

1 Thomas H. Bienert, Jr. (CA Bar No.135311, *admitted pro hac vice*)
2 Whitney Z. Bernstein (CA Bar No. 304917, *admitted pro hac vice*)
3 BIENERT KATZMAN LITTRELL WILLIAMS LLP
4 903 Calle Amanecer, Suite 350
5 San Clemente, California 92673
6 Telephone: (949) 369-3700
7 Facsimile: (949) 369-3701
8 tbienert@bklwlaw.com
9 wbernstein@bklwlaw.com
10 *Attorneys for James Larkin*

11 Paul J. Cambria, Jr. (NY Bar No. 1430909, *admitted pro hac vice*)
12 Erin McCampbell (NY Bar. No 4480166, *admitted pro hac vice*)
13 LIPSITZ GREEN SCIME CAMBRIA LLP
14 42 Delaware Avenue, Suite 120
15 Buffalo, New York 14202
16 Telephone: (716) 849-1333
17 Facsimile: (716) 855-1580
18 pcambria@lglaw.com
19 emccampbell@lglaw.com
20 *Attorneys for Michael Lacey*

21 Additional counsel listed on next page

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

19 United States of America,
20
21 Plaintiff,
22 vs.
23 Michael Lacey, *et al.*,
24
25 Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cr-00422-PHX-SMB
**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT OF ACQUITAL, OR, IN
THE ALTERNATIVE, A MISTRIAL**

1 Gary S. Lincenberg (CA Bar No. 123058, *admitted pro hac vice*)
Ariel A. Neuman (CA Bar No. 241594, *admitted pro hac vice*)
2 Gopi K. Panchapakesan (CA Bar No. 279856, *admitted pro hac vice*)
3 BIRD, MARELLA, BOXER, WOLPERT, NESSIM,
DROOKS, LINCENBERG & RHOW PC
4 1875 Century Park East, 23rd Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067-2561
5 Telephone: (310) 201-2100
6 Facsimile: (310) 201-2110
glincenberg@birdmarella.com
7 aneuman@birdmarella.com
gpanchapakesan@birdmarella.com
8 *Attorneys for John Brunst*

9
10 Bruce Feder (AZ Bar No. 004832)
FEDER LAW OFFICE PA
11 2930 E. Camelback Road, Suite 160
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
12 Telephone: (602) 257-0135
bf@federlawpa.com
13 *Attorney for Scott Spear*

14 David Eisenberg (AZ Bar No. 017218)
15 DAVID EISENBERG PLC
3550 N. Central Ave., Suite 1155
16 Phoenix, Arizona 85012
17 Telephone: (602) 237-5076
Facsimile: (602) 314-6273
18 david@deisenbergplc.com
19 *Attorney for Andrew Padilla*

20 Joy Malby Bertrand (AZ Bar No. 024181)
JOY BERTRAND ESQ LLC
21 P.O. Box 2734
Scottsdale, Arizona 85252
22 Telephone: (602)374-5321
23 Facsimile: (480)361-4694
joy.bertrand@gmail.com
24 *Attorney for Joye Vaught*

1 The government’s opening argument was a parade of horrors about human trafficking
2 destroying the lives of trafficked women and children, with barely any mention of charged counts
3 and zero linkage of any Defendant to any charged count. The opening offended the law, ignored
4 indisputable facts, and consisted of inflammatory, unproven, and unprovable assertions that fail
5 in any event to address what the government must prove to convict any defendant.

6 This Court repeatedly told the government what it must prove at trial: namely, whether
7 each Defendant performed an act with the specific intent to further the prostitution offenses of
8 the unlawful business enterprise referenced in each count of the indictment. The Court expressly
9 told the parties that the case is not about whether defendants promoted prostitution in general,
10 nor about what backpage did or did not do, but is about whether each individual defendant had
11 specific knowledge of each charged ad and specifically intended to promote a business of
12 prostitution by that ad. *See* Dkt. 946 at 13 (“**[Defendants] were not indicted for facilitating**
13 **the amorphous notion of ‘prostitution.’ They were indicted for facilitating (via publishing**
14 **ads) on fifty distinct occasions where prostitutes, prostitution-related businesses, or other**
15 **groups were involved in the business of prostitution.**”) (emphasis added); *see also* Transcript
16 of December 4, 2020 Hearing (“And I think one of the key things in my reason for denying the
17 recusal is that **this case is not about backpage**. backpage was prosecuted in a separate case,
18 entered a plea in a separate case. **This case is about these individual defendants and whether**
19 **they had specific knowledge of these ads as facilitating illegal activity.**”) (emphasis added).

20 The government’s opening argument absolutely ignored the Court’s admonitions. During
21 two hours of improper, inflammatory argument, **the government failed to allege that any**
22 **Defendant had knowledge of a single ad charged in the indictment, much less set forth**
23 **any facts that could establish the specific intent necessary to convict on any count.** This
24 failure to set forth any evidence that could sustain conviction on the charges warrants a judgment
25 of acquittal. *See* Section III, *infra*.

26 The government’s opening argument was full of improper and unconstitutional issues,
27 including:

- 28 a) repeated inflammatory, prejudicial, irrelevant, and impermissible references to child sex

1 trafficking and human trafficking;

2 b) unconstitutional burden shifting and commenting on the Defendants' constitutional
3 rights to remain silent;

4 c) intentional conflating of escorts and prostitutes;

5 d) an inaccurate and misleading definition of prostitution;

6 e) repeated conclusory assertions about the alleged extent of prostitution, child sex
7 trafficking, and human trafficking, with no ability or intention to prove such contentions;

8 f) false suggestions that strict liability or general intent is sufficient to find guilt as to the
9 charged specific intent crimes;

10 g) false claims that all adult-oriented ads on Backpage, and all of Backpage's "adult"
11 revenues, were from illegal prostitution; and

12 h) references to unnoticed 404(b) evidence.

13 If judgment of acquittal is not granted, then alternatively the Court must declare a mistrial
14 (*see* Section V, *infra*), due to the government's multiple improprieties described in Section I, *infra*.
15 Each one of these issues warrants a mistrial, and the egregious multitude of improprieties leaves
16 no doubt that these jurors have been irretrievably tainted. A mistrial would be the only means to
17 protect Defendants' due process rights to a fair trial.

18 Finally, the Court ordered the government to provide the date of disclosures and copies
19 of disclosures related to (1) an alleged 2011 statement by a Backpage.com representative and (2)
20 an alleged statement by Mr. Lacey. The government has not – and cannot – point to a specific
21 notice of its intent to use the 404(b) evidence and any statement it attributed to any Defendant.
22 As to the first statement, the government disingenuously argued that it evidenced guilt and
23 attributed this alleged statement to Defendants, in violation of this Court's prior order (Dkt.
24 1162). As to the second statement, the government's filing (Dkt. 1267) indicates that the
25 government blatantly and egregiously mischaracterized the alleged statement during its opening
26 argument. Further, Dkt. 1267 indicates that the relevant few pages of discovery were buried in
27 productions ranging from 174,000+ pages to 6,500+ pages, years after the government had the
28 information, without any explanation of the delay, and with no notice to the Court or the

1 Defendants about its intent to use the statement.

2 This motion supplements and incorporates by reference all arguments made by defense
3 counsel to the Court on Friday afternoon. *See* Transcript of September 3, 2021 (Trial, Day 3,
4 P.M. Session) at 58-85 (attached as Exhibit A).

5 **I. THE GOVERNMENT OPENED ON EXTENSIVE IMPROPER**
6 **ARGUMENTS, FALSE FACTS, AND INCORRECT STATEMENTS OF LAW**
7 **THAT DO NOT PREVIEW ANY ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE.**

8 **A. Repeated inflammatory, prejudicial, irrelevant, and impermissible**
9 **references to child sex trafficking and human trafficking.**

10 The government’s opening argument relied heavily on child sex trafficking and human
11 trafficking, referencing “children” at least 47 different times and “trafficking” at least 13 times.
12 But the government *never charged any such crimes* under 18 U.S.C. 1951; it only charged
13 facilitation of state prostitution. The government also *never provided any notice* under Federal
14 Rule of Evidence 404(b) during the past three and a half years of litigating this case.¹

15 During the past three days of jury selection, it was clear in each panel that child sex
16 trafficking and human trafficking were lightning-rod topics for potential jurors. Indeed, many
17 potential jurors indicated they could fairly assess a prostitution case but might or could not fairly
18 assess a child or human trafficking case. All potential jurors were reassured during four separate
19 panels that *no charges in this case pertain to child sex trafficking or human trafficking*.
20 Upon seeing the government’s opening statement slides depicting two photos of mothers of
21 alleged victims, before opening statements began, defense counsel raised with the Court the
22 concern that the government would improperly emphasize child trafficking in opening. The
23 Court thereafter admonished the government just before opening that it should not emphasize
24 child trafficking. Despite this objection and admonition, the government’s opening statement
25 prominently featured child sex trafficking and human trafficking throughout, unequivocally
26 prejudicing the jury.

27 Mindful of the page limits of briefs, below are just a few of many examples of the

28 ¹ Judge Logan ordered the government to make any disclosures under Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b) by February 4, 2019. Dkt. 131 at 2. The government never provided any notice under Rule 404(b), whether before or after that deadline.

1 government's egregious statements:

- 2
- 3 • The government's opening began with a detailed emotional, incendiary story about a
4 trafficked child. Ex. A at page 5 ("... the 14-year-old girl's pimp . . ."); *Id.* ("Upon
5 realizing that it is her mom, the 14-year-old girl drops down to her knees - -").
6 ***Critically, neither this mother, nor her daughter, nor her daughter's alleged
7 trafficker, nor any Backpage.com advertisement relating to the daughter or her
8 trafficking, nor the described incidents are the subject of any count in the
9 indictment.*** Beginning its opening statement with this example was purely to inflame
10 and incite the jury.

 - 11 • The government characterized this child sex trafficking example as one of many it will
12 present during trial on the indictment's 100 counts, ***none of which includes child
13 sex trafficking or human trafficking.*** Ex. A at page 5, lines 14-19 ("Ladies and
14 gentlemen of the jury, what I just shared with you is just one example, one of
15 numerous examples you will hear about by the close of this trial of women and
16 children being sold for sex on the website Backpage.com, a website these six
17 defendants ran with the intent to promote and facilitate prostitution.").

 - 18 • The government's opening repeatedly used inflammatory and conclusory terms to
19 described alleged child prostitution and human trafficking, ***uncharged crimes for
20 which no notice was ever given under Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b)***, such as:
 - 21 ○ Summarily claiming that "countless women and children were sold for sex" on
22 Backpage.com (Ex. A at 6);
 - 23 ○ Decrying "the scourge" and "misery of the women and children who will continue
24 to be victimized by the ads posted on Backpage.com" (Ex. A at 24); and
 - 25 ○ Arguing that "[t]he lives of countless women and children have been forever
26 changed by their running Backpage.com for 14 years." (Ex. A at 44).

 - 27 • The government ended its opening with another story of a grieving, traumatized
28 mother "on a mission to shut down Backpage" after her daughter had been trafficked.
Ex. A at 56 ("Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'll end my opening statement like I
began when I told you about a mother, Mrs. Pride, that you'll hear from, who had to
attempt to buy sex with her daughter in order to rescue her from being sold for sex
through ads through Backpage. And I'll end by telling you about another mother that
you'll hear from throughout the course of this trial, Nacole Svengard. Nacole will tell
you that after her daughter's trafficker had been arrested and convicted for selling her
for sex through ads placed on Backpage, Nacole went - - this mother went on a
mission to shut down Backpage.")². ***Critically, neither this mother, nor her
daughter, nor her daughter's alleged trafficker, nor any Backpage.com ads***

² Additionally, the government grossly and unethically mischaracterized Ms. Svengard's recollection of Mr. Lacey's alleged statements, as described more fully below.

1 *relating to the daughter or her trafficking, nor the described incident are the*
2 *subject of any count in the indictment.* Like the beginning of its opening argument,
3 ending with this example was purely to inflame and incite the jury.

4 **B. Unconstitutional burden shifting and commenting on the Defendants’**
5 **constitutional right to remain silent.**

6 In its opening, the government ignored this Court’s order precluding the government from
7 offering statements of alleged representatives and attributing such statements to Defendants (*see*
8 Dkt. 1162 at 2-3), unconstitutionally shifted the burden of proof to Defendants, and
9 unconstitutionally commented on a defendant’s right to remain silent. On the heels of three days
10 of jury selection, during which all four panels were extensively questioned and educated by
11 attorneys and the Court about the right to remain silent and the burden of proof, these comments
12 also warrant a mistrial.

13 With a forceful tone and invoking and commanding the authority of the United States
14 government, DOJ attorney Jones argued: “That’s right, ladies and gentlemen, *these defendants*
15 *can’t deny that they knew* that the vast majority of the ads on Backpage.com were nothing less
16 than prostitution ads.” Ex. A at 40 (emphasis added).

17 Because of this comment by the government, if Defendants exercise their Fifth
18 Amendment right to remain silent, some jurors may believe that this confirms what the
19 government said – that Defendants are guilty. It is impossible to cure this foundational
20 constitutional issue with the current jury without exacerbating the problem; nothing short of an
21 acquittal or mistrial will effectuate Defendants’ due process rights to a fair trial.

22 When questioned by the Court after its opening, the government defended this blatantly
23 unconstitutional comment by claiming that Professor Paula Selis will testify that this is “what a
24 Backpage representative told her.” Ex. A at 70-71. The government’s response is problematic for
25 at least two reasons: first, Selis will say no such thing; and second, this purported comment was
26 allegedly made by a Backpage lawyer, and in adherence with the Federal Rules of the Evidence,
27 the Court expressly precluded the government from introducing statements of attorneys before
28 the Court is able to “analyze the admissibility of statements . . . looking at the specific circumstances
and context surrounding them.” Dkt. 1162 at 2.

1 As the government’s own filing indicates, Selis said that a Backpage attorney allegedly stated
2 simply, “Don’t deny the undeniable.” Dkt. 1267, Ex. A, Ex. B. The actual alleged statement by a
3 Backpage attorney in 2011 is a far cry from what the government promised in defending this
4 unconstitutional burden shifting and commentary in its opening, namely a witness with “firsthand
5 knowledge” who was told that the six individual Defendants on trial cannot deny that the vast
6 majority of ads on Backpage.com or the charged ads in the indictment are for prostitution.
7 Additionally, in April 2020 when the government moved to admit attorney statements as non-
8 hearsay adopted statements, authorized statements, or agent statements, this Court *denied* the
9 government’s motion. Dkt. 1162. With blatant disregard for the Court’s order, the government
10 nonetheless opened with an inadmissible, prejudicial statement and perverted this statement to
11 unconstitutionally comment on the Defendants’ right to remain silent and unconstitutionally shift
12 the burden of proof to the defense.

13 **C. Intentional conflating of escorts and prostitutes.**

14 Throughout its opening, the government wrongly (factually and legally) substituted the
15 word “prostitute” or “prostitution” in place of the word “escort,” which is a legal activity. The
16 government simply described everything that related to lawful escort services as “so-called escort”
17 businesses (Ex. A at 7, 8, 9, 10) and then repeatedly indicated that all such things were
18 “prostitution.” The government’s repeated suggestion that escort services are the same as
19 prostitution is grossly incorrect (factually and legally). And the government knows this, as this
20 Court specifically told the government there is a legal distinction in response to AUSA Rapp’s
21 statement on June 7, 2021 that the terms “escort” and “prostitute” are synonymous. Dkt. 1171-1.
22 Despite knowing and being instructed by the Court that there is a significant legal distinction
23 between these terms, the government’s opening intentionally and improperly conflated the two.
24 The government also improperly referred to all dating ads, massage ads, and other adult ads –
25 which are perfectly lawful – as unlawful prostitution ads.

26 **D. Inaccurate and misleading definition of prostitution.**

27 The definition of prostitution has been the subject of extensive litigation in this case. *See,*
28 *e.g.*, Dkt. 1171, 1181, which are Defendants’ motions that the superseding indictment is defective

1 based on the failure to provide the grand jury with proper instructions of the term “prostitution.”
2 The government repeated this impropriety in its opening statement, wrongly suggesting that
3 “escort” is the same as “prostitution.” Throughout its opening, government counsel repeatedly
4 used the word “prostitution” when discussing ads, practices or documents that actually used the
5 word “escort.” The repeated suggestion that the term “prostitution” is synonymous with or
6 encompasses the legal “escort” business or “sexual services” is plainly incorrect, both legally and
7 factually.

8 The government compounded the issue in opening by giving the jury an inaccurate and
9 incomplete legal definition of “prostitution.” Ex. A at 5 (“And when the United States refers to
10 prostitution throughout the course of this trial, we mean sexual services in exchange for money, a
11 crime in all 50 states.”). Prostitution, of course, encompasses specific, proscribed acts of sex,
12 usually intercourse or oral sex in exchange for money. There are many “sexual services for
13 money,” however, that are perfectly legal, such as stripping, sensual massage, and other activities.
14 The government’s inaccurate definition runs afoul of the law that governs this case, as the
15 government well knows from its proposed verdict form listing fifteen different states’ prostitution
16 statutes and precise definitions (Dkt. 1216-2). It was completely improper, especially given the
17 extensive litigation about this, of the government to give an inaccurate and incomplete legal
18 definition to the jury for hours in its opening.

19 **E. Repeated conclusory assertions about the alleged extent of prostitution,**
20 **child sex trafficking, and human trafficking, with no ability or intention to**
prove such contentions.

21 Every single ad the government presented during its opening is a facially legal ad; not a
22 single ad says that a sex act will be performed for the exchange of money. Still, the government’s
23 repeatedly made sweeping, conclusory assertions about the alleged extent of prostitution, child sex
24 trafficking, and human trafficking on Backpage.com. Ex. A at 5-6 (“Backpage.com served as a
25 platform where countless women and child were sold for sex.”); *Id.* at 6 (“Backpage.com was the
26 internet’s leading hub, leading website for prostitution.”). This is particularly notable because the
27 government has *no ability or intention to prove this*. The overwhelming majority of the millions
28 upon millions of ads posted on Backpage.com during its 14-year existence are legal escort ads; the

1 individual intent behind these millions of ads is simply unknowable. And the government doesn't
2 even purport to show that these millions upon millions of ads over 14 years are for prostitution.
3 Yet its opening statement repeatedly makes such false, inaccurate, inadmissible, conclusory
4 assertions. As a few of many examples, in its opening the government asserted:

- 5 • "Backpage.com served as a platform where countless women and children were sold
6 for sex" (Ex. A at 5-6);
- 7 • the "vast amount of prostitution ads in the Sacramento escort section of Backpage"
8 (Ex. A at 9, 11);
- 9 • ads in the adult services section "were nothing less than prostitution ads" (Ex. A at 11);
- 10 • Backpage was "the internet's leading forum for prostitution" (Ex. A at 12);
- 11 • "prostitution ads were rampant all over the website" (Ex. A at 19);
- 12 • all the "prostitution" ads on Craigslist "migrated to posting those same prostitution ads
13 on Backpage" (Ex. A at 23);
- 14 • "the vast majority of advertisements on Backpage.com were prostitution" (Ex. A at 27);
15 and
- 16 • "Backpage was a hub for prostitution" (Ex. A at 27-28).

17 These conclusions are unproven hearsay and inadmissible in Court, devoid of any
18 foundation or evidence to assess their accuracy. The government has no ability or intention to
19 prove any of these statements. They were offered merely to improperly "present the jury
20 statements not susceptible of proof but intended to influence the jury in reaching a verdict." *United*
21 *States v. Dinitz*, 424 U.S. 600, 612 (1976) (Burger, J., concurring). This misconduct also is grounds
22 for a mistrial. *See also* Section IV, *infra*.

23
24 **F. False suggestions that strict liability or general intent is sufficient to find
25 guilt as to the charged specific intent crimes.**

26 The government's opening was also rife with significant errors regarding its burden of
27 proof. The government wrongly casts this case as the equivalent of a strict liability crime, arguing
28 that because Defendants were "on notice" of supposed past allegations of trafficking or

1 prostitution, they are thereafter criminally liable for later-in-time ads that turn out to involve
2 criminality, whether they knew about them or not. This distortion of the law would not even
3 satisfy the requirements of a general intent crime. And they are light years from the reality of this
4 case, where this Court has repeatedly recognized (including in the “Preliminary Instructions” to
5 this very jury) that the charged crimes require specific intent.

6 The Court held that “[t]his case is about these individual defendants and whether they had
7 specific knowledge of these ads as facilitating illegal activity.” Transcript of December 4, 2020
8 Hearing. The government committed clear error when it waters down its specific intent
9 requirement by telling the jury it will provide “notice” based on unrelated anecdotal events that
10 have nothing to do with the ad charged in each count. These “notices” include, as just a few
11 examples:

- 12 • A CNN “broadcast about children being sold for sex on Backpage.com” (Ex. A at 28);
- 13 • Letters from “all 50” state Attorneys General “urging” Backpage to terminate its adult
14 section (“You’ll also hear that these defendants met with - - continued to meet with
15 states attorney generals who put them on notice that they were promoting prostitution
16 by running Backpage.com.”) (Ex. A at 40);
- 17 • “Auburn Theological Seminary, a faith-based organization” that told Backpage they
18 were “selling sex,” including “children as young as 12 being sold for sex” (Ex. A at 42-
19 43), which is also improper for injecting religion into the proceedings (*See Sandoval v.*
20 *Calderon*, 241 F.3d 765, 777 (9th Cir. 2000) (collecting cases) (“Religious arguments have
21 been condemned by virtually every federal and state court to consider their challenge.”));
- 22 • The conclusory statement, “That’s right, ladies and gentlemen, it wasn’t just crimes
23 against children organizations, the public, and law enforcement, but news media outlet
24 also put these defendants on notice, as one letter told them pointblank, that Backpage
25 was a hub for prostitution.” (Ex. A at 28-29).

26 These hearsay conclusions are totally lacking in foundation. There is no evidentiary basis
27 as to their accuracy. The government has not analyzed all the ads on Backpage.com to verify these
28 claims. The government is not offering these hearsay conclusions as mere “notice” evidence
(which is also problematic); the government is actually offering these statements for their truth.
This violates Federal Rules of Evidence 401 and 403 and the rule against hearsay. These allegations
are clearly no proxy for actual evidence, much less credible evidence, of specific intent.

1 **G. False claim that all of the “adult” revenue was from illegal prostitution.**

2 The government’s opening also repeatedly made the false claim that all of the “adult”
3 content is for illegal prostitution. Furthering this theme, the government argued that over 94% of
4 Backpage.com’s revenue came from ads purportedly associated with unlawful conduct. Ex. A at
5 48. As the government well knows, Backpage.com had many other categories besides “adult
6 services,” as well as many “adult” categories that government does not even contend are illegal,
7 such as massage and erotic dancing. The government’s false proclamation also fails to account for
8 the fact that the purported offending ads are facially lawful escort ads, massage ads, and dating ads.
9 They are legal on their face, and the government can only claim funds are illegal that came from
10 ads *proven* to be prostitution. This staggering misrepresentation is yet another statement that
11 “will not or cannot be supported by proof” and is therefore grounds for a mistrial. *Dinitz*, 424
12 U.S. at 612; *see also* Section IV, *infra*.

13 **H. References to unnoticed 404(b) evidence.**

14 The government never noticed a single act under Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b), despite
15 a February 4, 2019 deadline to do so. Dkt. 131 at 2. Not only did the government never notice a
16 single act, but it also never stated any theory under which these acts were admissible or give defense
17 counsel an opportunity to object. Nonetheless, the government’s opening statement only
18 indirectly touched upon a handful of the 100 counts in the indictment and was otherwise a parade
19 of horrors allegedly committed by Backpage.com, which the government never connected to the
20 Defendants and which the government never noticed under 404(b). Every uncharged ad that the
21 government contends is for illegal prostitution is inadmissible as unnoticed 404(b) evidence. A
22 failure to notice other bad acts evidence that the government then opens on is grounds for a
23 mistrial. *See United States v. Vega*, 188 F.3d 1150, 1155 (9th Cir. 1999) (finding the government’s
24 failure to give notice of 404(b) evidence was not harmless error as it prejudiced defendants’ trial
25 strategy because she did not know the unnoticed 404(b) evidence would be introduced); *see also*
26 Section IV, *infra*.

27 After its inflammatory, prejudicial opening, bookended with heart wrenching stories about
28 child sex trafficking and human trafficking, unconstitutional burden shifting and commenting on

1 Defendants’ right to remain silent; intentional conflating of escorts and prostitutes; inaccurate
2 definition of prostitution; repeated conclusory assertions about the alleged extent of prostitution;
3 child sex trafficking; and human trafficking without any ability or intention to prove such
4 contentions, and false suggestions that strict liability or general intent is sufficient to find the guilt,
5 the government concluded its opening not with reference to guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to
6 the charged crimes, but instead by imploring the jury to “hold these defendants accountable for
7 their criminal conduct in running this website for nearly 14 years.” Ex. A at 57. Repeated
8 mischaracterizations of the law of the case, from a Department of Justice Attorney “with the
9 standing and prestige inherent in being an officer of the court” is grossly inappropriate and grounds
10 for a mistrial. *Dinitz*, 424 U.S. 612 (Burger, J., concurring); see also Section IV, *infra*.

11 **II. THE GOVERNMENT’S OPENING LACKED ANY ACTUAL EVIDENCE OF**
12 **GUILT AS TO ANY OF THE CHARGES.**

13 The government’s opening argument is also remarkable for the many things it did not say
14 or do at all, that it must proffer to prove guilt of any of the counts charged:

- 15 • The government did not cite a single ad in its entire presentation that was on its face a
16 prostitution ad; namely, one that offered a proscribed sex act³ in exchange for money.
Instead, all of the ads it showed were facially legal escort ads;⁴

17 ³ Each state makes its own prostitution laws; the common thread is that “prostitution”
18 involves payment of money or compensation in exchange for vaginal, anal intercourse, or oral sex
with the other person.

19 ⁴ Every single slide in the government’s opening PowerPoint presentation is a facially legal
20 ad presumptively protected by the First Amendment. See Exhibit B, a hard copy of the
21 government’s opening slides, given to defense counsel by the government on September 1, 2021,
22 in advance of its opening statement. The government argued against a preliminary instruction
23 about First Amendment presumptive protection on the grounds that it would establish that each
24 Defendant engaged in criminal conduct outside the scope of the protections of the First
25 Amendment, yet the government’s opening said nothing about the conduct of any Defendant with
26 respect to the publication of any of the charged ads, knowledge of any of the charged ads,
27 knowledge of the purported unlawful business enterprises associated with the charged ads, or
28 intent to facilitate the crimes of those purportedly unlawful business enterprises. The government’s
opening was devoid of any allegations that would eliminate the presumption of First Amendment
protection that the Constitution requires. Further, the government defended its opening by
claiming that defense counsel did not object to the slides, but that is not true, as the defense made
numerous objections to some of the government’s slides. And of course, the slides did not presage
the many improper things the prosecutor orally told the jurors. The government is not free to
engage in misconduct even if the defense does not anticipate misconduct and object in advance.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- Although the government’s opening only included passing mention to portions of five of the alleged “prostitution ads” charged in the indictment, and the government failed to discuss any of those ads in the context of the elements of the crimes charged in the indictment:
 - Three of them were ads the government mentioned as having the term “GFE,” which the government said means a person who is willing to French kiss (something that is not prostitution) (Ex. A at 10);
 - The fourth ad mentioned involved “Naomi” who will “tell you her traffickers told her point blank they were using prepaid card” (Ex. A at 45-46) – clearly inadmissible hearsay;
 - The fifth ad the government mentioned involved “Destiny” who will explain that Backpage’s website would not allow someone to post an ad if the age listed was under 18 but would allow the person to post the ad if they listed an age over 18 (Ex. A at 46)– a statement that sheds no light on prostitution;
 - The government did not mention at all any of the other 45 alleged prostitution ads in the indictment;
 - Significantly, the government did not assert that any of the Defendants knew of the existence of any of the ads charged in the indictment or mentioned in its opening statement;
 - The government did not assert that any of the Defendants knew of the existence of the purportedly unlawful business enterprise associated with any charged ad;
 - It did not assert that any of the Defendants performed an act with the specific intent to further the prostitution offenses of an unlawful business enterprise associated with any charged ad; and
 - It did not assert that any of the Defendants had knowledge of any of the ads it displayed in its PowerPoint (most of which did not relate to counts in the indictment).

23 The government’s opening was long, loud, inflammatory, and prejudicial. But its complete
24 and utter failure to assert any allegation that could arguably help prove a count in the indictment
25 was even more deafening. This failure reveals the flaw in this entire prosecution: ***the government***
26 ***has no evidence tying any Defendant to any charge in the indictment. It cannot prove***
27 ***specific intent.***

28

1 **III. THE GOVERNMENT’S OPENING REQUIRES A JUDGMENT OF**
2 **ACQUITTAL.**

3 A motion for acquittal following the government’s opening should be granted “when the
4 statement clearly shows that the charge against defendant cannot be sustained under any view of
5 the evidence consistent with the statement.” *United States v. Welch*, 97 F.3d 142, 148 (6th Cir.
6 1996) (quoting *McGuire v. United States*, 152 F.2d 577, 580 (8th Cir. 1945) (citing *United States v.*
7 *Oliver*, 570 F.2d 397, 400 (1st Cir.1978); *United States v. Capocci*, 433 F.2d 155, 158 (1st Cir.1970).

8 This Court has not only the power but also the **duty** to direct a verdict for the defense
9 upon opening statement of plaintiff’s counsel, where the statement establishes that the plaintiff
10 has no right to recover. *Best v. District of Columbia*, 291 U.S. 411, 415 (1934) (“There is no question
11 as to the power of the trial court to direct a verdict for the defendant upon the opening statement
12 of plaintiff’s counsel where that statement establishes that the plaintiff has no right to recover.
13 The power of the court to act upon facts conceded by counsel is as plain as its power to act upon
14 evidence produced.”). The Ninth Circuit has also followed this directive from the Supreme
15 Court, allowing a court to terminate a case after the plaintiff’s opening statement when the
16 statement affirmatively shows the plaintiff has no right to recover and when the plaintiff is given
17 an opportunity to correct. *Rose v. United States*, 149 F.2d 755, 758 (9th Cir. 1945).

18 As described above and to the Court on Friday afternoon, the government’s opening
19 argument was riddled with misleading statements that are entirely irrelevant to the indictment
20 and should be precluded. If the Court assumes, *arguendo*, that every single thing the government
21 said in its opening is admissible and true, the government has still not proffered anything more
22 than a general dislike and distrust of Backpage.com, various facially legal ads that appeared on
23 Backpage.com, and the fact that revenue was gained from Backpage.com. The government
24 ***never once even pretended to connect any of the charged Defendants to any ad***
25 ***referenced in the case or charged in the indictment.*** That is because the government has no
26 evidence to connect Defendants to the crimes in the indictment. Accordingly, the Court has the
27 power, authority, and duty to terminate the case and enter a judgment of acquittal.
28

1 **IV. ALTERNATIVELY, THE COURT MUST DECLARE A MISTRIAL.**

2 An improper opening statement is sufficient grounds to declare a mistrial. *United States v.*
3 *Millan*, 817 F. Supp. 1086, 1088 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (citing *Arizona v. Washington*, 434 U.S. 497 (1978);
4 *United States v. Peng*, 602 F.Supp. 298 (S.D.N.Y.), *aff'd*, 766 F.2d 82 (2d Cir.1985)). The
5 government’s obligation during opening arguments is quite clear. *Millan*, 817 F. Supp at 1088.
6 Although the opening statement should be an objective summary of the evidence reasonably
7 expected to be produced, *see United States v. Brockington*, 849 F.2d 872, 875 (4th Cir. 1988), the
8 prosecutor ***may not refer to evidence which will be inadmissible or unsupported at trial.***
9 *United States v. Novak*, 918 F.2d 107, 109 (10th Cir.1990) (emphasis added). “To make statements
10 which will not or cannot be supported by proof is, if it relates to significant elements of the case,
11 prosecutorial misconduct. ***Moreover, it is fundamentally unfair to an opposing party to allow***
12 ***an attorney, with the standing and prestige inherent in being an officer of the court, to***
13 ***present to the jury statements not susceptible of proof but intended to influence the jury***
14 ***in reaching a verdict.***” *United States v. Dinitz*, 424 U.S. 600, 612 (1976) (Burger, J., concurring)
15 (emphasis added); *see also Arizona v. Washington*, 434 U.S. 497, 512 (1978) (“An improper opening
16 statement unquestionably tends to frustrate the public interest in having a just judgment reached
17 by an impartial tribunal.”). “A trial judge is under a duty, in order to protect the integrity of the
18 trial, to take prompt and affirmative action to stop such professional misconduct.” *Dinitz*, 424
19 U.S. at 612 (1976) (Burger, J., concurring).

20 Each of these many government improprieties discussed on September 3 and above
21 warrants a mistrial. *See* Ex. A at 58-85. The government’s opening argument was based on
22 evidence that will be inadmissible or unsupported at trial and was strategically presented to inflame
23 and influence the jury to reach a verdict against Defendants (e.g., child sex trafficking and human
24 trafficking references; the government’s erroneous definition of prostitution and intentional
25 conflating of escorts and prostitution; repeated conclusory assertions about the alleged parade of
26 horrors on Backpage.com without any ability or intention to prove such contentions; false
27 suggestions that strict liability or general intent is sufficient to find guilt as to the charged crimes;
28 and patently false claims that ***all*** of the “adult” revenue was from illegal prostitution).

1 The opening's egregious combination of the multitude of improprieties, and the deafening
2 lack of actual evidence of the indicted crimes, leaves no doubt that these jurors have been
3 irretrievably tainted. Other than issuing a judgment of acquittal, a mistrial is the only means to
4 protect Defendants' due process rights to a fair trial.

5 **V. THE GOVERNMENT'S FILINGS SUPPORT DEFENDANTS' POSITION**
6 **THAT A JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL OR MISTRIAL IS NECESSARY.**

7 The government's opening ended by recounting a crass and inhumane purported
8 statement from Mr. Lacey to Nacole Svengard that *does not track what Svengard told the*
9 *government as reported in her 302*. The government argued that Mr. Lacey "pointblank"
10 threatened a grieving mother, when in reality, the purported statement was simply a random
11 comment supposedly overhead that was expressed to reporters. Ex. A at 57 ("Nacole will also
12 tell you that outside of the chambers of the U.S. Senate, *she crossed paths with defendant*
13 *Michael Lacey. And defendant Lacey told her, pointblank*, that if these yahoos would keep
14 their fucking mouth shut, we wouldn't have all these issues. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury,
15 thankfully, these mothers, NCMEC, Auburn Theological Seminary, the U.S. Senate, these entities
16 and individuals didn't keep their mouth shut, and because of it, Backpage.com is shut down."
17 (emphasis added)).⁵

18 When defense counsel challenged the government's use of this purported threat from Mr.
19 Lacey to Svengard, the government told this Court that Svengard's statement "where she relates
20 to running into Mr. Lacey at the Senate Subcommittee and making that - - him making that
21 statement to her" was in a previously disclosed 302. Ex. A at 72. The government's
22 representation is inaccurate. Fortunately, the Court asked the government to provide documents
23 in support of its position. Ex. A at 83. The 302s related to Svengard that the government filed
24 at Dkt. 1267-3 and 1267-4 (under seal at Dkt. 1269) confirm that the government is
25 misrepresenting what purportedly happened.

26 ⁵ This summary statement is a telling concession that the government's entire misguided
27 prosecution is based, not on any particular evidence connecting any Defendant to any illegal Travel
28 Act crime requiring specific intent, but instead based on this collection of conclusory, hearsay
opinions of parties who simply do not like the protected speech at issue. None of these opinions
have any place in a court of law.

1 The government’s own memos related to Svengard were created in February and June of
2 2020, but *inexplicably withheld from production to defense counsel for 16 months*. When
3 the government finally did produce these three pages, it buried them in 6500+ documents
4 dumped on defense counsel just before trial. Dkt. 1267-7. More importantly, these 302s confirm
5 that the government distorted its purported evidence and presented to the jury a highly
6 inflammatory statement. The government told the jury that Mr. Lacey essentially callously
7 verbally assaulted a mother grieving her child’s trafficking (Ex. A at 57), when Svengard actually
8 told the government that she overheard Lacey speaking to reporters (none of whom has ever
9 reported on the alleged statement). In February 2020, FBI agents Amy Fryberger and Desirae
10 Tolhurst reported that:

11 During the meeting with Svendgard in December 2017 (Serial 135) she
12 stated that James Larkin made a comment calling them “a bunch of yahoos
13 and they should keep their f’ing mouths shut.” Svendgard was shown
14 pictures of Larkin and Michael Lacey. She corrected her previous statement
to identify, by picture, Lacey as the one *to have made this comment to*
reporters outside of the U.S. Senate Hearing.

15 Dkt. 1269 at Ex. C. In June 2020, FBI agent Desirae Tolhurst reported that Svengard “reviewed
16 a digital copy (official record) of the FD-302 documenting her interview on February 19, 2020.
17 Nacole did not make any corrections other than the [last name of the] person who trafficked
18 J.S.” Dkt. 1269 at Ex. D.

19 The Court also ordered the government to provide information about its burden shifting
20 statement. Ex. A at 83. In response, the government filed a 302 of Paula Selis from an April 12,
21 2017 interview as well as Selis’ June 27, 2012 declaration from *Backpage.com, LLC v. Robert M.*
22 *McKenna, et al.*, Case No. 12-cv-00954-RSM (W.D. Wash.). Dkt. 1269 at Ex. A; Dkt. 1267 at Ex.
23 B. Contrary to the government’s burden shifting statement in opening (Ex. A at 40) and
24 justifications for this egregiously unconstitutional statement when questioned by the Court (Ex.
25 A at 70-71), the government’s own filings demonstrate that Selis *never* said that the six individual
26 Defendants on trial admitted or failed to deny “that they knew the vast majority of the ads on
27 Backpage.com were nothing less than prostitution ads.” Ex. A at 40; *see* Dkt. 1269 at Ex. B &
28 Dkt. 1267 at Ex. A (where this comment never appears). Further, as discussed *infra* at 5-6, the

1 Court expressly precluded the government from getting into statements of a Backpage attorney.
2 The government ignored this order.

3 **VI. CONCLUSION**

4 The government's opening was far from an objective summary of the evidence reasonably
5 expected to be elicited at trial. Instead, it was full of references to purported evidence that is
6 inadmissible and unsupported. The government's opening and its brazen disregard for this
7 Court's prior orders warrant a judgment of acquittal, or alternatively, at a minimum, a mistrial.
8 Nothing else will correct the extreme prejudice and constitutional violations the government
9 intentionally caused.

10 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6th day of September 2021,
11

12 BIENERT KATZMAN LITTRELL
13 WILLIAMS LLP
14 s/ Whitney Z. Bernstein
15 Thomas H. Bienert, Jr.
Whitney Z. Bernstein
Attorneys for James Larkin

16 *Pursuant to the District's Electronic Case Filing Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual (Oct. 2020) §*
17 *II(C)(3), Whitney Z. Bernstein hereby attests that all other signatories listed, and on whose behalf this filing is*
18 *submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized its filing.*

19 LIPSITZ GREEN SCIME CAMBRIA LLP
20 s/ Paul J. Cambria, Jr.
21 Paul J. Cambria, Jr.
Erin McCampbell Paris
Attorneys for Michael Lacey

22 BIRD MARELLA BOXER WOLPERT
23 NESSIM DROOKS LINCENBERG AND
24 RHOW PC
25 s/ Gary S. Lincenberg
26 Gary S. Lincenberg
Ariel A. Neuman
Gopi K. Panchapakesan
27 Attorneys for John Brunst
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FEDER LAW OFFICE PA
s/ Bruce Feder
Bruce Feder
Attorneys for Scott Spear

DAVID EISENBERG PLC
s/ David Eisenberg
David Eisenberg
Attorneys for Andrew Padilla

JOY BERTRAND ESQ LLC
s/ Joy Bertrand
Joy Bertrand
Attorneys for Joye Vaught

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on September 6, 2021, I electronically transmitted the attached
3 document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice
4 of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF registrants who have entered their appearance as counsel of
5 record.

6 /s/ Toni Thomas
7 Toni Thomas
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28