| _ | | _ | |
|----|---|---|--|
| | | | |
| 1 | BEFORE THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 2 | FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | | |
| 3 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, | | |
| 4 | Plaintiff, | . Case Number 21-238 | |
| 5 | vs. | • | |
| 6 | JOSHUA BUSTLE and JESSICA BUSTLE, | . August 4, 2021 | |
| 7 | | . 12:05 p.m. | |
| 8 | | • | |
| 9 | TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS F. HOGAN | | |
| 10 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | | |
| 11 | APPEARANCES: | | |
| 12 | | HAEL ROMANO, AUSA ted States Attorney's Office | |
| 13 | 555 | Fourth Street Northwest hington, D.C. 20530 | |
| 14 | | 11111g con, D.C. 20330 | |
| 15 | | TIMOTHY ANDERSON, ESQ. | |
| 16 | Sui | 2 North Landing Road te 104 | |
| 17 | | ginia Beach, Virginia 23456 | |
| 18 | | EEL KIBRIA, ESQ. | |
| 19 | 162 | in Kibria PLLC 7 I Street Northwest | |
| 20 | II. | te 600 hington, D.C. 2000 | |
| 21 | II ± | A A. WICK, RPR, CRR | |
| 22 | U.S | Constitution Avenue Northwest . Courthouse, Room 4704-B | |
| 23 | | hington, D.C. 20001 -354-3284 | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | Proceedings recorded by stenotype shorthand. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. | | |
| | | | |

PROCEEDINGS

(All participants present via video conference.)

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, this afternoon is the matter of United States versus Joshua and Jessica Bustle, Criminal Record 21-238.

I ask the parties to identify yourselves for the record, please.

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

MR. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Tim Anderson for Joshua Bustle.

MR. KIBRIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Nabeel Kibria on behalf of Jessica Bustle.

THE COURT: Both Mrs. Bustle and Mr. Bustle, you can hear us all right?

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: Yes, Your Honor. Good afternoon.

DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Bustle, your lighting is such, you show as a silhouette. I cannot see you too well, but I assume that is you there. All right.

We are ready to proceed to the sentencing. I have received the presentence report from the probation officer in this matter. I have reviewed those and discussed them with her. I have received the sentencing memorandum from the federal

government, a very excellent one done concerning these types of cases, and brief ones from counsel for each defendant.

And I'm going to have the government address us first and have each defense counsel address us and each defendant can address the Court as well, can allocute as to the statements they want me to hear.

I'm concerned, because of the nature of the events, with Mrs. Bustle, what she said and did and the nature of this offense. They are misdemeanor offenses that you've pled to, and the issue is whether or not incarceration is appropriate in this case. As to probation, I don't think anyone should start off in these cases with any presumption of probation. I think the presumption should be that these offenses were an attack on our democracy and that jail time is usually — should be expected.

I will hear from the government and counsel and from the Bustles.

Mr. Romano, I appreciate the memorandum. I reviewed the matrix that you have proposed. That's a reasonable approach, I believe. You're muted.

MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Your Honor. I make that mistake too often. Can you hear me all right? I know the computer I'm using, sometimes the microphone is a little weak.

THE COURT: No, we can hear you.

MR. ROMANO: Okay. Thank you.

So first as a housekeeping matter, Your Honor, the

government moves to dismiss Counts 1 through 3 of the information as to both defendants. That was a part of the plea agreement. We're at sentencing now. We would make that motion.

THE COURT: To dismiss those counts?

MR. ROMANO: Yes.

THE COURT: I will at the conclusion of this hearing.

I will wait until we've concluded and make sure --

MR. ROMANO: Okay. Then, Your Honor, as the Court is familiar from our sentencing memorandum, I will start with the sentence that we're seeking, and then I will go through my allocution.

The government is seeking a sentence of one month home confinement as to Mr. Bustle, three months as to Ms. Bustle, with three years' probation as to each, a \$500 restitution assessment for each of them as agreed to in the plea agreement, payable to the Department of the Treasury, a period of forty hours of community service for each of them.

We note that the presentence report also recommends that the Court impose a \$2,000 fine as to Joshua Bustle. This is not a specific part of our request, but if the Court finds it appropriate, we don't object to it.

As the Court knows, this matter is not governed by the sentencing guidelines, being a misdemeanor punishable by a maximum of six months. So the factors that the Court has to consider are taken from 18 U.S. Code Section 3553(a). And those

factors include: The nature and circumstances of the offense; the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide for just punishment; to deter criminal conduct; to protect the public from further crimes by these individuals; and to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities between similarly situated defendants.

Your Honor, we submit that in a case like this these factors provide mixed guidance. Some factors, as we outlined, favor incarceration, some favor a more lenient sentence. I want to start with the seriousness of the offense, the need to promote respect for the law, and to provide for just punishment.

We would submit that for this case, as in any case associated with the Capitol riot, this factor recommends a sentence of incarceration. We would note that the statute under which the Bustles were prosecuted could also be used to prosecute single protestors or small group protestors who briefly disrupt Congress, such as by shouting in the gallery and then are hauled out.

This case isn't like those cases. This is not a minor crime. And the conduct that they exhibited and the conduct of other rioters is not just a difference of degree from this other kind of conduct; it's a difference of the kind. The riot writ large was an attack on the seat of the legislative branch of the United States. It was an attack on the peaceful transition of

power between administrations, a cornerstone of our democracy and something that has existed in our country up until the events of January 6th, 2021.

I note what the Court said at the beginning of this hearing, which I think resembles what Judge Lamberth said in a prior sentencing, about how people should not necessarily assume that probation is going to be the default, which I think is an important thing to note here.

And I think it's worth considering that when looking at this factor, the seriousness of the offense, the need to promote the respect for law, and the need to provide for just punishment, probationary sentences for Capitol rioting cases, if they become the norm, could run the risk of undervaluing the seriousness of the offense and that punitive measures may be necessary to promote the goals of this sentencing factor.

I want to turn now to general deterrence. This factor is intertwined with the seriousness of the offense. General deterrence requires us to acknowledge that the property damage, the injury, the destruction, and the fear that members of Congress and their staff experienced was made possible by collective action on January 6th. No rioter acted in a vacuum. Each additional person who entered the Capitol building made it that much harder for the police to regain control of different parts of the building, to keep members of Congress and their staff safe, and ultimately to regain control of the exterior of

the building. And in particular, that's important given the level of violence and injury caused in certain parts outside the building where fighting took place.

General deterrence also requires us to acknowledge that many members of the riot were taking pictures of themselves, were recording themselves, were recording the events, were uploading evidence of their crimes in realtime or shortly thereafter to various social media sites. Members of the riot were writing their own narratives in many cases about how proud they were of what they accomplished.

And so when we consider the goal of general deterrence, we're not talking about dissuading individuals from bringing signs into the Capitol and picketing. We're talking about dissuading a group from violently storming the Capitol the next time, for example, we certify the results of an electoral vote or another major national election.

We promote general deterrence by imposing consequences. Consequences are essential. They discourage future criminal behavior. And we note that general deterrence is especially important here where the crime is so public, so widely known, and so closely followed.

It is also especially important where, as in the cases arising out of January 6th, almost every member of the riot was able to leave the Capitol building and grounds on that day without consequences.

So those two factors, we submit, support a sentence of incarceration and will support that for the vast majority of such cases.

The nature and circumstances of this offense we turn to next, Your Honor, and that presents a more mixed and nuanced question. In our pleading, we articulated a variety of factors for the Court to consider in evaluating between different defendants charged with offenses from the Capitol riot.

The Bustles entered through the east rotunda doors. They weren't a part of the group that originally breached the doors. There was about 20 to 30 minutes between breach of the doors and their entry. And we estimate they spent about 20 minutes inside the building.

So even though they weren't a part of that initial breach, the damage and the alarms, we submit, would have been obvious. The windows of the door where they entered were busted in.

Alarms were going off throughout the building. But there's no evidence that they engaged in any violence, that they incited violence, that they encouraged violence, or that they reacted to violence caused by others in a way that led to greater risk.

At the point where law enforcement officers attempted to clear the rotunda, it appears that they complied, although it's hard to tell because of the size of the crowd and the fact that the crowd moves into the background of the camera angle as the rotunda was cleared.

And as we look at the nature and circumstances of the offense, Your Honor, we note that there are some things that make the two defendants' conduct somewhat different, even though they were in the Capitol, in the same parts of the Capitol for the same amount of time. And that's Jessica Bustle's Facebook postings where she wrote that Mike Pence was a traitor, where she wrote that they stormed the Capitol, where she wrote of the need for revolution. We submit that this makes the nature and circumstances of her offense greater than his.

Likewise, the false information about whether or not there was violence at the Capitol and who caused the violence, this both makes the nature and circumstances of the offense somewhat more serious and also supports a heightened need for specific deterrence and the promotion of respect for the law.

But in general, the nature of the conduct within the building, the Facebook posts aside, which we take very seriously, support a lesser sentence here.

Next, we turn to the history and characteristics of the offenders. We note that were this matter subject to the sentencing guidelines, they would not have any criminal history score, or we believe they would not.

We placed substantial weight in making our sentencing recommendation on the early acceptance of responsibility by the Bustles. I believe that they were the first defendants who were charged solely with misdemeanor offenses to plead guilty. I

might be wrong about that, but they were certainly among the first, and they are among the first to be sentenced. I think I was originally planning to say that they were the fourth and fifth defendants to be sentenced, but I think Judge Jackson got to one this morning. So they're now number 5 and 6.

And that early acceptance of responsibility hopefully shows a desire not to engage in further criminal conduct, hopefully shows that the Court doesn't need to tailor its sentence as specifically to deterring these defendants from committing future criminal conduct, hopefully reveals a desire to rehabilitate and not participate in this sort of behavior in the future.

It also saves the government resources, which in these cases especially we know is not a small thing. The sentencing guidelines in general note, when giving credit for acceptance of responsibility and reducing offense levels, the importance of saving the time in preparing for trial and saving resources.

And here we note that the investigation and prosecution of offenses arising out of the Capitol riot is one of the most involved, complex, and resource-intensive investigations in American history. In the approximately seven months since the riot happened, more than 500 people have been charged with offenses. Others remain under investigation. I'm sure the Court is familiar with the scope and scale of our efforts to process evidence and provide discovery and with the fact that

many of these cases have interlocking evidence where one defendant's cell phone, for instance, might capture actions by another defendant.

And so all of these factors make prosecution of the Capitol riot writ large and prosecution of individual cases within the Capitol riot very resource-intensive tasks.

And so given this factor, the early disposition of the case is certainly worth consideration. It certainly speaks well to these defendants and suggests that a more lenient sentence is appropriate.

We also note that as is noted in the presentence report, that Ms. Bustle is expecting a child. That also certainly weighs into our analysis here in terms of what is appropriate and what is needed.

So Your Honor, I'm happy to answer any questions if the Court has any, but to reiterate, our request here is for home confinement for both defendants, one month for Mr. Bustle, three months for Ms. Bustle, and for each defendant to be sentenced to a term of three years of probation, a payment of restitution in the amount of \$500 each, and 40 hours of community service.

THE COURT: The government does not take a position on the suggested fine of the probation officer?

MR. ROMANO: That's right, we didn't take a position, Your Honor. I did see that the presentence report writer suggested that a fine be imposed. We don't object to it, but

we're not taking a position affirmatively one way or the other.

THE COURT: Judge Jackson's case this morning you referenced just now, that was the same misdemeanor offense as in this case?

MR. ROMANO: It was. I believe the defendant there was sentenced to a term of six months of incarceration, and I think that was driven by the fact that that defendant had been detained pretrial. I don't know the circumstances of the offense, why the defendant was detained pretrial. I suspect it had to do with criminal history. But I don't know the specifics.

I can represent that there was another case, U.S. v. Michael Curzio, where there was a similar sentence imposed where the defendant was right up on the verge of six months and had pleaded to the same offense. I know his -- I'm fairly certain that his case, the sentence was driven, again, by pretrial detention, and that was driven by his criminal history. I know Mr. Curzio had a fairly serious criminal history, to include a prior attempted murder charge, which probably led to his pretrial detention. I just don't know what the circumstance was for the case before Judge Jackson.

THE COURT: Judge Lamberth's case was -- the other one was a female that was given probation.

MR. ROMANO: Yes. I think there are a few things that distinguish this case from that case, Your Honor. Both of them

certainly involve early acceptance of responsibility.

As to Ms. Bustle -- the case before Judge Lamberth, the defendant's name was Anna Morgan-Lloyd. She had also written about the riot on Facebook, but I will submit some of her postings were less incendiary than the postings that we're dealing with here. She wrote generally about being proud of participating. She wrote of January 6th as the best day ever but didn't write specifically about the vice president as a traitor, efforts to, you know, indulge in a revolution, that sort of thing.

She was in the Capitol, I believe, for less time overall, and she was in a specific hallway. So that makes her conduct a little bit less serious.

And I think there were also somewhat greater efforts at being cooperative. I believe that she submitted to an interview in which she gave access to her phones. Here, I don't think there was that initial interview, and we obtained the defendant's phones through a warrant. I'm not saying they did anything inappropriate or obstructive, but Ms. Morgan-Lloyd, I think, made somewhat greater efforts upfront to be immediately cooperative.

THE COURT: She also went on Fox News the next day and somewhat discounted or changed her statement somewhat?

MR. ROMANO: That's true.

THE COURT: Which concerned me whether it was true

acceptance of responsibility or just temporary.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Romano. Again, I appreciate your brief.

I would like to hear from defense counsel at this time. Who would like to address the Court first?

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, if I could go first, I would appreciate it.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Judge, on behalf of Mr. Bustle, I would like to say just a couple of things preliminarily.

I think that the Court should at least review 18 U.S.C. 2102 to define what a riot is. And I will just read it into the record. This is from the code. "Anywhere in Title 18, the term 'riot' means an act or acts of violence by one or more persons part of an assemblage of three or more persons for which act or acts constitute a clear and present danger of or shall result in damage or injury to property or other person or persons of an individual or a threat or threats of the commission of acts of violence by one or more persons of an assemblage of three or more," and it goes on.

And the reason that I'm starting off with that is I take particular exception to the term "Capitol rioters" being used uniformly to everybody that participated in what happened on January 6. This was not a riot as far as Mr. Bustle is concerned.

Mrs. Bustle. I'm talking about Mr. Bustle.

THE COURT: Mr. Bustle went in, and Ms. Bustle sends out Facebook and other social media comments approving and praising the acts, but they didn't participate in violence?

MR. ANDERSON: Well, Judge, I'm not talking about

THE COURT: They were together. They went together.

MR. ANDERSON: Sure. So what did they do? They walked into a breached building. They walked around. There's even pictures of them right next to police officers casually talking to them. And they left. They did not participate.

Mr. Bustle did not participate in a riot. And I take exception to that, because that has all kinds of connotation to the actual behavior that is involved here.

Now, a riot did occur on January 6th. I'm not saying that. But Mr. and Mrs. -- or Mr. Bustle, at least, certainly did not damage any property. He didn't go in with violence, and he didn't make any threats of violence. He walked into the building, walked around, and left.

Now, that's unlawful. I'm not saying that that's not -
THE COURT: The building he went into, there were

alarms going off. There were broken windows and doors where he

walked in. There was pepper spray and other substances in the

air. There were masses of people. If you look at the pictures,

it was not just one or two people, but a mass of people. It was

not a normal situation.

MR. ANDERSON: In no way am I saying it is, Judge, and in no way am I saying that they didn't commit a crime, but what I'm trying to start the conversation on is I think saying "Capitol rioters" uniformly creates an annotation, an unfair annotation towards Mr. Bustle that he somehow engaged in a riot.

Now, he broke the law, and we're not saying he's innocent of the crime of unlawfully entering a building or what he pled to, unlawfully picketing. But to go so far to say he is a rioter, I take particular exception to that. And I think that by saying "rioter," it taints even the Court's mind of what the appropriate punishment is.

As the government just said, and there's no evidence to the contrary, Mr. Bustle entered the building 20 or 30 minutes after the breach. They walked around in the building for 20 minutes. There's pictures attached to the indictment of them standing within feet of police officers, casually talking to them. They created no dangerous situation of their own actions.

And I just think that that's important, and I think that was very much important in the case of Anna Morgan-Lloyd where the Court found that the appropriate disposition was no incarceration but probation only.

If we can separate the word "riot" from what happened here, you have unlawful entry of a building.

THE COURT: Why did he go in the building if not to support what had happened?

MR. ANDERSON: Judge, I think that -- I think that the -- there's different types of people that were on January 6th. There's people that came with weapons and came to be rioters, and then there's other people that were there that were caught up in the moment of wanting to see what was going on. And a lot of people were taking Facebook video and so forth almost in a reporter-like fashion.

And I don't think that there's any evidence that the government could point to that would say that anything Joshua Bustle did before, during, or after would be even close to a riot. And I think that puts him most close to the Anna Morgan-Lloyd situation, which the appropriate disposition for a class B petty offense with no criminal record, with early acceptance of responsibility, with full cooperation with the government would yield a no incarceration, probation-only sentence.

Anything more -- to treat Joshua Bustle differently than

Anna Morgan-Lloyd would be unjust. She received -- the only

difference between him and Anna Morgan-Lloyd is Anna

Morgan-Lloyd was a grandmother. But Josh Bustle has no criminal record, did nothing other than observe what was happening, was curiously observing, and left.

Now, Mr. Bustle has paid a substantial price for what has happened from the court of public opinion. Because everybody is called a rioter, he's lost his job, he's publicly shamed.

They're having to move from their home in Virginia to South Carolina to start a new life because they have lost everything in the court of public opinion. And so -- so Mr. Bustle has paid a substantial price for what has happened and what he did, from the loss of his income and now having to relocate to start over in a different place.

And so, Judge, in no way do I want to minimize what happened on January 6th. What happened on January 6th was terrible and was outrageous, and many people should be punished for what they did.

And Mr. Bustle should be punished for what he did, but what he did was he entered a breached door, walked around, and left. And there should be no purpose of giving him any more punishment than what Anna Morgan-Lloyd received in this particular situation. And accordingly, I would ask the Court to impose the same sentence.

Now, as far as a fine goes, I would ask the Court not to impose a fine, because Mr. Bustle has lost his job. His income sources have -- as a Realtor, he's lost that ability. And so he's -- a special assessment is appropriate. The restitution is appropriate. Community service is appropriate. But I would ask the Court not to impose a fine because of the other punishments Mr. Bustle has already received in the court of public opinion.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Does the government want to respond to that briefly?

MR. ROMANO: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

We don't think that the use of the term "rioter" is inappropriate to describe the people who participated in January 6th generally. I think you already noted in some of your questions to Mr. Anderson, Your Honor, the nature of what any person who stepped through the doors to the Capitol was stepping into, what they would have known, what they would have seen.

But also looking at the terminology in 18 U.S.C. 2102, I don't find issue with what's written here. One of the categories talks about an act or acts of violence by one or more persons part of an assemblage of three or more persons which act or acts shall constitute a clear or present danger of or shall result in damage or injury to the property of any other person or the person of any other individual.

That seems like a pretty good, if a bit legalese, description of what happened on January 6th. There certainly were people who committed acts of violence. There certainly were people who committed property destruction. They did it in a crowd, and the crowd helped enable the violence and the property destruction and the fear to take place.

The police officers were overwhelmed because of the size of the crowd. They took hours to clear the building because of the size of the crowd. In the lower west terrace and in other parts of the exterior and some parts of the interior of the building, police officers were fighting with people for hours, and every minute that police officers took inside taking longer to clear the building was an extra minute that that fighting could go on. It was an extra minute that officers like the ones who testified before Congress recently were stuck in the fighting because their compatriots were having to address problems going on somewhere else that made the situation more dangerous.

I certainly understand that there may be a difference of opinion about this and that the defense takes a different position, but the United States thinks that the use of the term "riot" is completely appropriate here.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Let me turn to counsel of Mrs. Bustle next, please.

MR. KIBRIA: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

So we would like to state first and foremost that, you know, the government through Mr. Romano has suggested that a probationary term be appropriate. And, you know, our rule of law here in this country is founded on also the key principle of precedent.

And so through Mr. Romano's suggestion and looking at precedent set by the Anna Morgan-Lloyd case, we do feel that the Court need not look any further than, you know, the suggestion and the recommendation that probation be the sentence here. And we believe that is --

THE COURT: I think each individual before the Court

in any sentence, this case or any other case, stands on its own. You do have to look at conformity in sentencing and fairness in sentencing, but you look at each individual. That's what they got away from in the guidelines. So I don't think it's a good example to use.

MR. KIBRIA: Understood, Your Honor.

Again, we ask that the Court look at the actual behaviors and the actions of Ms. Bustle. Again, all she did was walk into a breached building, walked around, and the evidence against her just simply suggests, actually shows that she was speaking with police officers in a very, you know, gentle manner and there was no violence, as Mr. Romano has stated. There was no violence, no incitement of violence on their part, and they did, you know, simply walk through the Capitol building.

As for her Facebook posts, I, as an officer of the court -
THE COURT: She did put up her "no vaccine" sign, the
parading and protesting.

MR. KIBRIA: And that is why we entered into that plea, because it did actually align with the actions she did take. And yes, Your Honor, you are correct, she did have a sign that said "no vaccines." However, that sign did not indicate as to any rioting or inciting violence or things like that.

So therefore, I will turn to her Facebook posts. As an officer of this court, I have had conversations with Ms. Bustle regarding her Facebook posts and her, you know, activity on

social media.

First of all, let me say that from our conversations and my suggestions as to, you know, the harms of social media and the kinds of cult-like, you know, personalities that have been formulated through social media in these last five to ten years in our country, I believe Ms. Bustle was generally, from her words, somewhat a victim to that when, you know, very, very large, important, and prominent figures -- I won't name who, but I think you know who exactly I'm talking to -- are constantly for four years shouting down orders basically through social media and through media. Many people fell victim to this.

And I will tell that you Ms. Bustle took my advice and has been off of social media since the charges came through. Her and Mr. Bustle have not been on social media, and they've told me that they actually found a new life and thanked me for, you know, giving them that advice that social media is very harmful and actually can lead people to believe things and do things that they may not actually be, you know -- believe in them themselves. I think Ms. Bustle was actually a victim.

Again, I don't discount the fact that she is an adult and makes, you know, actions on her own and thoughts on her own.

But I believe when you look back at the four years and especially the months leading up to the Capitol riot, that certain figures, very prominent, very large figures, and again, I think you know who, were directing orders to people, when, you

know, they have no other thoughts besides they believe in a certain ideology and the key leaders in those ideology are telling them to do certain things, people will partake in that.

And again, Mrs. Bustle is very remorseful for that. She has been off social media and has changed her life completely. And that is coming from me, again, from deep conversations with her. This is the truth. I would not put forth lies in front of this Court as an officer of the court. So I think she understands how she was affected and how her actions may have put her in this place.

However, we do need to look back, in terms of the sentencing, as to the physical actions she did take a part in that day. They were to cause no violence, to insight no violence. She simply walked through an already breached Capitol and was only there for 20 minutes.

And I guess if we take into account your words, Your Honor, that we don't want to look at Anna Morgan-Lloyd's case because that's a different case, fine, but we do put emphasis on the words of Mr. Romano as a representative of the government that he suggests that based on the behaviors and actions, that probation be the term.

We also do ask, though, that Ms. Bustle not to be fined.

As Mr. Anderson stated, Mr. Bustle, who is the key provider for this family in terms of income, has no income anymore. And Ms. Bustle was a housewife, and she has been raising their

children, their one child with another one on the way.

Therefore, we believe a probationary term is appropriate.

The only thing we would ask for is that there be no fine instituted. We also believe restitution and community service is also fine and appropriate.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I would like to have Mr. Bustle address the Court if he wishes. You have the right to do so. And then I will hear from Mrs. Bustle.

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I think my defendant has spoke well for me. I don't really have much else to say. I do recognize that I did break the law, and I just hope that you look at what I do there.

And that would be it. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, your attorney made the point that you've lost your job, which was in real estate at that time, and I understand -- I think it was mentioned on an earlier status call that you subsequently have a new real estate job?

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: I am still in real estate, but I have not been able to continue to perform anymore.

THE COURT: And the concerns about moving, you said you're going to move to somewhere down south?

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: Yes. I just need to have a fresh start.

THE COURT: And that is because of the notoriety of this case?

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, what's the situation with your family and your relationship with them because of this case?

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: It's not great.

THE COURT: You have family in this area?

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mrs. Bustle, let me talk with you for a few minutes about your situation and what you want me to consider as I determine whether probation is appropriate or jail time is appropriate.

DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: Thank you for letting me speak, Your Honor.

I don't have much to say other than that I'm sorry for my actions and that I love our country, and that's all.

THE COURT: Obviously, you did attempt to minimize your involvement or justify the conduct overall, what happened on January 6 in your postings. Your counsel indicated that you got away from that, you aren't doing that. But you did write on Facebook before the riot, "We don't win this on the sidelines. Excited to stand for truth with my fellow patriots and freedom fighters in D.C. today." And then after the riot, you wrote, "The vice president of the United States is a traitor" and that you stormed the Capitol.

Then you said that the information the media were portraying was false and saying that you walked right in with tons of other people and that some supporters were supposedly unruly and that Congress reassembled in the same place that was supposedly destroyed and people were simply making their presence known, finally growing a backbone, that the election has been undermined and stolen, that people are tired of being lied to and cheated and we need a revolution, that we can accept an honest and fair election but that this is not fair and patriots don't want to see their country brought into Communism, that I'm proud of them standing up. What am I to take of that, that you did not actively

support, essentially encourage this riot that occurred?

MR. ROMANO: Your Honor, I think we might have lost Ms. Bustle. I don't see her on the participant line anymore.

DEFENDANT JOSHUA BUSTLE: Can you give me one second, Your Honor? I think her computer is freezing up.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Bustle, just put her in front of your screen. Okay? Just go get her.

(Pause.)

1

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: Mrs. Bustle, I don't know if you heard my final statements.

DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: No, I heard it, Your Honor, right before the screen frozen and I was kicked out of Zoom.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Would you try to answer my question about your participation in the riot with that language beforehand and after it supporting it?

DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: Yes, Your Honor.

So we went down to D.C. for the medical freedom rally that took place a couple of blocks over. My son, my son that's living has been injured by vaccines. So my sign said "no mandatory medical procedures," that I don't believe that every medical procedure should be mandatory. And we walked over to the Capitol from the medical freedom rally.

And I understand that my terminology with saying "storm the Capitol," I didn't understand what that meant at the time. I didn't have any knowledge of what was going on in the front of the building. I only saw what was taking place on my side of the building, which wasn't anything like what was going on on the other side of the building, at least when we got there.

So that doesn't justify my actions in any way. Those Facebook posts were made before I had any clue what was actually going on, which actually didn't happen until the following day, and that the things that I saw were different than some of the things that happened in the front, because I didn't see that stuff going on.

THE COURT: All right. Your views are the same today, are they, the language that we need a revolution, that this is not fair and patriots don't want to see their country brought to

Communism and destroyed over on a lie and you're proud of them for standing up?

DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: I can't hear anything.

MR. KIBRIA: Your Honor, I believe she might be having trouble hearing Your Honor's latest question.

DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: I didn't hear your question, Your Honor. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Let me try that again. I said you indicated in your views -- this is, I believe, the day after the riot. You indicated -- it says you went into the building. So this is after the riot. You said this election is undermined and stolen, people are tired of being lied to and cheated, we need a revolution, you can accept a fair and honest election but this is not fair and patriots don't want to see their country brought into Communism based on a lie and I'm proud of them for standing up.

And that's what you still believe today?

DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: With respect to the things that I've seen that have taken place, no, Your Honor, I don't agree with that. The violence and stuff like that, I wasn't aware of that stuff because I didn't see any of those things going on.

So I condone and do not agree with anybody who is ever violent towards anybody in life, no matter who that is.

THE COURT: Now, your counsel has represented you're

1 presently expecting. Is that accurate? 2 DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. And you have a child who is 4 four years of age, a boy? 5 DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: He just celebrated his fifth birthday last week. 6 7 THE COURT: And you used to be employed in the dental 8 area, managing dental clinics, et cetera, had a very successful 9 job, but you left that after your son was born? 10 DEFENDANT JESSICA BUSTLE: Yes, Your Honor. 11 that to stay home with my son and take care of him. 12 THE COURT: All right. Either counsel have anything 13 else to add to this matter? 14 MR. ROMANO: Nothing else from me, Your Honor. 15 MR. ANDERSON: Nothing else from me, Your Honor. 16 MR. KIBRIA: Nothing further from me as well, Your 17 Honor. 18 THE COURT: Now, I was concerned about this matter, 19 and I'm going to pass sentencing at this time, because of the 20 nature of the offense. This case, I think, is somewhat unique, 21 because although I have grave concerns about Mr. and Mrs. Bustle 22 going into the Capitol during the riot, even though apparently 23 it was on the east side and the main riot was on the west side, 24 but still, they went through a door that had been -- windows had

been broken and the police were all there and, obviously, the

25

sound and the noises of the riot going on were all evident, and then Mrs. Bustle's posting before and thereafter are of great concern.

I'm saying it's unique because they were not there originally as Trump supporters, although they may be Trump supporters. But they were there on a medical protest, antivaccine protest at a different place than the Trump rally and came on after the main riot had begun and access into the Capitol had been forced by the rioters.

The unfortunate side is that, obviously, there's a riot, and it was a riot, and people were engaged in the riot. In fact, not only did violence occur, but people died. The day before yesterday, another Capitol police officer committed suicide, making it the fourth one since the riot, after what they went through for several hours. If you listened to the testimony of the officers on the Hill the other day, you can understand how tragic it was.

I think the people who engaged in this process should be punished and have to be responsible, and that may be jail time for most people. In this case, I'm not going to give jail time, and I'll explain my rationale and reasons.

First, I said this is unique. These people were not here originally to protest with President Trump and did not listen to the exhortations to march to the Capitol. They were not engaged in that process going on of the speeches and went in after the

riot had begun.

They're not tourists. I object to any individual who is trying to characterize this or the narrative that somehow these people were tourists while attacking our system and the democracy in this country. There was, obviously, an intent to interfere with the electoral process and essentially cause a revolution.

But at the same time, Mr. Bustle has no prior criminal records of any matter. He has worked his entire life in the realty business, supported himself early on as a young man on his own. He was qualified as a field mechanic and then went into real estate and became successful in the real estate business, which he has lost as a result of this arrest and charge and guilty plea in this case.

His counsel indicated that he has been substantially punished already. Both Mr. and Mrs. Bustle are being punished by feeling they have to leave the area because of the notoriety associated with having been charged in this case.

Mr. Bustle has been separated from his family, his parents and other family members who are from the same area. He hasn't seen them with their grandson. All of this is punishment. They will again be separated when the new grandchild is born, which is substantial punishment. They have to relocate to a new community and establish a new home.

Mr. Bustle had been somewhat successful financially and

worked all his life since a young teenager and has indicated that he was able to provide successfully. Mrs. Bustle had successful employment until the time she had a child and stayed home to care for her family.

But as to the nature of the sentence and the factors the Court has to consider under the sentencing guidelines -- not the guidelines but the sentencing statute. The guidelines do not apply to this offense because it's a misdemeanor offense.

Misdemeanor means it's a minor offense. It does not mean it's a felony offense. This is a class B misdemeanor. The maximum sentence is up to six months in jail and a fine of \$5,000.

I have to look at the sentencing factors in considering the appropriate sentence under Title 18 United States Code 3553(a): The nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendants; the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense and promote respect for the law and the need for the sentence to afford adequate deterrence; the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities between other defendants with similar records who are found guilty of similar conduct.

Obviously, the nature and circumstances of the offense, their particular offense has to be put in context. Their particular offense can be downplayed to say they were simply, quote, tourists, unquote, walking into the Capitol. In context, what we had was -- and they had some understanding of this when

they went in because of the surrounding circumstances. You can't be blind to it.

The nature of the attack was unique in the history of our country. I think the last time the Capitol had been under attack and occupied over strong opposition by the lawful authorities was maybe the War of 1812 when the Capitol was taken over by the British and burned.

And now we have a group of individuals irritated and misled by false claims of a fraudulent election who decided to take the law into their own hands. And the basic premise in this country is the rule of law where every person agrees as a part of the membership of this country as citizens to obey the law. It is concerning to the Court and, I'm sure, to all people in this country that this can happen in our nation.

The government has suggested maybe a spectrum or a matrix of how to consider these cases, and I take that suggestion seriously in determining what's a fair and just sentence on the spectrum. The government advises that we should look at whether and how the defendant entered the Capitol building, whether the defendant engaged in violence or incited violence, whether the defendant engaged in any acts of destruction, whether the defendant's reaction to the acts of violence and destruction, how they reacted to it, whether during or after the riot the defendant destroyed evidence, the length of time the defendant was in the building, exactly where the defendant traveled within

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that building, obviously what the defendant did in the building, defendant's statements and posts on social media, and whether the defendant cooperated with law enforcement, whether the defendant otherwise exhibited --

MR. ROMANO: I think the Judge's feed has frozen.

THE COURT: Really, you have to understand that there's no evidence, the government says, that Mr. Bustle engaged in any violence or destruction of property. He did not destroy evidence after the riot or write anything with respect to the riot on social media. He got into the building approximately 30 minutes after the other rioters had breached the door. At the time he entered, the doors were open. were police officers at either side of the door, and a group of rioters were crowding the opening, and there were signs of damage in the area. Obviously, he had to see that. The windows are smashed where he walked in. The alarms were sounding throughout the Capitol rotunda, and the -- but his actions were to walk into the building. He took some pictures of his wife holding onto the "no vaccine" sign, and a few of the other items listed in the spectrum the government has suggested.

His criminal history is none really. He doesn't come under the guidelines but looking at it. He agreed to plead guilty early on. He acknowledged his conduct. He wanted to promptly resolve the case, and that is significant to the Court.

Because of the nature of this riot and the damage done and

people who lost lives, obviously, overall the offense supports incarceration, but in this case Mr. Bustle is separate from that. Obviously, deterrence, people are going to have to realize this illegal type of activity, attacking the established government of the United States, it has to be deterred in the future.

Mr. Bustle has suffered consequences already, personal and professional consequences, and that seems to discourage any further activity of this sort.

Judge Moss, as the government indicated, made the following statement: "Democracy requires the cooperation of the governed. When a mob is prepared to attack the Capitol to prevent our elected officials from both parties from performing their constitutional and statutory duty, democracy is in trouble. The damage that that defendant and others caused that day goes way beyond the several-hour delay in the certification. It is a damage that will persist in this country for decades."

And I agree. The United States has been held up to the world. The country has always believed in democracy and pursued it until now we see what happened January 6th.

It seems to the Court that Mr. Bustle, in the very limited capacity, engaged only because he walked into the premises, I think with some understanding of what was happening.

I'm worried about having unwarranted disparities in sentencing. As I said, I think individual -- we have to treat

each case individually, and we do hope there will be some uniformity of sentencing in these matters. In this case, as I mentioned, the probationary sentence should not become the default to everyone who is charged with a misdemeanor.

I certainly considered giving jail time to Mrs. Bustle because of her publications, but that seems to me that this is not a type of sentence that would be productive in this case. They have already suffered and have to move from the area.

So I am going to sentence Mr. Bustle for all of those reasons and similar reasons for Mrs. Bustle.

I think the punishment because of the recommended probationary time of home confinement time, community service time, the restitution that will be due and paid would be an appropriate sentence in light of the consequences of his activities.

So the sentence will be as follows for Joshua Bustle:

Consistent with the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and in

consideration of provisions in 18 U.S.C. 3553, which I've

discussed with you, it is the judgment of the Court that Joshua

Bustle is sentenced to a term of 24 months (two years) of

probation on Count 4, which will include 30 days of home

confinement, and will be sentenced as well to 40 hours of

community service.

In addition, you are ordered to pay a special assessment of \$10 under Title 18 Section 3013. And while -- you are to abide

by the following mandatory conditions on the probation and supervision, as well as the standard conditions. Mandatory conditions include, obviously, not committing any other crimes, not unlawful possessing controlled substances. I will not require mandatory drug testing, and that will be suspended because I see you as a low risk for any substance abuse.

You will make your restitution in Title 18 Section 3653, and you will make payments to the Department of Treasury in the amount of \$500. I am not going to assess a fine against you because of your necessity to leave the community and join a new community and because of the upcoming child and you lost your employment. You have other assets that you can live on. You're very fortunate that you worked hard, but I do not think a fine is appropriate in your present condition.

Restitution can be made to the Clerk of Court of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the amount of \$500, and the victim is the United States Department of Treasury. The balance of the restitution will be paid no less than \$200 a month until paid in full. You have to provide the Probation Office access to financial information and release of any financial information to pay off this restitution.

Now, the home confinement will be monitored by the appropriate probation office in the district in which you join. Whether it's somewhere down south or you stay in Virginia, that will determine your home confinement, and they will establish

the appropriate location monitoring as necessary.

1.3

Home confinement means you're confined to your house except you may report to work, medical appointments, church services, and the like, and seek permission from the Probation Office for other special needs you may have if you have to leave the house. But otherwise, you're confined to your home.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, Tim Anderson for Mr. Bustle. Can I ask for one clarification on the home confinement?

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, Mr. Bustle and his wife are moving to South Carolina. The movers are coming on August 14th. So we would ask the Court to allow him to have a delayed report for home confinement to possibly August 27th to September 1st, just so that they can get moved in and then begin that home confinement period in South Carolina.

THE COURT: I'm going to grant that. I think he should talk to Ms. Field, the probation officer, the Pretrial Services officer here to make arrangements. You will have to make arrangements for the Probation Office wherever they move in South Carolina. They'll have to handle the home confinement as well.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I need to legally advise you that you have the right to appeal the sentence under Title 18 Section 3742 if

I gave you an improper or illegal sentence that departs upward -- there's no guideline range, but if it's longer than the statutory maximum, which it's not, and your right to challenge this conviction under Title 28 U.S.C. 2255 if you find new information that's been unavailable at this time or shows you should not have been guilty of this offense or that you received ineffective assistance of counsel.

All right. Now as to Mrs. Bustle. Mrs. Bustle, again for the rationale I've already put in the record, I believe you should be entitled to probation despite your publications on social media. I think the loss of your husband's position, the need to move from the area, the lost family as you have a new child coming has been substantial punishment as indicated by the Court.

Additionally, I believe that you have true remorse for what you did and a better understanding of what happened at this point than you did on January 6.

At the same time, I seriously considered putting you in jail because those statements concern the Court. The statements about patriots are so inaccurate and so misguided that, as your lawyer indicated, you have been swayed by social media and by others, but patriots are not one to attack ongoing operations of Congress and the legitimate operation of their constitutional duties and attempt to stop them. That is a revolution, not patriotism.

But under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and in consideration of the Title 18 Section 3553 factors as I've reviewed for you and your husband, it is the judgment of the Court that Jessica Bustle will be committed for a term of 24 months (two years) of probation as to Count 4. In addition, there is a special assessment of \$10 for the conviction of this misdemeanor.

An additional part of the sentence is I'm going to give you a sentence of home confinement for 60 days because of your activities being more serious than your husband's. Again, probation can set the terms of that confinement. You would be confined to your home, but if you need to leave, with the probation officer's permission, you can do so, but generally, you will be confined to your home for 60 days and subject to location monitoring.

Now, while you're on supervised probation, you have to follow all the mandatory conditions and the standard conditions of your supervision. Mandatory, obviously, no more crime of any kind, no unlawful possession of a controlled substance. I will not require mandatory drug testing because I don't think there's evidence of any future substance abuse. You have to make restitution under the law as ordered to the Department of Treasury for \$500. I'm going to waive any fine, because I do not believe you're in a position to pay any fines. Now, the obligation for the restitution is paid at no less than \$200 a

month until paid.

Additionally, I think that you have to understand that during your term of release as well, an additional provision of the sentence will be community service, and I will give you the same length of time that I gave your husband for community service, which I hope you will do something in the new community you move to for people who are less fortunate than you. I think it would be appropriate for you in your situation and not working with your son turning five and certainly going to preschool.

I'm not going to lecture you on your vaccine choices or not. That's your decision. I hope that you read appropriate media and accurate media about your decision, particularly in light of the delta variant and the danger it provides to you, to your unborn, and to your son if you're not vaccinated.

That will be the sentence of the Court. You have the right, again, to appeal, as I indicated to your husband, if I gave you a sentence longer than required by the law. You have the right to challenge your conviction or sentence if new and currently unavailable information should come to light or if you receive -- you claim you received ineffective assistance of counsel, your counsel didn't do a good job for you.

That will be the sentence in the case. I'm going to check with the presentence report provider. Ms. Field?

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, thank you.

If I may just clarify, what is the date that they are to report to the home detention? Was it August 27th or September 1st?

THE COURT: Let me ask their counsel. He's the one that suggested those dates. What is realistic for them to do it? They've got to get moved, get there, and they're going to have to stay home. So they can't go out and do things they might want to do for a while.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, I had a conversation with my client, Mr. Bustle, this morning on that point. And the movers are moving them, picking up furniture on August 14th. They're traveling to South Carolina. They're going to get set up. And he asked for a couple of weeks.

So under the circumstances, I would ask September 1st be the start date. That should give them enough time to be set up and start it at that time.

THE COURT: All right. I will put it in the order, then, for the Probation Office to begin his term, both of them begin their terms of home confinement on September 1st for the lengths I've indicated, and they will have to do that. Failure to do that would be a violation of the terms of probation, and you could come back to the Court subject to imprisonment. Failure to abide by any terms of your probationary requirements will result in your probation being revoked and going to jail up to the maximum, which is two years.

```
All right. Anything else?
 1
                 PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
 2
 3
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Romano. I
      appreciate your work on this case.
 4
                 MR. ROMANO: Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
            (Proceedings adjourned at 1:19 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| 1 | CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | T Cours 7 Wiele courtifies that the foregoing is a | |
| 3 | I, Sara A. Wick, certify that the foregoing is a | |
| 4 | correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the | |
| 5 | above-entitled matter. | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | Please Note: This hearing occurred during the | |
| 8 | COVID-19 pandemic and is, therefore, subject to the | |
| 9 | technological limitations of court reporting remotely. | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | <u>/s/ Sara A. Wick</u> <u>August 11, 2021</u> | |
| 13 | SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |
| | | |