1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
2	x
3	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Criminal Action No.
4	Plaintiff, 1:21-cr-00331-CKK-1 Friday, January 14, 2022
5	vs. 10:00 a.m.
6	KENNETH KELLY,
7	Defendant.
8	X
9	
10	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12	APPEARANCES:
13	
14	For the United States: HAVA ARIN LEVENSON MIRELL, ESQ. U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
15	312 N. Spring St., Suite 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012
16	(213) 894-0717 hava.mirell@usdoj.gov
17	nava.mrrerreadaej.gov
	For the Defendant: GEORGE TRAGOS, ESQ.
18	TRAGOS SARTES & TRAGOS, PLLC 2363 Gulf to Bay Boulevard
19	Suite 100 Clearwater, FL 33765
20	(727) 441-9030 george@greeklaw.com
21	
22	Court Reporter: Lisa A. Moreira, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter
23	U.S. Courthouse, Room 6718
24	333 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001
25	(202) 354-3187

1 PROCEEDINGS THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal Case 21-331, The 2 United States vs. Kenneth Kelly. 3 Counsel, would you please identify yourself for 4 5 the record starting with the government. 6 MS. MIRELL: Good morning, Your Honor; Hava Mirell 7 on behalf of the United States. 8 THE COURT: Good morning. 9 MR. TRAGOS: Good morning, Your Honor; George 10 Tragos on behalf of the defendant. 11 THE COURT: All right. And I see Dr. Kelly is here, and we have a probation officer, I assume. 12 13 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor; 14 Hana Field with U.S. Probation. 15 THE COURT: All right. Let me start. Dr. Kelly, 16 are you willing to proceed with this on Zoom video? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. So we're here for a 18 19 sentencing. The defendant pled quilty to Count 4, parading, 20 demonstrating or picketing in a Capitol Building. The 21 statutory penalty is the maximum, so six months of 22 incarceration, a maximum \$5,000 fine, five years maximum of 23 probation. He agreed to a \$500 restitution. At the end of 24 the sentencing the government will be dismissing Counts 1 25 through 3. He is in compliance with his Pretrial Services

1 report. 2 I have a presentence report dated November 23, 3 2021, the government's sentencing memorandum, the 4 defendant's sentencing memorandum, three character letters 5 in support of the defendant, and then a Dropbox with various 6 videos. I think that's all of the information that has been 7 provided to me for the sentencing. Am I correct? Is there anything else I've missed? 8 9 MR. TRAGOS: Your Honor, with regards to the 10 government -- the defendant's sentencing memorandum, there are three exhibits to that as well. 11 12 THE COURT: Yes, right. 13 MR. TRAGOS: Okay, because those are also 14 character letters, one of those exhibits, so I wanted to 15 make sure that it wasn't just three that the Court had. 16 THE COURT: So the character letters were from 17 Vincent, Mason, and Matsakis, and then there's a series 18 attached to it, a number of photographs and some additional 19 information. It's not clear to me -- I did look at the 20 attachments. Apart from the letters, I did look at the 21 attachments, which appear to be emails as far as I can tell. 22 MR. TRAGOS: A lot of them are in Exhibit C of the 23 memorandum.

THE COURT: Okay. And it's sort of To Whom It May Concern, but they're related to the sentencing; am I

24

25

correct?

MR. TRAGOS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

All right. In terms of objections to the presentence report, there was one which related to Paragraph 76, which as I -- it's the listing of three vehicles. There were quite a number of vehicles that were listed. They relate to vehicles basically registered in New Mexico 1987, 1995, and 2012. The probation officer relied on Accurint records so it's not clear to me -- it would appear that they show registration dates.

So he was living in New Mexico at various points.

I mean, did he drive vehicles during that time that may have been in his name but belonged to the hospital or something else? It's unusual to have -- you know, to have it such that they indicate that it's registered to him and then he's objecting to it.

MR. TRAGOS: Your Honor, he has no memory of a 2012 BMW. Again, I don't think it has any consequence to the sentencing, but it's just that he has no memory of ever owning a 2012 BMW or any BMW.

THE COURT: Okay. The fact that he doesn't have any memory is one thing. I mean, is he actually indicating that it's not correct? Did you look at what probation had in their report to support it?

```
1
                 I'm trying to figure out how you want it resolved
2
       is, I guess, my question. It doesn't make any -- obviously
 3
       you want a presentence report to be accurate. Does it make
 4
       any difference in sentencing? No. But I obviously would
 5
       like to have it accurate.
 6
                 So they relied on Accurint. He has no memory, but
 7
       is it likely to be wrong?
                 MR. TRAGOS: Your Honor, he just -- I mean, again,
 8
 9
      he doesn't own a BMW, and he's never owned a BMW.
10
                 THE COURT: So the 1987 and the 1995 he's not
11
       objecting to. It's only the 2012.
12
                 His objection related to the 1987 GMC pick-up,
13
       1995 utility vehicle, and then the BMW for 2012. So the '87
14
       and the 1995, is he objecting to that or not?
15
                 MR. TRAGOS: No, Your Honor.
16
                 THE COURT: Okay. So no objections to those.
                                                                So
17
       it's strictly the 2012.
18
                 And probation, you're relying on the Accurint; am
19
       I correct?
20
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor.
21
       relying on Accurint records for that. The vehicle was
22
      associated with him by name, date of birth, driver's
23
       license, and Social Security number.
24
                 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry?
25
                 MR. TRAGOS: Your Honor, there's another Ken Kelly
```

1 in that state who is related to the -- obviously not the 2 same date of birth, but the probation --3 THE COURT: Okay. So what is the date of birth? Do you have the Accurint report? Does it indicate what date 4 5 of birth they list? 6 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor, January 7 13, 1963, and it provides a driver's license number that was 8 also associated with Mr. Kelly, the K400-506-63-013-0. 9 THE COURT: Well, it's got the right birth date. 10 Let me put it this way, Mr. Tragos, how do you 11 want to resolve it? What are you asking for? 12 MR. TRAGOS: Your Honor, I think that the Court 13 can -- does the Court, I quess, have to resolve it because 14 it has --15 THE COURT: I do because I need to make factual 16 findings for it. I mean, we could put that you don't recall 17 the BMW as an extra sentence there or depending on, you 18 know -- I mean, if they have his birth date and it's an 19 accurate one, I would think that it would be associated. 20 Well, I would think from 2012 you'd remember if you had a 21 BMW. 22 Go ahead. We can't get a record if two people 23 talk at once, and I'll just tell you they'll only record 24 what the judge says so you're going to be missing out. So I 25 didn't hear what you said. If you could repeat, Dr. Kelly,

```
1
       what you said.
2
                 THE DEFENDANT: Oh, I've never owned a BMW.
 3
       did -- I would have liked to, but I never bought one so I've
 4
       never owned one.
 5
                 I leased a Jaguar. I thought that was what that
 6
       was about. That was a lease.
 7
                 THE COURT: So have you leased one? Would your
       wife have leased it?
 8
 9
                 THE DEFENDANT: I leased a Jaquar, but I never
10
       owned a BMW.
                 THE COURT: Okay. Would your wife have owned it
11
12
       and used your name?
13
                 THE DEFENDANT: We've always (inaudible) up until
14
       this process; so, no, I don't know how this -- I'm just
15
       afraid there are criminal charges for the BMW if I accept
16
       it, so I cannot -- it's nothing I've owned.
17
                 THE COURT: Probation, would you agree to just
18
       simply put that he only objects to the 2012 and just you put
19
       a sentence next to it?
20
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. We can
21
       revise the presentence report to note at the end of that
22
       paragraph that he has no memory or does not recall owning
23
       the 2012 BMW, if that would suffice with the Court?
24
                 THE COURT: Does that work, Mr. Tragos?
25
                 MR. TRAGOS: Yes, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we'll resolve it that way. As far as I know, there was nothing else.

Let me just indicate, in terms of sentencing, the advisory sentencing guidelines do not apply. There's no authority to impose supervised release, and as I've indicated, the maximum sentence is six months incarceration, maximum five years probation, the \$500 restitution, maximum fine is \$5,000, and there is a special assessment of \$10.

So for the undisputed parts of the presentence report, the findings of fact are under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32(i)(3)(A). For the one disputed paragraph, findings are pursuant to Rule of Criminal Procedure 32(i)(3)(B). I'll adopt the presentence report as written except. We'll do this additional statement relating to -- at the end of Paragraph 76 indicating that the defendant has no recollection of owning the 2012 BMW, and there's no other way really that I can see resolving it at this point.

All right.

And that will indicate that he's not objecting to the other two, but he is objecting to this one.

All right. And let me, at this point, hear from the government, then defense counsel, and then the defendant.

And defense counsel, if you could -- when you

speak, if you could move forward a little bit more to make sure. It's a little blurry in terms of hearing you, but let me hear from the government first.

MS. MIRELL: Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you.

Your Honor, the events of January 6, 2021, have left an indelible stain on the history and reputation of this nation. Each rioter, including Dr. Kelly, contributed to the global embarrassment that is the January 6th Capitol Riot. By now this Court is familiar with what occurred just steps away from its courthouse just a little over a year ago, so I will not belabor it.

The government's sentencing recommendation today in this case is based on Dr. Kelly's individual conduct.

Dr. Kelly drove alone from Florida up to Washington, D.C., to attend the Stop the Steal rally.

The morning of January 6th, Dr. Kelly met up with his good friend, Leonard Gruppo, and Leonard Gruppo's wife and walked to the Ellipse to hear President Trump's speech.

After President Trump had concluded delivering his remarks, Dr. Kelly, Mr. Gruppo, and Mr. Gruppo's wife walked from the Ellipse to the Capitol.

Upon entering the restricted grounds, Dr. Kelly could see bike racks strewn across the lawn. Dr. Kelly and Mr. Gruppo stood in the grassy area bordering the northern staircase on the west front of the building. There you

could see rioters scaling the retaining walls of the Capitol Building and climbing the white scaffolding that had been erected over part of the staircase for the inauguration.

Instead of departing after witnessing rioters engage in life-threatening behavior, Dr. Kelly instead decided to join the parade and to contribute to the crowd by hoisting himself onto the staircase ledge and by ascending a jam-packed staircase leading up to the Upper West Terrace.

There Dr. Kelly witnessed law enforcement violently clashing with rioters. Instead of departing at that point, Dr. Kelly instead chose to enter the U.S. Capitol Building by walking through an entryway littered with broken glass.

The Court has now had an opportunity to review the entirety of the surveillance footage of Mr. Kelly's pathway to the Capitol on January 6th. As the Court has by now seen, Dr. Kelly and Mr. Gruppo did appear to stop and ask a law enforcement officer near the Senate Wing door how to exit the building.

The government submits the law enforcement officer repeatedly pointed Dr. Kelly and Mr. Gruppo to the Senate Wing door, the door through which they had just entered. The government further submits that nothing prevented Dr. Kelly and Mr. Gruppo from exiting that door and leaving the Capitol Building at that moment. Nevertheless, the

government does not dispute that, after speaking with the law enforcement officer, the defendant and Gruppo and Gruppo's wife spent the next five minutes walking straight through the Capitol and did not further engage with any law enforcement officers until their exit.

It's clear from the defendant's sentencing memorandum that he now regrets and apologizes for his conduct in light of the professional and personal circumstances he has had to suffer, but in the hours immediately following this violent attack on democracy the defendant was not apologizing or expressing regret for his actions. Instead, he was boasting to family members about how he and other rioters had forced senators to hide underneath their desks and to go into recess. He considered his conduct patriotic, and he believed that when he and the others threatened the lives of members of Congress and halted the certification of the electoral vote that he had, quote, watered the tree of liberty.

Overall, the defendant's statements and conduct on January 6th establish the need for some type of restraint on Dr. Kelly's liberty to demonstrate the need for specific deterrence in this case. In sentencing Dr. Kelly, this Court must recognize the significance of the defendant's participation in a violent and destructive challenge to the peaceful transfer of power and really what that means for

our democracy.

To be clear, the government is not seeking the punishment of Dr. Kelly based on the actions of the worst actors that day, but by being present Dr. Kelly did help create the momentum for the violence that took place.

Whether or not he opened his mouth or engaged with any law enforcement officers, the defendant's mere presence validated and affirmed those around.

In terms of parity, the case most comparable to Dr. Kelly's is Mr. Gruppo's since the two spent the entire day together and engaged in nearly identical conduct.

Mr. Gruppo was sentenced by Chief Judge Howell in October 2021 to 90 days home detention as part of a 20-month probationary sentence. As discussed in the government's sentencing memorandum, there are some mitigating factors with respect to Mr. Kelly, which is why the government is recommending only 60 days home confinement as part of a 36-month probationary term.

First, the defendant has been cooperative with law enforcement, including by facilitating the self-surrender of one of his closest friends, Leonard Gruppo. The defendant has also provided passwords to his social media accounts and consents to search his phone. Finally, unlike Mr. Gruppo, the defendant did not swear oath to support and defend the Constitution. He therefore lacks the aggravating factors

1 that were facing Mr. Gruppo. 2 Balancing the factors set forth in Title 18 United 3 States Code Section 3553(a), the government respectfully 4 requests that this Court sentence Dr. Kenneth Kelly to a 5 two-month term of home detention as part of a 36-month term 6 of probation and 60 hours of community service. Thank you. 7 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Tragos. MR. TRAGOS: Your Honor, in one of the Court's 8 9 earlier colloquy of what the Court had reviewed, I think the 10 Court reviewed something it did not mention, and that was the four videos that were under seal. 11 THE COURT: No, I did. That's the -- I mean, 12 13 you've attached some things, and that's the Dropbox. 14 MR. TRAGOS: Okay. 15 THE COURT: The Dropbox is what I was -- I was 16 trying to describe because you've got photos of things. 17 videos themselves I watched through the Dropbox, so that's 18 what I was talking about. 19 MR. TRAGOS: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: I did see those. 21 MR. TRAGOS: Okay. 22 Your Honor, many years ago, in an earlier life, I 23 was chief of the criminal division for the United States 24 Attorney's Office in the Middle District of Florida, and as

such I had to establish policies to improve consistency.

25

And I understand the need for the government to have consistency, to avoid embarrassment, and to make sure that in a multidefendant-type case they have consistent policies, and they really don't look at the individuals as individuals.

And I admit 18 USC 3553 was not something I took into account in a lot of cases when a plea agreement was brought to me for approval, but just recently -- I don't know if the Court ever met Judge Hodges from the Middle District of Florida, but Judge Hodges passed away just a few days ago. He was chief judge when I was the chief of the criminal division, and we would meet regularly in his office in order to school me on various aspects of criminal procedure and criminal sentencing. And one of the things he schooled me on was when you sentence a large group -- and admittedly I've never had a group of 750 -- but when you have a large group, you have a group of people who at the top are the most culpable and at the bottom are the least culpable.

At the top you have the most culpable, who normally are people who give you a lot of cooperation because they know a lot of the criminal activities. At the bottom are the least culpable. They are sometimes because they don't know. But you can never sentence, he said, the most culpable to the less likely bottom of the triangle.

1 And then when you get to the bottom of the triangle, you 2 still have room if those people do cooperate --(Court reporter interrupts proceedings 3 due to difficulties hearing) 4 5 MR. TRAGOS: Was the Court able to hear? THE COURT: Go ahead. 6 7 MR. TRAGOS: Okay. 8 THE COURT: I would also ask that you not look 9 down because then it makes it harder for us to keep track. 10 MR. TRAGOS: Okay. So, Your Honor, just recently 11 we also heard a lot of speeches about what happened on 12 January 6th. They dealt with the violence, the destruction, 13 and the injury. And we've also seen a lot of video on 14 media, and there always are videos that are the worst of the 15 worst. 16 None of this was in the mind of Dr. Kelly when he 17 went through the Capitol, and I think when the Court takes a 18 look at the videos -- he wasn't armed. He didn't have 19 defensive gear. He didn't attack anyone. He didn't 20 confront anyone. He merely walked through the Capitol. 21 Yes, a violation of the laws. Yes, a violation of that 22 statute. But that's what he did. 23 And in that seven minutes -- we can take a look at 24 a five full minutes of the seven minutes that the government 25 has provided me and that I provided to the Court, and in

that five minutes we can see he was not with masses. He walked out that door. He did not attempt to enter the Senate Chamber or House Chamber. He did not look for the Senate Chamber or House Chamber. He didn't look for the Vice President. He didn't look for anybody. He just calmly walked through with the police officers. And when he was walking after his initial entry, he was just about by himself, with Mr. Gruppo and a couple of other people.

And his entering the Capitol, the pictures, as provided by the government that's in our sentencing memorandum, Your Honor, show us what the packed crowd was like outside that door. And it was chaos. Most everybody can admit to that. The safest place and the safest route was a criminal act, walking into the Capitol, which they did.

And when they walked in the Capitol, the video shows they started to go down a hallway. They didn't know where they were going. They came back after a police officer. He pointed out the door. Although we have a situation in a text message where he talks about the windows, he entered through the door, not through that window. And when he came back and the officer pointed out that door, the crowd — there was no safe way to go out that door. And the reason they came in was because they felt it was unsafe.

So they walked down the hallway, talked to two other officers, and finally one pointed down that other hallway where they could exit the Capitol Building.

In the complaint the government showed us --

In the complaint the government showed us -because they've gotten the data from his phone -- where he
was, and it was a straight line all the way across the
Capitol out that door. He didn't go anywhere else. He
didn't look for anything else. It was a straight line.

So there are 750 defendants. Somewhere along the line there has to be some people that are deserving of the privilege of probation. What does it take to deserve that privilege? I would submit to the Court that no one could do more than Dr. Kelly has done to deserve that privilege.

THE COURT: The government's not arguing for -- it's not indicating they're not recommending probation.

MR. TRAGOS: Well, they're recommending probation with house arrest.

THE COURT: Right, which is an ankle bracelet or something else, but it's still probation.

MR. TRAGOS: Right, but it is house arrest. And that house arrest -- and the reason that we attached those letters is to actually tell you the things other employers were telling us; that they're not going to hire Dr. Kelly because of this incident, and they specifically said that the ankle bracelet would be an issue.

And we attached one of those letters as Exhibit A,

I believe, to the memorandum in aid of sentencing. If he's

under house arrest, they're not going to hire him.

THE COURT: Well, house arrest -- I guess the question is whether they understand -- whether they think it's sitting at home. It's not.

Basically you're allowed to go to work. You're allowed to do all sorts of things, but the rest of the time, you know, you're expected to be at home or with an ankle bracelet they know where you are. I mean, as a practical matter it's not sitting at home.

I raise this because a lot of people don't know what house -- house arrest, everybody assumes, for those who are lay people, that you sit at home. That's obviously not what house arrest it, but go ahead.

MR. TRAGOS: But, Your Honor, I don't think that they thought that because they were willing to hire him, but the fact that he was under that sanction is what caused them the problem. Plus in the court records he's trying to do these home visits, this home care. He goes and visits people in their homes all the time. It just would be a very difficult thing for him to continue his practice of home visits with the ankle bracelet, plus, again, I think his employers would consider that just a killer as opposed to just straight probation.

And the government admits this defendant cooperated. He immediately contacted them through the lawyer saying that he wanted to plead guilty to it. He certainly has the remorse. He has certainly suffered. He is in a divorce because of it. He's lost his children. He can only visit them on holidays. He has lost -- he's living in an RV now. Even the probation office says that he can't afford to pay a fine. That's their recommendation.

So he has lost everything because of this, and he knows that he has lost everything, and he lost them because he made a decision which he wish he didn't make. He knows it was wrong. It was wrong then. He knows it's wrong now.

He has character letters that are attached to talk about his compassion, his ability to help people, the way he helps people, how he cares for those he helps, and it would be a shame to deprive the country of this support, especially doctors that have been in underserved areas, someone like Dr. Kelly.

And keep in mind that those character letters are about the humanitarian acts of what he does and how he tries to help people. He's been trying for years setting up the Mahala Project in South Africa as well as he helps (inaudible) \$920 a month so that they can have a doctor who can operate in one of the poorest areas of Mexico.

So, Your Honor, he has seen the repercussions of

his actions. He has learned from it, and looking at that video the Court knows nothing probably is a stronger bit of evidence in any trial than when the government puts on a video and the jury actually sees the crime as it's happening.

In this case the Court got to see the crime as it was happening, the crimes of the participation of Dr. Kelly.

I just don't see any of these defendants be of any lower level in the pyramid of sentencing than Dr. Kelly. So we ask the Court to please give him probation.

Dr. Kelly would also like to speak to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Dr. Kelly.

your Court a different man than I was on January the 6th. I admit that on that date on top of the stairs I panicked and didn't think rationally. Looking for the safest and fastest way to exit, I realized that the choice through the Capitol was the worst decision of my life. I never could have imagined what effect on my life those seven minutes cost me as I transited through the building.

I greatly regret my error in judgment, and I know it was wrong, and it always will be wrong. Congress, my country, and my loved ones deserve better from me. I realize that the country I love was built on the very laws that I breached. I add to this that I fully cooperated with

the government, which included convincing my best friend to surrender himself. I feel that up to this point I was a very loyal citizen to my country. I put a lot of energy into contributing to society.

I'm sorry for my bad decision that day, and I'm sorry for causing the Court to be faced with such a burden in deciding on how to appropriately discipline me. I know I leave you with a tough decision. I truly regret this.

Whatever the Court decides, it will actually only be a small part to what I've lost and the pain that I've experienced. When I say that I stand before you a different man than I was on January the 4th, I do not say -- I mean on the 6th, I do not say this with light consideration. I will repeat what one of my patients said to me. Sometimes we must be heated to the highest degree to be purified to do God's work. I know that committing a crime, pleading guilty, being sentenced, and being labeled a criminal forever along with the loss of my wife, custody of my children, and my finances, my profession, are certainly the firing furnace that purified me for the future.

I feel that the purpose of my life is clear thanks to the tribulations that I've created for myself. I want to love my country, to be a compassionate and caring physician, which has always been my life's purpose, and to honor our country and their laws. I'm an intelligent doctor who knows

the difference. I blame no one but myself for the decisions
I made that day, and I accept full responsibility. I humbly
respect your decision, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. In part of the information
that was indicated -- I realize that you're in a hiatus in

that was indicated -- I realize that you're in a hiatus in terms of your employment. Are you planning on trying to stay in Florida and, you know, go back to the hospital you were working for? Are you looking for something else? Do you have some idea of what your plans are?

THE DEFENDANT: I have attempted to get a job with 13 different emergency room groups, or about that. I've been blocked on all of those. The letter that we received said that under no condition would I be employable if I have an arrest. If probation, they'd allow me in the level that I've worked. I've worked as director for at least 15 years, and they mean I'm not employable as an ER doctor.

So if I have that -- if that's what is decided,
I'll probably try to do some sort of primary care but not as
an emergency room board-certified ER doctor because that
does not seem to be able. So it will depend on what you
say, ma'am.

MR. TRAGOS: Right now, Your Honor, he is practicing. He is doing some home visits in New Mexico.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. So are you in Florida? I'm

```
1
       also trying to figure that out. You're living in an RV.
                                                                 Is
2
       that in Florida or someplace else?
 3
                 THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am. I moved it -- I moved
       it to New Mexico where I was able to get malpractice
 4
 5
       insurance, but now --
 6
                 THE COURT: Okay.
 7
                 THE DEFENDANT: -- New Mexico is coming for my
       medical license for the insurrection.
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: Okay. The reason I ask is that I know
10
       probation generally wishes to have the supervision. They
11
       ask for jurisdiction. I don't transfer jurisdiction. But
12
       the supervision -- and at this point they're thinking it's
13
       Florida so obviously it's not.
14
                 MR. TRAGOS: It will probably -- depending on I
15
       guess the Court's sentence, his office is in -- still in
16
       Florida, but New Mexico is the only place he can practice.
17
       So he's been going back and forth with his RV.
18
                 Right now, Your Honor, frankly the RV broke down
19
       in -- where?
20
                 THE DEFENDANT: Nacogdoches.
21
                 MR. TRAGOS: Nacogdoches, Texas. It broke down on
22
       his way here, and it's being repaired in Nacogdoches, so the
23
       RV is actually in Texas right now. He has to go back, pick
24
       it up, and take it back.
25
                 THE COURT: All right. I think I would not put in
```

a specific supervision transfer to a particular place since we're not sure where he's going to wind up.

So I'm keeping jurisdiction, but I perhaps will plead it -- depending on where he winds up, as the best place to do this, any supervision of him. I'm going to plead that to a decision that probation makes once he's -- you know, once the sentence is done to figure out the best place to do the supervision, whether it's Florida or someplace else, rather than putting in Florida because it may be that that's not the best option.

All right. What I'm going to do is I'm going to take a short break at this point so I can go over what you've talked about and review things, and then I will come back. I have roughly -- I'll make it 20 to 11:00. At five to 11:00 I'll come back.

I would just stay on the screens. You can walk off, but don't get off the Zoom because we always have problems getting back on again. So if you -- you don't have to sit there, if you don't want to, but just leave it on, and I'll be back.

(Recess taken)

THE COURT: All right. I have to say I've been a judge for 37 years or a little over. Sentencings never get any easier, no matter how long you do them. So let me proceed.

The Court considers the presentence report, pleadings, argument, exhibits, and record in this case in addition to the following information in determining a fair, appropriate, and reasonable sentence in conformance with the factors set out in 18 USC 3553(a) except for (e).

The defendant is 59 years old. There is no criminal history. A summary of his background in terms of education: Bachelor of science in 1985 at the University of Central Arkansas; medical degree in '91, University of Arkansas College of Medicine; internships and residencies in internal medicine in Philadelphia at the Thomas Jefferson University Hospital in 1994. He was board-certified in emergency medicine in 2019. That will have to be renewed in 2023. He has active medical licenses in Florida, New Mexico, and Washington, the state of Washington.

Job history. This is going to be in summary form since he's been involved at various places, but at the time of his arrest he was employed at the Advent Hospital in Ocala, Florida, and Lake Wales as an emergency room doctor. And this would have been from 2019 to 2021. Since April 21st he's been the emergency room director at Mora County Emergency Medical Services. He's actually been the director since 2013 but evidently he's become more active this past year.

2016 to 2019, emergency room doctors at Plains

Regional Medical Center in Clovis, New Mexico. He was the area director.

2020 -- excuse me, 2012 to 2016, emergency room director at Alta Vista Hospital in Las Vegas, Nevada.

He self-reports 2011 to 2016 emergency room doctor at Gerald Champion Hospital in Alamagordo, New Mexico.

Unfortunately the hospital records don't seem to show the defendant has also been associated with the company Romaris, R-O-M-A-R-I-S, Incorporated. He's the director and treasurer. His wife is the president. It's active in both Florida and Nevada. I believe that he uses the company for contracts for his medical services so this would be the company for which he's an independent contractor.

In terms of nonprofits, he's done quite a bit of work. Dr. Kelly and his sister founded the Mahala Love Project, healthcare for students for one thing at an orphanage, many of whom have immune deficiency diseases. The other project is Doctor's House Call. The defendant's sister protocols for cloud-based healthcare systems for remote areas in the United States and elsewhere.

In terms of finances, present income is very limited. He does have assets that could be liquidated, but he's the sole financial provider for his spouse, who is an at-home mother, three children. He and his wife are in the process of a divorce. After reviewing his extensive

financial records at this point I'll find he has no financial ability to pay a fine.

There are no issues with mental health, substance abuse. He's not been drug-tested so he will -- I will be putting him on probation as one of the conditions. He will need to take the initial tests, which if they've come out as he's reported that will be the end of it, but we don't have any test results on the record at this point.

Physical condition. Not vaccinated, not tested, but he treated himself for what could be, in his view, symptoms for COVID, and he has described himself as an expert on COVID. But there's no particular issues that need to be addressed.

On a personal basis, he was born into an intact union. His father's deceased. His parents divorced when he was 15. Mother now lives in South Carolina. He has one sister. His mother has remarried two times. The first was to someone who is now deceased. Her present husband — the last marriage, the present husband, is still alive. After his parents divorced, he shared time between his parents in terms of custody.

The defendant got married in 2004, separated in September of 2021. They're in the process of getting divorced. There are three children ages 13, 11, and 7. The children and wife are now living in Hawaii. As I understand

it, the wife will have primary physical custody. Defendant will have supportive custody. As of yet there is no court order of child support payments. The children are in school, healthy. There are no issues. And I have authorized his traveling to Hawaii in order to be able to see his children.

He's resided as an adult in the state of Florida,

New Mexico, South Carolina, the state of Washington and

Arkansas. Numerous residents in various states. I won't go

through all of them. And the last home that he resided in

has now been sold. He owns a recreational vehicle, and

evidently that is where he has been living, on campgrounds

in Florida.

In terms of letters of support, there was, I guess, a number of sets of them. There were some that were separate and some attached to the memorandum in aid of sentencing. I'll start with the ones that were separate.

A letter from a fellow physician praising his medical skills and concern for family noted that the defendant made house calls, which is a rarity in these days.

A letter from his aunt that he was very helpful in providing medical advice for the family and for his grandmother, which would have been the aunt's mother; asked for leniency.

One of the defendant's attorneys that has known

the defendant in various capacities has described him as a dedicated physician caring for patients during COVID in emergency rooms, made state-of-the-art telemedicine available to remote areas, went out into the community to provide care. His nonprofit work in South Africa with the orphanage and the immune deficiency children is also the telemedicine to provide access to care to remote areas or where medical care is not accessible. The defendant's approach is described as, quote, to do the right thing, unquote, and the request is that he not be sentenced such that it will affect his continuing to be able to practice medicine.

I must say that in this case he forgot to do the right thing.

But in terms of what's attached, there was

Exhibit A, which is, as you've indicated, an employer of a

potential -- a potential employer, not the one he had been

with, which indicates that house arrest would negatively

affect his being hired.

Exhibit C is nine letters of support. All attest to the high quality of his medical services, his community outreach and service, and his care for his family. The letters are from his stepfather, three colleagues, his sister, who talks about the Mahala Love Project, among other things, a patient who has praised the excellent care he

received from Dr. Kelly, a letter from his former brother-in-law, from a nurse, and from an insurance company regarding malpractice insurance in New Mexico.

In terms of the statement of offense, I have found that instead of trying to summarize it, it works better to frankly just read what he actually agreed to. So I am going to put this in context so that some of the remarks that I make later make sense.

So we're talking about the Capitol located in D.C., which is secured 24 hours a day by the Capitol Police. Their restrictions generally include permanent and temporary security barriers and posts manned by the Capitol Police. Only authorized people with appropriate identification are actually allowed in the Capitol.

So this is generally what has been put in place for quite some time.

On January 6th, in addition, the exterior plaza of the U.S. Capitol was closed to members of the public, and on that date a joint session of the United States Congress convened at the U.S. Capitol, which is located on First Street in D.C. During this joint session, elected members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate were meeting in separate chambers of the U.S. Capitol to certify the vote count of the Electoral College of the 2020 Presidential Election which had taken place on November 3,

2020. The joint session began at approximately 1:00 p.m. At around 1:30 the House and Senate adjourned to separate chambers to resolve particular objections. Vice President Mike Pence was present presiding first in the joint session and then in the Senate Chamber.

As the proceedings continued in both the House and Senate, and with Vice President Pence present and presiding over the Senate, a large crowd gathered outside the U.S. Capitol. As noted, temporary and permanent barricades were in place around the exterior. Capitol Police were present and attempting to keep the crowd away from the Capitol Building and the proceedings that were underway inside.

At approximately 2:00 p.m., certain individuals in the crowd forced their way through, up, and over the barricades and officers of the U.S. Capitol Police, and the crowd advanced to the exterior facade of the building. The crowd was not lawfully authorized to enter or remain in the building, and prior to entering the building no members of the crowd submitted to security screenings or weapons checks by the Capitol Police or other authorized security officials.

The certification proceedings at that point were still underway and the exterior doors and windows of the U.S. Capitol were locked or otherwise secured. Capitol Police attempted to maintain order and keep the crowd from

entering the Capitol.

Shortly after 2:00 p.m. individuals in the crowd forced entry into the Capitol, including breaking windows, assaulting members of law enforcement, as others in the crowd encouraged and assisted those acts. The riot resulted in substantial damage to the U.S. Capitol requiring the expenditure of more than \$1.4 million for repairs.

At approximately 2:20 members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate, including the president of the Senate, which was Vice President Pence, were instructed to and did evacuate the chambers. Before that, they had been staying and hiding under desks. All proceedings of the U.S. Congress, including the joint session, were effectively suspended until shortly after 8:00 p.m. the same day in light of the dangerous circumstances caused by the unlawful entry to the Capitol, including the danger posed by individuals who had entered the Capitol without security screenings or weapons checks.

Congressional proceedings could not resume until after every unauthorized occupant had left the Capitol and the building had been confirmed secured. That didn't occur until 8:00 p.m. when the proceedings resumed. Vice President Pence remained in the Capitol from the time he was evacuated from the Senate Chamber until the session resumed.

Now as to Dr. Kelly. At approximately 3:00 -- so

I've given the other times, so this is after there has been the breach into the Capitol -- the defendant entered the Senate Wing door on the northwest side of the Capitol. He then walked through the Crypt and eventually exited through the Hall of Columns on the south side of the U.S. Capitol at approximately 3:07. So it's seven minutes.

The defendant texted a family member a photograph from inside the U.S. Capitol with the caption, "Inside White house" -- obviously it was not the White House, but the Capitol -- "via breaking in windows. Tree of liberty was watered today!"

The same day defendant also texted a family member a photograph showing several individuals climbing a retaining wall of the U.S. Capitol with the caption "Patriots storm the White house" -- again, it was the Capitol -- "Broke in while Senate was in session debating Arizona. They were hiding under their desks, forced into recess. Patriots took back our Capitol today."

Defendant knew at the time he entered the U.S.

Capitol Building he didn't have permission to enter the building and, as he's indicated, he paraded, demonstrated, and picketed.

So the defendant pled guilty. He indicated his interest at an early stage and so promptly resolved the case. He identified the second person who was with him,

assisting law enforcement and facilitating the selfsurrender of the other individual, his friend, quote, fellow rioter who accompanied him into the Capitol.

On arrest, Dr. Kelly was immediately cooperative with law enforcement regarding his social media accounts and cell phone. During his interview with law enforcement he didn't lie. He accepted responsibilities for his action in entering the Capitol with the rest of the mob. He was only in the Capitol for approximately seven minutes. He entered later in time to the first breach of the Capitol. He has no criminal history. He's a respected emergency room doctor and physician in general. He's been involved for some time in two projects to provide state-of-the-art medical services in South Africa, the Mahala Love Project, and the Doctor's House Call, which provides it to remote areas and to those who are underserved.

So I certainly view that as community service, and that appears to be what he's doing now, has done in the past, and presumably will continue to do that.

The defendant drove from Florida to D.C. to attend the rally of Former President Trump on January 6, 2021. He met a former colleague and friend and friend's wife. He spent some time on the Mall after the speech and then walked to the Capitol. So he was some time on the Capitol grounds before entering the Capitol.

The Capitol grounds were clearly packed with people. You can see it in all of the things. So frankly it makes no sense to me that you would go into the Capitol to be safer than staying on the grounds. Walking up to the Capitol you had to have seen all of these people and how packed they were and, frankly, could have walked away and never got on the grounds and just left.

He self-reports that in entering that he had to be pulled up onto the staircase by the rioters because the ledge was too high to climb over to get on the staircase to get into the Capitol, and there were too many people already on the staircase.

I must say these do dry out your throat.

He agreed he saw bike racks strewn over the grounds, rioters scaling the outside of the Capitol, and he agreed he saw broken windows next to the door that he entered and that the goal of this insurrection was to stop the certification of the Presidential Election and importantly the peaceful transfer of power as guaranteed in the Constitution, which is the bedrock of our democracy. He was — he admitted he was unauthorized to enter the Capitol and was clearly aware from his texts what was going on at the Capitol and his interest in interrupting it.

As I said, after the attack on the Capitol he sent these texts to his family expressing pride in his role as

part of the riot insurrection. He boasted that he and others entered the building -- although he called it the White House -- via breaking windows while the Senate was debating Arizona's electoral vote count. He lauded the fact that he was part of the insurrection that caused senators to, quote, hide under the desks and forced Congress into recess so that they were not able to proceed with the electoral process. He described and celebrated the obvious destruction and violent acts of his fellow insurrectionists texting inside via breaking windows. And you can see he -- there certainly have been enough videos that indicate the breaking windows, how it was done, glass all over the place. "Inside via breaking windows. Tree of liberty was watered today!" He described his actions as, quote, patriotic, unquote.

He gets credit for pleading guilty and acknowledging that he was unauthorized to be in the Capitol while the certification of electoral votes were counted. His commentary, however, gives me pause. His texts reflect his mindset and intent on that day.

Has Dr. Kelly learned his lesson for the future?

Does he fully appreciate the significance of having

participated in an insurrection, albeit for only seven

minutes, but clearly to disrupt the peaceful transfer of

power by stopping the certification of the Presidential

Election, which he clearly knew he was doing?

His regret now of having been involved in light of the consequences to him -- which are severe, there's no question of that. He's lost his job. His medical licenses are in jeopardy as well as his malpractice insurance. It's resulted in the dissolution of his marriage. He's now living in an RV. He's separated from his children. He's not in the same position he was. And so the question is, you know, the negative effects and consequences is not the same as appreciating the significance of what he participated in.

If you engage in criminal conduct, there are always consequences, and here -- his have certainly been negative and very personal to him in terms of himself, his family, and his profession, but I guess -- you know, I don't see them as the same thing as appreciating the significance of what he did.

And also, has he considered the consequences to himself, but to the hundred -- approximately 140 law enforcement officers that were injured, some very seriously? And I would say he didn't involve himself in any of that, but this is sort of like the getaway driver of a bank robbery. He's sitting outside. His compatriots go in. They have a gun in order to get the money, and somebody shoots him, and the getaway driver is going to have some

responsibility for the others' actions.

So I can't totally separate it. I certainly give him credit that he didn't damage or engage in any violence.

Now, I would point out that the only other time the Capitol's been invaded was when the British, in 1814, invaded it. Besides the Civil War, which is certainly not a small matter, there have been difficult times and divisions in our country based on political divisions, racial violence, presidential assassinations, unpopular wars and economic woes. In spite of those difficult times, there have been peaceful transfers of power during that period of time.

His explanation that he wasn't stopped, didn't damage anything, and did not engage in fighting law enforcement, I certainly give him credit, but it doesn't, in my view, lesson his guilt. It just appears to support a lack of acceptance of the import of his actions on that day. But he does get credit for not damaging property, not being violent, because he didn't engage in any of that, but his presence did help sustain the momentum of the other insurrectionists who engaged in violence.

The videos that were provided shows a lot of people milling around, but the point of it is that by participating he encouraged the others. Having a large number of people, which he could certainly see from outside

and while he was trying to get in, including the defendant, participating in this insurrection provided safety for those that engaged in the violent actions of others. So it provided safety. He didn't need to do it, but he's there, and his presence does help.

The violence of January 6th is an unacceptable way to resolve political differences. There are lawful means available in the democracy to change or challenge actions you disagree with which don't include violent insurrection. Your presence and actions by joining other insurrectionists was an inexcusable attack on our democracy and the peaceful transfer of power according to the Constitution and a disrespect for the rule of law which governs civilized societies. As an educated man, you should have appreciated that.

You should also appreciate what an extraordinary country you live in with a vibrant democracy. And I hope you teach your children how lucky they are to live in this democracy as opposed to some other country ruled by an authoritarian. It's my hope that my sentence sends a message to you, to deter you into considering going forward and others -- and that's important -- from ever engaging in this type of disruptive behavior in the future recognizing you live in a country with incomparable freedoms which are protected by the rule of law. Eliminate the rule of law,

and you jeopardize those freedoms.

Now, I do want to go back and talk a little bit about parity, which are in another part of my notes, if I can get them back here. I want to talk also about the videos briefly.

The videos that have been provided do show the insurrectionists milling around. Law enforcement's present. There's no fighting. There's no violence. There's no damage being done certainly during the period that evidently or at least what's captured when Dr. Kelly was there. Most of it would have been done presumably at an earlier point. But certainly in coming -- walking down from the Mall and the speech, you could not have missed the crowd of people and what they were doing even though it was later. You can see from the photo, in terms of the people getting up outside on the scaffolding, some, you know, engagement between law enforcement. Although he wasn't doing it, and it wasn't in the Capitol, he certainly was involved.

In terms of parity, parity in these cases, which is what I'm looking at in terms of the January 6th defendants -- ordinarily we would look at parity across criminal sentences, but I don't think that works for these January 6th cases. I think misdemeanants involved in other crimes probably wouldn't get these sentences. These sentences are more lenient, to be frank, than in many -- not

all, but in many instances, if you looked at misdemeanants across the board.

So I'm not looking at it that way. I don't think that's a good way to do it. I don't think it's fair to the January 6th group of defendants to compare them to other misdemeanants.

So I'm doing what I think all other judges are, which is we all have -- the government has put together a list of defendants, the charges in terms of the statutes, what the government has recommended, and what the Court has done. The Court itself has also done one that sets out and has a little more detail in which we have shared with all of us -- and each of us individually have cases and we have also -- I've done my own, and I've also indicated trying to make distinctions in terms of what people have done and why so that I'm fair to the group of people that come here.

I don't want to be an outlier at one end or the other. I want to have parity and be fair to those that were involved in these January 6th cases.

So I've done my own sort of view of the continuum in terms of what's involved in providing -- in sentencing particular defendants. So I've done individual sentences taking a look at specific things to make sure that I'm fair to the individuals, but also doing it in context of the broader group of defendants that have been sentenced as well

as my own sentences.

So in terms of what the government -- I'll deal with what the government starts with.

I think I will not do community service. I frankly think he's already doing it, and I think he'll continue to do it. I see no reason to require some additional time. He's obviously going to have to spend some time and some focus on getting himself employed so he can support himself, but probably more importantly his children and his wife. But most specifically his children.

I will put him on probation. I will not do -
I've debated back and forth about the length of the

probation. I think based on what I see as remorse -- I'm

still a little concerned about his -- based on his texts as

to what his understanding of the seriousness of his

participation was as opposed to just that it's had dire

consequences for him, which I can understand, and that may

be enough. It may certainly serve as a deterrence, but I'd

also like to feel more comfort in feeling that he really

understands this was not the way to challenge an election.

You don't do it this way. You don't try and overturn the

government.

So his comments are what have given me -particularly since some of them were after the fact so it
would have been -- I would have hoped he'd have given some

thought at that point to what he had actually been engaged in and what the effect had been. I think he clearly was happy that the process was stopped, that the -- their insurrection cowed senators who were hiding under desks. Those comments give me great pause, and so I will do -- understanding this may create problems for his employment, at least for an initial period, but I think those comments merit some home detention.

So in terms of the sentence, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and in consideration of the provisions of 18 USC 3553 it's the judgment of the Court that you, Kenneth Kelly, are hereby sentenced to a term of 12 months -- one year -- of probation on Count 4 and to serve 60 days of home detention while on probation. The location monitoring -- you'll be monitored in the form of location monitoring technology for a period of 60 days. You must follow the rules and regulations of the location monitoring program. The cost of the program is waived.

Location monitoring technology will be at the discretion of the probation office. It can include radiofrequency monitoring, GPS monitoring, SmartLink or voice recognition. This form of location monitoring technology will be used to monitor the following restrictions on your movement in the community.

You're restricted to your residence, wherever that

is, at all times except for employment, education, religious services, medical -- should there be need for substance abuse; unlikely, but we'll see the drug test -- any mental health treatment -- although I don't think that's probably necessary -- attorney visits, court appearances, and court-ordered obligations. And the probation office can preapprove other activities that are appropriate in terms of your going about your life and your employment.

The Court authorizes supervision of this case to be transferred to the district where they will be supervising him. I will not put something in there at this point, since it's unclear to me, and what you need to do is to talk to our probation here to work out where is the best place to be supervised.

I am not shifting jurisdiction. Jurisdiction will remain in this court.

The Court finds you don't have the ability to pay a fine and, therefore, waives imposition of a fine in this case. You do have to pay a special assessment of \$10, which I can't waive. It's required by the statute.

The financial obligations are immediately payable to the -- let me see -- payable to the Clerk of the Court for the District of Columbia, and you will be paying restitution in the amount of \$500. That can be paid -- do you plan on paying all together, or are you asking for

something that is done over time?

MS. MIRELL: Your Honor, I believe restitution has already been paid in this case.

THE COURT: Have you paid it? Okay. Let me indicate, then, that restitution has been paid. I will —it should be listed as there was restitution that was required and that he's paid it so it's clear that the condition that he agreed to in the plea agreement has been satisfied and that it actually was considered.

Probation will release the presentence investigation report to all appropriate agencies -- which is the U.S. Probation Office -- in whatever the approved supervision in order to execute the sentence, and the treatment agencies will return the presentence report to the probation office upon completion or termination from treatment.

USC 3742, you have a right to appeal the sentence imposed by the Court. The only condition that is left is if imprisonment is longer than the statutory maximum, which it's not. There is also one other exclusion, but that would be relating to ineffective assistance of counsel. Your notice of appeal is pretty narrow, but you should talk to counsel, if you wish to appeal; and if you choose to do so, you have to file it within 14 days of the Court entering

judgment. If you can't afford to file it, the Court can grant you leave to file without your having to pay the costs, and you also can ask for appointed counsel should you need appointed counsel and not be able to afford it.

As defined in 28 USC 2255, you also have the right to challenge the conviction entered or sentence imposed if new and currently unavailable information becomes available or on a claim that you received ineffective assistance of counsel. Again, if you cannot afford it or you need counsel appointed, you can do so with a request to the Court.

In terms of -- I would have you talk to probation. They're on -- you can either talk now or later as to how you want to go about this in terms of making some decisions.

I'll give you a period of time in terms of -- that the probation supervision does not have to begin until February 4th; so that gives you enough time to figure out where you want to live. They can work with you about where you're going to be supervised. So the probation and the home detention would start at that point, which would give you a couple of weeks to figure out where you're going to be and work with probation about where you're going to be supervised since it doesn't -- it's not clear it's going to be, you know, Florida.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit opinion, which is the *Hunter* opinion decided back in 2016, are there any other

1 objections to the sentence that we haven't already 2 discussed? If there's something else, this is the time to 3 bring it up. 4 So let me ask probation first. Is there anything 5 that -- in terms of the sentencing form or anything else 6 that I need to bring up? It's a year probation with the 60 7 days of home detention, and he's already paid the 8 restitution so he basically has the \$10 to pay. Anything 9 else that I need to address? 10 THE PROBATION OFFICER: I just want to clarify. 11 Probation doesn't start until February 4, 2022; is that 12 correct? 13 THE COURT: Yes, I'm sorry, I should have put the 14 year in. Yes, 2022. 15 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Okay. Thank you, Your 16 The only other thing I would ask is that the Court 17 ask Dr. Kelly to make himself available by telephone so that 18 I can go over the conditions of probation and get some more 19 information about where he's living so that I can -- we can 20 figure out where he can be supervised. 21 THE COURT: Okay. And I would add -- I will put 22 in as part of the sentencing format the mandatory conditions 23 as well as the standard conditions will be -- there are 24 basic expectations, and you should just be aware that the

mandatory conditions include not committing another federal,

25

state, or local crime; not unlawfully possessing a controlled substance. You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. You must submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervision and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter.

I will leave that to the probation office. They have a protocol as to, depending on if your tests come back negative, how often or lack thereof you need to do drug tests. I'm not exempting him from -- because frankly we don't have any drug tests so it's only self-reporting that there isn't any problem. But if they come back negative, then this will not be a continued condition.

So anything else?

But I would -- Dr. Kelly, you should call her to talk over the supervision. I've gone over the mandatory, but there may be other things; and also to discuss with her -- which may be an ongoing discussion -- about where you're going to be, where they're going to supervise you, which also relates to the kind of location monitoring they do. So different places have different ways of doing it so you may wish to engage in a discussion with them relating to that, but I'll give you the time until February 4th of this year to work all of that out.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Government, anything from you?

```
1
                 MS. MIRELL: No, Your Honor.
2
                 THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Tragos, anything from
 3
       you?
 4
                 MR. TRAGOS: Yes, Your Honor, I just want to clear
 5
       something up with the drug testing. He's going to do an
 6
       initial drug test. If that initial drug test is negative, I
 7
       thought the Court indicated that there wouldn't be a need
       for --
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: They do it within 15 days of placement
10
       on supervision, is the usual. At least that's my
11
       understanding, and the probation officer can correct me.
12
       Generally they do one 15 days on supervision, and then there
13
       may be periodic drug tests, two periodic afterwards.
14
                 Probation has their own protocol so instead of my
15
       deciding it, they have a protocol, which I would adopt,
16
       which indicates if the test comes back negative how many
17
       times you need to test or don't need to test. If it comes
18
       positive, then they have another protocol.
19
                 I'm correct, Probation Officer; am I?
20
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: That's correct, Your
21
       Honor.
22
                 THE COURT: Okay. So there will be a first one,
23
       and then depending on what comes back it will -- the
24
       protocol will kick in.
25
                 MR. TRAGOS: I'm just going -- because he has a
```

DEA license and therefore -- he has a DEA license so therefore it has to come back negative. That's why I was saying I don't know why they want the initial one, but I understand the Court is letting them do their protocol.

anything on our records about his tests, it's appropriate to be -- as a standard condition to have the test, and then, you know, if it comes back negative, and if there's other ways that are being tested there's no reason to duplicate -- a duplication. So if he's doing it as part of his medical license or some other way of doing it, probation may very well feel that that's enough. We'll leave it to them.

Usually you don't -- there's no need to duplicate, you know, testing. But I -- that's something that they're going to have to work out.

Usually they have language about -- determined by the Court. I don't think -- my point is he doesn't have to come back to me or probation to me. I want them to use their own protocol after the first test, okay? So I'm giving them discretion to use their protocol.

MR. TRAGOS: All right. Your Honor, the other is house calls, as we've mentioned during the course of this sentencing, is a situation where he actually goes to the home and treats patients. It has been, at least in some jurisdictions, when someone's put on probation or house

arrest, particularly the initial probation, they normally are strict about that. So we would ask that if the Court would tell them that he can continue to do house calls during probation and during house arrest.

THE COURT: Okay. Generally -- I'll hear from probation about this. Generally, for additional things besides what I've already put in, which is part of the judgment, we leave it to probation because they will check as to what house calls you're making and if they decide that you're going to be doing it. In other words, I'm not going to approve it without knowing he's going to do them and what's involved with it.

Probation will talk to him about his house calls; and if they're doing it, they may very well go ahead and approve it.

MR. TRAGOS: I just -- I guess I can inquire of probation if they have a situation where they do have a 60-day restriction or can they start this right away? Or do we need a court order, I guess is what I'm asking?

THE COURT: I guess, Ms. Field, I don't know whether it's done by different probation officers or there's a uniform one across the board. Do you want to address the issue of house calls?

My assumption is the house calls -- that they would want to check that there actually are house calls in

terms of your going. They're not going to, you know -- in terms of being able to do it, I don't know whether they'd approve it or not.

Ms. Field, do you want to address it?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: It sounds to me, Your Honor, that house calls are part of his employment, if I'm correct. So in that case he would submit a schedule -- traditionally in D.C. he would submit the schedule a week prior to whatever employment obligations, but where and when he would need to be, and those are approved by the probation officer. So it sounds like these house calls are a part of his employment that are permitted. Probation will go over the employment obligations by his supervising officer.

MR. TRAGOS: Your Honor, the house calls situation is where he can get called and have to leave immediately.

THE COURT: Well, he may need to call and let them know that that's what he's doing. I mean, I have to say to you home detention/location monitoring has restrictions. That's what it is. So they will make an effort, if it's part of his employment, to do it, and they may have procedures for -- he's, I'm sure, not the first doctor that's under home detention. They will have procedures for if an emergency arises, which can be true of other professions as well.

But I'm not going to get into the fine details

because frankly it needs to be done by the office who is actually going to supervise him as to -- and where he is as to doing it. If he's got a regular schedule of things, then provide it. They'll approve it, and he goes, and he doesn't need to do any other additional ones. If an emergency comes up, he'll have to talk to them about what their procedures are if you get an emergency call that you view as an emergency in terms of going there.

MR. TRAGOS: I think the Court did say travel to Hawaii. The Court's approving Hawaii travel to see his family.

THE COURT: In terms of travel, my recollection in probation is -- and Ms. Field can change this -- that generally speaking they have some limitations to start with, but I do believe that with visits to family -- but I will defer to her as to whether it's -- the procedure, the general procedure in probation and home detention. If you're doing it during home detention, you're going to have to get approval from the probation office in terms of supervising you as to whether they'll let you do that.

But in terms of the probationary term itself, the year, what is -- what do they usually do if it's going to be outside of the area where he's supervised, Ms. Field?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, he's permitted to travel to Hawaii. Requests will need to be submitted

prior to his intent-to-travel date.

These are all things I can go over with defense counsel once we go over the conditions after the sentencing hearing. Travel to Hawaii is permitted, but requests need to be provided to the probation prior though.

THE COURT: Okay. So generally what it is is that you set out whatever your travel is, and they -- you let them know. They approve it. They know they're going to be, you know -- going to be out of wherever it is that you're living, and they approve it unless there's some issue.

If you're in compliance, there's not going to be a problem. If you're not in compliance with your conditions, then they're not going to let you travel, to be frank, but what you do is you work it out with probation in terms of their letting you.

Generally speaking, if you're in compliance, there shouldn't be a problem of your being able to -- you're still within what's considered the United States. You're not traveling internationally. So it should be something that is worked out, but that's something you need to talk to them about.

MR. TRAGOS: And for the phone call, can we do this initial conversation right after the sentencing?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, my request is to do it right after the sentencing hearing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. What I can do -- let me finish things, and what I can do is leave you on Zoom. You know, our deputy courtroom clerk needs to be the host and around, but she's not going to be paying any attention to this. We'll get off and you and probation, while the three of you are there, can have a discussion. Ms. Field, are you prepared, or do you need other material to have a discussion with him? THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, I'm prepared to have a discussion. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. So once we're done, I'll get off, the government will leave, and you can talk so that you -- instead of doing a phone call, you'll actually be able to eyeball each other. So let me make sure that I've done what I need to do in terms of the sentencing. And let me just say if there's some additional issues once they have spoken, you can come back -- I'm keeping jurisdiction so you can come back to me to ask, if things are not worked out with probation or there's some question. But you're getting into the minutiae, and that really is something that probation -- they have regular procedures uniformly that they do across the board.

Obviously home detention is going to have some more

limitations than just the rest of the period of time on

probation.

So let me just look through and make sure I've covered everything.

All right. I think I have. I don't think there's anything else, Ms. Field, that I need to cover for the sentencing; am I correct?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: That's correct, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Dr. Kelly, I certainly don't expect to see you back here. I'm not switching jurisdiction; so if something comes up and you violate it, you'll be back in front of me. You're going to disappoint me to no end. I've given you, you know, a shorter period of probation.

Hopefully you will be able to get your employment, since you need to support your family, but I also want you to give very careful thought about what I said to you about the significance of what you got involved in and how, you know, the attack on the democracy is not something to be lightly taken, and I would hope that you would not participate in the future in. I still have some pause, which is why you're on home detention. If I didn't have a pause, I wouldn't have done that, but I think your texts give me some pause.

And I hope that is you -- if you talk to your

```
1
       children, at least the two older ones, that you -- if you're
2
       going to explain what you did, that you explain that this is
 3
       not the way to deal with a democracy in terms of overturning
 4
       it. But also, you should explain that when people make
 5
       mistakes, they own up to it, they get the consequences, they
 6
       get their punishment, and then they move on with their life,
7
       which is what I would expect you to do.
                 THE DEFENDANT: I have done that, Your Honor.
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: All right. The parties are
10
       excused other than we'll leave Ms. Field and Mr. Tragos and
11
       Dr. Kelly, and take care. Be safe.
12
                 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
13
                 THE COURT: Do you have some sense of how long
14
       this is going to be because Dorothy needs to head out as the
15
       host?
16
                 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Ten minutes at the most,
17
       if that's okay.
18
                 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. She can do other
19
       work at the desk.
20
                     (Whereupon the hearing was
21
                      concluded at 11:47 a.m.)
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
2	
3	I, LISA A. MOREIRA, RDR, CRR, do hereby
4	certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and
5	accurate transcript of my stenographic notes and is a full,
6	true and complete transcript of the proceedings to the best
7	of my ability.
8	NOTE: This hearing was held remotely by Zoom or some
9	other virtual platform and is subject to the technological
10	limitations of court reporting remotely.
11	Dated this 8th day of February, 2022.
12	
13	/s/Lisa A. Moreira, RDR, CRR
14	Official Court Reporter United States Courthouse
15	Room 6718 333 Constitution Avenue, NW
16	Washington, DC 20001
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	