# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
Plaintiff,	. CR No. 23-0252 (ACR)
<b>v</b> .	
MARIO MARES,	. Washington, D.C. . Wednesday, November 15, 2023
Defendant.	. 2:46 p.m.

## BOND REVIEW HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANA C. REYES UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

#### **APPEARANCES**:

For the Government:	KATHERINE E. BOYLES, AUSA U.S. Attorney's Office 157 Church Street 25th Floor
	New Haven, CT 06510
	RYAN SELLINGER, AUSA
	U.S. Attorney's Office
	601 D Street NW
	Washington, DC 20530
For Defendant:	CAROLYN STEWART, ESQ.
	1204 Swilley Road
	Plant City, FL 33567
Court Reporter:	BRYAN A. WAYNE, RPR, CRR
	U.S. Courthouse, Room 4704-A
	333 Constitution Avenue NW
	Washington, DC 20001

Proceedings reported by stenotype shorthand. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (Via Teleconference) 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Criminal action 23-252, United States of America versus Mario Mares. Would the 4 parties please identify themselves for the record. 5 6 MS. BOYLES: Good afternoon, Your Honor. AUSA 7 Katherine Boyles on behalf of the United States, and with 8 me on the line is AUSA Ryan Sellinger. 9 MR. SELLINGER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Ms. Boyles, have we met? 11 MS. BOYLES: Yes, we have, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Which case? 13 MS. BOYLES: I've been before you, along with AUSA 14 Sellinger, in two sealed matters. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Welcome back. Good afternoon. 16 MS. BOYLES: Thank you. 17 THE COURT: For the defense? 18 MS. STEWART: Yes, Your Honor. This is Carolyn Stewart 19 for the defendant, Mario Mares. THE COURT: Okay. So the reason I got us all on the 20 21 phone is because I've been looking at the Bail Reform Act 22 motion. 23 And, Ms. Stewart, just to start, you're got going 24 to get anywhere with me by claiming repeatedly that this 25 guy is being prosecuted because of his free-speech rights.

He's being prosecuted because he's been indicted by a grand 1 2 jury for violating the law. So I don't want to hear that 3 going forward, but the actual substance of your motion is actually quite a good one. And I'm worried that maybe I'm 4 5 missing something, so I wanted to get us all on the phone 6 before an evidentiary hearing. 7 As far as I can tell, Mr. Mares has no criminal history 8 background at all and no indicia of violence. Is that correct? 9 Is that correct, Ms. Boyles? MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor. No criminal history. 10 11 THE COURT: Okay. And then he was arrested in August 12 of 2023? 13 MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor. 14 So about two and a half months after --THE COURT: 15 two years and six months after January 6? 16 MS. BOYLES: That's correct. 17 THE COURT: And there was nothing that occurred during 18 that time period? He is not subject to any crime, he hasn't 19 been accused of any violence, he hasn't posted threats to 20 people, to your knowledge? 21 MS. BOYLES: Your Honor, there are some issues that 22 we've raised initially before the magistrate judge in Texas 23 regarding concerns about potential violence, but there's not 24 been an example or instance of actual violence.

THE COURT: Right. Yeah, yeah. Okay. I just want

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to make sure I understand everything so we're all on the same page here. All right. So for two and a half years, he was out and nothing happened so far as we're aware.

MS. BOYLES: That's correct, Your Honor. He did make statements upon his arrest to the FBI that were particularly concerning, but nothing else that we're aware of beyond those statements.

THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, I know, but we're going to go through those statements. And with respect to the FBI statements, basically the concern is -- I'm just looking at the -- sorry -- just looking for the actual statements here. One of the statements that he made to the FBI that you're concerned about is that he said he did not bring a firearm into D.C., but, if he had, it would have been his lawful right to do so. Right?

MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, I was just having a conversation with my clerk. I don't even know whether it would have been illegal for him to bring a firearm into the District at that time period, given Supreme Court cases. I mean, I know that D.C. just a couple of months ago settled with people who were convicted and put in prison for violating the firearms statute here and they were freed because of the most recent Supreme Court opinion, and then after that they sued and D.C. settled for \$5 million. So I don't know about

## Case 1:23-cr-00252-ACR Document 22 Filed 11/29/23 Page 5 of 31

whether it was obvious that he could or could not bring a firearm into D.C. given current case law. And I'm sure there's an answer to that, but his view that he had a lawful right to do so doesn't seem particularly troublesome.

I mean, he said, "I have a constitutional right to bear arms no matter what." Now, obviously, that's a broad reading of the Second Amendment, probably some people might be perfectly happy with it, but I'm not sure that that indicates that he's going to commit violence. And then --

MS. BOYLES: Yes --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Go ahead. Respond to that if you want.

MS. BOYLES: Yeah. All I was going to say was my understanding of the detention hearing that proceeded in Texas is that the magistrate there was concerned that the defendant would not follow conditions that had been set. And so the suggestion --

THE COURT: Yeah, I read the whole -- yes, I read the whole transcript, Ms. Boyles. I read the whole transcript. And the reason I'm going through this is because I read the transcript and I don't understand how he came to the decision he made. I mean, there was no -- well, let me just go through it so we're all on the same page. I just want to keep doing what I'm doing.

24 So we have that FBI statement, and then we have the second 25 FBI statement.

1 FBI says: "Do you think we're at a point where we're 2 ready for another revolution, yes or no?" 3 And he says: "This country has come to somewhere where 4 everybody needs to look at it and say what are we doing. 5 And like I said, if you -- the law and everybody's good, 6 it's good. But when you cross that line of tyranny, man, 7 yes. You should be strung up like in the old days and hung 8 for tyranny." 9 "You feel strongly about that." FBI: 10 "I mean, if you're corrupt, yes." Mares: 11 I mean, that's obviously not ideal, but that's -- you 12 know, that's a flag, essentially. I'm not sure if it's a red 13 flag; maybe it's a yellow flag. He owns a bunch of guns and 14 rifles, apparently. It's beyond me why people buy so many 15 rifles and guns, but they do have a constitutional right to 16 do so. And, so far as I'm aware, there's no assertion that any of 17 18 these guns that he's been associated with he had without a 19 permit or was somehow carrying illegally, putting aside carrying 20 them into the Capitol, right? 21 MS. BOYLES: So they were illegal to carry into the 22 Capitol. There's no --23 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. Of course. 24 MS. BOYLES: -- them illegally outside of D.C. Under 25 Texas law, he was abiding by Texas law.

#### Case 1:23-cr-00252-ACR Document 22 Filed 11/29/23 Page 7 of 31

THE COURT: Okay. So when he had all these guns in 1 2 Texas, he was abiding by Texas law. 3 MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor. Okay. All right. And so then we get 4 THE COURT: 5 to what I quess is really the heart of the matter, unless 6 I'm missing something, which is these posts that he made, 7 which, Ms. Stewart, I mean, they are pretty troubling. 8 So he has a post on December 27, 2020: "I believe that every #patriot should on January 6 if you can't make it to DC 9 10 you should go to your state capitol and local mayors offices 11 heavily armed and drag out and either jail or execute all the 12 known CORRUPT #politicians for treason!" 13 I mean, that's pretty bad, Ms. Stewart. 14 MS. STEWART: Yes, Your Honor, but --15 THE COURT: I'm not -- I haven't asked you to speak 16 You will have your time. yet. 17 MS. STEWART: Oh, okay. 18 THE COURT: I just want to get through this. 19 MS. STEWART: All right. Thank you. Okay. 20 THE COURT: And then we have another post on Christmas 21 Eve; I guess he wasn't out Christmas shopping. 22 He has: "Fuckin #Pelosi, you are not pulling anyone out of 23 the Whitehouse by their hair" -- blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, 24 lots of "f" word, lots of "f" word -- "WE ARE GOING TO FIND YOU 25 AND WE THE PEOPLE WITH NO MERCY ARE GOING TO HANG OR EXECUTE

7

YOU!!! WE HAVE HAD ENOUGH!! YOU BETTER HOPE TRUMP FINDS YOU FIRST!!!"

Okay. So, obviously, that's pretty bad.

And then on Christmas -- ironic, Ms. Stewart, given that apparently your client, based on all the letters I've read, is quite the devout Christian. I don't know how Jesus would feel about threatening to kill and execute people but, you know, to each his own, I guess.

All right. So on December 25th we have: "Time to start the LYNCHING party!! #PATRIOTS coming for you corrupt #politicians."

So, Ms. Boyles, those are the three tweets that I am aware of where there's actual -- or social media posts where there are actual threats of violence. Am I missing anything else?

MS. BOYLES: No, you're not, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. And these happened before January 6, so before he was at the Capitol.

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

MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And when he was at the Capitol, he was apparently there for about two hours. And there's an allegation that he was carrying a gun, and the grand jury did indict him on that offense; but there's no allegation that he participated in any violence himself, right? You all say that he was in an area where there was violence and he should have been aware of it, but there's no allegation that he engaged in any violence. Correct?

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

MS. BOYLES: That's right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then, again, two and a half years go by and he hasn't executed -- or tried to execute or carried out on any of these social media threats. Right?

MS. BOYLES: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And then what I've got are about 15 support letters -- were these support letters in front of the magistrate?

MS. STEWART: Your Honor, there was only, I think, two of them and the person was there, the justice of the peace; and then another person, Plummer, either a letter or in person; and then also his wife. I don't know if the defense submitted all of the other support letters. I'm not sure that they did. I think they just relied on those three people representing the community.

THE COURT: All right. Well, so, Ms. Boyles, I don't know if you had a chance to look at these letters, but I got a letter from his wife, obviously, a law enforcement official, a business person, a bank CEO, his bank teller, an assistant pastor, a farmer, a number of people who have worked together both on farm, welding, and financial industries.

I've had people who've known him for over 20 years, in some cases I think 23 to 25 years, and all of them say the same thing, which he's a law-abiding citizen, has never to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

their knowledge, other than of course the allegations with respect to January 6, ever violated the law, they all would feel very comfortable with him in a small town, and none of them have ever seen any indicia of violence. He also apparently has contributed mightily to his community including through something as simple as volunteer work.

So I guess my question, Ms. Boyles, is -- I mean, I guess that these social media posts are pretty bad, but nothing before or after those posts support that he's not a lawabiding citizen.

And the reason -- I don't want to put you on the spot, because I know if you want one you're going to have an evidentiary hearing, but first -- and I know that my court reporter has been working yeoman's hours to try to get everyone out of hearing prior to -- I guess you guys finally decided on a day on December 8, but I gotta to tell you, unless I hear something dramatically different at that evidentiary hearing other than these posts, or maybe the FBI's going to convince me, I don't know, I mean, I don't see how I could possibly keep this guy in jail.

And so I guess my question -- one of my questions is, Ms. Boyles, in light of the fact that you now have all of these letters, can the government -- does the government want to rethink its position? That's not a rhetorical question. I mean, I think you should consider it. If you want to put

### Case 1:23-cr-00252-ACR Document 22 Filed 11/29/23 Page 11 of 31

the burden on me, I mean, I'll do it. I have a job to do. Secondly is, I don't want this guy in jail for another three or four weeks because of scheduling issues if I do decide to release him. So what I would also like to do is see if we can all figure out a way -- if you want, have an evidentiary hearing -- get this done before December 8.

So, Ms. Boyles, I've said a lot, and I'm going to let you talk.

MS. BOYLES: I appreciate that, Your Honor. So if I could ask you just one question: Have you been able to review our motion for pretrial detention that was filed in Texas?

THE COURT: I have.

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

MS. BOYLES: Okay. So I just wanted to make sure that that was in front of you.

Your Honor, I think in this case the government is in the position of being very concerned, obviously, about any kind of violence happening in the Capitol, and the idea of an individual coming into D.C. with weapons, knowing, as the government alleges and the grand jury alleges, that he knew he was not supposed to be carrying weapons, and then even on the day of his arrest two and a half years later is still maintaining that, no matter what, he could still bring weapons into the Capitol, given some of the other posts and the text messages that are also documented in our original filings, which we did intend to supplement today -- I appreciate the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court kind of cutting to the chase here. Given all of that background, we do maintain that it's appropriate to detain him at this time given the potential for violence as well as the concerns over whether or not he would abide by conditions.

Now, I do take the Court's point and appreciate the fact that, with all this community support rallying behind him, that is a point that the Court should consider and may be less of a concern now that we have those letters and that we have that documentation that the Texas magistrate judge did not have the benefit of.

But, you know, at the end of the day, this is a case about -- this is a case about coming to D.C., knowing that he was violating the laws of D.C., and bringing in weapons that we know exponentially increase the likelihood and the potential for violence and what that violence looks like.

I don't have anything else to offer the Court today. We are still happy to file a responsive filing, but I understand if the Court wishes to rule today.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm not planning. I mean, if you guys want time to file, I'm not going to rule today. I'm not putting you on the spot that way. I mean, I would love to rule today, but I don't think that's fair to you all.

Ms. Stewart, can you explain these posts to me? I mean, so far as I can tell, the statements to the FBI and these posts are the linchpins of why he was detained pretrial and --

I mean, they're not nothing. I mean they're pretty bad. 1 2 Is there anything that you can do on those things? 3 MS. STEWART: Well, I can, Your Honor. Thank you. You know -- and I'd like to start off with he made these posts, 4 5 but he did not bring weapons into D.C. So I'll go back to the 6 posts. He was, I would say, angry. 7 He was inundated -- and I'm not blaming social media. 8 He'll take responsibility for making very bad posts and being 9 ashamed and embarrassed of them. 10 First, he was on a platform with all of about 10 or 12 11 viewers. So we can put that into perspective. He was not on 12 Twitter; he was on Facebook. He -- you know, somebody else 13 hacked into his account. So he wasn't on those major platforms. 14 But he made those posts, and that's -- I think this is the bad situation of what I'll call the "sewer" of social media, 15 16 where both sides and the middle are being riled up and wound up 17 by all of the different this is happening, this is happening, 18 with the different claims. 19 But he was hearing and seeing news, whether he has the radio 20 on when he's out doing his welding work or in the truck driving 21 between places, and he's hearing, you know, Nancy Pelosi say 22 "we're going to drag Trump out of the White House," and I think 23 as an American he found it very disconcerting to have members 24 of Congress threatening violence against the president. And

two wrongs don't make a right, and he'll say that to this day.

25

He has no good excuse for those other than it angered him. 1 2 So that's the angriest anybody in the world has ever seen 3 Mr. Mares. He's never picked up a weapon. He's never hit anybody. I know the government keeps saying he brought them in 4 5 because they pointed at his, you know, body fat and called that 6 a weapon, and we'll deal with demonstrations to show that that's 7 actually impossible with putting a weapon under a shirt to show 8 is almost ludicrous --THE COURT: If you're going to do that, I suggest 9 10 you make sure that it's the exact same weapon that they're 11 alleging he had --12 MS. STEWART: Right. 13 THE COURT: -- because otherwise they're going to 14 object. 15 MS. STEWART: Right. 16 But anyway, we'll get to that later. THE COURT: 17 All right. 18 MS. STEWART: Right. Right. 19 THE COURT: Well, let me say this: 20 Ms. Boyles, I'm obviously going to let the government have 21 -- you have a right to oppose the motion, and you don't have 22 to answer today, but do you need an evidentiary hearing? 23 Because I don't need to hear from the wife. I mean, I read 24 her testimony before. I have her letter before me. I have 25 letters that the magistrate didn't have. If you want me to

hear from your FBI agent, I guess we can do that.

But if this would just save everyone time and energy enough, we can do this on the papers. But again, Ms. Boyles, I just want to make clear that I'm going to give you all whatever hearing you want, and you can maybe tell us tomorrow what you want if you don't know right now.

MS. BOYLES: Your Honor, at this point I would say --I don't think that we need an evidentiary hearing. Your Honor has primarily the information that we were going to be presenting in our opposition. The government maintains that detention is appropriate in this case.

However, if the Court wishes to rule on the current papers, being the defense's motion that was filed here and our memo that was filed in Texas that's filed here at docket entry 16, Exhibit 4, we would rest on our original memo and are comfortable with the Court ruling today.

THE COURT: All right. Terrific. Thank you, Ms. Boyles. So I am going to order his release. I do think I need to make some findings. So we're going to write up a short order. We will get that posted probably not until tomorrow, and I will work with our probation people to figure out -- where is he being held right now?

MS. STEWART: Your Honor, he's in the D.C. jail, the D.C. detention facility. I think it's over on E Street, 19th. It's in D.C. THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Boyles, I am going to impose conditions of probation. Do you want to work together with Ms. Stewart to get those to me what you want? Ms. Stewart, he's not going to be allowed anywhere near any kind of gun. I'm talking not even a Nerf gun. Are we clear?

MS. STEWART: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. BOYLES: Your Honor, I was just going to say, I'm happy to work with Ms. Stewart on precise conditions, but just to forecast for the Court, we would also be seeking very strict conditions on any contact whatsoever with anyone who may be a codefendant or a witness in this case.

THE COURT: Yes.

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

MS. BOYLES: I believe Mr. Mares understands who those persons would be, and we want to make sure there is absolutely no contact with those individuals.

THE COURT: Yes. I mean --

MS. STEWART: Your Honor, if I may be heard --THE COURT: Sure.

MS. STEWART: If I may be heard, you know, it is a small-town America. And I think I went through this in the motion, but I think such an order, since this was done prior to his knowledge, sealed with the other two codefendants in this same case that they receive the order. I don't think we can say no contact, you know, where if they all -- there's one restaurant, and they're all in there. It's no talking, no

So, Ms. Boyles, if you want a no contact, just make sure that she has, and we have, the exact people so there's no dispute down the line that there was someone he didn't know about --

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

MS. BOYLES: Sure.

THE COURT: -- that you all thought he should have known about.

MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No firearms anywhere. I'm going to find the strictest no-firearm, whatever, I can find.

20 Pretrial Services? Okay. We're going to get -- we're 21 going to get Pretrial -- I'm going to figure out how to get 22 this done as quickly as possible to ensure that there are 23 conditions of release.

Ms. Stewart, please explain to your client that the Second Amendment, while a cornerstone of our democracy, is not

without some limitations, including that I can put limitations 1 2 on him during pretrial probation, okay? MS. STEWART: Your Honor, absolutely no problem with 3 4 that. Yes. 5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Boyles, thank you. 6 I appreciate your work. Ms. Stewart, thank you. 7 MS. STEWART: Your Honor, can I ask something before we 8 get into this? And I explained this in the motion. I know 9 the government all the time wants to put ankle bracelets and all this other stuff. 10 11 Can we dispense with that ahead of time so that we can come 12 up with something reasonable, least restrictive? I just -- I 13 just don't want to have that we're both coming in arguing and 14 the minds aren't going to meet. He runs all over the county 15 working. He's going to be out of GPS range. He's going to be 16 in barns and metal buildings that the signal won't --

THE COURT: I'm not putting him on home confinement, so why would he have an ankle bracelet?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. STEWART: Exactly. That's my point.

MS. BOYLES: Your Honor, we do typically, in cases like this, ask for electronic monitoring, not that that would keep him within home detention situations, that that would give authorities the ability to locate him if there were to be any kind of issue.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I don't think that's

necessary here, Ms. Boyles. I mean, look. My guess is, given where he lives, if you wanted to find out where he was, you would know in about 10 minutes. And if he's gonna flee -you know, given everything I have in front of me, I can't imagine that he's going to flee, but if you feel strongly, work something out with Ms. Stewart.

MR. SELLINGER: Your Honor, can I be briefly heard on that? This is AUSA Ryan Sellinger.

THE COURT: Yeah, sure.

MR. SELLINGER: So one of the things we're going for, which we're going to articulate and provide to the Court, is the stay-away. And the individuals and their home locations and the electronic monitoring would be significantly easier, and frankly necessary, to enforce the stay-away.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on --

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

-- (parties overspeaking) --

THE COURT: Hold on. What about Ms. Stewart's concern that he might be out of GPS range given where he lives? What can we do about that?

MR. SELLINGER: Your Honor, I'm not sure. From our perspective, we're obviously, you know, in the position we are where we're opposing release and we have, as I just said, significant safety concerns. So I think that, given that he is being released, it is the least restrictive condition. I don't know -- I don't even know what a GPS range is. So I'm

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not sure of what could be done to accommodate that, but we think electronic monitoring, at a minimum, is necessary under these circumstances.

MS. STEWART: Okay. Your Honor, if I may, I mean, I do know these devices, and I do know the problems from multiple other people, attorneys and defendants, and the fact of the matter is there's a requirement to be in cell phone range if you're in a building or something else and you're not outside, and these are rural areas where he's not going to be. And then he's going to get ten calls, go stand here, stop your work, go plug in, do this, and it serves no purpose because it's not going to be an immediate warning.

And I think if the other two unnamed-to-date codefendants are also told to stay away, we can tell them don't drive down that road; if you have to, go do business somewhere else, don't go down the road where their house is. I think we can make that order specific enough.

And the other thing I'm very concerned about is -- this has happened to other people who do outside work around machinery, is those ankle bracelets are dangerous. They run loose. They get caught on things. We could cause a serious injury. And to what purpose? He's not a flight risk. Because that's what those were designed for, actually, to keep child predators in a certain area and for flight risk, which he's not.

So I really, really want to object and argue against doing

22

23

24

25

something like that, because this could cause injury to him.

THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Sellinger, if Mr. Mares goes to the local Dunkin Donuts and you have the GPS he's at the Dunkin Donuts, I don't know, I assume the other defendants, or the other stay-away people, don't have GPS bracelets. So even if you knew that, you wouldn't know that they were together. And I mean -- I guess these guys aren't stupid enough to go to the house to meet if they have a GPS anklet.

MR. SELLINGER: So, Your Honor, we haven't anticipated and drafted the stay-away order that we're now discussing, but I imagine that there would be a location or locations that would be included as part of that stay away, and the way to enforce a stay-away for a location is both I guess someone letting us know, and then also GPS monitoring. And so that's -- it's not just for individuals. It's also for locations.

MS. STEWART: Well, his cell phone gives pings and locations. So, again, if he's in a cell phone area, if somebody wants to go back and check, Your Honor, you know, the government can put into Google to tell where he was or for the cell phone towers to provide that as opposed to risking him being injured and precluding his work where, you know, he's going to be places where again that GPS signal's not going to get through the metal barn and again -- it just leads to let's say he's violating his conditions of release. That's all it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

does at this point, other than offering to injure him.

THE COURT: All right. Hold on, everyone. Just let me think about this for a moment.

Okay. First, we need to get Pretrial Services involved, so I'm going to ask for their views on this. It seems to me that there should be some sort of compromise that we can figure out that would address the government's concern.

I mean, I have to tell you, Ms. Boyles and Mr. Sellinger, the reason -- and I'm not just saying he has to -- I think the actual concern here is just minimal. I mean, the guy was out for two and a half years doing nothing after January 6, so -- you know. You know. I hope to God I don't get proven wrong, but...

MS. BOYLES: If I could just be heard for a moment on that, I do think that the government's specific concern at this point is what's changed in the past two and a half years is Mr. Mares is now aware that two members of his community have been involved in the criminal justice system as part of this case and as a part of this investigation, and he knows who those individuals are.

And so we do have a heightened safety concern, as with any cooperator in any criminal case, that there's a potential threat to those individuals. So the request for electronic monitoring is to make sure that we can be assured of their safety. And if there is some kind of violation, understanding

1 that they may cross paths in common areas in their community, 2 we do think a method for verifying that he has not otherwise 3 violated a potential stay-away order that we will draft is of paramount importance for the safety of those individuals. 4 5 And with regard to Ms. Stewart's suggestion that we could 6 somehow just ping his phone, as I'm sure Your Honor 7 understands, that would require getting a search warrant. 8 I'm not actually sure that we could get -- I haven't looked --THE COURT: It's not even practical because he can just 9 leave his phone in his house. 10 11 MS. BOYLES: Saying we could track his phone --12 THE COURT: You don't have to convince me on that, That's a nonstarter. 13 Ms. Boyles. 14 MS. STEWART: Well, Your Honor, I would put in --15 THE COURT: Yes --16 MS. STEWART: Okay. THE COURT: Go ahead. 17 18 MS. STEWART: I don't know why Ms. Boyles thinks this 19 told Mr. Mares over a year ago that he is news. 20 was having to get a lawyer and he was being prosecuted in some 21 This isn't news. Mr. Mares could care less way or another. 22 about what say. He doesn't care about and 23 And as a matter of fact, as I mentioned in my motion, them. 24 it's all the more to his benefit if the government wants to 25 bring him as a witness. His view is bring them on because

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

their testimony and their prior inconsistent statements are to his benefit.

Their safety is of paramount importance to him. He doesn't want to see any injury come to them, nor has he ever in his entire life injured any person. And to say we're going to essentially put on something that would be a punishment, not a least restrictive means of saying he abides by release conditions but using it almost as a punishment just against him, it doesn't even make sense unless all three are wearing ankle monitors. And none of them need to be wearing ankle monitors, based on where they live and everybody knows what's going on.

THE COURT: Okay. Here's what we're going to do. I'm going to ask Pretrial Services to weigh in. If Pretrial Services recommends ankle bracelets, I am going to require that. However, I am going to ask for -- I am going to give Ms. Stewart the right to update me every 21 days. We'll figure out some language where if it's actually causing issues with respect to his work or with respect to dropped cell phones or whatever, then I will revisit it.

So basically, Ms. Stewart, I'm just -- I'm not going to assume it's going to be a problem. If Pretrial Services wants the ankle bracelet that the government makes -- I mean, I tend to agree that your logic sounds better. But I am letting the guy out of prison, so seems like an ankle bracelet is something

he would prefer to trade than prison. 1 2 But, again, if it becomes the problem that you think it's 3 going to become, then I'll give you the right to come back, and we can have another phone call and we can figure out if it 4 5 actually is needed or if it's actually more hassle than it's 6 worth. Okay? 7 MS. STEWART: Thank you very much, Your Honor. 8 MS. BOYLES: Your Honor? 9 Yes, Ms. Boyles. THE COURT: 10 I apologize. I don't perhaps know the MS. BOYLES: 11 precise language of what I'm asking for, but I would ask, 12 I guess nunc pro tunc, to redact the names that Ms. Stewart 13 just put on the record because --14 THE COURT: Yeah. Could you please -- Ms. Court 15 Reporter, I'm ordering that those names be stricken from 16 the record. 17 MS. BOYLES: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? 19 MS. STEWART: Your Honor, if I may, do we have at least 20 a projected time when he will be able to walk out the doors? 21 I know we're going to do release conditions. Can we have a 22 date, because we want to have his wife there with IDs. He 23 obviously has to get back to Texas, and I plan to go up and 24 assist him in getting outside the prison doors, or the jail 25 doors.

### Case 1:23-cr-00252-ACR Document 22 Filed 11/29/23 Page 26 of 31

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

THE COURT: Yeah. There's also going to be a D.C. stay-away order. So that should be part of your conditions as well. I have no idea how all this works. I'm actually trying to figure it out as we speak. I want this guy out of prison. He shouldn't be in prison. I will make this happen as quickly as I can. I just don't know how long that will take. If you guys can agree on the probation -- if we can talk to Pretrial and get that done tomorrow, or Friday at the latest, I mean I'll enter the order as soon as I get the go-ahead.

MS. STEWART: Okay, Your Honor. Well, I'd ask that the government and I come to an agreement by no later than close of business tomorrow.

THE COURT: Well, I'm doing a lot to Ms. Boyles right here. Ms. Boyles, please try to get it tomorrow if you can. I want this guy out of prison, okay?

MS. BOYLES: Absolutely, Your Honor. And I apologize, one more matter for the Court's consideration: At our prior status conference, you had tolled the speedy trial between that status conference and whenever we held this detention hearing, so I would be asking the Court to make a interestof-justice finding, until we can set another status conference, to continue tolling speedy. I don't know if you want to put something specific on the calendar, but at least toll speedy in the interim while we certainly get these immediate issues sorted out and continue to provide discovery and allow Ms. Stewart to do whatever investigation she needs to do on this case.

THE COURT: All right. Well, Ms. Stewart, I assume that's okay with you. I'm not going to make it endless, though, Ms. Boyles.

MS. BOYLES: Of course.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

25

THE COURT: Do you guys have an idea of when you want to go to trial or when you guys will be ready -- I want to get a trial date is what I want to get.

MS. STEWART: Well, from the defense's position, Your Honor, I mean, I'd like to have a status conference somewhere by perhaps 10 or 15 January, and from there to be able to give an assessment, because there is more discovery we need to request. There's a lot of video that we need to go through to see, and it's not just what the government gave us, what we don't have that exonerates him. So I ask --

THE COURT: Okay. And you're okay with tolling the Speedy Trial Act until -- Ms. White, we have the 16th free, right, for a status hearing?

20THE DEPUTY CLERK: 16th of which month, Your Honor?21THE COURT: January 16th. Do we have that free for a22status conference?

23THE DEPUTY CLERK: You'll still be in trial,24Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's the next date that we have?

#### Case 1:23-cr-00252-ACR Document 22 Filed 11/29/23 Page 28 of 31

THE DEPUTY CLERK: The 21st. 1 2 THE COURT: Oh, that's what it was, the 21st. 3 Can you guys do a status conference hearing on the 21st? MS. STEWART: Yes, Your Honor, for the defense. 4 5 MS. BOYLES: I'm sorry. Tuesday the 23rd? The 21st 6 is a Sunday. 7 THE COURT: All right. January 23rd. Can we all do 8 the 23rd? 9 MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor. 10 MS. STEWART: I will be in another trial, so the --11 after that. So the following week will be okay if there's 12 available time then? 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 Ms. White, how's January 30 look? 15 All right. Can we all do January 30 at 11 a.m. Eastern? 16 MS. BOYLES: Yes, Your Honor. Would you like that in person? 17 18 THE COURT: No. I think we can do it by video. Okay. Ms. Stewart, does that work for you? 19 20 MS. STEWART: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 21 THE COURT: All right. So, basically, what we're 22 doing going forward is you all are going to draft up release 23 conditions, we're going to reach out to Pretrial Services. 24 I'm going to draft up an order with the release conditions. 25 I'm going to enter that order as soon as possible unless I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

enter -- unless Pretrial Services recommends something that you all didn't agree to or unless there's some dispute.

I'll obviously give the parties time to think about that, but otherwise I'm entering an order as soon as you guys get agreement on these conditions. And I'm hopeful that that can happen Friday, and ideally no later than Monday. And then we are all going to meet again on January 30th at 11 a.m. Eastern.

By that point I want you all to come up with three proposed trial dates and an idea of how long you think trial will last and whether you have any idea whether you want a jury or a bench trial, which of course I will not hold you to, but we need notice. Anything else that we should be discussing?

MS. BOYLES: Just to make the record clear, you are tolling speedy trial between now and January 30th?

THE COURT: Yes, I am, with no objection from the defense.

MS. BOYLES: That's all for the government, Your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Boyles, did I give you all the *Brady* speech the last time we met?

MS. BOYLES: Yes. I have gotten the speech both in this case and in others.

THE COURT: Great. All right. I'm just going to wear a T-shirt from now on for my criminal status conferences. (Laughter)

MS. BOYLES: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, everybody. MS. STEWART: All right. Thank you very much, Your Honor. MR. SELLINGER: Thank you, Your Honor. Take care. (Proceedings adjourned at 3:25 p.m.) 

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* CERTIFICATE

I, BRYAN A. WAYNE, Official Court Reporter, certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

> <u>/s/ Bryan A. Wayne</u> Bryan A. Wayne