1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
2	FC	R THE DISTRIC	OF COLUMBIA	
3	United States of A	America,	) Criminal Action ) No. 23-cr-321	
4		Plaintiff,	)	
5	VS.		) SENTENCING HEARING )	
6	James Ray Epps,		) Washington, DC ) January 9, 2024	
7		Defendant.	) Time: 10:00 a.m. )	
8				
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING HELD BEFORE			
10	THE HONORABLE JUDGE JAMES EMANUEL BOASBERG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE			
11				
12		APPEAR	A N C E S	
	For Plaintiff:	Michael Matt	thew Gordon	
13		DOJ-USAO 400 North Ta	ampa Street	
14		Suite 3200 Tampa, FL 3	33602	
15	For Defendant:	Edward John	rd John Ungvarsky (By Zoom)	
16		Ungvarsky Law, PLLC 421 King Street		
17		Suite 505 Alexandria,		
18				
19	Court Reporter:	Janice E. Dickman, RMR, CRR, CRC		
20		United	Official Court Reporter United States Courthouse, Room 6523	
21		Washing	nstitution Avenue, NW gton, DC 20001	
22		202-354	1-3267	
23				
24				
25				

```
1
                          *PROCEEDINGS*
2
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good morning, everyone. We're
 3
      here today for a sentencing in criminal matter 23-321, the
       United States of America versus James Ray Epps, Sr.
 4
 5
                 Beginning with counsel for the government, please
       approach the lectern and state your name for the record.
 6
 7
                MR. GORDON: Good morning, Your Honor. Mike Gordon
       for the United States.
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: Good morning.
10
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: And defense.
11
                MR. UNGVARSKY: Good morning. Edward Ungvarsky on
12
      behalf of Mr. Epps. Mr. Epps and I are both present by video.
13
                 THE COURT: Good morning. Mr. Epps, can you see and
14
      hear me okay?
15
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
16
                MR. UNGVARSKY: Judge, the one thing is, I mean, we
17
      have a shot of the entire courtroom. So, I mean, I can see a
18
      person at the bench in a black robe.
19
                 THE COURT: It's me.
20
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: That's much better.
21
                 THE COURT: I can assure you, it's me.
22
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: Understand. We can't really see you,
23
       such as -- can't see your face, your expressions and all that.
24
                 Now I can.
25
                 THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
1
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: I can Zoom on everyone, or I
2
       can slowly Zoom in on the judge, whichever you prefer, Counsel.
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: I think the judge.
 3
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY:
 4
                                        Okay.
 5
                 THE COURT: The volume is a little high.
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes. It's loud because we
 6
 7
       have a hearing-impaired person in the courtroom.
                 THE COURT: Fine.
 8
 9
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Can I give him headphones?
10
                 THE COURT: Fine.
11
                 Okay. We're here today for sentencing. I've
12
       reviewed the -- I'm sorry, the presentence report author, let
13
       me have you enter your appearance.
14
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor.
15
       Aidee Gavito. I'm covering for the officer who authored the
16
       presentence report, she is an officer out of California.
17
                 THE COURT: Thank you so much for being here.
18
                 I've reviewed the presentence report and
19
       recommendation. I've reviewed the memorandum submitted by the
20
       government. I've reviewed the memorandum and the exhibits
21
       submitted by the defense. I reviewed the exhibits, also, the
22
       video exhibits submitted by the defense.
23
                 Anything else preliminary before we proceed,
24
       Mr. Gordon?
25
                 MR. GORDON: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: Mr. Ungvarsky?
                MR. UNGVARSKY: Your Honor, did you review the
2
      defense response to the government's memo?
 3
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I should have mentioned that.
 4
 5
      Yes, I did. Thank you.
                MR. UNGVARSKY: Thank you. Nothing else, Your Honor.
 6
 7
                 THE COURT: Okay. I'll hear from the government.
                MR. GORDON: Thank you, Your Honor. You want us to
 8
 9
      move straight to allocution?
10
                THE COURT: Yes.
11
                MR. GORDON: Okay. I have a PowerPoint presentation
12
       that one of my paralegals, Elizabeth Hayman -- she's on the
13
             What it contains is --
14
                 THE COURT: Sorry. Just one second.
15
                 (Pause.)
16
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Gordon. Go ahead.
17
                MR. GORDON: The PowerPoint presentation includes
18
       some videos referenced in the government's sentencing
19
      memorandum. Actually, the videos themselves, you can view
20
       them. One in particular has been treated with highlights and
21
       circles so it's easier to track the defendant. So when it
22
       comes time to get to the, sort of, real substance of what the
23
       defendant did, I would like to play those for Your Honor. It's
24
       going to take -- just to give you sort of an expectation of
25
       where we're going. Going through all of those will probably
```

take about 20 minutes, when I get to that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GORDON: We hope that will work. I have Zoom, so everybody can see them.

Your Honor, Ray Epps has been unfairly scapegoated, but he is not a victim. He was not a secret agent of the government on January 6th, trying to trick unwitting Trump supporters into committing federal crimes. That's not what happened. But he is not innocent, either.

Make no mistake, Ray Epps did not start the riot or cause it, but he did make it much worse. He committed multiple crimes on that day. He's only pled to one because that's the plea offer we made with him. But he committed multiple crimes that day. He was convinced that the election had been stolen and that the steal needed to be stopped.

He wanted a mass of people to descend on the Capitol, to go inside the Capitol, and in their presence, intimidate congress into not certifying the election. And he did everything he did to make that happen the night before. On January 5th he went down to a rally and he tried to persuade people that tomorrow we need to go into the Capitol, and even though he said, "I'll probably get arrested for saying this."

The next day, along with many members of the Proud Boys, he left the Ellipse, long before President Trump had finished speaking, and began that march on the Capitol. He was

determined to be at the front of the mob. When others broke down the very first police barricade, he eagerly ran through it and raced to stay at the front. When others broke down the second barricade, injuring an officer in the process, he eagerly ran through again to stay at the front. He contributed to multiple instances of violence against police officers.

He does not deserve the attention and threats he has received. Those are mitigating. But he does deserve to go to jail for what he did on January 6th.

This is unquestionably a unique and complicated case.

And I want Your Honor to know up front that I am not -- that I am asking you for the sentence that I believe is the appropriate one, not trying to ask high and hope you'll go lower.

He didn't start the riot; he made it worse. Beyond the mitigation of the conspiracy theory he's been victimized by, he is on video on at least five occasions directly trying to tamp down other instances of violence, trying to assert himself between rioters who were getting aggressive with police officers and those police. He's on video multiple times telling rioters, "Hey, they're just trying to do their job. We've made our point. Nobody needs to get hurt." I'm not aware of any other case where we have a defendant doing that. That's mitigating.

Just two days after the riot he called the FBI

himself and identified himself as the person in photograph No.

16 on the FBI's information wanted poster and then he gave a

20-minute voluntary interview in which he confessed. That's

mitigating.

He also voluntarily cooperated with Congress's investigation, so that -- you know, engaging in both a preliminary interview and a lengthy transcribed one to members of Congress. And his life has been destroyed by conspiracy theorists eager to blame the government for the violence that happened on January 6th.

So all of that goes into the stew that Your Honor has to consider to arrive at the appropriate sentence. I understand the defense has asked for probation. But generally in these cases probation has been reserved for the most minimally culpable people; those who have a misdemeanor parading plea and if they entered the Capitol and did so for an extraordinarily brief period of time and have no other aggravators. That's not Mr. Epps.

His behavior generally consists of six -- or, his key behavior, his relevant conduct consists of six key incidents.

I want to go through the video and the photographs of each of those now, using the PowerPoint that we have here.

So I'm going to begin with, Elizabeth, if you can pull up slide No. 3.

So this, that we're going to play in just a moment,

the first instance I want to talk about is the attempts

Mr. Epps made to build the size of the mob deliberately in

advance. So the video you're about to see is live-streamed

video recorded by another January 6th defendant named Anthime

Gionet, or "Baked Alaska" is the name he uses online, on the

left side of the screen, which you'll see scrolling are real

time comments written by unknown other people. I don't think

you need to read any of those.

Matter Plaza on the night of January 5th as this group aired their grievances to each other. And different people in that group had different arguments. At the beginning of this clip in the video, what you're going to see is a group of Metropolitan Police officers start to have some sort of confrontation with another person in the crowd. It's unclear what exactly it is. And then the crowds are turning its attention on the MPD officers and that's when Mr. Epps steps in to talk to the rest of the crowd, and that's what you're going to see. It's about a two-minute video in total.

So, Elizabeth, if you could play that now. (Video played.)

So what I'm noticing is that the audio is clear. The video is jumpy when played through the Zoom application so we can view it. So with Mr. Ungvarsky's consent, when we get to later videos where we've done the treatment where the

1 highlighting is on Mr. Epps, I'm going to ask to play those 2 directly from here. And Mr. Ungvarsky has copies of them 3 himself for clarity. 4 So the key here is that Mr. Epps is saying, "Tomorrow 5 we need to go into the Capitol." And he preferences with it, 6 "I don't want to say it," or, "I don't like to say it because 7 I'll get arrested." So it's an acknowledgment that he already understands or believes that what he's about to advocate for is 8 9 illegal. Whether it's right or wrong is a different question. 10 But he knows the wrongness of this and he's 11 advocating for it. And the person talking to him says, "Well, 12 then don't say it." And Epps' response is, "Well, I'll say 13 it." He leaps into that breach himself. And adding 14 "peacefully" on to the end of his urgings doesn't cure that. 15 He viewed this as a 1776 moment. Only Congress or the bridge. 16 And he and his fellow agitators, they were the Revolutionary 17 War heroes and they were headed to the Capitol to stop that 18 tyranny. 19 And then the next day, at the rally, he does similar 20 things. There are many instances on video. I'm only going to 21 play one, where Mr. Epps is talking to anyone who will listen 22 and saying, "After this we've got to go to the Capitol." 23 So, Elizabeth, if you can play slide No. 4, please. 24 (Video played.) 25 Just one example. But, look, this is still First

Amendment protected speech at this point. This is not rising to the level of incitement. I'm not suggesting that it does. But he is trying to build up what became a mob of thousands. He knew that in advance. I'm not saying he didn't. That's a contributing, aggravating factor, even though it's not criminal itself.

Moving on to the first breach.

Elizabeth, if you can pull up slide No. 6, but don't play it yet, please.

So this is the scene just before the first breach. This mob has arrived at the outer perimeter of a restricted area, where there's some bike rack barricades at the end of this Pennsylvania Avenue approach. That first level of barricades, or first layer of barricades is unguarded by police. There's no person there.

Just behind it, call it 50 feet away, you can see the second layer of barricades with officers standing behind that. There's about five officers in total. You see three on the screen at the moment, but there's about five officers standing there. This crowd only reached this point about three minutes earlier. So they've been sort of stymied at this first layer of barricades for about three minutes. And you can see Mr. Epps is right at the front.

The key here, at this moment, is any arguments that he thought they were allowed to be in the Capitol on January

6th has to be out the window at this moment. He has gotten there, there are barricades, people are stopped, nobody is walking through it, and he can see, just behind it, uniformed police officers standing in a higher plain with clear Area Closed signs. At this point it is abundantly obvious no further progress is lawful.

However, this is what happens: Mr. Epps works his way to the front the crowd, is there for a couple minutes and then other people -- not him, he doesn't touch a barricade -- but other people bust through that first layer of barricades and they run up to the second layer. So he didn't touch anything himself, but he was all too eager to take advantage of those who did.

So, Elizabeth, if you can play this slide, please.

(Video played.)

Mr. Epps doesn't turn back at this point, he surges forward.

Elizabeth if you can go to slide 8, please.

Because of how jumpy this video was, you didn't see the first person to reach the second layer of barricades was the man in the backwards Make-America-Great-Again hat, centered in the photograph. That's Government Exhibit 4. That man is a man named Ryan Samsel. And this image, captured from another rioter's video, is the one, essentially, that made Mr. Epps famous. This is him whispering to Ryan Samsel, just before

Ryan Samsel and others broke down that second layer of barricades.

For this video I would like to play it from the podium. Ms. Bell Norwood, if I can.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Sure.

MR. GORDON: The group is at this second barricade for seconds. Again, Mr. Epps doesn't touch the barricade himself, but rushes forward as soon as possible. He has worked his way to the very front.

When you watch the video I'm about to show, you'll see that there are approximately five officers. And on our right side -- would have been the police's left -- is a female officer, United States Capitol Police Officer Caroline Edwards. You'll see that when the crowd -- that's right there, rushes through the barricade, they knock her back and she hits her head on the stairs behind her. She sustained a concussion.

She also sustained injuries -- I have pictures you'll see -- to her eye and to the back of her leg from that fall.

Caroline Edwards got up and kept defending the Capitol that day. But this breach that Epps was at the front of in fact injured an officer at that moment.

But more importantly, this is when the floodgates opened. This is when a riot could have been something small, that maybe the assembled police could have dealt with, became a flood of thousands they could not. And here, while Epps does

```
1
       not break down that barricade himself, the fact that he was in
       front, the fact that he ran forward, the fact that he projects
2
 3
       authority, that he is a man who is 6-foot-4 -- and while he may
 4
       205 now, he weighed more than that then. He's a large man.
 5
       He's wearing desert camouflage sleeves. He's a man who looks
 6
       like, to others, as a man of action, someone to follow. He is
 7
       up front, busting through and running through that. So any
 8
       cues other people might have taken from their surroundings, he
 9
       was providing loud and clear.
10
                 Ryan Samsel has been charged with multiple crimes.
       He went over to Carol Edwards and tried to render some aid to
11
12
            Mr. Epps, he ran forward. So for all talk about being
13
       concerned about violence of other officers, as soon as the
14
       breach of the manned barricade happened, he made a beeline
       towards the Capitol.
15
16
                 He raced forward, others followed.
17
                 (Video played.)
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: I don't know if there was a video
18
19
       playing.
                I heard sound.
20
                 MR. GORDON: Mr. Ungvarsky, I don't think you're
21
       going to be able to see. It's a video of the breach, but it's
22
       playing on the Zoom screens. I don't believe it's viewable.
23
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: I tried to do -- do you see
24
       anything at all? Do you see the four screens?
25
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: I mean, I see four screens.
```

```
1
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you see a lady with a
       backpack, a peach backpack? That's the video. Do you see it?
2
 3
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: I don't see it.
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: If I take it out of the four
 4
 5
       screens --
 6
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: Just to be clear, when I can't see
 7
       it, it means Mr. Epps wouldn't be able to see it.
                 THE COURT: You can leave it in the four screens.
 8
 9
                 Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Gordon.
10
                 (Video played.)
11
                 MR. GORDON: Ms. Bell Norwood, can we switch back to
12
       Ms. Hayman's presentation?
13
                 Your Honor, that video doesn't show Mr. Epps because
14
       he's just off screen, to the right. There were photographs
15
       that were in the government's sentencing memo.
16
                 And, Ms. Hayman, if you show -- the next slides
17
       capture where Mr. Epps was right when those barricades went
18
       down, the crowd surged forward. So, Ms. Hayman, if you show
19
       10, then 11.
20
                 This is 10, at the moment when the barricades are
21
       going down. You can see Mr. Epps is right at the very front,
22
       feet away, watching this happen. If he thought what happened
       going forward was lawful or okay or a peaceful protest or he
23
24
       was going to somehow be able to keep it peaceful, which is
25
       something he's expressed on other occasions, that I wanted to
```

be at the front because I thought I could stop it from being violent. Again, that has to be out the window. At this point he is making a conscious decision to be part of a violent mob that is assaulting and overrunning police, and to lead the way for others to follow behind him.

We move to the next photograph, please.

This shows, second later, as the crowd goes surging over, climbing over those barricades.

If we could move to Government's Slide 13. That brings us to the next major incident of the story of Mr. Epps' day on January 6. That's what I'm referring to as the sign push. It's been called other things by other people. This sign, it's enormous. You can tell by this photograph. One person — probably looks like it's 10 to 15 people standing shoulder to shoulder wide. The sign itself is made of fabric, but the frame is heavy and it's metal.

There's four casters on it, four heavy metal wheels, each one described as being about the sides of a person's head. This had been wheeled all the way from the Ellipse, down either Constitution or Independence Avenue, then brought to the crowd, hoisted overhead and kind of crowd surfed, passed overhead from the south end of the west plaza towards the scaffolding in the center, which is where Mr. Epps was.

When it got to Mr. Epps, he put his hands up and as the sign is being turned towards the police officers, he is

reaching for it. And he is reaching for it even after it passes over his head and beyond his grasp. Now, reasonable people can look at the video of this sign at the moment when Mr. Epps' hands are up and disagree about whether his hands are on the sign, inches from it, whether one hand is touching it, whether both hands are. Reasonable people can and have looked at that and disagreed about exactly whether he's touching it or not.

What cannot be disputed, however, is not only that he is reaching for it, but the suggestion that he's only reaching for it to protect his own head is undermined by the fact that after it passes, sort of, his head space, you can see that he is continuing to reach for it. And there is a crucial distinction -- it doesn't happen for long, it's a second -- but if all you're doing is trying to protect yourself, there would be no reason to want to touch it once you can't.

But it's moving toward the police. Mr. Epps is still reaching forward. And when it goes beyond his grasp, he points forward, twice. And now in the still shot, you can argue he's pointed up, and the defense has argued that. But in the slow motion treatment of the video I'm about to show you now, he's pointing forward, in the direction of the police.

Is it possible he's saying, "Don't push it that way, there are police there"? Sure. We don't know. We don't have audio. I don't know what he's saying. But circumstantially,

1 taking that together, reaching out for it, continuing to reach 2 for it, and all these other times when he has been eager to 3 take advantage of others doing, sort of, the aggressive work of 4 breaking down the barricade or breaching the police line, with 5 him eagerly following, he contributed to that sign being pushed 6 into the police. 7 So, Ms. Bell Norwood, I'm going to show three videos, this time from the government's podium. 8 9 Basically what we have, Your Honor, is two angles 10 that I'm going to play for you and then a composite that sort 11 of links them up together so that you can see that. 12 Ms. Bell Norwood, can we switch to the podium, 13 please. 14 (Video played.) 15 I'm sorry, Your Honor. I did the composite one 16 first, which I did not mean to do. 17 (Video played.) 18 You saw all the things I described in my video, as 19 well as that -- what I've described as a rugby scrum push that 20 happened afterward, in the wake of the sign and the police. 21 That would be the officer in the white, sort of, 22 commander or superior shirt, pulls out a large canister of 23 pepper spray, starts spraying the crowd. That's when that 24 rugby scrum breaks up, Mr. Epps moves away, He approaches the 25 line. This is one of Mr. Ungvarsky exhibits. And then

1 Mr. Epps has the conversation with the officer. There's no 2 mystery what he says, it's recorded in the body-worn camera of 3 that officer from the other angle. Mr. Epps essentially tries to negotiate, "Hey, can we 4 5 stand here, but not here? If we're below these steps, is that 6 okay, if we maintain some space?" The officers don't 7 necessarily say, "Sure, that's fine," but it's, like, that's 8 better than charging us. And that's when Mr. Epps turns around 9 and directs the crowd, try to step back. 10 The next video is -- the one I just showed you is the 11 best angle, the best video we have of this incident. Limited 12 by the evidence that exists, that's the evidence that exists. 13 The next one is a composite that includes two other 14 angles that provides some context, particularly the timing of 15 just how soon after Mr. Epps' reach or touch of the sign occurs 16 to when it actually hits the police. And it's very short in 17 time. 18 This is another one of when Mr. Epps' hands are on 19 the sign or reaching toward it. 20 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: It's not coming up. 21 THE COURT: I don't have it yet, Mr. Gordon. 22 MR. GORDON: You don't have it? 23 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: I can't seem to keep it up at 24 the same time as everybody else. 25 Counsel, can you see the video?

```
1
                 MR. UNGVARSKY: I can see the video.
2
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Judge, can you see?
 3
                 THE COURT: It's not on my screen.
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: It's not on your screen
 4
 5
       either?
                 (Pause.)
 6
 7
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Press play, Counsel.
                 MR. GORDON: Sure.
 8
 9
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Nothing yet, Judge?
10
                 THE COURT: No.
11
                 I think you can just play it. Mr. Ungvarsky has seen
12
       it, I'm sure, numerous times. I think he's pretty well
13
       acquainted with it. If it works by just showing it to me.
14
                 (Video played.)
15
                 MR. GORDON: And you've seen the rest from there,
16
       Your Honor. The, sort of, weight of the sign and the force
17
       which it was thrust is hard to appreciate from that aerial
18
       view. So this last video is very brief, it just shows the
19
       moment of impact with the officers.
20
                 (Video played.)
21
                 You can see that the officers struggled to deal with
22
       the sign. You can see the impact it had on them. You can see
23
       the size of it. You can see the fighting that took place in
24
       its wake and the crowd surge forward afterwards, only to be
25
       repelled when the officers used pepper spray.
```

1 If we can go back to Ms. Hayman's presentation. 2 And, Ms. Hayman, if we can go to slide No. 19. That's a photograph you've seen in the sentencing 3 memorandum of Mr. Epps in the middle of that scrum afterwards. 4 5 From there, Mr. Epps walks the line on that west front for about a half hour, engaging in those instances of 6 7 deescalation that I had described previously. After that, he 8 leaves, goes back towards his hotel, and does have an impromptu 9 interview with another person. I can't call him a journalist, 10 but another person who is filming and recording people's words. 11 Mr. Epps gave that interview. It's about seven 12 minutes long. I'm only going to play the first five minutes. 13 THE COURT: He never went beyond -- he never went 14 further toward the Capitol than he's seen in these videos? 15 MR. GORDON: That's correct, Your Honor. He never --16 if you think of those three steps that separate the lowest 17 level of the west plaza from the next, he never went up those 18 three steps, other than a brief period of time. If he's to be 19 credited -- but, we can't corroborate -- but where he says that 20 he had to render aid to somebody who had suffered from a 21 medical incident. 22 So after that he goes back to this pizza place across 23 from his hotel and talked to the other person and described his 24 own motivation and why he did what he did. Describes his

actions. Whole thing is about seven minutes. I'm going to

25

```
1
       pull the first five minutes for Your Honor and then we're going
       to talk about, sort of, how this all comes together.
2
 3
                 This is the last piece of video or evidence that I
       want to show you about Mr. Epps' conduct.
 4
 5
                 Ms. Bell Norwood, if we can go back to me.
                 I don't have sound for some reason.
 6
 7
                 Let me try it with Ms. Hayman's instead. There may
       be an issue showing it with sound to Mr. Ungvarsky.
 8
 9
                 Ms. Hayman, this is going to be slide 21. If we can
10
       play that video.
11
                 (Video played.)
                 Stop there. Ms. Hayman, can you stop there.
12
13
                 THE COURT: Why don't we just interrupt for one
14
       second.
15
                 So, the sentencing that's set for 11, we're running a
16
       little bit late. So we'll shoot for 11:30. But we won't do it
17
       before then. Okay. Thanks.
18
                 MR. GORDON: I'm very close to being done, Your
19
       Honor.
20
                 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.
21
                 MR. GORDON: The two key points he makes in this
22
       statement, the first is, well, it was Antifa who were the
23
       violent ones. How did he know they were antifa? Oh, he didn't
24
       know, but we're not violent, so it must have been antifa.
25
                 In this Mr. Epps is doing the exact same thing, the
```

exact same thing that he, himself, has been the victim of this conspiracy theory. He made this point in his video on January 6, he made it to the FBI when he called in on January 8th. He made it to Congress a year later when he was interviewed on January 21st, 2022. Antifa is responsible. How do you know they were Antifa? Well, I didn't know, it must have been them because they're the only ones that would do this. And the same with the others who are eager to point the finger at the government for January 6th, he is eager to point the finger at others. He may have changed his tune today, but that is, you know, an aggravating factor.

The second point that matters here is what he said at the end, "They needed to know." "They" being Congress. "They needed to know how angry we were." And not by being, you know, at the Ellipse. He knew about that. That wasn't sufficient for Mr. Epps. Congress needed to know because he and thousands of others needed to go into the Capitol, into the Rotunda, and tell them, essentially face-to-face, en masse. He's explaining exactly what he did.

So reasonable people can look at all this evidence and disagree about whether it merits a misdemeanor or a felony charge. If a felony, whether it raises to a 1512 or doesn't, whether the barricade break and the sign push resonate or meet the elements of 231. Reasonable people can disagree whether the right result is a felony with a relatively light sentence

1 for a felony, or a misdemeanor with a relatively stiff sentence 2 for a misdemeanor. 3 Whenever I do presentations to the high school students, I always emphasize -- this sounds corny, but I always 4 5 emphasize that we are the Department of Justice, not the 6 Department of Convictions. And so as the Department --7 MR. UNGVARSKY: I'm sorry, Mr. Gordon. I really am sorry. Can the exhibit be taken down so I can see you? 8 9 MR. GORDON: Of course. I'm sorry. 10 MR. UNGVARSKY: I'm sorry, Mr. Gordon. I apologize. 11 MR. GORDON: And as the Department of Justice, that 12 means that we have to do what we think is right. And sometimes 13 we come across a unique and complicated case like this one 14 where that answer may not be obvious. But here we used our 15 prosecutorial discretion and arrived at the conclusion that the 16 best result in this case was a misdemeanor plea with a 17 relatively stiff sentence for a misdemeanor. 18 This is aggravated conduct in the realm of 19 misdemeanors in January 6 cases and it deserves an appropriate 20 sentence commensurate with that. 21 All that being said, I expect there's a lot that 22 Mr. Ungvarsky is about to say that I'm going to agree with 23 about the mitigating factors in Mr. Epps' favor, particularly 24 his efforts to de-escalate the conflict on multiple occasions,

and the fact that he was the victim of this widespread

25

1 conspiracy theory that is both false and continuing to be 2 promoted by many. 3 So, the last thing I want to say Your Honor is this: He has already received a substantial benefit for all that 4 5 mitigating conduct. The government already weighed all that, 6 we already factored that in to give him the significant break 7 of a misdemeanor plea offer, when it's entirely possible that a 8 grand jury could have indicted him on a felony. 9 So if Your Honor then goes and again uses that same 10 mitigation to ratchet his sentence on a misdemeanor far down 11 from what it might otherwise be, it's essentially double 12 counting that benefit. So the same way I asked --13 Mr. Ungvarsky is going to ask Your Honor to consider the 14 mitigation factors, I'm going to ask Your Honor to consider the 15 degree to which the government has already incorporated it in 16 the result of this case. 17 In the end, six months is the right sentence for 18 I don't envy the position you're in. this. THE COURT: Okay. Thanks so much, Mr. Gordon. 19 20 Mr. Ungvarsky. 21 MR. UNGVARSKY: Your Honor, thank you very much. I 22 probably -- I will be shorter than Mr. Gordon, but I don't know 23 if we'll be done by 11:30. 24

Your Honor, Ray Epps was in the middle of a crowd, a mob, on January 6th outside the Capitol. And persons in that

25

situation get stuck with joining the actions of the mob, a group think, a mob mentality. It can be impossible to break away. But Ray Epps did break away from the mob mentality. He was present, yes. He engaged in disorderly and disruptive conduct, yes. He admitted that. But his words and his actions were to try to de-escalate others, to suppress violence.

Nobody listened to him. None of the people there listened to what he said. But nothing that he did was to cause physical pain -- was to cause physical harm, to add to any violence, his plan was never that and his actions were never that. It takes character, principle, and integrity to break from the mob. We saw so many people that day and mobs on other days who failed to do so.

But Mr. Epps displayed his character, principle, and integrity when he broke from the mob on January 6th. He had gone through the early two barriers. He told others to stop their actions, their violent actions, their threatening actions, their endangering actions, follow the will of the law enforcement officers outside the Capitol.

Your Honor already noted that unlike those people who surged there, Mr. Epps didn't. He didn't go past those steps. He used his -- you know, the government wants to punish him for his voice and his size, but he used his -- and as a large man myself, I wish that weren't a characteristic that would be used against us -- but he used his voice and size to tell others not

to confront the officers. He acted to support the officers.

He turned away. He didn't press forward to the Capitol. He didn't enter the Capitol. He left. And I think -- I have seen video of him providing -- sort of escorting somebody out, providing medical aid to someone. I think it's on the exhibit that I provided to Your Honor. I think it's Exhibit 102B maybe.

But in any event, he rendered medical aid on his way out, and he left. And he displayed his character, principle, and integrity when he called the FBI on January 8th to record himself. And he displayed his character, principle, and integrity when he agreed to speak twice with the House Select Committee, including publicly.

Now, when you've been a member of a group, when you've been lied to and long believed one thing, it can be really impossible to break away, your mindset to change. And especially those of us who are older, like Mr. Epps and I, start to think one thing and we think that's how things are. And, you know, we really couldn't imagine that people who are like him, supporters of the President, could be so angry and violent.

But as he and his wife were threatened, especially as those threats escalated around the time of his congressional cooperation, and he really came to a crossroads. And those threats -- I'm not going to go into it in great detail, it's in

the materials. I mean, people -- you know, there was firearms, you know, brandished at them at their home. There was spent shell casings in line sight to their home and their bedroom. There were people who pretended to set up visits to potentially use the wedding and special event site that they had, and then they would be along with Mrs. Epps and cause her threat and fear.

You know, he really -- he and his wife, in a way, they're almost like (crosses fingers). They came to a crossroads. And what he did -- I think this is so admirable, so many people can't do it -- is he broke yet again from group think. He broke, he concluded that it was -- the Trump supporters, like him, who instigated and were there that day on January 6th -- gosh, he had wished it was someone else, he had wished it was antifa, or whatever, you know, they believed that phrase means. But he realized it was people who supported the President, like he did, people that had been told the election was stolen, like he had been told.

Mr. Epps concluded that the people there violated the Constitution by engaging in violence outside the Capitol and inside. He concluded that President Trump had lost the election and that President Biden had won the election. The election was not stolen. He had been wrong.

And he identified -- and you see this in his letter to the Court, and you read this, "The blame of the insurrection

is not on the FBI. It is on those who were at the Capitol, engaged in insurrectionist activities, and those who misled Americans, like myself, into believing that the election had been stolen."

You know, when he wrote that letter -- he's a very independent man, with very independent thoughts and desires of expression. He used the word "of the insurrection," because that's how he sees it. He talked about violence that was there because that's what he saw. He recognizes and saw that there was violence and that people engaged in that insurrection against a lawful, correct election result. He accepted responsibility for his offense, and he feels remorse for his actions that day that contributed to that mob.

Now, on the other hand, he's also proud that while he was there, while his presence contributed to that, he tried to de-escalate. He tried to stop it. And I don't -- you know, you don't have his experience, I don't think, Your Honor, because you're a judge and people listen to you. But, you know, you saw that people were not listening to him. He was called a "boomer." I don't know whether he's a boomer or not. But I know people don't listen to me anymore. And I've learned to keep my mouth shut when around my kids and their friends.

And Baked Alaska and that group of people on January 5th, they didn't listen to him. And that wasn't a large mob he was talking to, it was a group. And he said there, that day,

peaceful, peaceful, peaceful, peaceful because that's what he wanted. He didn't talk about violence, he didn't talk about storming, he didn't talk about intimidating Congress, as the government said, to certify the election. He didn't say any of that at all. He just said they should go down to the Capitol and express their view.

He wasn't listened to by Ryan Samsel when he said,
"Calm down. Stop. They're doing their job, hold back." They
didn't listen to him. Those people didn't listen to him. And
the people, when they got to the Capitol steps, didn't listen
to him. Nobody listened to him as he tried to de-escalate.
But that's what he did try to do.

I really -- as I listened to the government talk about the quote/unquote offense conduct, and as I talk about it here, I think it's an expansion over the statement of the offense. I think it's important that he never talked about intimidating Congress. In fact, even in that post video interview by the citizen journalist, if you will, he talked about -- the word he used was it is symbolic. The presence outside the Capitol was symbolic. Not designed to intimidate. It had symbolic value. And as thought that day, the election had been stolen and what happened was wrong. It was an amplification of a voice from the President's Stop the Steal rally and an amplification of what is from prior events. Symbolic amplification of voice.

He didn't contribute to multiple instances of violence against police officers. There's no indication that he knew that an officer had fallen to the ground when Ryan Samsel and the others went through there. There's no indication of that, or that his — his hands weren't on the gate. He wasn't the one who pushed through. He was trying to have people not do that. He was behind all that.

If he contributed, it's contributing in the sense that he was physically there. His hands — they talked about building the size of the mob. We already talked, nobody listened to him on January 5th. And he didn't say anything at all on January 5th. And it wasn't in his mindset that this day was about 1776. He's never talked that day about 1776. Somebody else said that, not Mr. Epps. He didn't agree with it.

By the way, unlike so many of these cases, there's no, you know, prior social media or even private text messages or anything by Mr. Epps talking about wanting -- you know, prevent the certification of the election, overturn the election. Just speak out about the result, but not overturn it, attack it. Certify it. There's nothing about violence. And we see that in so many other cases.

And there's nothing afterward because that wasn't his mindset. And what he said on the street was protected speech.

And there were a lot of people going to the Capitol to register

their voice. I'll be honest, I was in D.C. that day and there wasn't a moment's thought in my mind I would go anywhere near that Capitol that day. But he was there, as were others, to register a voice.

Samsel, we already talked about how there's no indication that person listened to him. He's not leading the way to others to follow him. Others led the way and he followed. Should he have followed? No. Did he think that, like, he would be like able to calm people down? That's what he said and there's no indication that what he has said isn't true.

You know, like a lot of people of my generation, a slightly older generation, we think people will listen to us and we think things can be the way we think it should be. But it's not necessarily going to be that way.

With the Trump sign, it did go over his head -
THE COURT: Maybe I should interrupt, Mr. Ungvarsky.

I think there's arguments in the defense memo regarding his
belief that the Capitol would be open on January 6th and
statements, therefore, he didn't -- wasn't doing anything
illegal. But if that's still your contention, then why would
he be saying, "I will probably going to jail for that." So can
you square that for me?

MR. UNGVARSKY: The way I'd square it, Your Honor, is that I think that some people who are supporters of President

Trump thought that they would be targets by, you know -- that their viewpoint wasn't supported by those in authority and that they ran some risk.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. UNGVARSKY: I think that he thought on, January 5th, that it would be open. I think he knew by January 6th, when he was -- that it was not.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. I agree that the sign and the push seem somewhat equivocal of the evidence. I think the video is somewhat equivocal on that, as you pointed out. But, I think that's where you were going next.

MR. UNGVARSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. I may have misunderstood the government's position in its filing. So what I see here, it seems to me that the government has conceded that. You know, when they say that reasonable people can look at the video as to whether Mr. Epps' hands were actually on it or not on it or this or that, to me that's sort of a concession because it really undercuts the contention that he physically caused that sign -- he physically pushed that sign to go in any certain direction.

I think the same with the scrum that was happening.

I see it more as a scrum. If you look at the video, he was in the midst of a large, tight crowd. I mean, I haven't been at one of those since -- well, I haven't been in such a large, tight crowd since I saw Phish when I was in my late 20s. I --

I know, no one else in this courtroom would have gone to see

Phish, certainly not Mr. Epps. But when we -- when you're in

that large, tight crowd -- you can see in that video, he's

being pushed from behind. He's not pushing, like a rugby

person. And then you can see in the video that we sent, he

tries to maneuver to try to get himself out of there. And he

tries to walk upstream and he has a hard time getting upstream.

And I think, because of his size, ultimately he's able to.

I don't think he contributed to that sign being, you know, pushed to the police. I think that's -- I think that's argument. And maybe it's fair argument by the government, but I think it's excessive.

And so -- and he talked about his motivations. So -- and I -- and it's very important, on January 6th, that there's no -- that in that interview, he wasn't talking about going into the Capitol in that interview after the events, he was talking about being outside the Capitol. And I think the reason why I'm saying that's important, I think the government blurs, they blur what he says on the 5th about going inside with what they say on -- with what he says on the 6th, which is about all the people were there on the outside.

But he doesn't -- like, we don't have a situation here where he's telling people no, you should break in, you should force in, you should breach, you know, or whatever the words are.

And, so, you know, that's -- so I think his offense conduct, I think it makes out the offense, which is why he pled guilty to this offense. And this is the offense he's before the Court for and I -- gosh, I haven't had this since I did Capitol murder cases, where the government somehow said we've been, like, already generous in giving a plea, when you wouldn't have accepted -- you would have gone to trial on anything else, so you don't get any sentencing mitigation for all the good -- all the good that we see in you and all the pain that you -- that you -- that was incurred by you for what you did.

I mean, I -- I'm actually kind -- I'm bothered by the government's argument that somehow or another their plea offer is what he -- is good enough. This is -- this is what they agreed to.

And so now it takes me to my request for the sentence, which is a sentence of probation. And I acknowledge that the government tends not to recommend probation unless it's, like, a parading case. And as the government said earlier today, but courts give probation on the misdemeanors, including not just a parading cases. And we gave four examples in our sentencing memo. And I think then the government gave yet a fifth example in its sentencing memo. And I think that --

(Mr. Ungvarsky's video froze.)

MR. UNGVARSKY: So we do ask for probation. Mr. Epps is -- I'm going to make this very clear to Your Honor: He and his wife feel threatened. They feel that as their address, their home becomes known, that they are in danger. They feel that way because of messages that they continue to receive. They feel that way because they've been told by the FBI that there were threats on their lives.

And while they're trying to live in a trailer in hiding in the woods, there's been, you know, there's been some identification of their location. And so as a man who's owned a gun for his whole life, he would like to have a gun in the house as protection. He would like that.

On the other hand, he recognizes the countervailing concerns about someone who is on community supervision having a firearm. And he fully consents to a gun restriction in this case.

He does ask, in terms of travel, that if the Court is going to limit his travel -- that he be permitted to travel.

But most definitely he needs to be able to travel to the

District of Delaware, Federal District of Delaware, because he has a pending civil case there where he's a party. So we ask that.

If the Court is inclined to include, for part of the period of probation, a period of home confinement -- which I don't think is necessary, I think it's more than -- than

required by the statute. I ask that, instead, what the Court do is have him on the GPS with a curfew of 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. His wife is -- his wife -- you know, he and his wife are what some people would say are elderly. He has physical concerns, he has emotional and mental concerns.

You know, he wants to be able to go and not, you know -- you know, there's snow where he is, and there's a lot of snow where he is, and it's hard to get out from where they are. And he doesn't want her to be the one who has to go do the grocery shopping and the medical appointments without him. And the propane. And he wants to be able to help. And we've seen during pretrial that he has followed all the conditions of pretrial, 100 percent.

Now, Mr. Epps, Your Honor, in support of his probationary sentence, he has no criminal record at the age of 62. In 2021 the government viewed videos, they viewed other evidence, and they decided not to charge him for any offense at all. Now, nobody knew that, other than the government, until I saw it, you know, buried amist of discovery. But then came the, you know, the misdemeanor and he agreed, because he did commit this misdemeanor.

He helped law enforcement on multiple occasions that day. He's a person who -- and I know you've heard this so many times, but I think he thoroughly -- he demonstrated it, his great respect for law enforcement.

I thought telling of the government was this line:
The government's not aware of any other case of a defendant, a

January 6 defendant, who took such actions trying to tamp down
the energy and the actions of the crowd. They couldn't think
of any other case.

I also can't think of any other case of which I'm aware in which the government formally said -- or, internally at least -- that they weren't going to charge somebody and then later -- later came with charges.

THE COURT: I think there are certainly cases where the government has found other video or other evidence that has given them a reason to charge. So that, to me, is less convincing.

MR. UNGVARSKY: All right. He's willing to help law enforcement because I think by nature he's a helper. You see that -- we've talked about his relations with his wife, and you see that in the letters. You see that as someone who would go -- would go find homeless people, and not one or two, but scores of them in November and December when they were living in Arizona, in Mesa, Arizona. He would go to Pioneer Park to invite people to his home for Christmas, to give them Christmas breakfast -- or lunch, I forget what it is -- and for gifts. For years, almost ten years he did that.

What I found so telling about that was in 1993, '94, I think at around the same time, I was living right by Mesa,

Arizona and I was going to Pioneer Park and I was interacting with the people who were unhoused at that time. So I find it interesting, he and I had this overlap, you know. But you know what I didn't do? I didn't invite anybody into my home. You know, I did -- you know, I was sort of arms length in my care and concern for those people in need. And he brought them into his home.

You see how he helps travelers. You know, if someone is broken down on the side of the road, you know, someone needed -- you know, someone's kids -- they're impoverished and their kids -- they didn't have money, somebody needed a ride for hours to another state. You know, he just dropped everything and he volunteered. And, you know, for neighbors, you know, he's a -- for neighbors he would help make home repairs, roofing and other home repairs.

As the Court fashions a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense and promotes respect for the law --well, first of all, I'll just do deterrence. I think a sentence of probation satisfies deterrence. You're never going to see Mr. Epps commit a crime again. I think you know that and the government knows that. And you're going to -- I think you also have general deterrence from the fact that, you know, notwithstanding all the vitriol (sic) that he speaks and notwithstanding his attempts to tamp down the crowd, the government has still charged -- a message has been sent by the

anything else you would like to say.

government, by the charge, by the conviction. And a probationary sentence will reflect the seriousness of the offense and promote respect for the law, and I ask the Court to so impose.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Ungvarsky.

Mr. Epps, I've read your letter. I am happy to hear

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning,

It is a privilege to be a citizen of the United States of America. I love our Constitution and this beautiful country in which we live. Trusted elected officials and Fox News led to my guilt -- gullibility in believing the election was stolen. This resulted in my trip to D.C. to be with my son for the January 6th protest -- excuse me, Your Honor. I'm a little nervous.

THE COURT: Take your time.

THE DEFENDANT: And in going from President Trump's rally to the Capitol. I regret both those decisions. I was wrong when I knowingly trespassed and engaged in disorderly conduct on the restricted grounds of the United States Capitol. I shouldn't have been there. In hindsight, I realize that's not what a constitutional-loving America should have done.

What I witnessed the night before and that day was rage in a vulgarian level that I have never seen before. The

crowd and its energy and the violence were not generated by the FBI or antifa. It was generated by people like me, who supported President Trump and listened to his lies and the lies of others that the election was stolen.

The election was not stolen. President Joe Biden won the election. Robin and I have come to realize that.

Unfortunately, my wife and I continue to experience that rage and vulgarity shown on January 6 from those that still refuse to accept the truth.

When I realized what I thought would be a peaceful protest turned violent, I did my best to help law enforcement and calm others. After, when I got home, I continued to try to do the right thing. When Fox News and the Trump cult turned on me and my wife for a convenient shift of blame, it was life changing, it was a life-changing reality check. My wife and I were forced to look elsewhere for the truth.

I have learned that truth is not always found in the places I used to trust, but in God, my faith in God, in our Constitution and those who abide by it, like the police officers who were there that day, the judges of this court and my lawyer.

I always choose God, our Constitution and truth over politics or a politician. I ask for this Court's mercy. I want to use the rest of my life to inspire others to recognize and learn the truth of election results and obey the laws of

our great country, even if they may not agree with them. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Epps.

As Mr. Gordon said in the beginning of his presentation, this certainly is a difficult sentencing. And the lawyers have very articulately and cleanly argued their cases and brought each positive inference for each side out of it. I also appreciate the fact that the government has been balanced in its presentation, explaining and conceding the mitigating factors where appropriate. Certainly I don't -- the defense's job isn't to do that. The defense's job is to advocate for the defendant, and Mr. Ungvarsky has certainly done that ably and fairly, and I appreciate that as well.

I don't think there's any dispute on the guidelines, which were zero to six months. There is a dispute about 4C1.1. But whether that's applied or not does not affect my sentence in this case.

I'm very familiar with the 3553(a) factors. So as we look at the defendant's behavior on that day, as I said earlier, I do find the evidence regarding the sign and the scrum somewhat equivocal. And Mr. Gordon, I think, has argued the best inferences against defendant, and Mr. Ungvarsky for the most favorable ones. I think anyone for whom a heavy sign passes is likely to raise their hands to protect themselves.

The sign is also moving laterally, parallel to the police line, rather than in front of the police -- rather than towards the police line when Mr. Epps initially has his hands up. It's awful hard to say whether his pointing is an instruction to push the sign towards the officers or not.

Similarly, the scrum, it's unclear whether he's caught in that scrum -- which he unequivocally disengages from rapidly -- or whether he has any intent to join in pushing forward. So I think those both are really too weak to dictate the appropriate sentence here.

So what we're left with is still certainly concerning behavior. Whether Mr. Ungvarsky is right that people were listening to Mr. Epps or not, the question is what statements did he make and what was he intending to influence people. I think on January 5th, that he is saying that we will go into the Capitol, and he mentions that he's probably going to jail. And so either that means he realizes it's unlawful then, which is I think the most natural position, or Mr. Ungvarsky's interpretation I think is possible, but perhaps less likely. Again, if he thought the Capitol was open, why would he go to jail for entering it?

But it's certainly true that to say he was a leader on January 5th and inspiring lots of people is a vast overstatement, that there are only a few people around him, they certainly seem to be discounting what he's saying. There

are lots of people saying lots of things out there. And so I think that it is an indication of his mindset, but it's certainly not a basis to conclude that he's some ringleader.

The most damning activities he takes are on January 6th; that he's early at the Peace Circle, and at that point he can certainly see that the Capitol is not open, that people are not welcome there. I think this is a point Mr. Gordon stressed, that, Mr. Epps, you certainly knew at that point that to go further would be to break the law. And you did not lead that group, you did not push over any bike racks or barricades.

But as the government says, you willingly went forward once those barricades were broken down. And you were one of the earliest members of that group to go forward. And that is serious, as the government points out. The mob only achieves its goals because it's able to proceed further toward and then into the Capitol.

So the first barricade was down, but you did not turn back, but went on to the next. And the next barricade, again, seeing where the police line was thicker, was more reinforced, you were closer to the Capitol, but once again, you didn't say, "We shouldn't be here. This is wrong. I've made my point, I'm leaving." You remained there and engaged with others. You were near the front now, once that line is breached. You do not enter. And, in fact, then you do turn back.

And, so, for the conduct that I've just mentioned, to

me some jail is appropriate. And whether it's what the government asks for or less is an interesting question.

So, stacked against that is your mitigating conduct. And even the government notes that that conduct was mitigating on January 5th and 6th. You did emphasize "peacefully" on January 5th. There was no social media posting beforehand about tearing this House down or hanging Mike Pence or Congress being traitors. And then on January 6th you did deescalate the situation, at least five times according to them, and even on the video we see you telling people to come up and no farther. So that's certainly mitigating behavior.

I think, more important, was what happened after

January 6th, that you turned yourself in on January 6th -- on

January 8th, willingly and voluntarily, and you then gave

voluntary and consensual interviews to law enforcement and the

January 6th Committee, in which you testified and cooperated

truthfully.

And for your cooperation and conduct, you have been vilified and threatened in a way unique to January 6 defendants. You were hounded out of your home, you were hounded out of your town, and you've had to live like a fugitive because of lies that others spread. There are plenty of January 6 defendants who suffered scorn and disdain in their communities for what they did that day.

But you seem to me, so far, the only one to have

suffered, and to a much greater degree, for what you didn't do. In other words, there are plenty of conspiracy theorists still who refuse to believe that this was an insurrection by supporters of the former President and not some violent act instigated by antifa or the FBI.

So, there have been more than 700 people convicted so far in this courthouse of crimes related to January 6th. Not one is a member of antifa or an FBI agent. So what you've been through because of lies is truly unfortunate.

I've also read all of the letters in support, your own statements. I believe you are truly remorseful for your conduct. And not remorseful because you were caught, but remorseful starting early on in this process.

I also believe that you've led a very positive life of service in your community. Mr. Ungvarsky touches upon a few of them, but the letters, which are lengthy and numerous, speak in great detail of the service you've rendered. And, really, none talk about your service in the Marine Corps, but your contributions to your family, your community, and your town with many good works over a long period of time.

Given all of that mitigation, I ultimately believe -and it's a difficult decision -- that prison is not warranted
in this case and that a probationary sentence is appropriate.

Again, as I've said, everything the government said and
everything it requested were reasonable. This is not an easy

sentencing, and I believe this is the appropriate one.

I will not enforce a travel restriction or home confinement because I just don't think those serve any purpose at this point. But I will impose a gun restriction, as I've imposed on all supervisees from January 6. And I know that there are reasons that Mr. Ungvarsky has stated that I should permit it, here but I will not.

So I sentence the defendant to a term of 12 months of probation on Count 1 and a special assessment of \$25. I will not impose any travel restriction. There will be a gun restriction.

I'm also going to require 100 hours of community service, Mr. Epps, along the lines that you, yourself, have just proposed in your allocution.

You shall abide by the following mandatory conditions, as well as all discretionary conditions recommended by the probation office in Part D of the presentence report, including not committing federal, state, and local crimes. I will not impose any drug testing requirement.

I will order \$500 in restitution, and that will be due within 60 days.

You may appeal this conviction if you believe your guilty plea was somehow unlawful or involuntary, if there was some other defect in your plea agreement. You also may seek relief from the Court if you believe you've been rendered

1 ineffective assistance of counsel in relation to the plea or 2 sentencing and if new -- I'm sorry, or if new or currently 3 unavailable information became available to you. You must file 4 such appeal within 14 days after the entry of judgment. 5 are unable to afford the cost of appeal, you may request 6 permission from the Court to file without cost and you may also 7 seek court-appointed counsel. 8 Do you understand all of that, Mr. Epps? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: Are there any objections to the sentence 11 imposed not already noted on the record, Mr. Gordon? 12 MR. GORDON: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Ungvarsky? 14 MR. UNGVARSKY: No, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. Again, Mr. Epps, good luck to 16 I hope that you are able to continue your contributions 17 to your community without continued threat of violence. 18 Thank you very much. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
I, JANICE DICKMAN, do hereby certify that the above and
foregoing constitutes a true and accurate transcript of my
stenographic notes and is a full, true and complete transcript
of the proceedings to the best of my ability.
Dated this 19th day of January, 2024
Janice E. Dickman, CRR, CMR, CCR Official Court Reporter
Room 6523 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001