1	BEFORE THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, .
4	. Case Number 21-360 Plaintiff,
5	vs.
6	BRITTIANY ANGELINA DILLON, . November 4, 2021
7	. 9:06 a.m. Defendant.
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DABNEY L. FRIEDRICH UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	For the United States: MICHAEL ROMANO, AUSA
14	United States Attorney's Office 555 Fourth Street Northwest
15	Washington, D.C. 20530
16	For the Defendant: THOMAS ABBENANTE, ESQ.
17	888 17th Street Northwest Suite 1200
18	Washington, D.C. 20006
19	
20	Official Court Reporter: SARA A. WICK, RPR, CRR
21	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
22	333 Constitution Avenue Northwest Room 4704-B
23	Washington, D.C. 20001 202-354-3284
24	
25	Proceedings recorded by stenotype shorthand. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
_ 3	The product of the pr

PROCEEDINGS

(All participants present via video conference.)

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, we are in Criminal Action 21-360, the United States of America versus Brittiany Dillon.

If I can have the parties identify themselves for the record, beginning with the United States.

MR. ROMANO: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Romano on behalf of the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Romano.

MR. ABBENANTE: Good morning, Your Honor. Thomas

Abbenante on behalf of Ms. Dillon. Ms. Dillon is present, and

Ms. Dillon agrees to proceed by video pursuant to the CARES Act.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Abbenante and Ms. Dillon.

And I see we have Ms. Reichler from probation as well. Thank you for joining.

PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Abbenante, so that I can make the appropriate finding under the CARES Act, can you give me some specific reasons why it's appropriate to proceed and not delay this matter further without a serious harm to the interest of justice?

MR. ABBENANTE: Well, Your Honor, my client is about an hour away from the court. She currently at this point has

made the decision, based on her religious beliefs and other reasons, not to be vaccinated. I am -- she would be concerned having to come into the courthouse and to travel on any kind of public transportation under those circumstances. And so that is -- those are primary reasons why we're requesting to proceed in this manner.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Abbenante.

In light of the pandemic and the numbers associated with COVID and the defendant's concerns about travel, consistent with the CARES Act and the Chief Judge's standing order relating to the pandemic, I do find it's appropriate to proceed by video today.

I've reviewed the final presentence report and recommendation. I've also reviewed the parties' sentencing memoranda, including both parties' supplemental filings.

Mr. Abbenante, have you reviewed the presentence report with Ms. Dillon?

MR. ABBENANTE: I have, Your Honor, and I provided her with a copy of it, too. She has it, too.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So Ms. Dillon, have you read the presentence report and had adequate time to talk to your attorney about it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you had a chance to correct any errors in the report?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: And Mr. Abbenante, do you have any 3 unresolved objections to the presentence report? 4 MR. ABBENANTE: No, Your Honor. There were just some minor things that -- concerning biographical information, and 5 6 those were, you know, quickly resolved. 7 THE COURT: All right. So there are no remaining 8 factual inaccuracies in the report? 9 MR. ABBENANTE: No, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Romano, how about the government? 11 Does the government have any objections to the report? 12 MR. ROMANO: No objections. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Reichler, I see in paragraph 7 14 on page 3 and I think perhaps elsewhere in the report it states 15 that the defendant is pleading quilty to Count 4. I believe it's actually Count 1 of the superseding information. 16 17 Is that correct, Counsel? 18 MR. ROMANO: One moment, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: She pled, I think, to the superseding 20 information. 21 MR. ROMANO: She did, and I'm pulling up the 22 superseding information now. Yes, you're right, it is Count 1. 23 When we superseded, we just included the one count. 24 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Reichler, can you make 25 those corrections?

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor, I would be happy to.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Abbenante?

MR. ABBENANTE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. With those edits relating to the charge, I will accept the presentence report as my findings of fact pursuant to Rule 32 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

As all of you know, the sentencing guidelines do not apply in this case, and that is because the offense to which Ms. Dillon has pled guilty to is a Class B misdemeanor. The guidelines don't apply pursuant to Section 1B1.9 of the sentencing guidelines.

Therefore, the Court will consider the factors set forth in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a) to decide the appropriate sentence in this case. I'm not going to state all of those factors here on the record now, but I am familiar with them, and I will consider each of them, even if I don't address them all during this hearing.

All right. Mr. Romano, if I can hear from the government first. The government has reserved its right to allocute fully here at sentencing. I've reviewed both your initial and your supplemental filing. You can assume I'm familiar with both.

Before you start, though, let me just ask you, are there any identifiable victims who seek to be heard here?

MR. ROMANO: No.

THE COURT: And is the restitution amount, the \$500 restitution amount, is that the amount that the government is seeking from all January 6 Capitol defendants?

MR. ROMANO: Not from all, Your Honor, but I believe that is the amount that we have been seeking in misdemeanor cases. In felony cases where there -- I believe in felony cases, the amount we have been seeking generally has been \$2,000, but it may be more in instances where we have specific evidence connecting a defendant to specific property destruction rather than the general damage caused to the Capitol or to a specific assault that resulted in a sort of identifiable harm to a particular victim.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. ROMANO: All right. Your Honor, I want to start by addressing what I think was the motivating question behind the Court's request for us to file a supplemental pleading on Monday, which was a question about disparities in sentencing between different defendants in connection with the Capitol riot.

As I'm sure the Court knows, the rioters' conduct, when looking at the riot on January 6 writ large, covers a fairly broad spectrum. There are more than 600 defendants that have been charged. Those charges range from misdemeanors to violent felonies. There's certainly a large spectrum of conduct when

looking at the defendants altogether.

But even among misdemeanor defendants, there are certainly differences, differences in whether people entered the Capitol, how long they were in the Capitol for, when they entered, conduct within or outside.

And there's a fairly small pool of cases that have gone to sentencing so far. In the chart that we appended to our submission, I believe there were 23 cases that we've identified that have gone to sentencing. 22 of those are cases resolved with misdemeanor charges. And even looking at those cases, when we look at specific factors and Ms. Dillon's conduct, the pool of comparable cases, I think, shrinks even beyond that, as we discussed in our submissions.

Looking at the conduct in this case and the factors in this case, the government submits that there are really two things that are especially significant. One is an attempt to enter the Capitol at a time when there was a crowd that was seeking to move past that police line as opposed to an attempt to enter the Capitol, for instance, after a point of access had already been breached, and second, the text messages that Ms. Dillon sent to somebody else who went to the riot on January 6.

The attempt to enter with other people is significant, because there are certainly other defendants who, while they -- when they entered, they would have seen broken glass, they would have seen overturned police barriers, there wasn't police

resistance at the point of entry as there was here.

And now, I want to stress, we don't have any evidence to show that Ms. Dillon assaulted or physically resisted police, but there were people around who were trying to get in through that door. And the video evidence shows that Ms. Dillon worked her way through the crowds in an effort to get to that door. This was not a case where she was carried across the threshold by a group of people. This was not a case where there was a sort of delayed entry where she was unable to see what was happening at the front. There were people that were near her who were jockeying with police officers. And I believe although the view is somewhat obstructed, that there were police officers outside the door who were engaging with other rioters, who were deploying pepper spray. I think that's how Ms. Dillon got pepper spray in her eyes, as she reported.

THE COURT: Mr. Romano, sorry to interrupt, but has the government provided this video, or are you just speaking about what you've reviewed yourself? I don't see it -- it's not on the docket.

MR. ROMANO: I'm speaking about what I've reviewed. I realized I hadn't provided that video, and I'm happy to share my screen and play it. The clips are only about one minute long, and there are two cameras that are relevant.

THE COURT: Mr. Abbenante, what's your position on that?

MR. ABBENANTE: Your Honor, Mr. Romano has been completely open with discovery. We've seen it, and Ms. Dillon has seen it. And in fact, initially when we were discussing a resolution of this case, I pointed out to Mr. Romano that the evidence, at least from my point of view and also Ms. Dillon's point of view, that she never actually crossed the threshold of the building.

So yes, we've seen it, and I don't have any objection to you seeing it.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Romano -- sorry?

MR. ABBENANTE: It's not that long, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Romano, I imagine there are folks listening in who can't view the video, and since the government hasn't, can it upload it to whatever system it has been placing such videos in so that the public can have access to it?

MR. ROMANO: I certainly can, and we do not object to making public these two videos.

THE COURT: Mr. Abbenante?

MR. ABBENANTE: I really don't have an objection to the video, but my client is always concerned that the more stuff that's out there associated with her name continues to cause problems for her and her family. I don't have any problem with the posting of the video if there's some way to redact Ms. Dillon's name from the video. I don't know --

MR. ROMANO: The video itself doesn't contain her name. I mean, certainly, videos disseminated in connection with this case, people who are observing the case or trying to research it might note the connection, but the video doesn't show the names of any people.

MR. ABBENANTE: As I said before, Judge, if you want to see it, I have no problem. Mr. Romano has accurately described the video here today and also in the pleadings, but if Your Honor wants to see it, no problem.

THE COURT: All right. And also, you don't object to it being made available to the public?

MR. ABBENANTE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Romano, I think it might be helpful for me to see it, because it wasn't clear to me -- from what the parties wrote, it wasn't clear to me whether Ms. Dillon actually was sprayed with pepper spray, and it wasn't clear to me -- I know that the government has not alleged that she assaulted any officers, but it was hard for me to understand if she was pushing back against the officers.

There was contact, correct, between the two?

MR. ROMANO: I am not 100 percent sure from my review of the video if there was contact. She sort of fell at the threshold of the building and stood back up, and there certainly could have been contact there. But as she then tried to get in, there were other rioters who the police were trying to get out

of the building. And so as that crowd moves forward, there's some officers that kind of step out of the threshold, there's some rioters that step out of the threshold, and there was certainly contact between Ms. Dillon and other members of that group. It is just hard to say with certainty that the contact is between her and a police officer.

THE COURT: So what makes her eventually turn away?

Does she do it on her own, or is she prevented from entering and, therefore, gives up? What's the government's -- I want to see the video, but what is your position on that?

MR. ROMANO: Well, I don't know that I can assess for certain. In her text messages, she reported getting pepper sprayed and being unable to see for a period of time. And based on the video, it does appear there's some engagement with police officers and other rioters outside the building. So it is certainly possible that she was pepper sprayed.

What I would submit as the most likely explanation is the combination of falling to the ground and pepper spray in the air made her decide to leave.

THE COURT: And I think she also alleged, at least in text messages, that she was tear gassed? Am I remembering that correctly? Pepper sprayed and tear gassed?

MR. ROMANO: I think that it's probably just the one, and it was probably spray and not tear gas. Based on the staircase and the position in the Capitol, I don't think this

was an area where the police deployed, say, a tear gas grenade. 1 2 THE COURT: I understand that, but did she not say in 3 her text messages that she was pepper sprayed in the eyes and tear gassed three times? 4 5 MR. ROMANO: I think that's right. 6 THE COURT: And that the officers tried to beat her 7 with batons? 8 MR. ROMANO: She did say that. I'm skeptical about 9 whether that's accurate. 10 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Romano, yes, it would be 11 helpful to see the video clip. 12 MR. ROMANO: All right. Bear with me for just a 13 moment, Your Honor. As I am looking at sharing my screen, there 14 are a few too many windows open for the video to pop up as an 15 option. I'm just closing some other things. 16 Okay. Your Honor, can you see this video? 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 MR. ROMANO: All right. I'm going to hit play. 19 to orient you before we start, you will see Ms. Dillon approach the middle of the doorway, and then it appears she falls to the 20 21 ground. 22 (Video recording played.) 23 MR. ROMANO: And there she is. She's fallen. 24 I'm sorry. Were you asking me to pause, Your Honor? 25 THE COURT: I had a hard time spotting her.

MR. ROMANO: Okay. I'm going to back up a few 1 2 seconds. Now we're at 18 seconds. She is the figure, the 3 blonde woman a little bit shorter than other members of the crowd who right now is kind of in the middle of the crowd near 4 5 Her head is near the American flag that's off to the 6 right-hand side of the door. 7 THE COURT: It's in between the flag and the red --8 the individual with the red hat? 9 MR. ROMANO: Yes. 10 (Video recording played.) 11 MR. ROMANO: And there she's fallen. And there it 12 looks like she's trying to maintain her position or move 13 forward. There's a crowd of other people are funneled out of 14 the door. 15 I'm pausing, too, Your Honor. This was somewhat obstructed 16 by the left-hand door that you can see police trying to close, 17 but on the outside past the door, you can see officers in riot 18 gear, one with a protective face shield, who just came into view 19 and before the door closed. I'll back it up slightly.

those -- that officer and some others just out of view, I believe, were engaging with other rioters who were outside.

(Video recording played.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So did the officer to the left have a baton?

MR. ROMANO: I'm not sure, Your Honor. It would not

surprise me if he did. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MR. ROMANO: And there's another video from outside 4 that I can play. It's from the outside looking in the same 5 door. 6 (Video recording played.) 7 MR. ROMANO: So now you can see Ms. Dillon just enter 8 the bottom of the frame and move toward the door. 9 THE COURT: It's difficult to see much with the flag. 10 MR. ROMANO: Right. 11 MR. ABBENANTE: You just saw her fall there, Your 12 Honor. 13 THE COURT: I wish I could see it. I take your word 14 It's very difficult to see much from this angle. 15 MR. ABBENANTE: Mike, can you point to her? There's 16 her head in the middle. Do you see it? 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 MR. ROMANO: I will back up just a little bit. 19 Yes, you can definitely see her head in the middle right 20 there, the blonde hair kind of right in front of the break 21 between the two -- the closed door and where the other door was 22 closed. 23 And over to the right again blocked by the pillar, you can 24 see what looks like a police officer in a gas mask, although 25 that could be another rioter.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ROMANO: So it is difficult from the angles of the camera to get a good view on what the police did, as you can see, Your Honor, and to get a good view on exactly the level of police engagement with the rest of the crowd, when pepper spray or tear gas, as Ms. Dillon put it, may have been deployed, or when batons may have been used against members of the crowd.

THE COURT: Regardless, she was very much engaged, both verbally and physically, whether she assaulted them or not.

MR. ROMANO: Right. It's not clear from the evidence that any sort of assault happened, but it is clear that she was trying to enter the building and that she was trying to at the very least maintain her position as the -- as people were leaving the Capitol and as the crowd was surging and trying to get into the building.

So that is definitely an important piece of the conduct, Your Honor, that the government submits makes Ms. Dillon's case more comparable to other cases where misdemeanor defendants, although they may not personally have committed assaults or property destruction, nonetheless were a part of a crowd that overwhelmed a police line elsewhere in the Capitol. This police line here was not overwhelmed, probably in part due to the tight nature of the access point -- there wasn't really a lot of room for a crowd to gather around the door -- and probably in part due to police engaging with rioters on the outside.

We also submit that the text messages that we highlighted in our sentencing submissions make this case somewhat different from other cases. We look at these text messages both to assess the seriousness of the conduct, to give us some sense of why a defendant was at the Capitol, why they carried out the conduct that they did, but also to look at the possibility of recidivism and the need for deterrence.

And what we can see here is that even if Ms. Dillon did not stay beyond the point where this video was taken, left shortly thereafter, even if she was dissuaded from further conduct by the presence of some type of chemical or possibly getting hit or made contact with as the crowd was surging against police, she anticipated that this day, January 6, and the certification of the Electoral College vote was connected with what she saw to be some kind of violent showdown between the two different forces in American life.

And she talked about the government being infiltrated by Congress. She talked about a civil war. She talked about the coronavirus pandemic and the restrictions put on people as a way to prep her side for lockdowns, restrictions, disruptions in supply.

And this is the sort of thing that is troubling as it speaks to her conduct, but also troubling as far as looking ahead to whether there is a possibility of further participation in an event like this.

In our sentencing submission, Your Honor, we stress that this riot is a sui generis one-of-a-kind case, and it certainly is when compared to other cases we prosecute. But that doesn't mean that the danger of the riot has passed just because January 6 has passed. The danger, the government submits, is ongoing and can recur, especially if there is inadequate deterrence when events like this come up again, when there are further elections, when there are further certifications of the votes. The danger --

THE COURT: So along those lines, Mr. Romano, why is the government in this case only seeking probation for three years as opposed to a longer period past, for example, the next election?

MR. ROMANO: Well, given the sentences that we have requested in other cases and the -- that much time of supervision represents, we think that three years is a reasonable sentence for the Court to impose. If the Court wanted to impose a sentence of probation until the next election, I think that's certainly the Court's prerogative, and we would not necessarily object to that.

THE COURT: Mr. Romano, help me understand the government's position. As it appears to the Court based on your submission, it seems like the government has kind of a standard recommendation it's making in these misdemeanor cases in which there is not clear evidence of an assault or property damage,

and that is, the government is recommending three years' probation, some period of community service, some period of home confinement, and \$500 in restitution. Is that fair?

MR. ROMANO: That's generally fair, yes. I think that's been a fairly consistent recommendation in a number of these cases.

THE COURT: And yet, you do -- despite the recommendations you've made in other cases, you do distinguish this from the Bustle case, for example. You compare it to Bennett and Vinson and argue that in some ways this case is more aggravated, in other ways less. So I'm just kind of curious. The government's sort of taking a broad approach with these nonassault, nonproperty damage misdemeanor cases, correct, and just kind of an even approach across the board even though you're arguing in your sentencing memoranda that the Court should distinguish in certain ways from these cases in which the government's made the same recommendation.

MR. ROMANO: I don't think our recommendation has always been the same, and I would note, too, that there are -- on the third page, the cases where we've recommended some period of incarceration, all but one of those cases are misdemeanor cases as well. There's the Hodgkins case, which Mr. Hodgkins, I believe, made it into the Senate floor, was in the building for a prolonged period of time, and was charged with intent to obstruct Congress.

But the other cases on that list are cases where we were recommending some period of incarceration even for a misdemeanor defendant. Some of those are -- I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I just want to understand, is it -- am I correct that the cases that the government thinks this case is most analogous to would include the Bustle case in which you've argued here the facts are more aggravated, the Vinson cases, and Bennett? Are those the primary ones?

MR. ROMANO: Yes, that's fair.

THE COURT: Okay. And, you know, in Bustle, am I correct, you made the same recommendation as you're making here?

MR. ROMANO: For Jessica Bustle, yes, not for her husband. Her husband, we recommended one month of home detention.

THE COURT: Okay. And the Bustle case, I think, was the Hogan case; correct?

MR. ROMANO: Yes, Judge Hogan presided over that one.

I would add, too, Your Honor, that the sentence in Bustle was handed down before we drafted our sentencing memorandum here. So I'm not saying definitively that the recommendation might have changed if the sentence in Bustle had changed, but certainly seeing what Judge Hogan did in Bustle and what was done in other cases has informed our thinking on this case and other cases that came after that one.

THE COURT: All right. And in Bennett, I believe

Judge Boasberg imposed a sentence of 24 months' probation, as 1 2 did Judge Hogan in Bustle; correct? 3 MR. ROMANO: I believe that's right, yes. THE COURT: And both of them imposed some period of 4 home detention or home incarceration? 5 6 MR. ROMANO: Yes. 7 THE COURT: And then in the Vinson cases, I think 8 Judge Walton imposed five years' probation; is that right? 9 MR. ROMANO: Yes, and also a pretty substantial fine, 10 I believe. 11 THE COURT: Right, a fine. But in this case no one 12 disputes Ms. Dillon doesn't have the financial resources to pay a fine? 13 14 MR. ROMANO: Right. 15 THE COURT: Walton did impose five years' probation 16 but no period of home incarceration or home detention; correct? 17 MR. ROMANO: That's right. 18 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you. 19 wanted to make sure I was accurately understanding your position 20 in this case relative to those other cases. You think it 21 falls -- it's most analogous to those three cases, and it's more 22 egregious than the Bustle case? 23 MR. ROMANO: That's right. And also, just as I 24 distinguished Jessica Bustle's sentence from Joshua Bustle's 25 sentence, I think it's also important to point out, as I'm sure

the Court noticed, that we think this case is more comparable to Thomas than Lori Vinson. Thomas Vinson was the defendant for whom we recommended probation with a period of home confinement. Lori Vinson's conduct was substantially different in that she submitted to a number of news interviews where she talked about being in the crowd participating in the riot and that she would do it again. We thought that conduct was more egregious and merited a sentence of incarceration. Obviously, Judge Walton imposed a different sentence than what we recommended there, but we are specifically comparing this case to Thomas Vinson's case.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead, Mr. Romano.

I didn't mean to cut you off.

MR. ROMANO: No, that's completely fine.

So Your Honor, I was nearing the end of my argument anyway. For all those reasons and the reasons that we stated in our memorandum, we submit that a sentence of three years of probation with a three-month period of home confinement and the other conditions we have laid out balances the different 3553(a) factors and represents a sentence that will reflect the nature and seriousness of the offense for deterrence, will take into account the history and characteristics of this defendant, and also promote a -- promote respect for the law and provide just punishment.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Romano. Let me ask you one last question.

MR. ROMANO: Certainly.

1.3

THE COURT: In the interview that Ms. Dillon had with law enforcement officers following her plea in this case, I think she was asked about her -- well, wait. I'm not sure whether this was in the texts she had with the other individual who was involved in the Capitol attack or whether this was actually in the interview. I thought it was in the interview. But she talked about deleting her Instagram account because other online accounts of hers had been hacked?

MR. ROMANO: Yes.

THE COURT: Can you shed any light on that? Do you have any evidence to that other than her own statement?

MR. ROMANO: We knew before the fact that her
Instagram account had been deleted. I don't have other evidence
about other accounts being hacked. She was speaking about bank
accounts specifically there. And I didn't want to go into a lot
of detail about that, but she was not talking about social media
accounts being hacked. She was talking about bank accounts and
other apps on her phone, I believe. And so she also, according
to her, decided to take down her Instagram account.

THE COURT: And that was the day after January 6?

MR. ROMANO: I don't know that it was the day after

January 6. It was shortly after January 6.

THE COURT: Okay. But the government doesn't have any independent evidence, aside from her own statements, to support

that?

1.3

MR. ROMANO: To support why she took down the accounts? No.

THE COURT: And the hacking of bank accounts and other social media accounts.

MR. ROMANO: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Abbenante, I've also reviewed your filings, and I do want to give Ms. Dillon an opportunity to make a statement after I hear from you first if she desires to do so.

But as I mentioned during our last status hearing, our telephonic hearing that we held before I decided to continue the sentencing hearing in order to get more information from both sides, as I mentioned before, I am troubled by the statements Ms. Dillon made both before the Capitol attack and shortly after and then even later after she pled guilty in this case in her interview with law enforcement agents, her statements before January 6 about the new administration stealing the election, about the Democrats shutting the country down and letting the U.N. and China take over, her statements just after the attack calling the officers who defended the Capitol devils, her later statements in the post-plea interview in which she stated that she stayed at the Capitol so that the United States would not end up without free speech like China.

She also said she didn't talk to the other rioter about the

presidential election, which her texts show clearly isn't true. She also said she tried to keep the conversation silly and lighthearted with him.

None of this rings true to me, and it does make me wonder whether there's a real risk that she will continue to engage in this kind of unlawful conduct in the future.

So can you speak to that, and can you also tell me what she meant when she said during her post-plea interview with law enforcement agents that she only supported violence in extreme circumstances, like the Revolutionary War, and sort of the implication being this was that, January 6 was that. All of those statements give me great concern.

MR. ABBENANTE: Your Honor, I don't -- there's really no defense to any of those statements. They're her -- the statements that she made concerning the election, the statements that she made concerning China, many people still believe those facts, that those are true facts. After a recent rally that former President Trump had, two people, I saw on the news, were interviewed, and I was sort of shocked because they said the exact same things that Ms. Dillon said.

THE COURT: She is certainly entitled to her views, but here, she took those views, and she engaged in violent conduct and unlawful conduct, and that combination is extremely concerning.

MR. ABBENANTE: I understand that, and Ms. Dillon

understands that. She is entitled to her views, but she is not entitled to do what she did in this case. And she regrets it.

I've been doing this for over 40 years, and I think that I have a pretty good sense in dealing with my particular clients to determine whether or not someone is just trying to get over on the Court or get over on the Probation Department or the government and whether or not they're truly sorry for what they did.

Ms. Dillon truly is sorry for what she did here. She regrets saying those things. She regrets even coming to the Capitol. As the government pointed out, she didn't come here with any weapons. I think she just got caught up in the entire speeches and went up to the Capitol --

THE COURT: But you say that, Mr. Abbenante, and you said that in your filing as well, that she, you know, quote, got caught up in the moment. But as Mr. Romano has pointed out, her text messages suggest that she went to D.C. clearly anticipating violence and clearly willing and interested in becoming a part of that violence, and in fact, her actions bear that out.

So I view her case differently than those who decided to attend the rally and then also decided to walk down to the Capitol. It seems to me, based on her texts before this event, that she clearly anticipated something very different, and this was not a surprise to her, and this was really what she went to D.C. to do.

MR. ABBENANTE: Well, she says that that's not the case, and then I have to just rely on what she says. And she will tell you -- when she makes her statement to the Court, she will explain what was going through her mind at that time.

But I can't defend her text messages, and all I can say about them is that they were thoroughly vetted by the government. As I explained in my memoranda, the individual that she was texting with came into her church, befriended her and her father. Both of them exchanged text messages with this individual. We don't deny it. We don't deny anything the government is saying concerning the content of those messages.

But once they were -- the father was interviewed about those text messages, and no other charges were brought against the father or Ms. Dillon.

THE COURT: And just to be clear, Mr. Abbenante, I'm not suggesting here by my questions that additional charges should be brought based on her pre-offense texts. What they do, though, is they inform her intent with these actions. And, you know, arguably, what she said to law enforcement agents could be prosecuted as false statements. I don't find that the statements that she made to them ring true in light of the text messages that the government has represented were made. But the government has not made a decision to charge those.

It's just, in assessing her degree of remorse, this is after arrest, this is after plea. In an interview with law

enforcement, even at that time her statements seem very much separated from reality and her own conduct, and that too troubles me.

MR. ABBENANTE: Well, I can't argue with that, because they do seem to be that way. All I can tell you is that from my observations and my discussions with Ms. Dillon and when she was interviewed by the Probation Department, I truly believe that she is sorry for what she did and that this is not going to ever happen again.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ABBENANTE: And -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

THE COURT: Mr. Abbenante, you are suggesting that the Court impose probation without any conditions, and if I were to impose any conditions, that they be restricted to community service.

In light of what's on Ms. Dillon's plate in terms of caring for her daughter, her disabled uncle, her husband's grandfather, her -- I think it's her nephew who has disabilities, to me that doesn't make a lot of sense. That's not what she needs. She may need part-time work, and to the extent she has extra hours, it seems to me her efforts would be better directed in that way, seeking employment, than community service, although I certainly value community service. But I'm just concerned, given what she has on her plate, that she may not be able to do both, and it seems like a job would be helpful to her.

MR. ABBENANTE: Well, Your Honor, I can tell you this:

Ms. Dillon is the one who suggested that I make that

recommendation to the Court in terms of the hours of community

service, because she feels that that would demonstrate how sorry

she is about this. And although it may be a hardship to her,

over a period of two years' or three years' probation or

whatever if Your Honor were to go that way, she thinks she could

do that on weekends, on one weekend day a week.

THE COURT: Is she also continuing to pursue employment?

MR. ABBENANTE: She is trying to pursue part-time employment, as she has in the past. She periodically has had part-time employment, and there have been no issues with that. At this point in time while this case has been pending, she has been reluctant to actually apply for jobs because most of them ask whether or not you've got a conviction or whether or not you've got any kind of cases pending and things of that nature. So she hasn't pursued that type of, you know, regular employment while this case is pending.

But as her prior record of employment indicates, this is not a woman who doesn't want to work. She's just decided that while this case is pending it's best that she just basically lay low and just wait until this case is resolved.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Abbenante, I also want to flag for you, to the extent you want to respond, I am

considering, based on the presentence report and, in particular, paragraph 48, a special treatment condition.

MR. ABBENANTE: I talked to her about that, and she, you know, feels that she's been able to deal with the various issues through her interaction with her church and the people that support her there. But I certainly don't have an objection if Your Honor deems it appropriate to order any kind of special treatment. She may very well benefit from this because this has been a traumatic experience for her. And I don't really think -- I mean, I know it's set in, but I don't think that's a bad suggestion.

Again, I'm not trying to make it personal, because it's not personal to me, but what I can say is this: You know, when I started practicing, I started as a student attorney. I represented a lot of people in disorderly conduct cases. And then when I started my practice in Superior Court, I've done so many diversion cases. And even through the federal -- while I've been practicing more recently in the federal court than the state court, I've seen cases like this where people like

Ms. Dillon who have no prior record, where the Probation

Department is recommending probation, where the government is recommending probation, we're in agreement with that. The only thing that we were in sort of disagreement or not in step with was the conditions of probation.

I understand Mr. Romano's argument. I understand what

Judge Hogan and the other judges did when they imposed a period of home confinement. I just feel that that is -- that's all right, I get it, but I thought that the community service would be a way for Ms. Dillon to demonstrate how sorry she is for what she's done.

And when I cited the Bustle case, at that time it was the closest case that I could find that sort of mirrored her conduct. But when Mister -- and the other ones that I cited, I thought that those were sort of worse than Ms. Dillon. But the ones that Mr. Romano pointed out in his memorandum I think even further support why Ms. Dillon is a good candidate for probation and that the recommendation is in step with other cases.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Abbenante, to be clear, if I impose a home confinement-like condition, I would be imposing something like home detention where I would expect that she would be out and about trying to find employment to the extent she couldn't perform community service.

But given the demands on her with her family, I agree with you, I think being locked down in the home is not necessarily productive, assuming, of course, she's engaged in other constructive things. But when she's not, it seems to me there should be a period of time when she's in the home but for those constructive things.

MR. ABBENANTE: I really don't have any problem with that. I just think Your Honor sees from the report that what

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

she -- as long as she's allowed to attend church, as long as she is allowed to pick up her nephew from school --THE COURT: Seek treatment, et cetera, yes. MR. ABBENANTE: -- and also, you know, go grocery shopping for her family and take care of her grand -- I think sometimes she has to take either the uncle or the grandfather to medical appointments. As long as those things are unrestricted, again, we don't have any objection to it. THE COURT: Well, it's not that they would be completely unrestricted. It's just that probation would be aware of what she's doing and approve what she's doing. MR. ABBENANTE: And as the Pretrial Services has indicated, as Ms. Dillon has shown, she's been completely compliant with all the conditions that Pretrial has placed on her. And many times, she was traveling from her house to Baltimore to meet in person with the Probation Department, and she met all those appointments. She did it all. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Abbenante, anything else? MR. ABBENANTE: No, no, Your Honor, but I do think that Ms. Dillon has something that she would like to say. THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So Ms. Dillon, this is your opportunity to make a statement today if you choose. You don't have to, but you have the right to make a statement if you would like to.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, and I thank you so

much for -- everyone here, the dignity I've been treated with and the fairness.

This day was the worst day of my life. This does not line up with the rest of my life, you know. I admit, I have strong beliefs, most definitely, but what I did was inexcusable and unacceptable. I don't like upsetting people. I don't like -- I have expressed before, I'm very private, and I don't like seeing people in pain. I don't like seeing people hurt. I admit that I was really passionate in the lead-up to that.

And there is no excuse for my actions by any means. I was going through an incredibly difficult time with a loss. And I tell you, my world view has changed so much. Just since, I mean, even since July, I've experienced two more losses, and that's really shaped the way I see things because life is just so precious.

And just I do not want to do anything to create any misery or any unhappiness for any person ever, and I am so truly sorry for my choices. So much of that day just comes in flashes, and it was just so -- emotions and everything going on around me in my personal life and then what was happening in the country and things, it was so overwhelming. And it's a lot of times even very hard to remember, because it's just painful and traumatic.

I never want to set foot in Washington, D.C., again, and I love that city, and I have beautiful memories with my family in that city, and I will never step foot in it again because I do

not -- I don't want to think about that day. It's horrible.

And I just don't want to -- I am so -- I wake up in a panic some mornings because I'm so troubled about what I did, thinking of like what this would mean for my family, what this would mean for me in my future. Because I don't have a college education, and I don't have those things, that it's like I just blew my whole life, I just blew my whole future. And it takes a lot to even calm down when I think about it, you know, because it's just so much.

And I -- this moment has just -- this moment right now has played in my head because I'm not very good at explaining my thoughts and my feelings sometimes, and I am just so truly sorry to be a burden and create this problem for anybody. I don't want to ever do anything again. I want to obey the law, and I've shown that before, and I would like to continue being that person I was before January 6, which was never breaking the law.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your remarks,

Ms. Dillon. I can imagine that this has been a traumatic event

for you, and I hope, genuinely hope that you will take advantage

of the kind of treatment services that will be offered to you

while you are on probation.

I am inclined to impose a sentence of probation in this case with a period of home detention and require you to seek employment and to the extent you're unable to obtain it, do community service.

But there are many lawful and productive ways to channel your frustration over the government and what's going on in this country, and you have lived an otherwise lawful and law-abiding life here. This one mistake doesn't have to define you, but perhaps the way in which you respond to this mistake can define you.

So again, I am going to encourage you to learn from this and take advantage of the services that will be offered to you as a part of your conditions of probation.

Counsel for the government, for both sides, is there any reason why sentence should not be imposed at this time?

MR. ROMANO: No, Your Honor.

MR. ABBENANTE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. As I've already noted, I'm required to consider the various factors outlined in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a). Again, I'm familiar with those factors, and I'm considering them all here.

Beginning first with the nature and circumstances of this offense, although this is a misdemeanor offense, it is nonetheless a very serious one. Ms. Dillon has admitted that she was a part of a large crowd that breached the U.S. Capitol on January 6 of this year. At that time members of Congress had gathered to certify the vote count of the Electoral College for the 2020 presidential election, as had the vice president.

Despite the presence that day of many Capitol police

officers and barricades around the exterior of the Capitol building, a crowd of hundreds, including Ms. Dillon, forced its way through barricades and through Capitol police. Although Ms. Dillon did not enter the building, many did through locked doors and windows of the Capitol building. As a result, members of Congress, as well as Vice President Pence who was present, were forced to evacuate the Senate and House chambers.

It's estimated that on that day there was more than \$1.4 million in property damage done to the Capitol building. Although there's no evidence in the record that Ms. Dillon herself damaged property or injured any Capitol police officers or others, she was very much a part, as the government has described and the videos have shown, of the initial and violent crowd. Her actions that day contributed both directly and indirectly to the violence and destruction of that day.

Ms. Dillon tried to enter the Capitol through the Senate carriage door, and in doing so, as the video illustrates, she pushed through a crowd before eventually falling near the entrance. After she fell down, she got up, seemed to engage with law enforcement officers, verbally if not physically, but she ultimately left the area, perhaps due to pepper spray or some other chemical agent.

As we've discussed here, the evidence suggests that

Ms. Dillon went to D.C. that day expecting there to be violence
and intent on doing her part to stop Congress from fulfilling

its constitutional duty. The attack in which she participated was an attack on our institutions of government, the rule of law, and our democratic process.

When she tried to enter the Capitol, she knew full well she didn't have any authority to enter the building. She was, by her actions, in no way exercising her First Amendment rights. She was clearly trespassing. And she not only violated the law, she subjected career law enforcement officers whose job it is to protect the Capitol, members of Congress, and others who were present inside the Capitol that day, she subjected those officers to great, great risk. Though she didn't injure anyone, the evidence before the Court is that more than 100 law enforcement officers were injured that day as a result of this violent attack.

As I've stated, Ms. Dillon's online statements before and after the attack, as well as her statements to law enforcement agents after her plea are concerning to the Court.

Considering next her history and characteristics, as found by the probation officer, Ms. Dillon has no prior criminal record. She did, to her credit, accept responsibility early, and by pleading guilty early, she saved the government and the court resources.

Ms. Dillon currently cares for her child and her husband's disabled 64-year-old uncle and his 90-year-old grandfather. All of these individuals reside in the home with her and her

husband. She also assists her sister-in-law in the care of her autistic child.

Though Ms. Dillon is not working outside the home at the moment, she has worked on and off consistently since her teenage years.

Ms. Dillon has no history of drug or alcohol abuse. She has a number of health issues which are documented in detail in the presentence report.

Looking at the range of sentences available here, this petty offense has a maximum penalty of six months in prison, up to five years' probation, a maximum fine of \$5,000, and is subject to a \$10 special assessment. As I've said, I don't find, given Ms. Dillon's limited resources, that she has the ability to pay a fine in this case.

We also discussed restitution, which Ms. Dillon has agreed to pay, consistent with other similarly situated defendants.

She has agreed to pay \$500 to defray some of the costs associated with the January 6 damage to the Capitol.

Considering the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, while it's certainly important to sentence

Ms. Dillon based on her individual conduct, Section 3553(a) does require this Court to take into account the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, and the guidelines themselves usually aid judges in doing that, but those don't apply here. So the defense has provided the Court with

information relating to other similar Capitol cases in this court, and I asked the government for the same information.

I've considered the aggravating and mitigating facts of this case and compared them with the facts of those other cases, and I've taken into account the sentences imposed by my colleagues in those cases.

While no two cases are alike, several do have similar facts. The defendants in those cases were sentenced to probation, some with community service. Some received home confinement. Most of the cases cited by the government, or I think all that are analogous to this case, the government has made the same sentencing recommendation in each, and that is that the defendant serve three years' probation with community service and a short period of home confinement, plus pay restitution.

I do agree with the government that what makes this case aggravated compared to some of the other similar cases is the fact that Ms. Dillon was clearly anticipating violence when she arrived at the Capitol or in D.C. on January 6, and her statements after the attack as well give the Court concern. She was also a part of the initial crowd that tried to enter the building. She seemed intent on, if not herself, supporting those who were trying to halt the certification of the Electoral College vote.

To her credit, as I've said, there's no evidence that she

injured any officers or that she committed any property damage.

Nonetheless, she did engage, it appears, physically and verbally with the officers.

The defense has argued the facts of this case are comparable in some ways to the case of U.S. v. Bustle, a case in which Judge Hogan sentenced the defendant to 24 months' probation with two months of home detention and 40 hours of community service and \$500 in restitution.

Again, I think this case is different in the respects that have been noted. Namely, Ms. Dillon anticipated violence ahead of time, and her text messages before and since have been disturbing. She's also an early rioter who fought hard to get in the Capitol.

The defense's comparison to Doyle and Ehrke is less persuasive.

The government argues this case is like U.S. v. Bennett and U.S. v. Vinson, at least one, Lori Vinson, I believe. In Bennett, Judge Boasberg imposed a sentence of 24 months' probation and \$500 of restitution. In the Vinson case, the government analogizes this to Judge Walton, who imposed five years' probation, a \$5,000 fine, and \$500 in restitution.

I think before imposing sentence, I think it is worth emphasizing what Judge Hogan and other judges of this court have made clear, and that is that defendants in these Capitol cases should not presume that probation is a default sentence, given

the seriousness of the offense, and that is especially true for those who committed assaults on officers and property damage.

But consistent with the sentences of other judges on this court in similar cases and as recommended by probation, as I've said, I think a sentence of probation is warranted in this case. But given the aggravated circumstances of Ms. Dillon's conduct, I do think a substantial length of probation is warranted, and therefore, I will impose a three-year sentence of probation, coupled with a two-month period of home detention. I do believe that's sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes of punishment.

Ms. Dillon is certainly not among the least culpable in this large group of Capitol offenders, but she is certainly not the most either. I'm encouraged by Ms. Dillon's remarks here that at least now she does appreciate the serious severity of her offense. I credit her acceptance of responsibility and her clean criminal record to date. It does appear that this is an aberrant event in her otherwise law-abiding life.

Even so, I do find, consistent with Section 3553(a), that a three-year term of probation coupled with a 60-day period of home detention is sufficient to address the goals of sentencing, considering the nature of the offense and the other relevant factors. I believe that this is adequate to protect the community and to fulfill the goals of deterrence, both specific and general, as well as punishment. I don't believe that

imprisonment is necessary to provide specific deterrence or respect for the law.

As I've mentioned, I'm not going to impose a community service condition, given Ms. Dillon's other family obligations, but I do expect her to seek and find employment, at least part-time employment.

I do expect her to participate in mental health treatment and undergo the mandatory drug tests. At this time I don't see the need for substance abuse treatment, but I will order, based on what's stated in the presentence report and Ms. Dillon's actions here, the mental health treatment.

So I'm now formally going to read the sentence. Is there any reason either side at this point has to object?

MR. ROMANO: No, Your Honor.

MR. ABBENANTE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Pursuant to the Sentencing
Reform Act of 1984 and in consideration of the provisions of
Title 18 United States Code Section 3553 as well, it is the
judgment of the Court that you, Brittiany Angelina Dillon, are
hereby sentenced to a term of three years' probation as to
Count 1. In addition, you are to serve two months, or 60 days,
of home detention. And I will go over the conditions of that in
a moment.

You are also ordered to pay a special assessment of \$10 in accordance with Title 18 United States Code Section 3013.

While on supervision, you shall abide by the following mandatory conditions, as well as the standard conditions of supervision, which are imposed to establish the basic expectations for your conduct while on supervision. The mandatory conditions include not committing another federal, state, or local crime, not unlawfully possessing a controlled substance, refraining from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, submitting to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervision, and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the Court.

You must make restitution in accordance with Title 18 United States Code Section 3663 and 3663(a).

And you shall comply with the following special conditions: That is, participating in a mental health treatment program and following the rules and regulations of that program. The probation officer, in consultation with the treatment provider, will supervise your participation in the program.

With respect to home detention, you will be monitored by the form of location monitoring technology for a period of 60 days, and you must follow the rules and regulations of the location monitoring program. The costs of the program will be waived. Location monitoring technology at the discretion of the probation officer, including SmartLINK or any other technology in the discretion of the probation officer. This form of technology will be used to monitor following restrictions on

your movement in the community. You're restricted to your residence at all times except for employment or seeking employment opportunities, education, religious services, medical or mental health treatment, attorney visits, court appearances, court-ordered obligations, community service activities, or any other activities as preapproved by the probation officer.

In addition, you must seek and maintain at least part-time employment. You will advise the probation officer of your employment and notify the probation officer of any changes to your employment status.

As I've said, I find you don't have the ability to pay a fine. Therefore, I waive imposition of a fine in this case. You are ordered to make restitution to the Architect of the Capitol in the amount of \$500. I've determined that you do not have the ability to pay interest and, therefore, waive any interest or penalties that may accrue on the balance. The restitution shall be made to the Clerk of Court for the U.S. District Court to the Architect of the Capitol, and you must pay the balance of any restitution owed at a rate of no less than \$50 each month. The financial obligations are immediately payable to the Clerk of Court. You shall notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address.

The Probation Office shall release the presentence investigation report to all appropriate agencies in order to execute the sentence of the Court.

All right. Ms. Dillon, you do have the right to appeal your conviction and sentence except to the extent you may have validly waived that right as a part of your plea agreement. If you do choose to appeal, your notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days after the Court enters judgment. If you're unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to file in forma pauperis, which simply means that the Court costs such as filing fees will be waived.

The same holds true for your right to challenge the conviction entered or the sentence imposed under 28 United States Code Section 2255 if new and currently unavailable information becomes available to you or on a claim that you received ineffective assistance of counsel in entering a plea of guilty to the offense of conviction or in connection with this sentencing.

All right. Are there any objections to the sentence?

MR. ROMANO: No, Your Honor.

MR. ABBENANTE: Your Honor, I don't have any objections, but I would ask Your Honor to include her ability to take her -- I know you mentioned medical appointments, but I think that that applied to only Ms. Dillon. I would ask that you allow her to transfer or transport her husband's grandfather and uncle to their medical appointments as she has been doing, as well as picking up and taking her nephew, who is autistic.

THE COURT: All right. I don't disagree with you,

Mr. Abbenante. I just think that these fall into the other activities preapproved by the probation officer, and I certainly think that medical appointments for herself or family members would be included in that.

MR. ABBENANTE: All right.

THE COURT: Are you concerned that the probation officer -- I can say medical appointments for Ms. Dillon or her family. Does that take care of your concern? I'm reluctant to, you know, delineate, because I'm sure there are many other things that would fall into this category, carpool and other things, and I just feel like probation should be able to work it out with Ms. Dillon. If they can't, I'm certainly here to hear any objections that you have.

MR. ABBENANTE: All right. That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Reichler, do you have any

concerns, corrections, additions to make to the sentence imposed?

PROBATION OFFICER: Not at this time, Your Honor. I just ask that Ms. Dillon hang on the line so that I can read her the probation conditions.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Romano, anything else?

MR. ROMANO: Nothing for me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ABBENANTE: Your Honor, I know that we filed a superseding information, but does that require the government to

```
move to dismiss the other charges, I believe?
 1
 2
                 MR. ROMANO: Yes, thank you. The government does at
 3
      this time move to dismiss the charges in the original
      information.
 4
 5
                 THE COURT: All right. The motion is granted.
 6
            Is there anything else?
 7
                 MR. ABBENANTE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 8
 9
           Ms. Dillon, I wish you the best.
10
                 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. Thank you so much.
11
                 THE COURT: Thank you all.
12
            (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER I, Sara A. Wick, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Please Note: This hearing occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic and is, therefore, subject to the technological limitations of court reporting remotely. /s/ Sara A. Wick November 10, 2021 SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE