1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
2	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
3	Criminal Action No.
4	Thursday, June 16, 2022
5	vs. 10:06 a.m.
6	SIMONE MELISSA GOLD,
	Defendant.
7	x
8	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING
9	HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	APPEARANCES: For the United States: APRIL HOLLY AYERS-PEREZ, ESQ.
12	U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 11204 McPherson Road
	Laredo, TX 78045
13	(956) 723-6523
14	JASON MANNING, ESQ. DOJ-CRM
15	1400 New York Avenue NW Washington, DC 20005
16	(202) 514-6256
17	For the Defendant: DICKSON J. YOUNG, ESQ.
18	WHITESTONE YOUNG, PC 10513 Judicial Drive, Suite 300
19	Fairfax, VA 22030
	(757) 591-0200
20	KIRA ANNE WEST, ESQ. LAW OFFICE OF KIRA WEST
21	712 H Street, NE, Unit 509 Washington, DC 20002
22	(202) 236-2042
23	Court Reporter: Lisa A. Moreira, RDR, CRR
24	Official Court Reporter U.S. Courthouse, Room 6718
25	333 Constitution Avenue, NW
4.0	Washington, DC 20001 (202) 354-3187

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, we're on the
3	record for Criminal Case 21-85. This is Defendant 2.
4	United States of America vs. Simone Melissa Gold.
5	Counsel, please approach the lectern and identify
6	yourselves for the record.
7	MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Good morning, Your Honor; April
8	Ayers-Perez and Jason Manning for the government.
9	THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Ayers-Perez. And if
10	you're addressing the Court, feel free to remove your mask,
11	if you're comfortable doing so. Okay?
12	MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	MR. YOUNG: Good morning, Your Honor; Dickson
14	Young appearing on behalf of Defendant Gold.
15	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Young. Good to meet
16	you in person.
17	MR. YOUNG: Good to see you in person also, sir.
18	Kira West is also here with me. I didn't realize
19	she was behind me.
20	MS. WEST: Good morning, Your Honor, Kira West for
21	Dr. Simone Gold.
22	THE COURT: Dr. Gold, how are you?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. Are we ready to proceed?
25	MR. YOUNG: Yes, sir.

1 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. The Court has reviewed the 2 3 presentence investigation report. And Mr. Walters from probation, is he on Zoom? 4 5 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor. 6 Yes, sir, I'm here. 7 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Walters. 8 The Court has reviewed the presentence 9 investigation report and the memos that have been presented 10 by both sides. There was also a supplemental memo filed by 11 the defense, the video of the defendant entering the Capitol 12 that was filed by the government, and there was also a video 13 presentation featuring Dr. Gold and testimonials from 14 several of her colleagues and acquaintances that the Court 15 has reviewed. 16 The Court has also received a statement from a 17 Ms. Kristina Lawson, who I believe is the former head of the 18 California Medical Board, who has contacted the government, 19 I believe, and I might ask the government to address that 20 issue. 21 Anything else for the Court's consideration? 22 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: No, Your Honor. 23 MR. YOUNG: Judge, we would like to get a copy of 24 what you just referenced from the California Medical Board

since that's the first we've heard of it.

25

1 THE COURT: I'll hand it down to the defense. 2 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. 3 (Pause) MS. WEST: Your Honor, Ms. West for Dr. Gold. 4 5 Mr. Young just said this is the first we've heard about this 6 letter. It has some serious allegations in it. 7 THE COURT: We'll get there, okay? MS. WEST: Okay. 8 9 THE COURT: We'll get there. I'll give you an 10 opportunity to address it. 11 MS. WEST: Okay. 12 THE COURT: All right. Just for the record, the 13 Court has also received upwards of perhaps 30 letters in 14 note card format in very similar envelopes from Dr. Gold's 15 supporters, as well as a number of emails that were 16 received -- as well as a number of emails we received from 17 supporters in chambers. 18 First of all, let's start with the factual 19 findings in the presentence investigation report. There 20 were a number of objections that were noted. I'm not sure 21 the Court is in a position to resolve the disputes at this 22 point. The objections are noted in the report. For most of 23 them, Mr. Walters has simply referred to the statement of 24 facts, which speaks for itself.

I think the only one that I noticed that calls for

25

some response by the Court is the notation that she did not report once or twice to probation at the appointed time, and there's a dispute as to whether it was because she was caring for her mother or not. I'm not sure that that cuts one way or the other so I'm not inclined to consider that violation, okay?

MS. WEST: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Dr. Gold, has Ms. West reviewed the presentence investigation report with you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you been satisfied with her services in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

All right. Hearing no objection, the Court will accept the factual findings in the presentence investigation report regarding the circumstances of the offense, and those facts as stated are incorporated or adopted by the Court for purposes of this sentencing subject to the objections by the defense noted in the report.

All right. Moving to the calculation of the sentencing guidelines range. Dr. Gold pled guilty to entering and remaining in a restricted building in violation of 18 USC 1752(a)(1). I believe that was Count 2 of the indictment.

1 Ms. Ayers-Perez, is that right? 2 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: That is correct, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. The statute carries a one-year maximum imprisonment, supervised release of up to one year, 4 5 up to a \$100,000 fine, and a \$25 special assessment. 6 The base offense level for the offense is 4 under 7 the advisory sentencing guidelines. That was enhanced by 8 two points because the trespass took place in a secured 9 government facility. Dr. Gold was given a two-point 10 reduction for acceptance of responsibility, leading to a total offense level of 4. Dr. Gold had no criminal history, 11 12 so level 4 at Criminal History Category 1 results in an 13 advisory sentencing range of zero to six months. 14 Pursuant to her plea agreement, Dr. Gold has 15 agreed to pay restitution in the amount of \$500 to the 16 Architect of the Capitol to help compensate for the damage 17 done to the Capitol. 18 Any objections for the record on the guidelines 19 range? 20 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: No, Your Honor. 21 MS. WEST: No, Your Honor. 22 MR. YOUNG: No, sir. 23 THE COURT: All right. The Court has received a recommendation from the probation office of six months 24 25 incarceration, one year of supervised release, and a \$9,500

fine.

Mr. Walters, your recommendation is above the government's recommended 90-day period of incarceration. Do you want to address why the probation office has made that recommendation?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, I'd be happy to.

As outlined in the recommendation, I considered

Defendant Gold's conduct on January 6th. I think that is

fairly apparent there, regarding what she actually did while

in the Capitol with the bullhorn making a speech. She had

to be asked several times by officers, law enforcement

officers that were present, and ultimately they had to guide

her out.

I considered other defendants that have been before Your Honor as well as other cases that I've been involved in. In many instances the defendants trespassed. They entered the Capitol. They took pictures even while -- even in the Rotunda area. They may not have gone further. They took pictures, and they left.

It's my view that Defendant Gold did more than that. She helped add to the chaos of that day with her speech, with her bullhorn, you know, adding to -- you know, kind of promoting what was happening.

There was an instance during the presentence investigation -- during the interview it was explained to Ms. Gold that a home assessment had to be conducted. She provided an address. Florida probation was contacted. When they went to that address, it was discovered that it was a UPS store. It wasn't a legitimate address.

I subsequently called counsel, called Ms. West, and she knew that the defendant had provided a false address. She had, you know, realized it. And ultimately they later provided the proper address, but it went to just kind of the nature of how Ms. Gold or Defendant Gold is taking these charges, taking the seriousness of this offense.

I think on the website, the America's Frontline

Doctors website, I think Your Honor's aware that there is a

fundraising campaign. There's language in that campaign

that could be construed as not accepting responsibility.

The probation office considered denying acceptance of responsibility based on the language on the website that's been used to raise over \$430,000 for legal fees, but instead of denying acceptance of responsibility, I think a top of the guidelines sentence would be more appropriate.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ayers-Perez, would you

```
1
       like to first address the sentencing factors.
2
                 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
                 MS. WEST: Your Honor, will I have an opportunity
 4
       to --
 5
                 THE COURT: You will, Ms. West.
 6
                 MS. WEST: Thank you.
 7
                 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Your Honor, would you like me to
 8
       go to --
 9
                 THE COURT: Yes, please come to the podium.
                                                               Thank
10
       you.
11
                 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
12
                 In looking at this case, I agree with the
13
       probation officer that there has been a lack of acceptance
14
       of responsibility. In looking at the sentencing factors,
15
       Your Honor, the thing we're most concerned about under 3553
16
       is deterrence.
                 The defendant has not shown remorse. She has not
17
18
       accepted responsibility for her conduct in an appropriate
       manner that has remained consistent over time. She has
19
20
       continued to minimize and diminish her responsibility and
21
       her criminal conduct throughout this, and with Your Honor's
22
       permission, I'll go through the factors and the facts of
23
       this case and what is most concerning to the government,
24
       Your Honor.
25
                 THE COURT: Very well.
```

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: So when Defendant Gold and her Co-Defendant, Strand, first are shown on video at the Capitol, it is outside the East Rotunda doors on the east side of the Capitol. There is a giant mob at that point outside the Capitol and very few Capitol Police officers to guard that door. Strand and Gold are right at the front of that mob, and there is one police officer in particular who you see -- and this is on Government's Exhibit 1, and with the Court's permission I will play it for Your Honor.

You'll see this Capitol Police officer wedged against the door, the East Rotunda door, which has already had a window broken out. He is in distress. He is then pulled away from the door, pulled down to the ground, and Defendant Gold is standing right there when it happens. This is made even worse by the fact that she is a medical doctor. She does not stop. She does not help. Others in the mob helped this officer up, who is still in distress.

Defendant Gold and Defendant Strand used this as an opportunity to move further in the mob and closer to that East Rotunda door, and they are some of the first who get in through that East Rotunda door that the Capitol Police officers are still trying to maintain leverage over.

And with the Court's permission, I do have Government's 1 that I can show Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

1 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Your Honor, this is an open 2 source video taken by somebody else who was there at the 3 riot. (Video playing) 4 5 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: And I'm pausing the video at 6 time-stamp nine seconds. If you can see in the lower 7 right-hand corner, Your Honor, the top of that head is the U.S. Capitol Police officer who is going to be dragged down 8 9 right in front of Ms. Gold and Mr. Strand, and you can see 10 there in kind of the middle right-hand side that the window 11 of that East Rotunda door has already been smashed out at 12 that point but that a Capitol Police officer is still trying 13 to hold that door shut. 14 I'm starting it again right at nine seconds. 15 (Video playing) 16 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: And, Your Honor, I'm pausing it 17 at 16 seconds. And there in the left-hand corner, that is the head of Ms. Gold. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Before you move on, what real 20 time was this taken? 21 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Your Honor, it was right around 22 2:27 p.m., because they actually entered the East Rotunda 23 doors right at 2:27 p.m. So this is within --24 THE COURT: So that was about 12 minutes or so 25 after the first breach?

1 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Right. And the first breach 2 occurred on the west side of the Capitol, so this is the 3 east side where the breach occurred later. THE COURT: And this is the first wave of people 4 5 through the East Rotunda doors? 6 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: That is correct, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. MS. AYERS-PEREZ: I'm starting it again at 16 8 9 seconds. 10 (Video playing) MR. AYERS-PEREZ: And I'm pausing it at 21 11 12 And that is Defendant Gold and Defendant -- I seconds. 13 apologize -- Defendant Strand next to her in the sunglasses, 14 and the U.S. Capitol Police officer has now been dragged to 15 the ground in the mob. He's clearly in distress, and he's 16 in a very dangerous situation for himself right now. 17 (Video playing) 18 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: I'm pausing it at 27 seconds. 19 And, Your Honor, I see about half a dozen people here who 20 have now bent down to help this Capitol Police officer to 21 his feet and hopefully get him out of this situation. 22 Defendant Gold is right off screen. Defendant 23 Strand is right off screen. They do not help the officer. 24 They do not administer any sort of medical care. 25 THE COURT: So according to the defense memo, she

1 doesn't recall having seen the officer. Is that plausible? MS. AYERS-PEREZ: I don't see how that's 2 3 plausible, Your Honor. It happens right in front of her, 4 and, as I continue, I will show you that she is going to 5 appear again against the wall and is using this opportunity 6 to move forward into the mob where that officer had been 7 standing prior to being pulled down. Your Honor, I will play again starting at 27 8 9 seconds. 10 (Video playing) 11 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: I paused it at 40 seconds. I'm 12 playing it again, Your Honor. 13 (Video playing) 14 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: If you see right here in the 15 bottom right-hand side, that's now Defendant Strand and 16 Defendant Gold. They have moved closer to the East Rotunda 17 doors, and they're now standing where that officer had been 18 standing prior to that officer being pulled down into that 19 mob. 20 And I'm starting again at 43 seconds, Your Honor. 21 (Video playing) 22 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: And I'm pausing it at the 1:19 23 mark, Your Honor. And by now Strand and Gold have already 24 entered through the doors. They come in right at the two

minute and 27 -- or 2:27 p.m., Your Honor, and they're some

25

of the first ones through those doors into the East Rotunda.

The path they take from there, Your Honor, is very interesting. In Gold's sentencing memo, she says she is there to make a speech. Indeed, she was scheduled to make a speech that day and had not done so at that point. Her speech had been cancelled. But instead of immediately giving a speech, Gold and Strand make an almost beeline to the House Chamber.

They walk straight through the Rotunda. They don't stop. They don't look around.

They walk through Statuary Hall. They don't stop. They don't look around.

At about 64 seconds they're part of a group that is being stopped by U.S. Capitol Police near the House Chamber. They stay there for about a minute. They walk away for about a minute and a half. They come back.

They're now at the back left-hand side of that group.

They move to the right side, and they keep inching forward closer and closer to where U.S. Capitol Police are trying to stop them from getting towards the House Chamber and where congressmen are still in the House Chamber at that moment in time, Your Honor. They are there for approximately five minutes and 35 seconds before that group, which they are near the front of, breaks through the U.S. Capitol Police officers.

For the next 18 minutes, they are over by the House Chamber. We don't have surveillance video of them. We just have surveillance video 18 minutes afterwards when they come back through that area where they had originally gone past U.S. Capitol Police. We know that that scene was very chaotic, very dangerous, and it is one of the most recognizable moments from these U.S. Capitol riots.

It is only afterwards, after they've spent the majority of their time in the Capitol, that Gold proceeds to make her speech. She stops in Statuary Hall where U.S.

Capitol Police are trying to clear Statuary Hall and have an area that is clear, and she proceeds to give a speech with her Co-Defendant Strand recording her. There are up to six Capitol Police officers who are telling her to stop, and she continues to give her speech.

Her speech lasts for two minutes and two seconds, Your Honor, and then she walks into the Rotunda directly next to Statuary Hall, and she and Strand look around for a bit. Strand directs her where to go, and then she stands on a statue of Dwight D. Eisenhower. She gets a bullhorn from an unknown subject, and she proceeds to give another speech. This one is four minutes and 57 seconds in length, and a crowd gathers under her to watch this speech.

The Rotunda has a number of people inside of it at this point, and she's gathering a group of people around her

as she rallies the crowd up with her conversations about COVID and vaccine mandates. This is the picture that is seen widely in the days and weeks after the Capitol riots of Simone Gold standing on a statue in the Rotunda with a bullhorn giving a speech to fellow rioters.

In total, of the 48 minutes and 36 seconds that Simone Gold spends inside the Capitol, she only spends six minutes and 59 seconds of that giving a speech. But she spends 23 minutes and 28 seconds of that over by the House Chamber where congressmen were attempting to go through the transfer of -- the peaceful transfer of power in counting the Electoral College votes.

So it certainly is confusing to say that she is here to give a speech when that is not what she spent her time inside the Capitol doing. Her time was spent with a mob outside that House Chamber, and on her way out she gave two speeches.

What is also extremely concerning is her

Washington Post interview she gives in the days after the

Capitol riot.

THE COURT: Before we get there.

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any evidence that she went into any otherwise private parts of the Capitol or parts that were not public or would not have been public on any other day?

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: No. She took the path of East Rotunda doors through the Rotunda, through Statuary Hall, to the House Chamber, and she went back in the exact same pattern.

THE COURT: Okay. So not in the chamber, not in anyone's offices, not in any other sensitive or private areas?

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Not that we know of, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay.

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: She did exit through the same East Rotunda doors that she had entered through.

And then, in the days afterwards, she gave an interview to the Washington Post where she said, "I can certainly speak to the place that I was, and it most emphatically was not a riot. Where I was was incredibly peaceful." And that is in direct contrast to what we see in Government's Exhibit 1, Your Honor.

experience. He was pulled down into a mob. There is -there are police officers trying to block this door that
Simone Gold and John Strand managed to make their way
through. It is not a peaceful event, and any attempt to
diminish and minimize her conduct by calling it that is not
remorseful and is not taking responsibility for what she
did.

She also said she followed a crowd inside and assumed it was legal to do so. And, Your Honor, looking at Government's Exhibit No. 1 it is difficult to see how Simone Gold would think it would be legal to do what she did on that day. There's a mob of people. There are police officers trying to stop them from getting inside, trying to stop them from assaulting them and hurting them, and she is part of that mob.

She's near the front of that mob, which is another continuing course of conduct with Simone Gold, is that she's not just a part of it, she manages to make her way to the front, to be in the front, to be one of the first people inside the East Rotunda doors, to be one of the first people to get past U.S. Capitol Police outside the House Chamber. And even if she doesn't start in the front, she makes her way up there with John Strand.

The other thing she said in that Washington Post interview is that she was only inside for 20 minutes. We know she was inside for 48 minutes and 36 seconds, more than double the time that she said during this interview which she's claiming is her example of being remorseful, but it's actually just a continuing course of conduct with Ms. Gold where she continues to diminish and minimize her conduct on this day, her criminal conduct on this day.

And then we have her America's Frontline Doctors

website. Simone Gold is the CEO and founder of America's Frontline Doctors from before January 6th, but in the days since then she has been using her website to fundraise based upon her conduct on January 6th. She does it under the guise of a legal defense, although as of June 15th, just yesterday, at 2:58 p.m. Eastern Time she had raised over \$433,000, Your Honor.

And she does include a notation on there that the overage fees would go to America's Frontline Doctors. She includes the message in there that this -- this prosecution, the reason we're all here today -- is political persecution of a law-abiding emergency physician designed to threaten and intimidate any American who dares to exercise their First Amendment rights.

Simone Gold did not have the First Amendment right to go inside the Capitol the way she did and to do what she did that day, and she still does not understand that, Your Honor.

All of her talk about remorse is not shown in her actual actions: in her interview with the Washington Post, in the information they put up on America's Frontline

Doctors website, in her fundraising and making money off of her criminal actions. And because of that, she needs to reach deterrence, Your Honor, and deterrence for Ms. Gold is coming in the form of incarceration, not probation or home

confinement.

So, Your Honor, we are asking for 90 days incarceration. We're asking for one year of supervised release when she gets off this. We do feel she needs to continue to be monitored afterwards, and her conduct and her behavior -- as you've heard from the probation officer or the Pretrial Services officer, they're already having issues with her. I expect that those would continue. I see no reason why they wouldn't. 60 hours of community service and, of course, the \$500 in restitution for her part in being part of the mob that damaged our Capitol building.

THE COURT: Okay. I handed down the letter from Ms. Wagner. Obviously there seems to be some dispute between at least the organization and -- I'm sorry,

Ms. Lawson. Does the government make anything of that or --

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Your Honor, if I could have Mr. Manning come up and address that?

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Thank you.

THE COURT: Should this play any role in the Court's determination today?

MR. MANNING: Thank you, Your Honor.

We view the letter that was submitted directly to the Court by Ms. Lawson as akin to the letters that the Court has already received from supporters of Ms. Gold; that

```
1
       is to say, Ms. Lawson is not a victim under the terms of the
2
       CVRA who has been directly proximately harmed by the conduct
 3
       at issue here, and so we did not see fit to include her
 4
       submission as part of the government's submission. But when
 5
       we had been contacted by her, and she said she had
 6
       information that she wanted to share in the Court's
 7
       consideration of Ms. Gold, we told her she could submit it
 8
       directly to the Court.
 9
                 THE COURT: Okay. Let me just say this on that
10
              There is obviously going to be another side of the
       topic.
11
       story, and so the Court is not in a position to make any
12
       factual findings regarding the allegations in the letter,
13
       and it will not play a role in the sentence that the Court
14
       arrives at today. Okay?
15
                 MR. MANNING: Thank you, Your Honor.
16
                 THE COURT: All right.
17
                 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Yes, Your Honor.
18
                 THE COURT: Anything else?
19
                 MS. AYERS-PEREZ: That would be it, Your Honor.
20
       We're just asking for that sentence.
21
                 THE COURT: Okay.
22
                 Ms. West.
23
                 MS. WEST: Mr. Young is going to argue first.
24
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Young.
25
                 MR. YOUNG: May I remove my mask?
```

THE COURT: You may. Please.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

Judge, thank you for the time that you have spent reviewing the submissions we have given you on behalf of Dr. Gold. It's sort of interesting -- and I have to compliment the government and April for all of the cooperation she has demonstrated to us throughout the case in terms of providing us discovery and cooperating in terms of discussions and the plea in the case. Obviously we're at a point now where we disagree in terms of the case, and what I'd ask the Court to do is look at the facts of the case -- all of the facts of the case -- because I think what drives the bus and what drives the decision of this Court should be the facts of this case.

So the statement of facts in this case, which we all agreed to and pled guilty to, indicated that the defendant entered the Capitol without permission and remained there after being instructed to leave, akin to a trespassing, and to that she pled guilty. And I submit to the Court the circumstances -- you have had many cases arising out of this incident, and you have seen many videos, and the west side of the Capitol looked like a war zone.

We've seen it on TV, the steps, the facades, all the things going on; people climbing the outside of the wall, people bashing windows in and entering the door.

Totally different scene on the east side of the Capitol. The east side of the Capitol faces the Supreme Court of the United States.

You look at the door that was just shown to you in Government's Exhibit No. 1. It's a big brass door. And the interesting thing about that door -- because the government gave us a tour of the facility and allowed us to know where the defendants were and where they entered -- is that door is dead-bolted in both the ceiling and the floor from the inside. That door can only be opened from the inside, and it can only be opened with a key from the inside.

And as you see in this particular video, albeit the window was broken, they would not have gained access.

Somebody had to have opened that door from the inside of the Capitol. And whether the police officer --

THE COURT: There are at least three or four police officers that are trying to keep people out of the doors, right?

MR. YOUNG: There's no suggestion --

THE COURT: You're not suggesting that Dr. Gold felt that she was invited in.

MR. YOUNG: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YOUNG: No, no, but I'm suggesting to you that the way she got in was to walk in through an open door. She

was not the person that committed any act of violence to gain access. She did not open the door. She did not break the window. She simply walked into the building.

And her purpose in being there was not to Stop the Steal. She was not a supporter of the Stop the Steal. She was not making a speech about the Stop the Steal. She was there to make a speech that she had been given a permit to make on The Ellipse which, for unexplained reasons, was cancelled, and the staff told her to go to the Capitol to make the speech, which she did.

THE COURT: Let's stop there. I read that in your memo. Are you taking the position that she thought, based on what she heard from her staff, whoever her staff is, that she was permitted to go in and make the speech?

MR. YOUNG: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YOUNG: No.

I mean, these are -- Judge, we pled guilty because she is guilty. What she did going into the building is a crime, and she pled guilty to that and expressed responsibility for it and accepted a statement of facts.

THE COURT: But by saying that someone else told her to go make the speech, that suggests, at least, that she's not taking full responsibility for it.

MR. YOUNG: No, no, no, I think that's a

circumstance or a fact that you can consider.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. YOUNG: That's all.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, okay. Okay.

So -- and the reason I say that, Judge, is because we're before this Court today in the midst of the latest congressional inquiry into the incident surrounding January 6th, and Neal Katyal had written a letter to the New York Times recently in this week, which I think is very much applicable to this case and all of these cases, that indicates that the Congress is involved in a very complex dance to determine accountability with the Department of Justice, with the United States -- the public in the United States, and with history to determine accountability.

And we're in that same dance today to determine accountability, and I would submit to the Court that what guides us in this case are the facts of the case.

So the facts of the case are that the defendant has pled guilty to trespassing in the Capitol. She's accepted responsibility for doing that. The circumstances that the government indicated to measure -- pardon me if I step back and get my notes.

Aside from all the 2553 [sic] factors, on Page 16

of the government's memorandum, they had a spectrum that they had developed to determine aggravating and mitigating circumstances, which I thought was well done, and I think I'd like to address them, as the government did, and sort of answer at least our perception.

One, whether, when, and how the defendant entered the Capitol. She entered the Capitol through the east wing door. She didn't breach the door. She didn't hurt anybody. She didn't incite any violence. She didn't do any destruction. She was there with a crowd of unruly people and went through the door. And it was wrong to do it, and it was a crime, and she's pled guilty to that.

Two, whether the defendant encouraged any violence. The answer to that question has to be no. She didn't incite anybody. She didn't incite anybody in the crowd. Her speech was not about the Stop the Steal. It was the masking mandates and about the vaccination mandates and such, which were of concern to her and the organization for whom she works.

Three, did the defendant engage in property destruction? The answer to that is no.

Four, the defendant's reaction to acts of violence or destruction. There's nothing -- there's no reaction one way or the other. She was never interviewed. She was obligated by the terms of her plea agreement to be debriefed

by the government prior to the sentencing today, and I think, if she had been asked, she would tell you today that she was shocked to see people hurt and shocked to see people damaged and shocked to see what was going on inside the Capitol.

Five, whether during or after the riot the defendant destroyed any evidence. The answer to that question is no, she did not. In fact, when arrested by the police, she voluntarily gave up her computers, her cell phones, her password-protected information and cooperated in terms of the surrender of that.

Defendant's statements in person to a social media. The evidence before the Court is there are no statements post the incident arrest. The statement on the website is a dated statement that I believe happened shortly after her arrest.

If the Court recalls, I think we made statements to the Court at the time of her bond being set that she was arrested by the 20 police in her home in California with long guns. She's a person who has no prior criminal record. She was shocked and essentially so traumatized that she moved out of California and has moved out of that neighborhood and has relocated to Florida to continue Frontline Doctors.

THE COURT: So you talk about her statements and

her statement to the *Post* and to -- otherwise. She's

America's Frontline Doctors, right? So when they issue a

statement, she -- I can assume that she has seen and

consented to --

MR. YOUNG: Correct.

THE COURT: -- and authorized those statements.

MR. YOUNG: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YOUNG: But I think that the statement that the government was referring to was a statement that happened long before she entered a plea of guilty in this case and is a historical statement that nobody went back and changed, and the circumstances of that statement are, in fact, accurate.

I mean, she was arrested by 20 armed police officers for an offense in her home, taken -- handcuffed, taken to prison in front of her neighbors. That, to somebody who has never been in any trouble before and has no criminal record, is a traumatizing event. So what she put in there at least at that point in time was accurate.

Certainly, since the passage of time and after her plea of guilty, it would have been smart to go back and maybe redact that and take that out of the website and take that -- but that's not her -- that was not her thinking at the time of her plea before Your Honor where she accepted

the statement of facts and pled guilty to trespassing.

Whether the defendant cooperated with or ignored commands from law enforcement officials. You know, that's not a statement of just what happened on January 6th.

That's a statement of what's happened with her from her involvement with law enforcement officials up and including the present. And when accosted by the police, she cooperated.

She did leave the Capitol. She indicated that she was in the Capitol and was not familiar with where she was. She was trying to make a speech to people that were there about something that was important to her, these mask mandates. So I think she was looking to make a speech to people, not to make a speech in an empty room, and she was looking around the Capitol to find other people.

think it's important that the Court consider that she admitted to the Washington Post her involvement prior to being charged in this case and indicated that she regretted being in the building, unlike many other people who on social media and when interviewed didn't regret that and considered themselves to be a patriot and considered themselves emboldened by this whole matter.

THE COURT: All right. What the article actually says -- and who knows what she told the reporter, but what

the article says is that she was worried that the photos of her inside the Capitol would distract from her advocacy work, and for that reason, she says, I do regret being there. That's different than regretting being there because of what happened, assuming that this is accurately reported.

MR. YOUNG: That was not the impression that I got from her in terms of why she regretted being there.

THE COURT: I'm just going by what it says in the article.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Okay.

So I would submit to the Court, in looking at the facts of this case, that her role in this offense was minor. She was not an instigator. She was not a member of any organization. She was there to make a speech about something totally unrelated to what was actually going on in the Capitol, the certification of the election. She entered the east side of the Capitol and should be punished based upon her individual conduct.

And I agree with the government that that's their suggestion. That's my suggestion. That's the Court's obligation. But I would submit to the Court there's no evidence in this case of any extreme entry into this place. There's no suggestion — although there is a suggestion in the government's memorandum that she crossed barriers and she heard the mobs and there's an extreme entering, it's not

in the statement of facts. And with the exception of seeing the broken window and the officer being pulled down by somebody other than her at the east side of the Capitol, she simply walked through the door.

extensive fighting and chemical irritants in the air and other stuff depending upon the timing and where she approached from. I don't think that's something that should be considered if that, in fact, hasn't been stipulated to in the statement of facts or proven by some other evidence or suggestion. What might have been observed is entirely speculation, and to punish somebody on the basis of speculation would be wrong.

The government does, in these factors, indicate what they consider aggravating and mitigating circumstances, and violence is a big component of that. They list violence as a component to that but then suggest that the absence of violence is not a mitigating factor.

I mean, I think it cuts both ways. I think if you're in a riotous situation such as this and people are infected by this group mentality, and she is not and is peacefully assembling and talking to people about what her Frontline Doctors is about, the absence of her violence is a factor -- I think a serious mitigating factor -- for the Court to consider.

about, I hadn't intended on saying anything other than what was in our written submission but feel compelled to say something about it. We are retained by Dr. Gold, and we have been paid by Dr. Gold personally from her funds. We have received no funds from this organization. We have received no funds from what was raised for her legal defense fund. She has taken that entirely out of her pocket, and the combined expenses for this case are nowhere near that.

I mean, without getting into a specific number, I just don't want the Court or anybody to think that she has paid that kind of money in this case.

THE COURT: So the excess has gone to the organization.

MR. YOUNG: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YOUNG: Correct.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. YOUNG: As far as I know, the entirety of that money has gone to the organization to pay their expenses, and one of the expenses is the salary that she gets from that. But, I mean, the suggestion in the government's memo is how could you pay somebody hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees for a case we haven't had to file motions on, and we pled, and it was a relatively

straightforward case? We didn't charge that, anywhere near that.

So in looking at the case, Judge, the 18-minute video that you've seen demonstrates who she is and where she's come from. It's pretty impressive to see not only her but her family structure and her inspiration in life being her father, who is a survivor of the Holocaust, who was a physician himself, who encouraged his children to give and to be healers and to be physicians. And both she and other members of her family are all in that role so it's -- she comes from a very, very accomplished background.

As the Court knows from the background in the presentence investigation, she is a well-educated person having gone to Stanford Law School, having completed medical school. She's licensed. She's a mother of two children. You know, there's a lot of positive things for her in terms of what she has done with her life for the first 50 years. And the people who are associated with her, the testimonials from the physicians with whom she's worked for many years out in California, speak accolades of who she is in terms of a person, a doctor; wouldn't hurt a fly.

And so these are all facts on the train that we're riding today, and what concerned us is, you know, the circumstances of how she's arrested in California. And as the Court might recall throughout the course of this case,

there were problems that we were addressing to the Court about her inability to fly.

Her business is making speeches for whom Frontline Doctors required her to fly from place to place, and immediately she was on a no-fly list with Homeland Security, and we couldn't find out why. And what we filed with the Court under seal demonstrated why she couldn't fly is the FBI certified to Homeland Security that she was charged with treason, which is a much more serious offense than the charge of trespassing.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I just want to make sure the record's clear.

What I recall being filed was a letter from a Florida medical board of some -- which indicated that she was -- had pled guilty to a statute that they labeled as treason. Is that what you're referring to, or are you referring to something else?

MR. YOUNG: I thought that the letter -- co-counsel can bring it up. The statute reference was accurate, but the word "treason" was not.

THE COURT: But that came from a clerk at a medical board of some sort in Florida.

MS. WEST: I'll address that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. WEST: My understanding, Your Honor, is that

1 there was a communication between the FBI, and the FBI from Washington, D.C. is actually here -- from the FBI in 2 3 Washington, D.C., to the FBI in Florida that she had been charged with treason, and that's how that got to the Florida 4 5 medical board. 6 That's my understanding. That's what I'm told. 7 THE COURT: Well, obviously the statute referenced It's obstruction of a proceeding, correct? 8 is not treason. 9 MS. WEST: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 11 MR. YOUNG: But as a result of that allegation, actions were commenced against her in California and in 12 13 Florida concerning her continued ability to practice 14 medicine. So, I mean, that was obviously a mistake, to 15 include the word "treason." 16 THE COURT: Has she lost any medical license or 17 any other professional license as a result of her involvement in this case? 18 19 MR. YOUNG: No, but those actions are pending, to 20 suspend her or sanction her. So that's not over with, and I 21 would think that they're waiting to see what the outcome of 22 this proceeding is to make a determination. 23 You know, I might suggest, too --24 THE COURT: I'm sorry, out of curiosity, is a 25 misdemeanor conviction a grounds to rescind anyone's medical

1 license anywhere in the country? MR. YOUNG: I don't believe it is. 2 3 THE COURT: If it doesn't involve patient care? MR. YOUNG: Well, we were party to conversations 4 5 with Dr. Gold's counsel that represents her in these 6 proceedings, and he was extremely concerned that the record 7 in this case not include anything about treason because that is -- my understanding --8 9 THE COURT: Well, the statute number speaks for 10 itself. The statement of facts speaks for itself regardless of what label you put on the statute. I don't think anyone 11 12 could reasonably suggest -- certainly the government doesn't 13 suggest that Ms. Gold has pled quilty to anything 14 approaching treason, okay? 15 MR. YOUNG: But the actions as a result of those 16 allegations are pending against her. THE COURT: Those bodies will now have the benefit 17 18 of the transcript of this proceeding. 19 MR. YOUNG: Okay. And at least for the last year 20 and a half she's not been able to fly because she's been on 21 a no-fly list as a result of her involvement in this case, 22 which ended up being a misdemeanor that should not disenfranchise --23 THE COURT: How did she get here? 24 25 MR. YOUNG: She drove, and -- she drove into

Alexandria two days ago and is staying at a hotel. So, you know, those are consequences that befell her in this case.

And, you know, at the end of the day, Judge, you have a 50-year-old woman on the date of this offense who is dressed as a civilian. She's in street clothes. She enters a building. She's unarmed. She's in the building. She does not yell at anyone outside the building or inside the building. She does no acts of violence there, does not condone any acts of violence, does not condone any destruction of property. She's simply just there.

And her message is something that has offended a lot of people, and I would -- and without getting into the pros or the cons of any particular message, I would say that, you know, after the last year and a half the country is divided probably close to 50/50 on this message of -- we have U.S. senators, we have congressmen, we have governors of many states opposing mask mandates, opposing mandatory vaccinations.

So the facts of this case are really not disputed. She did not belong where she was, and she should have left sooner than she did. She indicated that she couldn't get out of the building because people were continuing to pour into the building when she was in the Rotunda. She did want to make the speech. She was prevented from making the speech and didn't make the speech.

And I believe, consistent with the submissions that we made to the Court, she's an appropriate candidate for being punished by time served. She has endured a great deal of self-inflicted humiliation by her conduct over the last year and a half. She's been under restraint for the last year and a half and, with the exception of the minor incident involving visiting her mother, has been compliant with all terms of pretrial conditions and supervision. She is certainly a person who, prior to her involvement in this, according to the video that we submitted, has been involved in a lifetime of community service in different hospitals in the inner city. She's got real value that she can give to the community with community service.

So the question is is this the kind of person that needs to go to jail? Certainly the message to her has been received. The message to others in terms of deterrence, I would submit to the Court, is not going to be -- I mean, in my opinion, hopefully there's never another January 6th. There's certainly not going to be another Stanford graduate participating in this incident and perhaps not another doctor.

So I would ask the Court, consistent with our previous submissions in this case, to sentence her to time served, to sentence her to a portion of community service, to order her to pay restitution and consider a fine in the

1 case consistent with her ability to pay. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Very well. Do you or Ms. West want to address Mr. Walters's 3 comments regarding her cooperation with probation? 4 5 MR. YOUNG: Ms. West does. THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. MS. WEST: I'll be brief. I'll try, Your Honor. 8 9 I guess we'll start with what the Court is most 10 interested in. 11 I take serious -- serious -- umbrage with 12 Mr. Walters saying, quote, I called Ms. West, and she knew 13 the defendant had provided a false address, end quote. That 14 is patently false. Untrue. 15 Here's what happened. When I got the presentence 16 report, the draft, as I do with every defendant I have, 17 every client, I Google the address, and I saw that it was not a home. And this is a critical fact because less than 18 two months before Dr. Gold had moved from California to 19 I don't even know if Dr. Gold knew at that time 20 Florida. 21 what her address was, but... 22 THE COURT: What is the address she gave? 23 MS. WEST: She gave an address to a UPS store. 24 THE COURT: Where? 25 MS. WEST: In the same city where she resides

```
1
       currently.
                 THE COURT: In Florida?
2
                 MS. WEST: Yes, sir.
 3
                 THE COURT: Well --
 4
 5
                 MS. WEST: That's wrong. She shouldn't have done
 6
       that.
 7
                 So Mr. Walters called me and said, "Hey, I just
       sent somebody over to a UPS store. What's going on with
 8
 9
      your client?" I think that's a valid question.
10
                 And I said, you know, I know that that's wrong.
      don't remember if I told him I Googled it and that's how I
11
12
      knew it. But Dr. Gold didn't tell me that she gave a UPS
13
       address or else I would have said, "You can't do that,
14
      Dr. Gold. You have to give a real address."
15
                 So I called her immediately. I said --
16
                 THE COURT: Putting your role out of it.
17
                 MS. WEST: Yes, all right.
18
                 THE COURT: She provided an incorrect address to
19
      probation.
20
                 MS. WEST: She did.
                 THE COURT: Okay. That's all I need to know.
21
22
                 MS. WEST: And as soon as I explained to her, she
23
       corrected that. And I think it's important for the Court to
24
       know that Dr. Gold has been threatened with physical harm,
25
       travels with a bodyguard, and that is why she gave that
```

address. And as soon as I told her that it would only be given to the Court and to the probation officer and her defense team did she feel that she could give me the -- and I took this so seriously, Your Honor, I personally visited that home myself in Florida to make sure that this was corrected.

So with regard to this issue, the probation officer, on ECF 65, filed his recommendation to the Court, which didn't mention this at all, so it came up today for the first time as far as that goes.

You asked a very important question, Your Honor, to Mr. Young, when the government played their Exhibit No.

1, that she didn't see the officer. You asked, "Is this plausible?" A good question. I think, when you look at the videotape in conjunction with her Washington Post interview, which it was five days after that event, she said that she at that time had not seen any violence, and that is completely in line with what she told the Washington Post.

THE COURT: Well, she said, "It was most emphatically not a riot. Where I was, it was incredibly peaceful." Would you describe that scene that we just saw in Exhibit 1 as incredibly peaceful?

Also, it shows that -- I should state --

MS. WEST: I'd describe it as just the opposite, Your Honor. I agree.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. WEST: There were other areas when Dr. Gold went into the Capitol and on the Capitol grounds that were incredibly peaceful. And I think what's important for the Court is the government's lack of compelling evidence about what Dr. Gold actually did in this case is exemplified by the fact that she spent valuable time talking about Dr. Gold not helping the officer up and, as the government has already described, is already receiving help from a number of people within a two-second time frame. And I think, as I said in the memo, it would be physically impossible for her to do that.

Finally, Your Honor, the Court has stated already that the letter from Kristina Lawson, quote, should not play a role with the Court, and you won't make any factual findings with regard to this, and it won't play a role.

But then the Court asked -- and is quite right -whether a medical board can take somebody's license away
from them about something that doesn't have to do with
patient care, and it's really important, I think, as far as
punishment in this case, for the Court to know that Kristina
Lawson is the head of the California Medical Board and is
sponsored in legislation which is currently pending in
California simply for that reason, to take someone's medical
license away from them. Dr. Gold is the subject. She's

been mentioned on the floor of the legislature in California as the reason for this law that they're going to pass.

I haven't seen a draft of that law, but it's important for the Court to know that that is exactly what's happening. Not only are they trying to take her license away from her in California -- and I think Mr. Young said, that's what the \$430,000 fees may go to -- but they're also going to -- you know, the transmittal from California, Washington, D.C., to Florida to keep her from getting a medical license there.

So she has to, after her criminal case --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, but those proceedings have to do with the advice that she is giving patients and potential patients and the general public. Those proceedings have nothing to do with the effect of this misdemeanor charge on her license. You're not telling me that, right?

MS. WEST: From what I understand, this misdemeanor, as the Court aptly says, criminal proceeding is playing a role in what's happening in California, with them trying to take her license.

And so I would like -- since the Court has -- although you're not going to consider this, I would like to make this letter from Kristina Lawson a part of the record as an exhibit for identification.

THE COURT: This was submitted to the Court. I've allowed -- because it was given to me and there was a possibility that I might consider it, out of fairness I've given it to both sides, but it's not a part of the sentencing record, okay, except to the extent that we have discussed it today.

MS. WEST: So we'll get a copy of it? I didn't want to take the Court's only copy.

THE COURT: I'd ask for it back actually.

MS. WEST: Yes. May I approach the clerk, Your

THE COURT: Yes.

Honor?

MS. WEST: I guess my point is, Your Honor, after today and the Court's punishment in this case, it's not going to be over no matter what you give Dr. Gold.

In our sentencing memorandum, Mr. Young and I have -- I mean, this Court has several of these cases. I have several of these cases. And I pointed out specifically cases that, of course, are yours: Jennifer Ryan, Scirica, and Gracyn Courtright. You know those cases better than I do, and I have total confidence in this Court that you will consider the punishments that you gave in a case -- I guess the one that's I think closest would be Anthony Scirica where you gave him 15 days.

There the defendant was not remorseful. That's

not the case here. But he was close to the chamber, and Dr. Gold was close to the chamber. He chanted "USA" at police; she did not. He directed the crowd inside the Capitol; she did not. But she was, you know, communicating with the crowd so -- and he also took photos and video of himself, and her co-defendant did. So I felt like that case was more in line with what you had previously seen.

Ms. Courtright, she was a real problem. You gave her 30 days. She went onto the Senate floor. How she got a misdemeanor is beyond me because every case where I have or any case that a client went onto the Senate floor they're charged with a felony. She stole a sign, and she returned it only because an officer ordered her to, and she chanted at a line of police officers: "Whose house? Our house."

And what's really unique about Dr. Gold is she didn't do any -- she was giving a speech, but she didn't chant the horrible things that were chanted that day; and not only that, she didn't post anything or describe anything that happened in the Capitol that day. She's the only client I have that didn't post anything.

So in that sense, Your Honor, I believe that a sentence, as Mr. Young said, of time served is an appropriate punishment considering what her actions were in this case and what's coming for her.

THE COURT: Very well. Thank you.

MS. WEST: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, this is

Officer Walters with the probation office. Can I have a
quick moment to respond?

THE COURT: Of course.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: I wanted to make sure the timeline was clear. The presentence investigation -- the presentence interview in which the address was -- the initial address was given was held on April the 12th. When I spoke to Ms. West regarding the wrong address, it was on April 22nd. She had advised that she had just visited Ms. Gold over Easter weekend.

As soon as I called Ms. West, you know, the first thing she said was, "I know why you're calling me." She acknowledged that it was a wrong address. So on April 22nd is when I received an email from Ms. Gold apologizing and providing the proper address.

Contrary to what Ms. West said, as noted on the face page of the presentence report, the draft presentence report was not disclosed until May 12th. So it was not the draft presentence report being disclosed and counsel realizing that the address was wrong. Counsel had gone to Florida, had been to the proper address. It wasn't until I reached out and said this address is wrong that they took it — that they provided the new address.

1 So that is why I said counsel knew the address was incorrect, and it wasn't until I prompted them that I was 2 provided the proper address. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 5 MS. WEST: I don't disagree with that at all. THE COURT: Counsel -- okay. Fine. 6 7 Dr. Gold, I've reviewed your video statements. Ιs 8 there anything that you would like to add before I impose 9 your sentence? And if so, step up to the podium. 10 THE DEFENDANT: May I remove my mask? 11 THE COURT: You may. 12 I kind of just wanted to speak THE DEFENDANT: 13 spontaneous so I'm not really reading from prepared remarks. 14 THE COURT: Just talk to me. 15 THE DEFENDANT: I'm shocked that the government 16 thinks I'm not remorseful. I did everything within my 17 power, as I perceived it, to show that I regretted being 18 inside the Capitol. I gave a single interview. I said I 19 deeply regretted being there, meaning inside the Capitol, 20 and since then I was silent. I don't know what they base 21 their assertion that I'm not remorseful on. I thought I 22 showed the Court great respect by being silent. I felt that 23 was the most I could do. 24 I'd like to just take a moment, though, to say who

I am because we've heard a lot about people thinking who I

25

am.

I try to do my best to help people in every situation. That's to the best of my ability.

I became an emergency doctor, and I'm grateful because it means I can help people in a variety of situations. I'm Jewish, and I was raised by a Holocaust survivor who impressed upon me the Jewish law pikuach nefesh, which is to save a life is the most honorable thing I can do with my life.

I'm a mom, which has taught me an even deeper commitment to humanity, that the only thing that really matters is love and being good to people.

But I've certainly learned that I'm imperfect. I did not intend to become involved in a situation that is so destructive to our nation. It's the opposite of who I am.

I was there, as I always am, trying to do my best. I will always try to help others. Sometimes I don't succeed due to my own imperfections.

If I could just say, people have wondered why I was at the front. I was at the front because I was supposed to give a speech that was cancelled, and then I was trying to give the speech. This is all I was there for.

It could have -- it was misguided. I should not have entered. Obvious. And as Ms. West has pointed out, the punishments will chase me forever. My reputation has

been utterly shredded. What do I have, if not my reputation?

I've been called violent. I've been called violent. And I ask you for leniency I think mostly based upon the fact that everything I did on January 6th, misguided or not, was consistent with all of my efforts to try to do my best to help people. I've spent my entire career working in very impoverished states.

And I say that just as a continuation of I'm just trying my best, and I was imperfect. I made a mistake. I have consistently said so. I deeply regret going inside the Capitol.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Stay up there, please.

We obviously have hundreds of these cases. There have been over 800 defendants charged in our court. I certainly have my fair share. I haven't counted recently, but I have at least 30 defendants, probably more.

And each case is different. And Mr. Young is exactly right, that we -- or I -- fashion sentences based on the facts and circumstances of what happened that day and what has happened since. Okay? So I want you to know that I have considered all of the facts. I've read everything that's been submitted.

And this is not about what's going on on Capitol Hill. It's not about COVID. It ain't about mask mandates or vaccines or anything else, okay? It's about what happened that day and what's happened since with you individually. All right?

The Court starts always with the count of conviction and the sentencing guidelines, all right? You pled to a misdemeanor, as we've discussed, but you pled to the most serious of the misdemeanors that have been charged in this case.

That count has a maximum sentence of one year. It is in the nature of trespass, but it's more than just trespass. It's trespass into a restricted and secure building, okay? That's why it's a higher-level misdemeanor.

Your guidelines range, as we've said, is zero to six months, and you agreed in your plea that any sentence within that range would be a reasonable one, and I agree with that. My role is to decide where within that range is the most appropriate place to land.

Taking your conduct on January 6th, it is true, as Mr. Young has stressed, you were not a leader. You didn't assault anybody. You didn't steal anything. You didn't encourage anyone to commit violence. You didn't enter the Senate floor or any other areas that would have been restricted but for the lockdown and what was going on on

January 6th.

All of those factors place you on the lower end of the culpability spectrum considering all of the 850 cases that have been charged in this court, and part of that is reflected in the fact that you were offered and pled to a misdemeanor as opposed to a felony.

On the other hand, you were not simply a casual bystander like many of the other misdemeanant defendants that we see. It is obvious from the video that we watched today that you were part of an angry and aggressive, I would say, mob, crowd, of people intent on getting past law enforcement and entering the East Rotunda through those doors where the windows had been broken out and where, regardless of how the door got opened, the police were obviously trying to keep people out, unsuccessfully.

The Capitol Police officer there was pulled to the ground right in front of you. I find it implausible that you didn't see that, okay? And you used that as an opportunity to get into the building.

Given the chaos and the broken glass and the presence of the multiple police officers, it is obvious that you knew it was a very dangerous and potentially violent situation, yet you went in nonetheless.

Not only do we assess where folks went but how long they stayed. Ms. Courtright, who your counsel

mentioned, was in there for a very short period of time. Others were in for a very short period of time. I'm not sure we ever got an exact accounting, but it seems beyond dispute that it was at least 45 minutes, maybe up to an hour. And you remained, and you continued to give your speeches after multiple officers directed you to leave, which diverted them from doing more important things than dealing with you.

And that raises a point that I've mentioned in the past and that many of my colleagues mentioned in the past.

Even if you didn't assault anybody or destroy any property, every member of the crowd that breached the Capitol, at least those that were in or among the first wave and that weren't just lookie-loos, you know, an hour later, facilitated the ability of those who did engage in violence to do so because, as we know, there were not a lot of law enforcement there for whatever reason.

We talked a lot about acceptance of responsibility and your actions after January 6th. You've been given credit for that. You had a two-point reduction in your guidelines range because the government did not dispute that you accepted responsibility through your guilty plea and your factual admissions.

But sitting here today, I don't think that you have truly accepted responsibility, and I'll tell you why.

Most importantly, as Mr. Walters noted and Ms. Ayers-Perez noted, your organization has used your notoriety to raise money and garner support for you in connection with this sentencing and for its general operations by mischaracterizing what this proceeding is all about, and it's done so by telling your supporters that, quote, This is a political persecution of a law-abiding physician that is designed to threaten and intimidate any American who dares to exercise their First Amendment rights. And all of the letters that I've read and emails have repeated that exact sentiment. And let me just refer to a few.

This is from a gentleman in California. "Dr. Gold did nothing wrong that day except read her speech in regard to safe and effective treatments. She's being suppressed and censored."

"She has a right to speak. Americans have a right to hear her. The J6 witch hunt is still raging."

This is from -- I'm not sure where this supporter lives, but another supporter writes, "She merely exercised her rights as a concerned citizen."

Another, "Dr. Gold did nothing wrong in expressing her medical opinions. Our Constitution proves and provides the right to free speech."

"She is only guilty of having compassion and humanity."

"All she did was try to get the word out about preventing COVID."

"Dr. Gold did nothing wrong that day except reading her speech in regard to safe and effective treatments. She deserves the right to speak, and Americans deserve the right to hear her speak."

All of that may be true, all right, but that's not why we're here, all right, and your organization is leading people to the misimpression that this is a political prosecution or is about free speech. It ain't about free speech.

I mean, January 6th was about a lot of things, but it was not about the First Amendment, and it was certainly not about COVID treatments or vaccinations. And you have obviously found many platforms from which to share your views about those topics, all right? And you are free to do so so long as you don't violate any laws. And I may have views about that message, but those views are absolutely totally irrelevant to this proceeding.

The only reason you're here is where and when and how you chose to express your views, and I want to be very clear about that.

And I've read your statements, and I've heard you here today. I've heard a lot about the manner in which you were arrested, about how, again, this is a political

persecution, about how you've lost your job, about how you haven't been able to get on a flight. But what I haven't heard is anything about the five people who died that day, the four people who committed suicide because of the trauma that they suffered that day at the hands of the mob, or the members of Congress or the 20-year-old or 25-year-old congressional staffers who were behind some of those doors where chaos was breaking out all around them and not knowing whether they would be able to go home to their families and hearing a bullhorn outside contributing to that, all right? I haven't heard about that.

Now, you're obviously very bright. You're professionally accomplished. You clearly take great pride in that, as you rightfully should, but in some ways those factors cut against you because you should have known what you were doing. I think you did know what you were doing, and you're unlike many of the other defendants who I see who were misled and hoodwinked into coming to D.C. that day and have had to pay the price for that. I think you well knew what you were doing.

We've talked about -- and the messages that we've heard from your supporters based on the fundraising and the appeals that you've sent out, that's a matter of general deterrence, okay? People need to know that this is not acceptable, and that this is not what this proceeding is all

about.

As Ms. West said, I've had many of these cases. Every case is different. I do my best to try to slot in people where I think it is appropriate so as not to create disparities in sentencing, and I've done that in this case to the best of my ability.

So with that, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform

Act of 1984 and in consideration of the provisions of 18 USC

3553 as well as the advisory sentencing guidelines, it is
the judgment of the Court that you, Simone Gold, are hereby
committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term
of 60 days on Count 2. You are further sentenced to serve a

12-month term of supervised release as to Count 2. In
addition, you are ordered to pay a special assessment of \$25
in accordance with 18 USC 3013.

While on supervision, you shall abide by the following mandatory conditions as well as the standard conditions of supervision, which are imposed to establish the basic expectations for your conduct while on supervision. These conditions include you must not commit another local, federal, or state crime. You must not unlawfully possess 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

as determined by the Court.

You must make restitution in accordance with 18
USC 3663 or any other statute authorizing a sentence of
restitution. The restitution payment shall go to the
Architect of the Capitol. The Court determines that you do
not have the ability to pay interest and, therefore, waives
any interest or penalties that may accrue on that balance.

You're also ordered to pay a fine in the amount of \$9,500 as recommended by probation. The Court determines that you do not have the ability to pay interest and, therefore, waives interest or penalties.

And I will say that -- I've mentioned this in connection with acceptance of responsibility, but I find it unseemly that your organization is raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for its operations, including your salary, based on your participation in January 6th. I think that is a real disservice to the true victims of that day.

You shall also comply with the following special conditions.

You shall remove all firearms, destructive devices, or other dangerous weapons from areas over which you have access or control until the term of supervision expires. You must pay the financial penalty in accordance with the schedule of payments sheet on the judgment. You must also notify the Court of any changes in economic

circumstances that might affect the ability to pay this financial penalty.

Having assessed the defendant's ability to pay, payment of the total criminal monetary penalties is due as follows. Payment in equal monthly installments of \$915 over a period of 11 months. Payment during the term of supervised release will commence within 30 days after release from imprisonment.

You must provide the probation officer access to any requested financial information and authorize the release of any financial information. The probation office may share financial information with the U.S. Attorney's Office. You must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of your probation officer.

Restitution shall be made to the Clerk of the Court for the District Court for the District of Columbia for further disbursement to the Architect of the Capitol.

Financial obligations are immediately payable to the Clerk of the Court. Within 30 days of any change of address you shall notify the Clerk of Court of the change until such time as the financial obligation is paid in full.

The probation office shall release the presentence report to all appropriate agencies, including the probation office in the approved district of residence, in order to

1 execute the sentence of the Court. Treatment agencies shall 2 return the presentence report to the probation office upon 3 the defendant's completion or termination from any treatment. 4 5 Mr. Walters, you've recommended that I transfer 6 supervision to the Southern District of Florida; is that 7 correct? THE DEFENDANT: Middle. Middle. 8 9 MS. WEST: I think it's the middle, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Middle District of Florida. 11 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, she'll be 12 supervised there. I don't think I recommended the transfer 13 of jurisdiction. 14 THE COURT: That's correct. The Court will 15 transfer supervision to the Middle District of Florida --16 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: -- but will retain jurisdiction over 18 the case, so, Dr. Gold, if there are any violations of 19 supervised release noted by the probation office in Florida, 20 those will come to me, and we'll have to deal with them. 21 assume that there will not be any. 22 You have the right to appeal the sentence imposed 23 by the Court if the period of imprisonment is longer than 24 the statutory maximum or the sentence departs upward from

the applicable guidelines range. If you choose to appeal,

25

you must file any appeal within 14 days after the Court enters judgment.

You also have the right to challenge the conviction entered or sentence imposed if new and currently unavailable information becomes available to you or on a claim that you received ineffective assistance of counsel in entering a plea of guilty or in connection with this sentencing. If you are unable to afford the cost of an appeal, you must request permission from the Court to file an appeal without cost to you.

Any other objections for the record, Counsel?

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Ayers-Perez, would you like to move to dismiss the other charges in the indictment?

MS. AYERS-PEREZ: Yes. Pursuant to the plea agreement, the government would move to dismiss the remaining counts of the indictment.

THE COURT: So moved.

All right. Ms. Gold, good luck to you. As I said, any violations will come to me, but I don't expect that there will be, and if -- I sometimes schedule reentry hearings in this these matters, but I don't feel a need to do that in this case.

So good luck, and hopefully you can put this past you and get on with your life, okay?

1	MS. WEST: Your Honor, can we ask for self-
2	surrender in this case? I believe it wasn't opposed by the
3	probation office.
4	THE COURT: The defendant will be allowed to self-
5	surrender.
6	You will get notice from the Bureau of Prisons as
7	to a report date and as to a facility. For this short of a
8	sentence, BOP usually will contract with a local facility,
9	but I don't know whether that will be the case here or not.
10	MS. WEST: And can we ask that you make a
11	recommendation, then, if there is such a thing, for it to be
12	close to her home?
13	THE COURT: The Court will recommend that she be
14	placed in proximity to her home in what city is she in?
15	MS. WEST: Naples.
16	THE COURT: Naples, Florida.
17	All right. Unless there's anything else, we're
18	adjourned.
19	MS. WEST: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	(Whereupon the hearing was
21	concluded at 11:33 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	Dated this 18th day of June, 2022.
9	
10	/s/Lisa A. Moreira, RDR, CRR
11	Official Court Reporter United States Courthouse
12	Room 6718 333 Constitution Avenue, NW
13	Washington, DC 20001
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	