robertson*, 21-cr-34, Minute Entry (Apr. 5, 2022); *United States v. Thompson*, 21-cr-161, Minute Entry (Apr. 11, 2022); *United States v. Webster*, No. 21-cr-208, Minute Entry (Apr. 25, 2022); *United States v. Hale-Cusanelli*, 21-cr-37, Minute Entry (May 23, 2022); *United States v. Williams*, 21-cr-377, Minute Entry (June 27, 2022); *United States v. Bledsoe*, No. 21-cr-204, Minute Entry (July 18, 2022). And, using the first five jury trials as exemplars, the voir dire that took place undermines the defendant's claim that prejudice should be presumed.³

In *Reffitt*, the Court individually examined 56 prospective jurors and qualified 38 of them (about 68% of those examined). See *Reffitt*, ECF 136, Trial Tr. 521. The Court asked all the prospective jurors whether they had “an opinion about Mr. Reffitt’s guilt or innocence in this case” and whether they had any “strong feelings or opinions” about the events of January 6 or any political beliefs that it would make it difficult to be a “fair and impartial” juror. *Reffitt*, ECF 133, Trial Tr. 23, 30. The Court then followed up during individual voir dire. Of the 18 jurors that were struck for cause, only nine (or 16% of the 56 people examined) indicated that they had such strong feelings about the events of January 6 that they could not serve as fair or impartial jurors.⁴

³ Because all but *Reffitt* and *Robertson* remain restricted on PACER, the transcripts from the voir dire proceedings in the restricted transcript cases are being submitted under separate cover to the Court and counsel.

⁴ For those struck based on a professed inability to be impartial, see *Reffitt*, ECF 133, Trial Tr. 49-54 (Juror 328), 61-68 (Juror 1541), 112-29 (Juror 1046); ECF 134, 172-73 (Juror 443), 174-78 (Juror 45), 202-09 (Juror 1747), 223-35 (Juror 432), 263-74 (Juror 514); ECF 135, 358-69 (Juror 1484). For those struck for other reasons, see *Reffitt*, ECF 134, Trial Tr. 168-172 (Juror 313, worked at Library of Congress), 209-24, 281 (Juror 728, moved out of D.C.); ECF 135, 284 (Juror 1650, over 70 and declined to serve), 340-51 (Juror 548, unavailability), 382 (Juror 715, anxiety and views on guns), 398 (Juror 548, medical appointments); ECF 136, 441-43 (Juror 1240, health hardship), 453-65 (Juror 464, worked at Library of Congress), 465-81 (Juror 1054, prior knowledge of facts).

In *Thompson*, the Court individually examined 34 prospective jurors, and qualified 25 of them (or 73%). See *Thompson* 4-11-22 Tr. 169, 171, 180, 189, 192. The court asked the entire venire 47 standard questions, and then followed up on their affirmative answers during individual voir dire. *Id.* at 3-4, 34. Of the nine prospective jurors struck for cause, only three (or about 9% of those examined) were stricken based on an inability to be impartial, as opposed to some other cause.⁵

Similarly, in *Robertson*, the Court individually examined 49 prospective jurors and qualified 34 of them (or about 69% of those examined). See *Robertson*, ECF 106, Trial Tr. 303. The Court asked all prospective jurors whether they had “such strong feelings” about the events of January 6 that it would be “difficult” to follow the court’s instructions “and render a fair and impartial verdict.” *Id.* at 14. It asked whether anything about the allegations in that case would prevent prospective jurors from “being neutral and fair” and whether their political views would affect their ability to be “fair and impartial.” *Id.* at 13, 15. The Court followed up on affirmative answers to those questions during individual voir dire. Of the 15 prospective jurors struck for cause, only nine (or 18% of the 49 people examined) indicated that they had such strong feelings about the January 6 events that they could not be fair or impartial.⁶

⁵ For the three stricken for bias, see *Thompson*, ECF 104-105, 4-11-22, Tr. 52 (Juror 1242), 85 (Juror 328), 158 (Juror 999). For the six stricken for hardship or inability to focus, see *id.* at 43 (Juror 1513), 44 (Juror 1267), 49 (Juror 503), 40 (Juror 1290), 92 (Juror 229), 109 (Juror 1266).

⁶ For those struck based on a professed inability to be impartial, see *Robertson*, ECF 104-106, Trial Tr. 26-34 (Juror 1431), 97-100 (Juror 1567), 121-30 (Juror 936), 136-42 (Juror 799), 160-71 (Juror 696), 189-93 (Juror 429), 256-65 (Juror 1010), 265-68 (Juror 585), 287-92 (Juror 1160). For those struck for other reasons, see *Robertson, id.*, Trial Tr. 23-26 (Juror 1566, hardship related to care for elderly sisters), 83-84 (Juror 1027, moved out of D.C.), 156-60 (Juror 1122, language concerns), 193-96 (Juror 505, work hardship), 245-50 (Juror 474, work trip); 279-82 (Juror 846, preplanned trip).

In *Webster*, the Court individually examined 53 jurors and qualified 35 of them (or 66%). *Webster* 4-26-22 AM Tr. 6, though it later excused one of those 35 based on hardship, *Webster* 4-25-22 PM Tr. 217-18. The Court asked all prospective jurors whether they had “strong feelings” about the events of January 6 or about the former President that would “make it difficult for [the prospective juror] to serve as a fair and impartial juror in this case.” *Webster* 4-25-22 AM Tr. 19. During individual voir dire, the Court followed up on affirmative answers to clarify whether prospective jurors could set aside their feelings and decide the case fairly. *See, e.g., id.* at 32-33, 41-42, 54-56, 63, 65-66. Only 10 out of 53 prospective jurors (or about 19%) were stricken based on a professed or imputed inability to be impartial, as opposed to some other reason.⁷ The *Webster* Court observed that this number “was actually relatively low” and therefore “doesn’t bear out the concerns that were at root in the venue transfer motion” in that case. *Webster*, 4-26-22 AM Tr. 7.

In *Hale-Cusanelli*, the Court individually examined 47 prospective jurors and qualified 32 of them (or 68%). *Hale-Cusanelli* Trial Tr. 226, 231. The Court asked prospective jurors questions similar to those asked in the other trials. *See id.* at 72-74 (Questions 16, 20). Of the 15 prospective jurors struck for cause, 11 (or 23% of those examined) were stricken based on a connection to the events of January 6 or a professed inability to be impartial.⁸

⁷ Nine of the 19 stricken jurors were excused based on hardship or a religious belief. *See Webster* 4-25-22 AM Tr. 46 (Juror 1464), 49-50 (Juror 1132), 61 (Juror 1153), 68 (Juror 951), 78 (Juror 419); *Webster* 4-25-22 PM Tr. 102-04, 207, 217 (Juror 571), 188 (Juror 1114), 191 (Juror 176), 203-04 (Juror 1262). Of the ten other stricken jurors, three professed an ability to be impartial but were nevertheless stricken based on a connection to the events or to the U.S. Attorney’s Office. *See Webster* 4-25-22 AM Tr. at 58-60 (Juror 689 was a deputy chief of staff for a member of congress); *Webster* 4-25-22 PM Tr. at 139-41 (Juror 625’s former mother-in-law was a member of congress); 196-98 (Juror 780 was a former Assistant U.S. Attorney in D.C.).

⁸ *See Hale-Cusanelli* Trial Tr. 62 (Juror 499), 67-68 (Juror 872), 84-85 (Juror 206), 92-93 (Juror 653), 124-25 (Juror 1129), 152 (Juror 182), 156 (Juror 176), 182 (Juror 890), 197-98 (Juror 870), 217 (Juror 1111), 224 (Juror 1412). For the four jurors excused for hardship, *see id.* at 77-79 (Juror 1524), 99 (Juror 1094), 132 (Juror 1014), 151 (Juror 899).

In these first five jury trials, the percentage of prospective jurors stricken for cause based on partiality is far lower than in *Irvin*, where the Supreme Court said that “statement[s] of impartiality” by some prospective jurors could be given “little weight” based on the number of other prospective jurors who “admitted prejudice.” *Irvin*, 366 U.S. at 728. In *Irvin*, 268 of 430 prospective jurors (or 62%) were stricken for cause based on “fixed opinions as to the guilt of petitioner.” *Id.* at 727. The percentage of partiality-based strikes in these first five January 6-related jury trials—between 9% and 23% of those examined—is far lower than the 62% in *Irvin*. The percentage in these cases is lower even than in *Murphy*, where 20 of 78 prospective jurors (25%) were “excused because they indicated an opinion as to petitioner’s guilt.” *Murphy*, 421 U.S. at 803. *Murphy* said that this percentage “by no means suggests a community with sentiment so poisoned against petitioner as to impeach the indifference of jurors who displayed no animus of their own.” *Id.* As in *Murphy*, the number of prospective jurors indicating bias does not call into question the qualifications of others whose statements of impartiality the Court has credited.

Far from showing that “an impartial jury actually cannot be selected,” *Haldeman*, 559 F.2d at 63, the first five January 6-related jury trials have confirmed that voir dire can adequately screen out prospective jurors who cannot be fair and impartial, while leaving more than sufficient qualified jurors to hear the case. The Court should deny the defendant’s request for a venue transfer and should instead rely on a thorough voir dire to protect the defendant’s right to an impartial jury.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the defendant's motion to transfer venue should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

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

By: /s/ Mona Lee M. Furst
Mona Lee M. Furst
Assistant United States Attorney
Detailee – Federal Major Crimes
Kansas Bar No. 13162
United States Attorney's Office
1200 Epic Center, Suite 1200
Wichita, Kansas 67202
Telephone: (316) 269-6537
Mona.Furst@usdoj.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On this 17th day of August, 2022, a copy of the foregoing was served on counsel of record for the defendant via the Court's Electronic Filing System.

By: /s/ Mona Lee M. Furst
Mona Lee M. Furst
Assistant United States Attorney
Detailee – Federal Major Crimes
Kansas Bar No. 13162
United States Attorney's Office
1200 Epic Center, Suite 1200
Wichita, Kansas 67202
Telephone: (316) 269-6537
Mona.Furst@usdoj.gov