1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mark J. Geragos (SBN 108325) Tina Glandian (SBN 251614) Setara Qassim (SBN 283552) GERAGOS & GERAGOS APC 644 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017-3411 Telephone: (213) 625-3900 Facsimile: (213) 232-3255 Angela M. Machala (SBN: 224496) AMachala@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 333 S. Grand Avenue, 38th Fl. Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543 Telephone: (213) 615-1700 Facsimile: (213) 615-1750 Abbe David Lowell (admitted pro hac vice Abbe Lowell Public Outreach@winston.com	
	AbbeLowellPublicOutreach@winston.com Christopher D. Man	
11 12	CMan@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 1901 L Street NW	
	Washington, DC 20036-3508	
13	Telephone: (202) 282-5000 Facsimile: (202) 282-5100	
14	Attorneys for Robert Hunter Biden	
15	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
16	CENTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA
17 18	UNITED STATES	Case No. 2:23-cr-00599-MCS
19	Plaintiff,	Hon. Mark C. Scarsi
20	VS.	MR. BIDEN'S THIRD MOTION IN
21	ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN,	LIMINE TO EXCLUDE REFERENCE TO HIS
22	Defendant.	"EXTRAVAGANT" LIFESTYLE
23	Defendant.	AND SALACIOUS DETAILS ABOUT SPENDING ON
24		PERSONAL EXPENSES
25		Hearing Date: August 21, 2024
26		Hearing Time: 1:00 p.m.
27		Courtroom: 7C
28		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Defendant Robert Hunter Biden, by and through his counsel of record, hereby files this Motion <i>in Limine</i> to exclude any reference to his purportedly "extravagant" lifestyle and any salacious details about his personal expenses. This evidence should be excluded under the Federal Rule of Evidence 403 balancing test, as the risk of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, and misleading the jury far outweighs any purported probative value of including such specific unnecessary details. On May 17, 2024, Mr. Biden's counsel asked for the Special Counsel's position on this proposed motion <i>in limine</i> . On May 20, 2024, the Special Counsel indicated he intends to oppose such a motion.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dated: July 31, 2024 Respectfully submitted, /s/ Angela M. Machala Angela M. Machala /s/ Mark Geragos Mark J. Geragos Tina Glandian Setara Qassim Abbe David Lowell Christopher D. Man
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Attorneys for Robert Hunter Biden

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Mr. Biden moves to exclude any evidence, testimony, or reference to his alleged "extravagant" lifestyle during the time period in question and any salacious details about money purportedly spent on certain personal expenses, including, but not limited to, reference to sex workers, adult entertainment, a sex club membership, pornography, and strip clubs.¹ To the extent the Court is inclined to allow into evidence that Mr. Biden spent money on items other than his taxes in the years charged, Mr. Biden would agree to stipulate that he spent money on other, generalized "personal expenses."

The Special Counsel's focus on Mr. Biden's payment for items sexual in nature, referenced repeatedly in the Indictment, would be unfairly prejudicial beyond any possible probative value and would pose a danger of confusing the issues and misleading the jury. Fed. R. Evid. 403; *Boyd v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 576 F.3d 938, 949 (9th Cir. 2009) (failure to exclude song lyrics referencing prostitution was an error because they had no probative value and were unfairly prejudicial in light of their offensive nature); *United States v. Rakow*, 2006 WL 8445943, at *5 (C.D. Cal. July 3, 2006) (prohibiting government from highlighting specific expenditures from a credit card statement as prejudicial); *Kitsch LLC v. Deejayzoo, LLC*, 2023 WL 4291445, at *5 (C.D. Cal. May 8, 2023) (on motion to exclude derogatory or inflammatory descriptions about plaintiff or its products, such as "knockoff," "Chinese," or "pirate," the court excluded such terms under Rule 403, and stated "parties shall make their arguments in neutral, non-inflammatory terms."). None of the evidence on this issue is relevant to any of the elements that the Special Counsel needs to prove in this tax-focused Indictment.

¹ Mr. Biden raised concerns with this type of language in his Motion to Strike Surplusage. (DE 33.) The Court issued an order stating that it is not this Court's practice to read the Indictment, or provide a copy of it, to the petit jury. (DE 34.) However, that order does not remedy the issue of presenting the jury with prejudicial language through evidence and testimony at trial.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Unnecessary salacious details—especially relating to collateral alleged sexual conduct—is exactly the type of prejudicial, inflammatory evidence that makes a conviction more likely because it provokes an emotional response in the jury. <i>See United States v. Yazzie</i> , 59 F.3d 807, 822 (9th Cir. 1995). The Special Counsel may wish to introduce such evidence for the very reason that it is salacious and would pique the interest of the jury, but for the same reasons and because such evidence would distract the jury from the crimes charged, such information would also be highly prejudicial to Mr. Biden. Introduction of this evidence would be an improper use of character evidence and is irrelevant to prove that Mr. Biden allegedly committed the crimes charged in the Indictment. Accordingly, Mr. Biden respectfully requests that the Court exclude reference to his purportedly "extravagant" lifestyle and salacious details about money spent on certain personal expenses, including, but not limited to, sex workers, adult entertainment, a sex club membership, pornography, and strip clubs.	
16 17	Date: July 31, 2024 Respectfully submitted,	
18 19	By: <u>/s/ Angela M. Machala</u> Angela Machala (SBN: 224496)	
20	AMachala@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP	
21	333 South Grand Avenue	
22	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel.: (213) 615-1924	
23	Fax: (213) 615-1750	
24 25	Abbe David Lowell (<i>admitted pro hac vice</i>) Christopher D. Man	

26

27

28

AWN LLP venue 0071 (admitted pro hac vice) WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 1901 L Street NW Washington, DC 20036 Tel.: (202) 282-5000 Fax: (202) 282-5100