1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	United States of America,) Criminal Action) No. 1:21-cr-00235-RC
4	Plaintiff,)
5	vs. Sentencing (via Zoom)
6	Richard Franklin Barnard and) Jaffray Chang Witgher) Washington D.C.
7	Jeffrey Shane Witcher,) Washington, D.C.) February 4, 2022
8	Defendants.) Time: 2:30 p.m.
9	Transcript of <u>Sentencing</u> (via Zoom)
10	Held Before The Honorable Rudolph Contreras (via Zoom)
11	United States District Judge
12	<u>APPEARANCES</u>
13	For the Government: Brandon K. Regan
14	(via Zoom) UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
15	555 Fourth Street, Northwest Washington, D.C. 20001
16	For the Defendant Richard Franklin Barnard:
17	(via Zoom) Jesus M. Salinas, Jr. FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, TXW AUSTIN
18	504 Lavaca Street, Suite 960 Austin, Texas 78701-2860
19	For the Defendant Jeffrey Shane Witcher:
20	(via Zoom) Samuel Bassett MINTON, BASSETT, FLORES & CARSEY, P.
21	1100 Guadalupe Street Austin, Texas 78701
22	Also Present (via Zoom):
23	Aidee Gavito, U.S. Probation Officer
24	
25	

Stenographic Official Court Reporter:
(via Zoom) Nancy J. Meyer Registered Diplomate Reporter
Certified Realtime Reporter 333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20001 202-354-3118

PROCEEDINGS

(REPORTER'S NOTE: This hearing was held during the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and is subject to the limitations of technology associated with the use of technology, including but not limited to telephone and video signal interference, static, signal interruptions, and other restrictions and limitations associated with remote court reporting via telephone, speakerphone, and/or videoconferencing.)

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: This is Criminal Action
21-235, United States v. Richard Franklin Barnard and Jeffrey
Shane Witcher. For the United States, I have Brandon Regan.
For Richard Barnard, I have Mr. Jesus Salinas.

MR. SALINAS: Good afternoon.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: For Jeffrey Witcher, I have Samuel Bassett. Our probation officer today is Aidee Gavito, and our court reporter, again, is Nancy Meyer.

All parties are present.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody.

MR. BASSETT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's start with the colloquy for proceeding by video rather than in person.

The Chief Judge in this district has authorized the use of videoconferencing for sentencings because they cannot be conducted in person without seriously jeopardizing public health and safety. We're prepared to proceed by videoconferencing for this hearing today. Do the parties believe that proceedings today via videoconference rather than

```
1
       waiting until a hearing can be held safely in person is in the
       interests of justice?
2
 3
             Mr. Salinas?
                 MR. SALINAS: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
 5
                 THE COURT: Okay. And why don't we make a short
 6
       record as to why it behooves everyone to proceed today by video
 7
       rather than waiting some indefinite period of time until COVID
 8
       disappears and we can all get together in person.
 9
                 MR. SALINAS: Sure, Your Honor. Due to the rise in
10
       numbers of infections of the COVID-19 virus, and including the
11
       uptick in the Omicron virus, we believe it is in the best
12
       interest for Mr. Barnard and the parties to proceed through
13
       videoconference to avoid travel, to avoid the spread of
14
       infection. So we believe it is in the best interest to proceed
15
       today rather than waiting an extended period of time. We
16
       believe the interests of justice fits the -- us proceeding
17
       today.
18
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bassett, I -- do you
19
       agree with that?
20
                 MR. BASSETT: I absolutely concur, Your Honor.
21
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Regan?
22
                 MR. REGAN: I do, Your Honor.
23
                 THE COURT: All right. Let's start with Mr. Barnard.
24
       Mr. Barnard, do you agree after having consulted with your
25
       counsel to participate in today's sentencing hearing using --
```

```
1
                 DEFENDANT BARNARD: Yes, sir.
                 THE COURT: -- videoconferencing rather than being
2
      physically present in the courtroom?
 3
                 MR. BARNARD: Yes, sir, I do.
 4
 5
                 THE COURT: All right. Are you comfortable with the
      videoconferencing equipment made available to you?
 6
 7
                 MR. BARNARD: Yes, sir.
                 THE COURT: And do you have an ability to consult
 8
 9
      with your counsel in private, if necessary, during this
10
      hearing?
11
                 MR. BARNARD: Yes, sir.
12
                 THE COURT: All right. In addition to whatever you
13
      may have set up with him, also the Zoom technology allows for
14
       you to make a request to talk in private with your counsel, and
15
       that my courtroom deputy can put you and him in a separate
16
      virtual breakout room in which no one else can hear or see
17
      what's going on. So if at any point you want to have that sort
18
       of private conversation with him during the hearing, just ask
19
       and we'll go ahead and do that.
20
                 DEFENDANT BARNARD: Thank you, sir.
21
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Witcher, do you also consent?
22
                 DEFENDANT WITCHER: I do, Your Honor.
23
                 THE COURT: Okay. And you're comfortable with the
24
      videoconference equipment that you have available to you?
25
                 DEFENDANT WITCHER: Yes, sir, I am.
```

1 THE COURT: The Court finds that the use of the VTC 2 is necessary because it is not practical to appear in person 3 and proceeding by VTC today is justified because the interests of justice will be harmed without a prompt hearing. And the 4 5 defendants, after consultation with counsel, have consented to 6 proceeding in this fashion. 7 All right. Do the parties have a preference as to what order we go here? 8 9 MR. BASSETT: Up to you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 MR. SALINAS: No preference, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: So let's start -- let's start with 13 Mr. Barnard then. 14 All right. Mr. Barnard and Mr. Salinas, have you reviewed the presentence report as revised following the 15 16 defense and the government's submissions? 17 MR. SALINAS: We have, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: And any additional objections? 19 MR. SALINAS: No additional objections, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Per the Federal Rule of Criminal 21 Procedure 32(i)(3)(A), the Court will accept the presentence 22 report as its findings of fact on issues not in dispute. 23 The defendant has pled quilty to a Class B misdemeanor 24 to which the sentencing guidelines do not apply. Therefore, I 25 will assess and determine the proper sentence in this case by

reference to and in consideration of all the relevant factors pursuant to the sentencing statute at 18 U.S.C. 3553(a).

The defendant has pled guilty to Count 5 of the information; that is, parading, demonstrating, or picketing in a Capitol Building in violation of 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G). The defendant has no criminal history. The maximum term of imprisonment for this offense is six months, and the maximum fine is \$5,000.

Would the government like to address the Court regarding sentencing?

MR. REGAN: It would, Your Honor. And the government intended on allocuting for both at the same time. I don't know if -- if the Court would prefer that for equity -- or for time equity purposes.

THE COURT: I'd just as soon do them separately because one of them has guidelines and the other one doesn't, and this one is going to be a little bit shorter. We'll just get this one out of the way and do the other, which raises -- I mean, your question -- or your statement raises a good question.

And clarify for me a little bit why these two defendants that essentially did everything together were treated somewhat differently as to what charge they pled to. I don't have any insight on that.

MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor. So in -- in this case,

the original indictment -- or the only indictment, Mr. Witcher was charged with 1512(c)(2), which, as this Court knows, is a felony, based on some of his conduct inside the building, and Mr. Barnard was not. Mr. Barnard was charged solely with misdemeanors throughout the pendency of this case, which is why in terms of plea -- the plea scheme that the government has.

Because Mr. Witcher was given the benefit of not having to plead to that sole felony, he was asked to plead to the 1752 offense. Where Mr. Barnard was given the choice of the misdemeanor offenses, which I'm sure, as the Court is well aware now, most of them are pleading to the 1504(e)(2)(G). So that's the distinction of the charges, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And what were the -- what were the actions inside the Capitol Building that led to a felony charge?

MR. REGAN: So for Mr. Witcher inside the building, as the government described, there's -- there were several videos that he himself took, which included him participating in chants and yelling at law enforcement officers, which I'm happy to elaborate during his allocution, making statements, either berating law enforcement officers or participating in some of the fervor inside the building that Mr. Barnard, quite frankly, was just not captured doing any of.

THE COURT: Okay. So it's not necessarily a matter that they did anything different; it's just a matter of what

evidence you had?

MR. REGAN: Well, I think it is -- it is a matter of doing things differently, Your Honor. They both entered the building. Once inside the building, based on the evidence that's available to the government, Mr. Barnard was more of a -- I don't want to call it passive, but there's no video of him yelling at law enforcement officers, participating in chants, things like that inside the crypt that Mr. Witcher is captured doing. So the distinction is really what they did once they entered the building.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, my question is a little bit more nuanced than that. Is it that you don't think he did any of those things, or you don't have videos of him doing any of those things?

MR. REGAN: Your Honor, at this point the government doesn't believe he did any of those things with respect to Mr. Barnard.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right. So go ahead and continue with your allocution with respect to Mr. Barnard then.

MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor. And, again, I'm not going to belabor the point in our sentencing memorandum. I think a good place for the Court to start, though, when fashioning appropriate sentences in these cases is on a, sort of, macro scale, and that's looking at January 6th at large.

And then, ultimately, which is the Court's obligation, is taking a look at what this individual defendant did that day and then balancing them, which is something the government has been trying to do too for equity purposes.

So from that lens, like we've noted, what happened on January 6th is unquestionably one of the darkest moments in modern American democracy. We all watched -- and the world watched -- you know, on CNN and Fox News and across the world as the building that is sort of the foundation and the pillar of our democracy was breached by mobs of rioters, thousands of people, with violence, destruction, theft, and the building was overrun. And it was happening live on television for the world to see, and it is certainly a stain on America and American democracy.

Now, on a macro scale, that included things like law enforcement officers, you know, being hurt, abused. People died that day. There was over a million dollars in damage to the building. All of these things as rioters -- we watched on television -- traipsed around the building as if they're on a sightseeing tour, when very clearly they were not supposed to be there, and it was very obvious that they knew that.

Against that backdrop, with respect to Mr. Barnard, the government has made great effort to create a sentencing plan where we are not only addressing the individual defendant but trying to address defendants that did similar things and

getting them similar plea agreements and a sentencing allocution scheme.

With respect to Mr. Barnard, he entered the building that day, which is a distinction between him and several other rioters that day. There were a lot of people on Capitol grounds that day or in D.C. that day that chose not to go into the U.S. Capitol Building. That is a big distinction among rioters that day. And, unfortunately, he was one of the ones that did enter the building.

To be fair, Mr. Barnard did not participate in any violence. There is no indication that he shouted at law enforcement officers, participated in chants, or anything like that, but the government believes it is a big deal that he actually entered the building. And he entered the building at a time when it was volatile. There was violence occurring all over the Capitol Building, and not necessarily just where Mr. Barnard was or where he was at the time. But he was part of a mob of people that entered the building and ultimately made it into the crypt.

And as you've read in the government and defense sentencing memorandums, the crypt was a particularly volatile -- at a particular volatile moment in time. They entered in there and the police were severely outnumbered, just like they were everywhere else in the Capitol that day. The numbers of -- you know, 10, 15 to 1, rioters to law

enforcement. And they came in that day in droves. It wasn't just Mr. Witcher and Mr. Barnard that came in through -- into the crypt at that point in time.

There was hundreds and hundreds of people piling into the crypt and the surrounding areas, like the rotunda, which had a tremendous impact not only on the officers there, but law enforcement's ability to actually get the scene under control, which took hours after that, roughly six hours, until they were able to get the building secure again.

Now, Mr. Witcher -- or excuse me. Mr. Barnard, like I said, wasn't shouting, wasn't screaming, didn't hurt anybody, but I wouldn't call him a passive participant on January 6th.

Going inside the building was a knowing act. He was there with -- surrounded by other people, including Mr. Witcher, who were screaming at law enforcement, calling them traitors, telling them to remember their oath, things like that, and he was still there.

Now, he's certainly not the worst offender on January 6th. I don't think anybody would disagree with that fact, but putting it in the backdrop of January 6th at large and Mr. Barnard's actions that day, it matters. And what happened that day matters.

Now, the government also addressed in our sentencing memorandum, there are mitigating factors in this case, and the government doesn't hide from those because they are notable.

With respect to Mr. Barnard and Mr. Witcher, they both came to the aid of law enforcement inside the crypt that day.

THE COURT: What evidence do you have of that, other than their statements?

MR. REGAN: So, Your Honor, we actually corroborated that on our end through the FBI. We've actually identified that officer, like Mr. Salinas noted in the sentencing memorandum from the defense. And that officer corroborated that event. Along with Mr. Barnard and Mr. Witcher, there was a handful of others, as officers were being overrun, that sort of formed like a picket fence around them to prevent them from being trampled. And that is notable, and that is why the government points it out.

I think it's also notable that they didn't take part in any violence. They did not destroy any property or steal anything, all of those things that the government has addressed in the sentencing memorandum.

They were fully compliant with law enforcement. They provided voluntary interviews. And one thing I do want to address, Mr. Salinas pointed out, is that the government used as an aggravating factor military service. And to a certain extent, the government does believe that is an aggravating factor because based on the training and experience that those gentlemen have, you would expect to hold them to a higher standard.

I think it is also worth noting as a fellow veteran, that is not to say that -- and a fellow Marine, that is not to say that the government doesn't also concede that military service is admirable, and it's certainly something that cuts both ways, but I just wanted to put that on the record.

THE COURT: But let me ask you this question about that point. You know, obviously some of the allegations against some of the Oath Keepers, it seemed like they used their military training on that day. It doesn't seem to me that these two are in that same category. It doesn't seem like they used their military training to -- for anything on that day. Would you agree with that?

MR. REGAN: I would agree with that, Your Honor. There's no suggestion by the government that they used any military tactics or training to breach the building or -- you know, we've all heard of the stacks and things like that. There is no indication that either of these defendants did that. The suggestion from the government is just that as being prior Marines and prior Army soldiers, that we would expect to hold them to a higher standard and expect them to know that a secure facility like this is not somewhere that they can just breach and traipse around like sightseers, but I think it is worth pointing out that the government doesn't just consider that an aggravating factor.

So with respect to Mr. Barnard, Your Honor, his case is

obviously a little bit more clear-cut in terms of the facts.

That's why we're asking for 30 days of home confinement, the

60 hours of community service, the 36 months of probation, and

the \$500 of restitution agreed upon in the plea agreement.

One final note. I think that the -- the selfie-style photograph of these two individuals inside the building is sort of telling or a microcosm of that day. It would make one believe, if they didn't know any better, that these gentlemen, along with all these other rioters, were on a sightseeing tour, except that they're inside the United States Capitol as it's being violently breached by thousands of people, which is offensive to most Americans and American democracy.

So for all those purposes, Your Honor, that's why we're asking for that sentence for Mr. Barnard.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Salinas.

MR. SALINAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

And I will try to, kind of, truncate or have my statements be as brief as possible but at the same time address some of the things that the government addressed here today. I did file my sentencing memorandum and a response to the government's sentencing memorandum, which is -- you know, kind of, gives the backdrop of what we're asking for today and what we're asking the Court to consider.

You know, the government does have a difficult job;

there is -- this is -- just by the sheer massive number of defendants in this case, to try to come up with a sentencing scheme for all these individuals and, kind of, place them into categories. I know you've addressed the Oath Keepers as far as, you know, people that are at the high end of that spectrum that caused violence towards officers and destruction.

At the very far end of that spectrum is Mr. Barnard who I don't think fits into any of the categories that the -- this Court or any of the other courts have sentenced so far. I believe the unique individual circumstances in his case present -- are by far unique and extraordinary. There is evidence -- looking at the evidence provided in discovery, somebody could spend a career or a lifetime going through the sheer amounts of discovery.

But the -- the government did provide the specific discovery and recordings and interviews that are addressed to Mr. Barnard, and those indicate and show that the resistance that they met was not until they had entered into the Capitol and they're in the crypt. There's minutes before violence starts occurring. And I think that's evident in the selfie that Mr. Witcher took, is that you see officers behind them, kind of, just milling around.

At some point when the large group of individuals start rioting, Mr. Barnard and Mr. Witcher make it a point to try to calm people down and then use themselves as human shields. So

I would say that it's actually that their military experience helped officers that day and that they did not run the other way, they did not lose sight of their convictions, lose sight of who they are, and they said, "Hey, this is not right. This is wrong." And they tried to help officers.

As soon as they made sure that those officers were safe -- and I did identify that officer in my sentencing memorandum -- then they exited the building and realized that's not what we're here for. And I think that's quite telling for Mr. Barnard, is that his story throughout this -- and his version of the events -- have been consistent from the day that he voluntarily called the FBI and met with them and interviewed with them. It is the same story that he said throughout from his point of view.

Now, once he was confronted with, hey, look, people caused destruction, people died, people attacked officers, he realized that at that point he was part of something that was bigger and realized at that point that's not who he was. And he agreed that this was a stain on democracy, and he agreed that these events will forever be linked to him. But at that point, there's nothing he can do other than keep apologizing, keep trying to be remorseful, and show regret, but that has been consistent.

I had the privilege of meeting Mr. Barnard at his initial appearance here in the Austin division when he was

arrested and detained overnight. And when I met him, the first thing he says, "I want to plead guilty. I don't want to fight this. I want to accept responsibility for my actions." And, ultimately, that's what the Court has to do today.

They have to look at his individual actions, and I understand that there's a backdrop of hundreds of other defendants in one of the largest, I guess, events in our history. But at the same time, the 3553(a) factors, which the Court has to consider, are looking at his individual acts and his individual circumstances. They are unique.

And we are asking that -- any term of home -- home confinement or home detention would ultimately cause

Mr. Barnard, who is the sole provider to his wife and children, to lose his job. Prior to January 6th, Mr. Barnard had never lost a job. He'd never been fired from a job. He had never been unemployed. He had never been arrested. He had never been charged with a crime. All of that changed January 6th, and he knows that, and that's the burden that he has to bear.

I understand he is quite nervous today, more nervous for his family's sake. He asked that I address this Court. I know he is -- he's willing to answer any questions that this Court has, and I have no doubt he will have the same version of events that he did when he met with officers on his own accord back in January.

He -- and I, kind of, highlighted that -- some of his

statements to officers that day in my sentencing memorandum where he indicated to them, "My worst fear is that this will follow me for the rest of my life." And I think it will. It will follow him for the rest of his life. But at the same time, he was afraid he would lose his job. That came true. He lost his job. He was unable -- due to the media attention of this case, you know.

He was originally indicted -- or originally charged by complaint with the misdemeanor offenses and also he was indicted on those misdemeanors only. But the agents came and told him, "Don't worry. You've been cooperative with us.

We're not going to come and arrest you. We'll give you an opportunity to self-surrender." That wasn't true. He was arrested at work late in the afternoon. They coordinated an arrest of him where he was in front of his coworkers where he was a home builder. He lost that job due to that public arrest.

And he's not trying to blame anyone. He's just trying to show factually that any sort of home confinement would ultimately cost him another job.

THE COURT: Mr. Salinas, can you explain that to me?

The way -- the way we do home confinement, at least in this district, is that individuals are allowed to work during the period of home confinement. Why do you think he would lose his job if he was subjected to, let's say, the 30 days the

government is asking for?

MR. SALINAS: Well, it's my understanding -- I guess in my division, home confinement means you can't leave. You are -- you're on monitor. You're at home. You cannot come and go as you please. And that's why I'm making this -- this assessment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So if we used our traditional home confinement here, which allows people to leave for purposes of work and church services and medical appointments and the like -- they can't just go out to, you know, get a beer after work -- do you think the fact that he has an ankle monitor on would cause him to lose his job?

MR. SALINAS: I don't believe so, Judge. But I think that the fact and circumstances of his case do not warrant that extra supervision based on the -- and I guess I should have started off with this. My client from the get-go did not want to point fingers, did not want to say, "Hey, look at what this person got and look at what this person did." He said, "I want to be held accountable for what I did that day."

But when we have these schemes -- these sentencing schemes, we have to point and look at others that have been sentenced or similarly situated. I don't believe anybody is as similarly situated as Mr. Barnard and Mr. Witcher. I have not seen in any of the evidence, I have not seen in any prior sentencings where individuals who were charged with crimes

actually came to the aid of officers. So I think in that respect, he is unique and different. And that's why I believe -- I don't believe further supervision is -- would be required to meet the -- the 3553(a) factors.

I believe -- and that's why we were asking for a time-served sentence. But at the end of the day, Mr. Barnard informed me -- and I think he'll inform the Court too -- that he respects this Court's decision. But we are asking that if -- if -- if His Honor does not feel that a time-served sentence is appropriate, that further supervision is needed, that we believe that 12 months without a period of home detention, home confinement would be sufficient based on him being on, essentially, supervision this last year without any hiccups or without any -- any concern.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Barnard, do you wish to address the Court?

DEFENDANT BARNARD: I don't know what else to say.

I've lost a six-figure job. I've had my bank account shut down. I can't cosign for my own daughter's apartment with a 750 credit rating because my bank of 30 years with a home loan shut me down and -- and put on my credit rating the words derogatory public record, like I'm some kind of criminal or terrorist or drug dealer. I -- I had to get my in-laws to cosign my own daughter's apartment.

I've lost -- I say I've lost everything. I have lost a

career that I've worked my tail off for decades. I lost a six-figure income, and I'm working for half -- less than half what I was making before. My retirement is gone. My savings are gone. There is nothing that the Court can do to me at this point that will even come close to what I have lost. Nothing.

If this is to prove a point that I shouldn't have been there, I get it. I got it. What -- the only thing I have left -- and I've got property taxes coming in for \$7,000 that I don't have and I'm trying to muster up. There is nothing that the Court can do to me that is worse than what I've done.

I went from my saying this has ruined me, they've ruined me, they've ruined me -- I came to a realization about -- it was about two months ago. I said, "Nobody's ruined me."

They've ruined my career. This is -- not they. This has ruined my career. It has not ruined me. I've got my wife, I have my kids, and I have my friends and my family all standing behind me who know who I am.

Did I do something wrong? Yes. Did I know I couldn't be there? This is what kicks my tail is that I did not have the self-awareness, the situational awareness to understand what was going on. I have videos on my phone where people walked onto the Capitol grounds. There were people everywhere. I spent the entire morning trying to find anyone who wasn't 6-foot-3 200-pound white male to talk to that day, just wanted to talk to people about why they were there. That's all I was

doing was taking video.

I happen to be at the very top front when somebody yelled, "We're going in." There was no way -- we fought our way getting out of that building, getting called every name in the book as we left that building. I mean, they cussed us up one side and down the other as we fought our way through that crowd still piling into that building to get out of there, after we got those officers to safety.

There was half a dozen of them in the crypt, maybe eight of them. We formed a barrier -- it was me, Shane, and at least one other man -- stood in front of the crowd, and that crowd knew -- because of, once again, our military experience, they knew they weren't going to touch those officers. Period.

That's the first time I saw officers, first time I knew I wasn't supposed to be there.

We asked those officers after we got behind them, "Do you have a place to go?" They said yes. "Go there now. We will take your six." We took their six back to another area where there was about a dozen more. Instantly, Shane and I both scanned for is anybody injured, is anybody hurt, anybody needing assistance. The worst we saw was a raspberry on the left check of one officer and a lot of tired, very tired, scared officers. We walked around to them, shook hands, told them we're sorry, this is not what this was all about. It never was supposed to be this, asked them how we get out of

there. And two of them helped us out of there.

That was the first time I saw a broken window. This -I hung my head going, my God, what has happened here? We
walked out of that place. We got out of that little window and
went through the crowd, and we were called every name in the
book as we got off that property. And halfway back to my
hotel, my wife texted me and said, "Somebody's been killed."

"No, they haven't. Just a bunch of people being stupid."

We got back to the hotel and found out what had gone on, just -- we were appalled. There was nothing we could say or do. I mean, we're -- we're done. We knew right then. We're done.

I went back to work, tried to live my life. My bosses didn't -- they tried to cover up for me, but when the FBI surrounded that building, my -- my work, with a full-on SWAT team and took me out of there -- they walked through the door and shoved me around like I never would have done an officer, not in my wildest dreams. Took me out of my place of work and put my arms in handcuffs and put me in a car and took me out of there. That's what got me fired.

The owners of the company found out and knew my name because I was the most awarded builder for my builder in the two and a half years I've been with them. I have plaques, T-shirts, tools, dress shirts. They were trying to find what

to give me to award me. They didn't want me gone, but the owners found out, and it was done. They came down from Dallas and fired me on the spot on April 22.

And I was out of work for months because nobody would hire me. My friend who owns a roofing company needed someone. He needed me more than anybody's ever needed me, but he can't afford to pay what I was being paid. So he --

Again, all I can tell you is there's nothing that the Court can do to me to make it worse. If you put me on detention, fine. I get it. I get it. But there's nothing you can do to make it worse than what I've already gone through. It's just going to be -- drag it out until it's over with.

I have a plan for starting my own business one day, but it's going to take a year after this ends before I can get the license I need. I can't have probation on this for a license. I can't have whatever is going to go on. So that's all I've got to say. There's nothing I can do to change it, and nothing I can say to change whatever y'all are going to do to me.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So let's start with the financial issues. The parties have agreed to an amount of restitution, which is \$500, paid to the Clerk of the Court to be forwarded to the Architect of the Capitol. The maximum fine available is \$5,000, although probation has indicated he has an inability to pay. I'm not going to impose a fine given the financial strain getting fired

has put on that family.

The Court is to impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set forth in the subsection. I'm to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant, impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, and provides just punishment for the offense.

Of course, the offense is serious. A number of my colleagues have spoken eloquently about this. Defendant took part in the mob riot that took place at the Capitol on January 6th, 2021. Many of the rioters engaged in violence and some destroyed property. I've watched numerous videos of rioters engaging in hand-to-hand combat with police officials. It was not a peaceful event. More than a hundred law enforcement officers were injured on that day. Moreover, the Capitol sustained almost \$1.5 million in property damage. Many of the rioters intended to block the certification of the votes for President Joe Biden, and although the rioters failed to block that certification, they delayed it for several hours.

The security breach forced lawmakers to hide inside the House gallery until they could be evacuated to undisclosed locations. In short, the rioters' actions threatened the peaceful transfer of power and a direct attack on our nation's democracy.

With that said, no evidence has been presented that shows defendant assaulting law enforcement or destroying property. After entering the Capitol Building through an entrance at which law enforcement had been overwhelmed a short time beforehand, the defendant entered with his codefendant, made their way to the rotunda, and remained inside for a period of about 15 to 20 minutes.

The riot was successful in delaying the certification, in large part, because of the numbers of participants involved, which simply overwhelmed the outnumbered law enforcement officers present. Regardless of the defendant's intentions, because he contributed to those numbers, he has to be held accountable for his actions and the results to which his actions contributed.

However, evidence has been presented that the codefendants helped shield law enforcement officers in the rotunda when the tenor of the interactions began turning violent. That is to their credit.

The defendant also destroyed electronic evidence on his cell phone that could not be recovered by the FBI. Subsequent to January 6th, however, he voluntarily cooperated fully with the FBI, submitting to an interview and a search of his phone and pleading guilty at the earliest opportunity.

Otherwise, defendant has no criminal history. He's a 56-year-old man with some college education. He served in the

Marines and served during wartime, although the details of his discharge are unclear. Since that discharge, he appears to have been gainfully employed for the majority of his adult life. Otherwise, defendant's background is not particularly remarkable.

His parents divorced when he was young, but there's no indication that his material needs were not provided for. He lived with his father who was reported to be a successful businessman. Tragically, his father took his life after experiencing financial difficulties, but this occurred after defendant was an independent adult. Mr. Barnard is married with children and appears to have a strong family support system in place.

The Court is to impose a sentence that affords adequate deterrence of criminal conduct, protects the public from further crimes of the defendant. The events of January 6th involved a rather unprecedented confluence of events spurred by then President Trump and a number of his prominent allies who bear much responsibility for what occurred on that date. Since Mr. Barnard's arrest, he seems to have done well while on release status, and the Court is confident that given his lack of prior criminal history and lack of a violent past he's unlikely to reoffend, will not be emotionally swept up in irrational actions, and will not be a risk to the public.

With respect to general deterrence, the Court does not

believe that incarceration or a lengthy home confinement is necessary to deter other nonviolent protesters from crossing the line into lawbreaking. The defendant's ordeal through the criminal justice system, restitution, community service, and probation with limited home confinement should serve as an adequate deterrence to those who can be deterred.

The Court is to impose a sentence that provides the defendant with needed educational and vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. Nothing with respect to this has been brought to my attention. And I'm to consider the kinds of sentences available. Given the nature of the crime and the defendant's lack of criminal history, this Court is only considering a period of probation that contains limited restrictions and imposes home confinement for a short period of time.

The Court is to impose a sentence that reflects the sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines. The Court is cognizant that the guidelines do not apply. No pertinent policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission have been brought to my attention. The Court is to impose a sentence that avoids unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct.

The government has provided a chart that lists a number of January 6th defendant sentencings. There is not enough granular information there to make apt comparisons. However, the list does make it clear that the government has recommended noncustodial home confinement probation sentences in a number of these cases. The Court finds it hard to distinguish this case from those.

I already dealt with the \$500 restitution to which the parties agreed.

I'll now indicate the sentence to be imposed, but counsel will have one more opportunity to make any legal objections before the sentence is imposed.

Mr. Salinas, do you have any objections to the factors I'm considering?

MR. SALINAS: Judge, not -- there's not any legal objections, but I did also want to point out, I know a number of other defendants who have been sentenced by the courts after they were initially arrested posted on social media and tried to minimize the situation. Mr. Barnard did none of that. There were no postings by him before nor after. At any point he has not tried to minimize or mitigate what actually happened on January 6th. So I wanted to point that out.

So I wanted to point out that, essentially, the -the -- what we are asking for would be different -- is actually
something difficult to do, but I think the specific factors

that Mr. Barnard's case presents actually -- I don't believe that would be an unwarranted sentencing disparity. I believe it would be warranted for him to -- to be given something different than what has already happened to other defendants.

THE COURT: I understand that. I mean, the reality is that the -- for defendants such as your client, the going rate seems to be the government is now requesting incarceration. So I think the fact that they're requesting just home confinement is -- takes into consideration all those factors. And I certainly take it all into consideration.

Mr. Regan, do you have any objections to any of the factors I'm considering?

MR. REGAN: I do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It is the judgment of the Court that you,
Richard Franklin Barnard, are hereby sentenced to serve a

12-month term of probation on Count 5, and the term of
probation shall include a one-month term of home confinement,
location monitoring, which I'll explain shortly.

You are further ordered to pay a special assessment of \$10 by statute. As I indicated, I'm going to waive the fine given the period of unemployment your family suffered and the reduction in income that resulted thereafter. The special assessment and -- is payable to the Clerk of the Court and -- as well as the restitution to the Architect of the Capitol in the amount of \$500. Within 30 days of any change of address,

you shall notify the Clerk of the Court until such time as the financial obligation is paid in full.

While on supervision, you shall not use or possess an illegal controlled substance, and you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended based on the Court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse. You shall also abide by the general conditions of supervision adopted by the U.S. Probation Office, which will be set forth in the judgment and commitment order, as well as the following special conditions:

Location monitoring. You shall be monitored by radiofrequency or GPS monitoring at the discretion of the probation office supervising you, and you shall abide by all the technology requirements for a period of one month. So the monitoring restricts your movement in the community and restricts you to your residence at all times except for employment; education; religious services; medical, substance abuse, or mental health treatment; attorney visits; court appearances; or court-ordered obligations, which includes the community service; or other activities as preapproved by the probation office.

With respect -- I -- because there are some amounts outstanding, including the restitution, there's some financial disclosure requirements that come with it, but to the extent

1 that you pay those things up front, you won't have to deal with 2 those things. So I -- to the extent you can, I would advise 3 you to pay them up front. All right. Counsel, Mr. Salinas, other than those 4 5 things previously argued, do you have any objection to 6 imposition of the sentence as just stated? 7 MR. SALINAS: Judge, I don't think I heard -- you may have said it. How many hours of community service? 8 9 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Sixty hours of community 10 service to complete -- to be completed within the six months. 11 MR. SALINAS: Okay. THE COURT: I apologize for that omission. 12 13 MR. SALINAS: And -- and I did have one more 14 question, and I know we raised it previously to the Court, but 15 we were waiting for the sentence to address again. Because 16 this is a misdemeanor or a petty offense, he's not precluded by 17 law of possessing firearms. But I understand that's the 18 standard condition for probation for someone who is on a 19 misdemeanor or felony. 20 But Mr. Barnard is an avid hunter, which he hunts 21 seasonally to provide food for his family. We are asking for a 22 special exception where he would report if he's hunting, to 23 have possession while -- for hunting purposes with permission 24 from his probation officer, if the Court could make that

25

finding.

```
1
                 THE COURT: So possession for purposes of hunting
      with permission from probation?
2
 3
                 MR. SALINAS: Correct, Your Honor. So he would have
       to, essentially -- once -- he'd have to get permission from his
 4
 5
      probation officer, you know, provided that he give the
 6
       information of who he would be hunting with and what hunting
 7
       season in order to -- to maintain that Second Amendment right.
 8
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Regan, do you have any
 9
       opposition to that?
10
                 MR. REGAN: Your Honor, the government does oppose
11
       that. I think that that's a slippery slope in terms of
12
       individual defendants. So I will just put on the record the
13
      government opposes that request.
14
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Salinas, I'm amenable to that
15
       request. I would like to talk to probation -- our probation
16
       folks before I do that, but I don't -- I personally have no
17
       objection to that --
18
                 MR. SALINAS: Okay.
19
                 THE COURT: -- requirement. And to the extent I feel
20
       comfortable doing it, I'll include it in the judgment and
21
       commitment order.
22
                 MR. SALINAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
23
                 THE COURT: All right. And I gather that Counts 2,
24
       3, and 4 of the information need to be dismissed; is that
25
       correct, Mr. Regan?
```

MR. REGAN: That's correct, Your Honor. And the government motions the Court to do so.

THE COURT: Okay. I --

THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry, Judge. We can't hear you right now.

THE COURT: I will go ahead and do that, get those counts dismissed.

All right. Mr. Barnard, you were convicted by a plea of guilty. You can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow involuntary or if there's some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that were not waived by your guilty plea. Your guilty plea did waive a number of your appellate rights. So if you're inclined to appeal, go ahead and discuss that with your counsel. You also have a statutory right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances to the extent not waived by your guilty plea. So I would consult on those as well.

And to the extent you do choose to appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis -- that means without the payment of costs -- if you request and qualify. The clerk can help you prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf, although I note that you're represented by able counsel that can assist you in that process. But most importantly, with few exceptions, any notice of appeal has to be filed within 14 days of the entry of the judgment. It's a

```
1
       Friday afternoon. So it's -- the judgment will not be entered
2
       today, but presumably it will be entered early next week.
 3
       14 days from that point, to the extent you choose to appeal.
              Now, the probation office has requested that I transfer
 4
 5
       jurisdiction of the supervision to the Western District of
       Texas. Is that the right district?
 6
 7
                 MR. SALINAS: That is, Your Honor.
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Any objection to that
10
       transfer?
                 DEFENDANT BARNARD: None.
11
12
                 MR. SALINAS: None from Mr. Barnard.
13
                 MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor.
14
                 THE COURT: I'll go ahead and fill out the paperwork
       to get that transfer made.
15
16
              Anything else we need to get resolved with respect to
17
      Mr. Barnard?
18
                 MR. REGAN: Nothing from the government, Your Honor.
19
                 MR. SALINAS: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
20
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Barnard, you're welcome
21
       to stay on and see how your friend fares, or you can take
22
       Friday afternoon off, whatever your pleasure is.
23
                 DEFENDANT BARNARD: I'll quietly hang on. Thank you.
24
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Witcher, are you ready?
25
                 DEFENDANT WITCHER: I am, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Defendant, Mr. Witcher, and defense counsel, have you reviewed the presentence report as revised following the defense and the government's submissions?

MR. BASSETT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Any additional objections?

MR. BASSETT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32(i)(3)(A), the Court will accept the presentence report as its findings of fact on issues not in dispute.

This case, contrary to the prior one, falls within the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 under which Congress created the Sentencing Commission which has issued detailed guidelines for judges such as myself to consider in determining the sentence in a criminal case like this. The commission has set those ranges in the *Guidelines Manual*, but in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Booker*, the guidelines are not mandatory; they're advisory. But they must be consulted by the Court in determining the appropriate sentence in a case.

Therefore, I will assess and determine the proper sentence in this case by reference to and in consideration of the guidelines in the first instance, but the guidelines will be treated as advisory, not mandatory, and there's no presumption that the guidelines sentence is the correct sentence. The guidelines will be considered, along with all the other relevant factors under 18 U.S.C. 3553(a).

1 Defendant has pled guilty to a Class A misdemeanor, 2 which is Count 2, entering and remaining in a restricted 3 building or grounds in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1). 4 Using -- as reflected in the presentence report, using 5 the 2021 Guidelines Manual, base offense level is 4. There's a 6 2-upward adjustment for trespass occurring in a restricted 7 building, which results in an adjusted offense level of 6. There's a two-level decrease for clear demonstration of 8 9 acceptance of responsibility, which brings it to a total 10 offense level of 4. Defendant has no criminal history, which 11 puts him in Criminal History Category I. The guidelines range 12 for imprisonment based on a total offense level of 4 and a 13 criminal history category of I is zero to six months. 14 Any objections to those calculations? 15 MR. BASSETT: No, Your Honor. 16 MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. As I've said, under Booker 18 the guidelines are advisory in this case but will be considered 19 fully by the Court, along with the other relevant factors under 20 the sentencing statute. 21 Would the government like to address the Court regarding 22 Mr. Witcher? MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor. 23 24 And, Your Honor, I'll ask how the Court wants to do it. 25 So there are a couple of videos I plan on playing that I can

share my screen with, that I indicated in the sentencing memorandum. I'm happy to allocute before I play them and go after.

THE COURT: I've watched everything that has been submitted to the Court, but if you want to play them, I'm happy to watch them again.

MR. REGAN: In -- in that -- if that's the case, Your Honor, then I'll save the Court the time.

So like I said earlier, with respect to Mr. Witcher, he is somewhat differently situated than Mr. Barnard was. They traveled together. They entered the building together, and many of the actions they took that day were either similar or exactly the same. Notably, for Mr. Witcher, he also participated with Mr. Barnard in coming to the aid of officer -- one of the U.S. Capitol police officers, which the government has noted in its sentencing memorandum and I've spoken exhaustively with Mr. Bassett about as well.

The major distinction here and why the government is asking for more home detention is what Mr. Witcher does once inside the building. Once inside the building, you can tell that he's somewhat emotional about entering the building. I would describe it as jubilant. And then when he first encounters law enforcement officers in the crypt, although not violent, he certainly has words for them, things like: "Do or die"; "Respect your oath"; "Don't be a traitor"; "Fulfill your

constitutional duties"; which, words on their own, are perhaps menacing but certainly not violent. But like the government said earlier, you have to take that under the construct of what's happening on January 6th inside that building.

Now, he is among throngs of rioters screaming at these law enforcement officers, telling them to do what they want them to do, which is not what their oath requires, which is not what their duties require. And when you take that into account, it's not surprising that in the crypt when Mr. Witcher is there, violence breaks out because he is among many that are harassing these officers, following these officers, screaming at these officers. So although he does come to the aid of an officer, he's also part of the mob in there, much more so than Mr. Barnard, contributing to what ultimately leads to violence. That is in no way to suggest that he is responsible for the violence of others in terms of putting hands on officers or anything like that.

But it is certainly not as benign as Mr. Barnard's presence in the U.S. Capitol that day, and that's -- I apologize, Your Honor. I thought you spoke. That's really the notable distinction.

He's cooperative with law enforcement, just like

Mr. Barnard was. He provides a voluntary interview. He gives

access to his phone. He also did delete some items from his

phone before the FBI could get their hands on it, but

ultimately the distinction is, like the Court pointed out earlier, just the sheer number of people is something for the Court to consider because that is what enabled January 6th to become the day that it was.

And then you can separate those into classes of people where are they just a number or are they sort of a force multiplier because of how they're acting and the words that they're saying while they're inside the building. I think Mr. Witcher falls into the category of a force multiplier because he is saying things and doing things that are encouraging others to act in a similar fashion.

Mr. Barnard being there is problematic. Mr. Witcher being there and saying the things that he says are more problematic. And it's for those reasons that the government believes he deserves a more severe sentence than Mr. Barnard, and we think that 60 days' home confinement, in addition to the same conditions the Court imposed on Mr. Barnard -- we would ask for more probation as well. We've asked for 36 months -- are appropriate.

And I think the Court aptly pointed out in looking at analogous cases that the going rate for some of these cases is confinement. And the government, although -- went back and forth, ultimately didn't ask for confinement because some of the mitigating factors were strong enough. Like I've told Mr. Bassett, that based on his criminal history, his

background, that we don't believe incarceration is necessary in order to deter him, but we do think a more severe sentence than that of Mr. Barnard is necessary for both general and specific deterrence.

So for those reasons, Your Honor, the government is asking for 60 days of home detention to be part of a term of probation of 36 months, to include 60 hours of community service, and the \$500 restitution as agreed upon in the plea agreement.

THE COURT: So I understand your argument about the differentiation between Mr. Witcher and Mr. Barnard with respect to the aggravating factors, but as far as the mitigating factors, Mr. Witcher has an incredible military record for which he's paid a tremendous price. How should I factor that in?

MR. REGAN: Well, Your Honor, that's something that I think the government has considered. Like I said, as a fellow veteran, I think that is an extremely mitigating factor. I also think there's also some aggravating to it, and I did read in the -- the presentence report, as someone sort of familiar with it, what that jargon means. He does have a distinguished military career. And if memory serves, it was actually two branches of the military, both in the Marine Corps and the Army.

And -- and I think it's certainly something for the

Court to consider, and I think where it's appropriately considered is when the government made the decision not to act for -- to ask for an active incarceration sentence, which other similarly situated defendants are facing and he is facing as a Class A misdemeanor. I think that's where that should appropriately be considered, which the government has also considered when fashioning what we believe would be an appropriate recommendation for the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me see if I have any other questions.

All right. Mr. Bassett.

MR. BASSETT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. BASSETT: There are -- I'm going to do my best,
Your Honor, not to repeat what's already been discussed at this
hearing with Mr. Barnard's case. I may have some overlap.

I think there's some distinguishing -- obviously

Mr. Witcher will tell you he regrets yelling inside the

Capitol. One of the things he yelled, just to show you the

kind of emotion that he was dealing with, was he said, "We're

in the White House." I don't know what the interaction between

his PTSD and this situation was, but it was obviously something

he regrets very much. And in my own sentencing memorandum, I

talk about the remorse he has for contributing in any way to

the -- the atmosphere that became really terrible, upon

entering into the Capitol. So he'll talk to you about that.

He -- he also -- Mr. Witcher, inside the Capitol, he will tell you he felt badly when he saw the eyes of the police officers. He felt badly. He saw the fear in their eyes, and it reminded him of soldiers under his command. And he -- he felt like he needed to do what he could to protect them at some point. Obviously, those are two, kind of, inconsistent themes, yelling, you know, at the onset; and yet then when he sees the officers, he -- a new emotion is injected in his brain.

And he realizes I've got to protect these young men from -- from some of these things people are doing, throwing fire extinguishers and things like so. So it's a mixed bag for sure, Your Honor. But I think the -- the yelling was a very temporal, emotional thing, and he came to his senses. Not only did he protect them -- and as Mr. Barnard talked about, they -- they were actually yelled at for leaving. Once the officers were in safety, they left, and -- and he realized that he had done something really wrong, first, by entering the Capitol; second, by participating in any way in any chanting.

But even while in the Capitol, he reversed course and changed his mind and realized I've made a terrible mistake here. I've got to get out of here. First of all, I've got to protect these officers, and then I'm going to get out of here. So I'm not saying that it all erases everything that he did that was wrong, but it certainly mitigates it.

What happens after that, Your Honor, is significant in my mind. He -- he hears somebody in the community say, "The FBI is looking for you." So he calls the FBI agent himself before he is called, and he readily participates with the FBI less than two weeks after January 6th.

He hands them his phone. He admits, "I deleted some of the things." Some of the very evidence used against him today was provided by him voluntarily. He didn't have a lawyer at the time. And he'll tell you what was going through his head at that time was I've made a bad mistake here and I need to help this law enforcement investigation move forward so these guys don't have to do any more work than they have to to -- to understand the situation.

Finally, Your Honor, I -- I would echo what you had brought up, and that is, his service to the country. Although, obviously, in this situation you could say, you know, you should have known better. Two ten-year stints in the military with some fairly hostile tours of duty and combat engagements doesn't excuse his conduct, but I think it should be taken into consideration.

What's extraordinary to me about Mr. Witcher from the first time I met him here in the law office on a weekend, after he had talked to the FBI and after he turned over his phone, is he said, "Look, I'm willing to accept the consequences for what I did. I know I did wrong." And that to me was unusual in a

first interview with a client.

THE COURT: All right. I just have a couple questions for you. I know he doesn't have any criminal history points, but there were -- there's some arrests for assaultive behavior well into his 50s, which raised my eyebrow. Can you shed any light on that?

MR. BASSETT: You know, I -- I can't, but I believe Mr. Witcher would be happy to. I think that some of that may be related to some of his posttraumatic stress disorder issues, but I'm not going to -- I'm not deeply familiar with those situations, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then the other question I had was probation has recommended mental health treatment, but I read that he's already getting some counseling and he may have access to it through the VA. Do you know whether I should order that? Do you have an opinion as to whether I should order additional mental health treatment through probation, or does the VA have him covered?

MR. BASSETT: I believe the VA has him covered,

Your Honor, not only for that but for his post-cancer. He had

prostate cancer, and he's continuing treatments, both -
treatment evaluations for that. So I think he's -- he's very

participatory in VA benefits, and he will continue to do that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Witcher.

DEFENDANT WITCHER: Yes, sir. Would you like me to -- would you like me to answer your question first, or would you like me to just talk?

THE COURT: Just tell me whatever you think I need to know.

DEFENDANT WITCHER: Well, you asked a question about assaultive behavior, and I think I know exactly what you're talking about. I was arrested for domestic violence. However, there's a situation -- it was dismissed. The DA went to the grand jury and told them it needed to be dismissed. And the reason is I had prostate cancer at the time, and I was married to my ex-wife at the time. And I was 100 percent disabled. I had gone through a surgery on my foot to repair two tendons that were ripped in the process of doing my job, and I was undergoing at that point radiation treatment, which was exhaustive, and I went home every day and just pretty much passed out.

Once they started investigating and looking into this, they realized that there was no way -- and doctors affirmed it -- that there was no way I could do what they -- what I was accused of doing that night. Now, the question arises from that: Why would my ex-wife accuse me of that? We've known each other since we were 14 years old. We went to school together and everything.

The bottom line that's come out of this is that she --

we have -- we had tons of mutual friends throughout high school and -- and here in Bastrop, and she didn't want to be the woman who left the person with cancer. She didn't want to be married to a guy with cancer. She thought I was dying. She thought I was terminally ill, and it looked pretty dicey there for a little while. It was pretty bad, prostate cancer. She wanted out, but she didn't want her friends to see that. So she accused me of that. The medical end of the deal bore out that it was completely impossible for me to have done what she accused me of. And the DA said, "I'm going to make sure that this goes away," and he did.

THE COURT: All right. Tell me more about what I should consider in sentencing you for what you did on January 6th.

DEFENDANT WITCHER: Okay, sir. Basically, sir, I -- on January 6th, I went to Washington, D.C., and I made an uncharacteristically bad decision. By uncharacteristically, I mean, I made my living making good and sound decisions that were life and death and often had to make them on the spur of the moment.

I am a passionate person, and I allowed my passion to be interjected into the situation and cause me to make a bad choice, and it was a bad choice to go in there. And I've thought about it. I've had a year to think about it. I've had a year to reflect upon, you know, the -- the pain that it has

caused my family. Every member -- every male member of my family has served in the military, in the Marine Corps, and most have saw combat. And I cast a shadow and cast embarrassment upon my family name and that legacy. And I feel like I let down my son. I could have caused him some embarrassment. But he has stood by me.

And I feel like I -- I let down my countrymen, I let down my fellow veterans, and I let down my wife, my grandson, you know, who counts on me being there for him.

And I -- I wish I could take it back. But I can't, but I've always felt, Your Honor, that the real measure of a man is not that he makes mistakes, because we all -- not mistakes.

That was not a mistake. A mistake is writing -- misspelling a word. I made a really bad choice and a bad decision.

And I've always felt like the measure of a man when he makes a bad decision is the actions that he takes in the aftermath of it and the contrition that he shows for that mistake and the -- and what he does to rectify that situation.

And once I got into that Capitol -- and Mr. Regan is absolutely right. I saw -- there was videos that he referenced, and I am embarrassed with my behavior in there. It was not me, but -- but I did that. Nobody else did it. I did it. I did it. I did it of my own volition, and I regret that deeply. It'll be a stain on my reputation and who I am as a man for the remainder of my life. I cannot take it back.

But what I did to rectify it, in the immediate, was that I went to the aid of those police officers. I looked at those men and I was interacting with them. At one point I was yelling at them, but I began to interact with them. One young man told me, "I'm a veteran just like you." And I said, "I know you are, and I won't let anything happen to you." I saw it in their eyes.

It became, kind of, like my troops in war. And I felt like I had a duty, was incumbent upon me to help these young men and women. There were women there also. And so at that point, Mr. Barnard and I linked arms. We spaced out more. We got these officers into -- behind us. As people would pass, I said, "Don't even look at these officers."

At one point, an officer named Juan Lopez came -- he was -- some other people were out there bringing these young officers in to try to keep them safe, and they saw what we were doing over there, and they brought him to us. Mr. Lopez looked distraught. He looked like a man who was very upset and disappointed that he wasn't able to do his job.

And I looked at him at that point, and I said -- I said,
"Don't worry, Lopez." I said, "You did the best you could do
out here. You got overwhelmed." I said, "Stay here with us."
I said, "We won't let anything happen to you." And then at
some point, those officers were called to another place. We

watched their back. And then Mr. Barnard and I exited the position.

The mitigating factors that I think that I would like to be considered in this have very little to do with me. They have to do with -- I have a son who attends Texas Tech. He goes on my GI bill. And that's seven hours from where I live, and I need to go up there oftentimes because he's only 19, only getting started. So I go up there to help him out.

My -- my mother and my stepfather live about an hour and a half from me. They're both in their 80s, and my mom has battled cancer. And they're both, kind of, in declining health. And my brothers live out of state, and my sister has suffered a stroke so she's unable to help out. So I do go over and help out, you know, my elderly parents.

My grandson lives right around the corner. It's my stepdaughter's son. And I like to be there because I often babysit him whenever he's not in his little Montessori school or things like that. We have a very close relationship.

And, you know, one of the things that really pains me is that my son is my pride and joy. You know, I've always often said my job on this world is to get him to heaven, and I feel like I let him down. I feel like I embarrassed him, and I feel like I potentially could have done something that harmed his ability to get his education.

And my wife has been a tremendous support system for me

throughout this. She's been very -- she wasn't happy with what I did. She wasn't -- but she stood by me and -- and I don't want to let her down.

The one thing that I would like to address, other than that -- and I think Mr. Regan was pretty spot on in his assessment of my behavior that day. I have very little to argue with him on that. But I will say this: My military service -- I think Mr. Regan is right. I should have known better. I should have. I'm a senior noncommissioned officer. I'm a seasoned combat vet, and I've taken care of a lot of young men.

I've worked as a -- a -- I worked in the child at-risk youth field for a lot of years. I've had a lot of good influence on young men, but that day -- the only thing I will say that reflected greatly upon my service is is that between my parents raising of me and my brothers and my sister and the -- and the military and the values that I learned in both the Marine Corps and the Army, I think that's what made me change the direction I was taking inside that Capitol that day and go to the aid of police officers, because that is my true nature.

I never meant any malice when I went in there. I really didn't. I had no nefarious intent. I'm a passionate man, and I got caught up. And shame on me for that, and I am embarrassed of that, and I regret it greatly. I regret the way

it reflected on the military. I regret the way it reflected on my fellow veterans, my countrymen, my family, my family's military legacy.

But all I can do now is stand here today and take the consequences of my actions, and I'm ready to do that. I mean, I believe that I have consequences coming, and I felt that from day one; that there's a price to pay for bad choices and bad decisions. And really, Your Honor, that's all I've got to stay.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

You know, what's particularly puzzling is, you know, we're all -- all of us are doing a number of these cases, and a lot of the folks in your position are like, I don't know what I was thinking that day, I got caught up in the mob, and I just followed the mob, which -- but when one looks at your record, there's nothing in there but leadership, you know. You shouldn't have turned into a follower at that moment. You should have been the leader that you otherwise are.

DEFENDANT WITCHER: May I speak and address that?

I completely agree with you, Your Honor. It wasn't -- I am -- I have been a leader all of my life. I enjoy that position in life, and you're right. And I want to make sure that I'm very clear; when I said I got caught up in the moment, there is no one -- no one -- to blame for what I did except myself. I chose to go through that open door. I chose to go

down that hallway. I chose to address those law enforcement officers. And I -- I don't blame the mob. I don't blame anyone else. The Capitol Police did not wave me in. They did not say, hey, it's okay. I did not take a selfie with the police officers. The police officers I encountered were frightened, and they were doing their duty. And they weren't welcoming, and I should have picked up on that sooner. But once I did, I changed my mind.

You are absolutely right, Your Honor, and that is one thing that I did myself a great disservice in not standing up earlier and saying we're not going in there, that's not the correct thing to do. And I wish I would have, but I didn't. And that's why I feel like I pleaded guilty because I'm a man who believes in accountability, and I -- I broke -- I broke the law. I went in there and I -- I did. I broke the law and not with malice and not with nefarious intent, but it's undeniable, and I accept that responsibility.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. As with Mr. Barnard,

I'll start with the financial matters. The parties have agreed
on the \$500 to the Architect of the Capitol for the
restitution.

There's a maximum fine in this case of 100,000 dollars with a guidelines range of 500 to 9500 dollars. Probation indicated that the defendant has an ability to pay a fine, but it did not recommend one, and I don't intend to impose one.

The defendant's on military disability, and I don't intend to stretch that farther than it needs to go, especially with a child with the expense of college.

All right. The Court is to impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary, and I'm to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant and assess the need to impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, and provide just punishment for the offense.

I won't repeat everything I said earlier with respect to Mr. Barnard about how serious I think the offense was and that it was a violent event that resulted in a lot of damage. But as I indicated with Mr. Barnard, there's no evidence to present — has been presented that shows defendant assaulting law enforcement or destroying property. After entering the Capitol Building through an entrance at which law enforcement had been overwhelmed a short time beforehand, defendant entered with his codefendant, made their way to the rotunda, and remained inside for about 15 to 20 minutes.

The riot was successful, as I previously indicated, in delaying the certification, in large part because of the numbers of the participants involved, which simply overwhelmed the outnumbered law enforcement officers present. And the defendant needs to be held accountable for his contribution to

that.

However, evidence has been presented that the codefendants helped shield law enforcement officers in the rotunda when the tenor of the interaction began turning violent, much to his credit. The defendant also attempted to delete electronic evidence on his cell phone, although the FBI was able to recover it; and subsequent to January 6th, he voluntarily cooperated fully with the FBI, submitted to an interview and search of his phone, and pleaded guilty at the earliest opportunity.

Otherwise, defendant has no criminal history resulting in points. Defendant is a 59-year-old man, which just -- I note you were born within two days of me. So I think -- I read somewhere that you climbed over a wall. Is that you or -- no?

DEFENDANT WITCHER: Climbed over a wall that day?

THE COURT: Yeah.

DEFENDANT WITCHER: Although I've climbed over many walls, I don't recall --

(Indiscernible simultaneous cross-talk.)

THE COURT: No. I may be -- there are a lot of

January 6th defendants. I may have gotten you confused with

someone else. I don't think I could get over a wall these

days. So if you had --

DEFENDANT WITCHER: I think our wall-climbing days are over, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You've got a high school education with some recent college coursework. Upon graduation from high school, he entered the United States Marines and later the Reserves, serving for about ten years from 1982 to 1993. Remarkably, about ten years later, after working in a therapeutic school for at-risk youth, he enlisted in the Army and served another ten years from 2004 to 2014.

His lengthy service in the military included stints in areas of imminent danger, including Egypt, Afghanistan, and Iraq. Unfortunately, this distinguished service came at a cost that he now suffers from PTSD requiring medication, counseling. Mr. Witcher is now retired from the military with 100 percent disability.

Otherwise, his background is not particularly remarkable. His parents divorced when he was young, but there's no indication that his material needs were not provided for. He describes his upbringing as normal and free from abuse. Mr. Witcher's married with a 19-year-old son from his prior marriage and stepchildren from his current marriage. He appears to have a strong family support system in place.

The Court is to impose a sentence that affords adequate deterrence to criminal conduct and protects the public from further crimes of the defendant. As I indicated, with respect to Mr. Barnard, under these circumstances it's such a unique event, I don't think you are likely to reoffend or be swept up

in irrational actions in the future. I don't think you're a risk to the public.

With respect to general deterrence, the Court does not believe that incarceration or necessarily even home detention is necessary to deter other nonviolent protesters from crossing the line into lawbreaking. The defendant's ordeal through the criminal justice system, restitution, community service, and probation should serve as an adequate deterrence to those that can be deterred.

Given that he's already receiving services through the VA, I don't intend to recommend mental health counseling as part of his probation. And that was the only education or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner that was suggested to me.

I've considered the types of sentences involved, and given the nature of the crime and the defendant's lack of criminal history, the Court is considering a period of probation. I'm to consider the kinds of sentences and the sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines. The Court is cognizant that the guidelines do not require any kind of incarceration or home confinement. No pertinent policy statements by the Sentencing Commission have been brought to my attention.

I'm to impose a sentence that avoids unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct. I already spoke previously with respect to Mr. Barnard about the chart the government has provided, but the Court -- that list doesn't make it clear to the Court that the government has recommended noncustodial or nonhome confinement probation sentences in the past, and I find it hard to distinguish this case from those. And the defendant's lengthy service to his country and efforts to protect law enforcement in the rotunda makes any sort of home confinement excessive.

We already dealt with the \$500 of restitution.

I'll now indicate the sentence to be imposed, but counsel will have one more opportunity to make any legal objections before the sentence is actually imposed.

Mr. Bassett, do you have any objections to the factors I've considered?

MR. BASSETT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Regan?

MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It is the judgment of the Court, that you, Jeffrey Shane Witcher, are hereby sentenced to serve a 12-month term of probation on Count 2. You are further ordered to pay a special assessment of \$25. That's pursuant to statute as to Count 5. And then there's a \$500 restitution paid to the

Architect of the Capitol. Those things are paid -- made payable to the Clerk of the Court. And as I indicated with respect to Mr. Barnard, within 30 days of any change of address, you have to notify the court of that change until such time as the financial obligations are paid in full.

While on supervision, you shall not use or possess an illegal controlled substance, and you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended based on the Court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse.

You shall abide by the general conditions of supervision adopted by the U.S. Probation Office, as well as the following special conditions:

As I indicated to Mr. Barnard, there's some financial disclosure requirements in there, but if you pay up front, you might not need to comply with any of that. And then the community service, you must complete 60 hours of community service within 6 months. The probation officer will supervise the participation in the program by -- by approving the program.

Mr. Bassett, any reason other than those previously argued as to why I should not impose the sentence that's just been stated?

MR. BASSETT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Regan?

MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry, Judge. We didn't hear
that first sentence.

THE COURT: I said I'll go ahead and do that, impose the sentence I just stated.

I gather, Mr. Regan, that there's -- there are charges to dismiss. The defendant pleaded guilty to Count 2, and I believe he's charged in 1, 3, 4, and 5. Do those need to be dismissed?

MR. REGAN: They do, Your Honor. The government moves to dismiss those counts now.

THE COURT: I'll go ahead and do that then.

All right. Mr. Witcher, you were convicted by a plea of guilty. You can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow involuntary or if there's some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that was not waived by your guilty plea. As I indicated to Mr. Barnard, your plea includes a pretty expansive waiver of appellate rights, but to the extent you're considering appealing, you can talk to your attorney about that. You also might have a statutory right to appeal under certain circumstances, and you can talk to your attorney about those as well.

You have a right to -- if you're inclined to appeal, you have a right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis.

That means without payment of costs. And if you so request and

1 qualify, the Clerk of the Court will prepare and file a notice 2 of appeal on your behalf, although I note that you're 3 represented by very able counsel who can assist you in that process. But with very few exceptions, any notice of appeal 4 5 must be filed within 14 days of the entry of the judgment. As I indicated to Mr. Barnard, it's not going to be docketed today 6 7 given that it's a Friday afternoon, but sometime early next 8 week it should be, and then you'll have 14 days from that point 9 to appeal. 10 Probation has been -- has asked me to transfer 11 jurisdiction to the Southern District of Texas. Are the two defendants in different districts? 12 13 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Witcher 14 resides in Bastrop, Texas, which is in the jurisdiction of the Southern District of Texas. 15 16 THE COURT: Okay. Any objection to that transfer? 17 MR. BASSETT: Yeah. I think it's more convenient to 18 do the Western District, but -- is Bastrop in the Southern? 19 MR. SALINAS: No, it's not. 20 MR. BASSETT: I believe it should be the Western, 21 but --22 THE COURT: I looked on the map, and the two 23 defendants seem to live relatively close to each other, but --24 MR. SALINAS: We waive any objection to change it to 25 the Western District in ours, and I'm assuming that they didn't

```
1
       make that correction on Mr. Witcher's.
2
                 MR. BASSETT: I missed it, Judge. If I can orally
       request the Western District, it's a lot closer. Austin.
 3
                 THE COURT: Ms. Gavito?
 4
 5
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: I'm double-checking,
      Your Honor. If I could have a minute.
 6
 7
                 MR. BASSETT: He'll go wherever he needs to go.
 8
                 MR. REGAN: Your Honor, while that happens, obviously
 9
      no objection from the government on whichever district is
10
       easier. And just to confirm, that did not include a sentence
11
       of home confinement; correct?
                 THE COURT: That is correct.
12
13
                 MR. REGAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
14
                 THE COURT: I weighed the service to his country a
15
       little bit differently than you did, ironically, given your
16
       service.
17
                 DEFENDANT WITCHER: I appreciate that, Your Honor.
18
                 MR. SALINAS: And, Your Honor, since you're still on
19
       the line, because Mr. Barnard was ordered for home confinement
20
       and -- when is he supposed to start that?
21
                 THE COURT: He should talk to his local probation
22
       office. I don't -- you know, whenever they can arrange for
23
       that because he has to be fitted with the GPS and the like or
24
       the monitoring, whatever. So, you know, as soon -- at the
25
       front end of his probation, but whenever they're able to do
```

```
1
       that.
                 MR. SALINAS: I didn't know, since Ms. Gavito is on
2
 3
       the line, if she needs to give him any further instructions,
 4
       but, you know, a lot of times they say within 72 hours or
 5
       5 days or whatever.
 6
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: With regards to Mr. Witcher,
 7
       Your Honor, it is Western District of Texas. I apologize for
       that.
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: Okay. No problem.
10
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: And with regards to
11
       contacting Mr. Barnard and Mr. Witcher to -- to discuss the
12
       conditions of probation, I'll call them on the telephone later
13
       on today or maybe even tomorrow morning.
14
                 THE COURT: All right. Anything else with either
15
       defendant we have to deal with today?
16
                 MR. REGAN: Nothing from the government, Your Honor.
17
                 MR. BASSETT: No, Your Honor.
18
                 THE COURT: Mr. Barnard and Mr. Witcher, I don't
19
       expect I'll ever see you again, but good luck to you.
20
                 DEFENDANT WITCHER: Thank you, Your Honor.
21
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You're excused.
22
                 (Proceedings were concluded at 3:57 p.m.)
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
2	
3	I, Nancy J. Meyer, Registered Diplomate Reporter,
4	Certified Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that the above
5	and foregoing constitutes a true and accurate transcript of my
6	stenograph notes and is a full, true, and complete transcript
7	of the proceedings to the best of my ability.
8	
9	Dated this 20th day of February, 2022.
10	
11	/s/ Nancy J. Meyer Nancy J. Meyer
12	Official Court Reporter Registered Diplomate Reporter
13	Certified Realtime Reporter 333 Constitution Avenue Northwest
14	Washington, D.C. 20001
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	