1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	Plaintiff,	Criminal Action No. 1: 21-153
5	VS.	Washington, DC June 6, 2023
6	DANIEL GOODWYN,	2:00 p.m.
7	Defendant.	/ p.m.
8		
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE REGGIE B. WALTON	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
11	APPEARANCES:	
12	For the Plaintiff:	ANDREW HAAG
13		USAO Criminal Division
14		601 D Street NW Washington, DC 20530
15		
16	For the Defendant:	Carolyn Stewart 1204 Swilley Road
17		Plant City, FL 33567
18		
19		
20		
21	Court Reporter:	SHERRY LINDSAY Official Court Reporter U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts
22		
23		333 Constitution Avenue, NW Room 6710
24		Washington, DC 20001
25		

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: This is criminal matter 21-153, United States of America versus Daniel Goodwyn. On behalf of probation, we have Jessica Reichler.

May I have counsel approach the lectern and state your appearance, beginning with the government.

MR. HAAG: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Andrew Haag for the United States.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. STEWART: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Carolyn Stewart for Daniel Goodwyn.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Okay. I took this matter under consideration and gave a considerable amount of thought on what was the appropriate thing to do in this case and, ultimately, had to look at what occurred here and assess what the appropriate sanction should be. And first of all, the defendant, as unfortunately as so many other of our fellow Americans has accepted the false impression based upon information that has been disseminated about the 2020 presidential election that somehow it was stolen. And there is just no proof whatsoever that that was, in fact, the case. To the extent that there may be some or may have been some irregularities in the electoral process, there has been no indication that those irregularities had any impact on the ultimate outcome of the election.

There have been over 60 lawsuits that were brought seeking to challenge the electoral result. None of them have been successful. And judges from all aspects of the bench have made that conclusion. And as with so many other Americans, the defendant accepted the false conclusion that the election had been somehow stolen. And there is no evidence that I have heard that establishes a nexus between him having reached that conclusion and his problem or situation with autism.

The defendant with the intention to protest the election results, traveled all of the way across the country to come here as he had a right to do. And it is the American way to protest peacefully, when protest is thought to be appropriate. But here, the protest became more than just the peaceful protest in opposition to something that the American citizenry — at least some disapprove with. While I can't say to what extent the defendant is associated with the Proud Boys, he clearly online did make statements indicating an association with them and that he made the same statement that the former president made when referencing the Proud Boys indicating stand back and stand by.

And, again, there is no evidence that I have heard regarding his autism that would establish a nexus between him having made that statement and the autism from which he suffers. And he, after listening to apparently the former president make his statements at his rally — he then comes

down to the vicinity of the Capitol with a bullhorn. He then is exulting other rioters to find their way into the Capitol.

And counsel represents that he needs a clear indication of something in order for him to appreciate what is being expected or what is being denied. And here, according to the evidence that the government showed when he was on the bullhorn, he made statements to the effect that a critical mass was needed in order to accomplish the objective of impeding the certification of the presidential election at a time when it seems clear to me that he would have seen a larger number of police officers who were, in fact, impeding the ability of people to gain access to the Capitol. And that statement, it seems to me, is inconsistent with the suggestion that he had no appreciation that he and others who were a part of the group were not welcome inside of the Capitol.

And, again, there is nothing that would indicate that his autism impacted on his perception in that regard. The defendant after he entered a plea of guilty, within several months, then appears on the Tucker Carlson show. And, unfortunately, Mr. Carlson has been a lightning rod and he has said and done things that I think clearly have been divisive. And he, obviously, had an objective in the show that he had when the defendant appeared on that show. And that was to give the impression that individuals who have been charged in reference to the events on January 6th of '21 have been treated

unfairly. And I see no evidence that, in fact, was the case.

But he sought to try and minimize, not only the conduct of the defendant, but the conduct of others who have been prosecuted as a result of what took place on that day. And counsel suggests that the defendant did not have the opportunity to correct the record. But he made no attempt to correct the record. And when Carlson suggested that all the defendant did was go into the Capitol and walk around for less than a minute and leave, that just wasn't correct.

And that misinformation that is disseminated to the American public has contributed to the discord that now exists in our country in reference to the presidential election and what occurred on January 6th. And there are people who are proclaiming that the individuals who have been prosecuted, who are being detained as a result of that are being held as political prisoners. And there is just nothing that supports that proposition.

But, nonetheless, it is something that parts of the media have sought to portray. And as a result of that have, in fact, continued to stir up the anger that people have resulting from the misinformation that has been disseminated to the American public about the events that took place on January 6th of '21.

And the defendant did not mention the fact that he was on the bullhorn encouraging people to breach the Capitol,

which clearly he did when he made his statements. And he did not relate the fact that when he got to the door. And it was clear to me from the evidence that the government submitted, the videos, that when he was at the door, it is clear, considering what took place immediately thereafter, that the police officer who had directed his attention to the defendant, for whatever reason, was saying to the defendant that he could not enter the Capitol. Because as soon as the defendant entered the Capitol, the officer went immediately after him having previously been in contact with him and sought to try and — the evidence would show have him leave the Capitol.

The defendant sought to avoid him. And then when the officer came back in contact with him, again, the defendant had the audacity to call the officer an oath breaker, which clearly was, in my view, an inappropriate statement to make to a police officer who was doing nothing other than carrying out his official duties to protect the Capitol and to protect those at the Capitol he has an obligation to protect. And, again, there is just no evidence whatsoever in the record that would suggest that the defendant's autism caused him to either get on the bullhorn and say the things that he did or to make that inappropriate statement to that police officer.

And all of that, obviously, causes me very significant concern, because the argument that has been made is that his autism should be reason for the Court to basically

overlook what he did and not impose any punishment as a result of the conduct that he engaged in. And, again, there is just no evidence that would support that was the case. And the defendant, even as of yesterday, still points out his concern about allegedly individuals who were purportedly assaulted by the police, and according to him, have died as a result of those encounters.

I have seen no evidence that would indicate to me — and I have seen hours and hours of the videos of what took place that day. I have seen nothing that would indicate that the police did anything that would indicate they were acting excessively. The police were under assault. Several police officers, because of the violent nature of what they experienced have committed suicide, another officer who died as a result of the trauma he experienced as a result of that.

And the defendant's concern has been in reference to these individuals who allegedly had a demise as a result of their encounter with law enforcement. Well, those individuals put themselves in that position. All the officers were doing was carrying out their official duty trying to protect the Capitol from those individuals. So to the extent that there were, in fact, individuals who were injured who allegedly died as a result of their injuries — which I don't know about other than Ms. Babbitt, who is the only person I am familiar with who suffered injuries and died as a result of that. Again, he

associates himself with these individuals who were engaged in wrongdoing as compared to the officers who were merely performing their official duty.

And, again, that would suggest to me that despite counsel's representations about him being contrite about what he did and his representations about that, that just rings hollow considering those sympathies that he has towards those who created the problem as compared to those who were performing their official duty.

And all of that — and, again, there is nothing that I have heard in the evidence that has been presented to me that shows a nexus between his autism and his perspective about these individuals and their alleged injuries and demise as compared to what happened to the police officers.

So having reached all of those conclusions, I just don't see how I can conclude that he should be treated any differently because of his autism as compared to other individuals who engage in similar conduct. And I deemed it appropriate on several occasions to impose something less than a prison sentence on individuals who merely went into the Capitol, did not do any damage to the Capitol and did not engage in assaultive behavior. Under those circumstances, I thought that while I don't in any way condone what they did because they contributed to the mob mentality that resulted in what occurred on January 6th, I nonetheless felt under those

circumstances those individuals were entitled to a probationary sentence as compared to a period of detention. For those individuals who have done more, I felt that that wasn't appropriate. And that includes not only what occurred on that day, but things that they did thereafter.

And, clearly, one of the problems that we are suffering as a country as it relates to the 2020 election and the events that occurred on January 6th is this information that continues to be disseminated to the American public. And as a result of that, is creating the dissension that exists in America and that is just not good for the future of our country.

And the defendant contributed to that by what he did and what he said and didn't do when he appeared on the Tucker Carlson show, because that misinformation that he contributed to, in my view, contributes to what we are still experiencing as a result of what occurred on January 6th of 2021. And absent, again, my conclusion that anything has been shown that his autism should cause him to be treated differently than other individuals, it is my conclusion that a period of detention is therefore appropriate.

And then, obviously, the question becomes what is the appropriate amount of time. He has already apparently served 21 days. And he should be given credit, obviously, for that. But it is my conclusion that a period of detention for

punishment purposes, which is an appropriate factor to consider is appropriate. Also I think it is important that deterrence, both specific and general, be a part of any sentence. And I would hope that individuals in the future would appreciate that if they are going to engage in the type of inappropriate behavior that occurred on January 6th that there are going to be consequences. And those consequences are going to result in their freedom being denied, at least for some period of time, with the hope that will cause individuals not to engage in this type of behavior again. And will send a message to others discouraging them from engaging in such behavior.

I don't know if there is anything — there would not appear to be anything that would need to be done to provide him with the skills and the coping mechanisms to not involve himself in anything of this nature. But I don't know if that is true or not. But I don't think that is really a significant factor to consider. Considering the types of sentences available to me — obviously, there are a lot of different options. But it has been my position in these cases and the seriousness of these cases and what it has done to our country that a sentence of something less than detention, absent those situations that I explained earlier where someone just went into the Capitol and did not do any damage and did not assault individuals, that those alternative sentences are not an appropriate sentence to impose in this case. And I have

considered other individuals who have engaged in similar conduct and what type of sentence they have received to avoid not giving a sentence that is inappropriate — different from sentences given to other individuals who engaged in similar conduct. It is my view, again, that a period of detention is appropriate. And I would conclude that defendant should be detained for a period of 60 days with credit for any time he has already served.

I also would require he serve on supervised release for a period of one year. And that while he is on supervised release, he cannot be rearrested for any reason whatsoever. While he is on release for any offense, he also must fully cooperate with his probation officer, which means he has to meet with that person each and every time he is told to. Also there is no indication of drug use, but he cannot possess or use illegal drugs. He will have to be tested as required at least once within 16 days of his release from his jail sentence to see if he is using drugs. And he also has to provide a sample of his DNA so see if he is involved in further crime that can be used to identify him.

I would, consistent with the parties' agreement, require that he pay \$500 in restitution. The probation department has done an assessment of his financial situation. And while I in no way condone the fundraising that he engaged in, it appears that he does not have the money to pay the fine.

And, therefore, I would impose a fine, but not the amount that is being requested. I would impose a fine in the amount of \$2,500.

Also, I would require that he participate in mental health treatment, if that is deemed to be necessary and that he remain in that treatment until it is no longer felt to be necessary by the probation department. Also until he has satisfied his financial obligations to the Court that he provide any financial information to the probation office that is requested and that he not create any new financial obligations by way of credit obligations until those amounts are paid or he gets authorization to do that from the probation department.

I also would impose a restriction that he not possess any firearms or any other dangerous weapons while he is on supervised release and that he maintain employment, if he is able to do so while he is under supervision.

And since he has used social media in order to provide what I consider to be disinformation about this situation, I would require that he permit his computer use to be subject to monitoring and inspection by the probation department to see if he is, in fact, disseminating information of the nature that relates to the events that resulted in what occurred on January 6th of 2021.

The restitution is to be paid to the Architect of the

1 Capitol. And those payments are to be made to the Court. And 2 the Clerk's Office will then forward that money to the 3 architect. I will also authorize the release of the 4 presentence report to the appropriate entities who need it in 5 order to carry out the orders of the Court. 6 The defendant does have a right to appeal his 7 conviction and his sentence to the Court of Appeals. If he 8 cannot afford to pay for a lawyer to represent him on appeal or 9 if he cannot afford to pay for the papers to be filed with that 10 Court to let the Court know he wants to appeal, those expenses 11 will be paid free of charge by the government. 12 Probation, anything else? 13 MS. REICHLER: Nothing additional at this time, Your 14 Honor. Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Anything else from the government? 16 MR. HAAG: Your Honor, at this time, the defendant 17 having been sentenced, the government moves to dismiss the 18 remaining four counts of the indictment. 19 THE COURT: Very well. That motion is granted. 20 Anything else from the defense? 21 MS. STEWART: Yes, Your Honor. Since you have 22 determined that he should have --23 THE COURT: I will permit him to self report. 24 MS. STEWART: Excuse me, sir? 25 THE COURT: I will permit him to self report to the

facility where he is designated to serve his jail sentence. 1 2 MS. STEWART: All right. So self reporting. And 3 also I would ask that you notate to the Bureau of Prisons his 4 request for minimum security, which would be a prison camp at Bastrop, Texas, B-A-S-T-R-O-P. And if that is not available, 5 6 second choice of El Reno; E-L, second word, R-E-N-O. That is 7 in Oklahoma and also a minimum security camp. But the request is for minimum security imprisonment, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: I will recommend that he be permitted to 10 serve a sentence at a location as close to his family as 11 possible. But I will leave it to the Bureau of Prisons to make 12 an assessment as to what his level of detention should be. 13 MS. STEWART: Your Honor, in other cases it is 14 allowable. I request here that at least we be allowed to enter 15 that his request is for minimum security. It has happened in 16 other cases that the judge enters the minimum security request, 17 noted by the defendant. The Bureau of Prisons doesn't have to 18 listen to us. We understand that. THE COURT: Very well. I will recommend that he be 19 20 held and detained at a minimum security facility. 21 MS. STEWART: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 (Proceedings concluded at 2:23 p.m.) 23 24

25

${\tt C}\ {\tt E}\ {\tt R}\ {\tt T}\ {\tt I}\ {\tt F}\ {\tt I}\ {\tt C}\ {\tt A}\ {\tt T}\ {\tt E}$ I, SHERRY LINDSAY, Official Court Reporter, certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Dated this 14th day of June, 2023. Sherry Lindsay, RPR Official Court Reporter