UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1	ſΤ	VITED	$\Delta T \Delta$	TFC	OE	ΔM	FRIC	Δ
ı.		N I I I 7 I 7		1 1 2 3	\ / I '	~ ıvı	1 / 1 / 1 / /	$\overline{}$

v.		Case No. 1:23-cr-257-TSC
DONALD J. TRUMP,		
Defendant.	/	

DEFENDANT DONALD J. TRUMP'S MOTION FOR RECUSAL OF DISTRICT JUDGE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)

Ex. B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff, . CR No. 21-0328 (TSC)

v.

ROBERT SCOTT PALMER, . Washington, D.C. . Friday, December 17, 2021

Defendant. . 12:36 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE TANYA S. CHUTKAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: ROBERT C. JUMAN, AUSA

U.S. Attorney's Office 500 E. Broward Blvd. Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33132

(786) 514-9990

For the Defendant: BJORN E. BRUNVAND, ESQ.

> Bjorn Brunvand, P.A. 615 Turner Street Clearwater, FL 33756

(727) 446-7505

Court Reporter: BRYAN A. WAYNE, RPR, CRR

U.S. Courthouse, Room 4704-A 333 Constitution Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 354-3186

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

Excerpted Pages

extinguisher, a piece of wood, and a pole -- should not qualify as weapons as they are not equivalent to knives or firearms. And with regard to the need to avoid sentencing disparities, Mr. Palmer notes that any sentence within the guidelines range would be higher than any other defendants as yet sentenced in connection with the Capitol riots.

Mr. Brunvand, have I adequately summarized your position in your motion for downward departure?

MR. BRUNVAND: You have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I've reviewed the government's opposition.

Now I'm going to deny the motion for a downward departure. I find that despite the factors outlined in Mr. Palmer's motion, the two-level reduction and a downward variance is given -- the two-level reduction is given for acceptance of responsibility. I've already said why I am not giving the two-level reduction, and I find that the factors in Mr. Palmer's motion for a variance do not warrant a variance in this case.

Mr. Palmer, it is true, has -- and I'll go into this further when I consider the 3553(a) factors -- has endured a difficult childhood, but he overcame those difficulties, and it is to his credit. His early criminal history notwithstanding, he built a business. He has, by all accounts, been a good father, a good friend, a good neighbor.

Therefore, the difficulties that he experienced in his

upbringing weren't the cause of why he went to the Capitol.

They may have been the cause of why he got those convictions as a younger person, but he seems to have overcome all of those problems, or at least to have dealt with them, and was living an otherwise productive life.

He went to the Capitol because, despite election results which were clear-cut, despite the fact that multiple court challenges all over the country had rejected every single one of the challenges to the election, Mr. Palmer didn't like the result. He didn't like the result, and he didn't want the transition of power to take place because his guy lost.

And it is true, Mr. Palmer -- you have made a very good point, one that has been made before -- that the people who exhorted you and encouraged you and rallied you to go and take action and to fight have not been charged.

That is not this court's position. I don't charge anybody. I don't negotiate plea offers. I don't make charging decisions. I sentence people who have pleaded guilty or have been convicted.

The issue of who has or has not been charged is not before me. I don't have any influence on that. I have my opinions, but they are not relevant. And you're correct in that no one who was encouraging everybody to take the Capitol has been charged as of yet, but I don't think that fact means that you should get a lower sentence.

The fact is that there are lots of people who agreed with you, who didn't like the results of the election, who perhaps thought the election was stolen in some way. They stayed home. You decided, of your own free will, to leave Florida and come to Washington and go to the rally.

That's your right. You're not being sentenced for your political views. When you left that rally and went to the Capitol and saw what was going on and engaged in combat with those law enforcement officers, that's what you're being punished for. So you have a point, that the people who may be the people who planned this and funded it and encouraged it haven't been charged, but that's not a reason for you to get a lower sentence.

With regard to your argument that there's a need to avoid sentencing disparity, I will address that issue when I go through the 3553(a) factors in detail. Which is now.

Section 3553(a) requires me to consider a variety of factors including the sentencing range that the guidelines prescribe, which I've just discussed, and the applicable penal statutes. The charge of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding Certain Officers Using a Dangerous Weapon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 111(a)(1) and (b), is a Class C felony that carries a maximum term of 20 years of imprisonment.

The statute provides that Mr. Palmer is eligible for one to five years of probation. Under the guidelines,

Excerpted Pages

* * * * * *

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