# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	\ §	
	§	
vs.	§	CAUSE NO.: 1:22-CR-15
	§	
ELMER STEWART RHODES, III	§.	

#### MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DETENTION

**COME NOW** PHILLIP LINDER and JAMES LEE BRIGHT, attorneys for Elmer Stewart Rhodes in the above referenced cause number and request this Court to reconsider the January 26, 2022 decision ordering the detention of the Defendant pending his trial.

#### BACKGROUND

On January 8, 2021, the Government Indicted Mr. Rhodes along with ten other codefendants based upon events occurring in and around the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. On January 24, 2022, Mr. Rhodes appeared before U.S. Magistrate Kimberly Priest Johnson in the Eastern District of Texas subsequent to his arrest on the instant indictment at which time a detention hearing was conducted. On January 27, 2022, the Judge issued a ruling ordering Mr. Rhodes detention pending trial on the instant charges. The Defendant is currently being detained at the Fannin County Jail in Bonham, Texas.

#### LEGAL STANDARD

While the Rules of Criminal Procedure do not explicitly provide for motions to reconsider, the courts in this district have repeatedly held that such motions are proper in criminal cases. See *U.S. v Sunia*, 643 F. Supp 2d 51, 60 (D.D.C. 2009), *U.S. v Slough*, No. CR 08-360 (RCL), 2014 WL 3734139, \*2 (D.D.C. July 29, 2014), *U.S. v Cabrera*, 699 F. Supp. 35, 40 (D.D.C. 2010). In deciding motions for reconsideration in criminal cases, the courts apply the same standard applicable in civil cases under F. R. Civ. P. 59(e). See *Sunia*, 643 F. Supp 2d. at 60; Slough, 2014 WL 3734139 at \*2. With respect to interlocutory orders, such as the order granting this Rule 15 deposition, reconsideration should be granted "as justice requires." Id.

As the Court articulated in Slough, "asking 'what justice requires' amounts to

determining, within the Court's discretion, whether reconsideration is necessary under the relevant circumstances." Id. To "determine whether 'justice requires' reconsideration of a previously issued interlocutory order, the Court considers whether it 'patently misunderstood a party, has made a decision outside the adversarial issues presented to the Court by the parties, has made an error not of reasoning but of apprehension, or where a controlling or significant change in the law or facts [has occurred] since the submission of the issue to the Court." Id. (citing *Singh v. George Washington Univ.*, 383 F. Supp. 2d. 99, 101 (D.D.C. 2005)). Moreover, "[e]ven if the appropriate legal standard does not indicate that reconsideration is warranted, the Court may nevertheless elect to grant a motion for reconsideration if there are other good reasons for doing so." *Sunia* at 61 (citing *Isse v American Univ.*, 544 F. Supp. 2d 25, 29 (D.D.C. 2008)).

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Movant prays that the Court will grant his Motion for Reconsideration on the face of this pleading and requests that the Court set this matter for a hearing so that Movant may present evidence in support of this motion.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

/s/ PHILLIP A. LINDER

PHILLIP A. LINDER

3300 OAK LAWN AVENUE, SUITE 700 DALLAS, TEXAS 75219 (214) 252-9900 OFFICE (214) 252-9902 FAX PHILLIP@THELINDERFIRM.COM TEXAS BAR NO. 12363560

/s/ James Lee Bright

JAMES LEE BRIGHT

3300 OAK LAWN AVENUE, SUITE 700

DALLAS, TEXAS 75219 TEL: (214) 720-7777

FAX: (214) 720-7778

JLBRIGHTLAW@GMAIL.COM TEXAS BAR No: 24001786

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

## CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I certify that I conferred with Kathryn Rakoczy, Counsel for the government regarding this Motion. Ms. Rakoczy does not oppose the filing of this Motion but does oppose the Court's granting of the Motion.

/S/ PHILLIP A. LINDER
ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a true and correct copy of this Motion to Reconsider was served on the Assistant United States Attorney Kathryn Rakoczy via ECF on January 28, 2022.

/S/ PHILLIP A. LINDER
ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT