

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
**Chief Judge Philip A. Brimmer**

Criminal Case No. 20-cr-00152-PAB

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

1. JAYSON JEFFREY PENN,
2. MIKELL REEVE FRIES,
3. SCOTT JAMES BRADY,
4. ROGER BORN AUSTIN,
5. TIMOTHY R. MULRENIN,
6. WILLIAM VINCENT KANTOLA,
7. JIMMIE LEE LITTLE,
8. WILLIAM WADE LOVETTE,
9. GARY BRIAN ROBERTS, and
10. RICKIE PATTERSON BLAKE,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter comes before the Court on Mr. Blake's Motion for Discovery of Jury Selection Procedures [Docket No. 125], wherein defendant Rickie Patterson Blake seeks discovery of the Court's jury selection plan and any related COVID-19 juror excuse policies for both grand juries and petit juries. Mr. Blake states that the COVID-19 pandemic has affected distinctive groups differently. Docket No. 125 at 2.<sup>1</sup>

The grand jury returned an indictment in this case against four defendants, not

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Blake defines the phrase "COVID-19 pandemic" to refer to the time period from March 13, 2020 to the present. Docket No. 125 at 2 n.1.

including Mr. Blake, on June 2, 2020. Docket No. 1. The grand jury returned a superseding indictment on October 6, 2020, adding six defendants, including Mr. Blake. Docket No. 101. The grand jury that returned the indictment and the superseding indictment was selected in September 2019.

### **A. Legal Standard**

The Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution guarantee a criminal defendant a trial by a jury selected from a fair cross-section of the community. See *Taylor v. Louisiana*, 419 U.S. 522, 530 (1975). This guarantee has been extended to grand juries by the Jury Selection and Service Act (“JSSA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1867. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1867(f) provides, in pertinent part:

The contents of records or papers used by the jury commission or clerk in connection with the jury selection process shall not be disclosed, except . . . as may be necessary in the preparation or presentation of a motion under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section. . . . The parties in a case shall be allowed to inspect, reproduce, and copy such records or papers at all reasonable times during the preparation and pendency of such a motion.

In *Test v. United States*, 420 U.S. 28, 30 (1975), the Supreme Court held that “[t]his provision makes clear that a litigant has essentially an unqualified right to inspect jury lists. It grants access in order to aid parties in the ‘preparation’ of motions challenging jury-selection procedures. Indeed, without inspection, a party almost invariably would be unable to determine whether he has a potentially meritorious challenge.” However, § 1867(f), by its own terms, covers only records (1) “used by the jury commission or clerk in connection with the jury selection process” and (2) “necessary in the preparation or presentation of a motion” challenging compliance with the JSSA. 28 U.S.C. § 1867(f). See *United States v. Cerna*, 2009 WL 2998930, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 16,

2009) (“Disclosure under the Jury Selection and Services Act is only permitted in preparation of a claim under the Act”).

## **B. Discovery Requests**

Mr. Blake requests the following documents:

- (1) The Jury Plan for the District of Colorado currently in effect, if different from that available on the Court’s website, and a description of any changes that have been made in the selection of prospective jurors due to the COVID-19 pandemic, to the extent not otherwise stated in the Court’s Jury Trial Protocols;
- (2) Documents sufficient to show: (a) the race, religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, year of birth, zip code, income, and occupation of all grand juries empaneled in the District during the COVID-19 pandemic; (b) the race, religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, year of birth, zip code, income, and occupation of all grand jury members excused or deferred from participating in a grand jury after it was empaneled in the District; and (c) the race, religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, year of birth, zip code, income, and occupation of any grand jury members added after a grand jury was originally empaneled in the District;
- (3) The Juror Qualification Questionnaire distributed to potential grand or petit jurors, as contemplated in Section 14 of the Court’s Plan, and any additional forms being distributed during the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (4) The District’s two most recently submitted AO-12 forms;
- (5) Documents sufficient to show: race, religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, year of birth, zip code, income, and occupation for those individuals on the Master Jury Wheel in this District;
- (6) Documents sufficient to show: race, religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, year of birth, zip code, income, and occupation for those individuals eligible for jury service in this District;
- (7) Documents sufficient to show: race, religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, year of birth, zip code, income, and occupation for those individuals (a) to whom summonses and jury questionnaires were sent, as contemplated by Sections 11, 12, and 15 of the Court’s Plan, and (b) those deemed qualified for jury service, as contemplated by Section 16 of the Court’s Plan;
- (8) Documents identifying all excuses received from potential jurors and, separately, all excuses accepted from potential jurors for the District, as contemplated by Sections 17 and 18 of the Court’s Plan, during the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (9) Documents reflecting any policies or practices established by the Court or Clerk’s Office for excusing grand or petit jurors during the COVID-19 pandemic;

- (10) Documents sufficient to show: race, religion, sex, gender, ethnicity, year of birth, zip code, income, and occupation for all prospective jurors for the District who have been excused from or granted a deferral of their jury service based on the COVID-19 pandemic; and
- (11) Once criminal trials in this District resume and a trial schedule in this matter is set, any additional documents or data responsive to Request Nos. 2–3 and 5–10 for the period between March 13, 2020 and 30 days before voir dire in this matter.

### **C. Analysis**

The Court has four jury divisions. The division for trials conducted in Denver is Jury Division No. 1. However, grand jurors sitting in Denver are selected from Division Nos. 1 and 4. Because the grand jury that indicted Mr. Blake was selected from Jury Division Nos. 1 and 4 and because the petit jury in any trial of Mr. Blake would be selected from Jury Division No. 1, only information regarding those jury divisions will be provided, depending on whether the request is for grand jury or petit jury information, since information from other jury divisions could not assist Mr. Blake in preparing a challenge regarding his indictment or potential petit jury pool.

Mr. Blake does not seek personal identifying information or information “in individualized format.” Docket No. 189 at 2. Thus, the Clerk’s Office, in responding to any request that the Court grants, will not provide names, birth dates, addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, names of employers, social security numbers, or any other information that the Clerk’s Office believes, under the circumstances, may enable a reviewing party to identify a specific person.

**Request No. 1** - Granted in part and denied in part. The Court’s website contains a copy of the Court’s Jury Plan for the District of Colorado and the Jury Trial Protocols in effect during the pandemic. The Court will not create a description of

changes that have been made to the selection of prospective jurors due to the pandemic since such document, if not described in the Jury Trial Protocols, would have to be created to respond to the request. See *United States v. Corbett*, 2020 WL 5803243, at \*4 (E.D.N.Y. August 21, 2020) (“Section 1867(f) entitles defendants ‘only to records and papers already in existence’ but ‘nothing . . . entitles defendants to require the jury administrator to analyze data on their behalf” (quoting *United States v. Miller*, 116 F.3d 641, 658 (2d Cir. 1997))).

**Request No. 2 – Denied.** The Court finds that subparagraph (a) is irrelevant. That subparagraph seeks demographic information about all grand juries empaneled during the pandemic. However, such information could not properly be the basis of a challenge by Mr. Blake since the grand jury that indicted him was selected before the pandemic. See *United States v. Braxton*, 2020 WL 6083649, at \*4 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 15, 2020) (“because the grand jury here was empaneled months before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, any changes made to address the effect of the pandemic on the current grand jury selection process is irrelevant to any potential motion by defendant.”); *United States v. Eldarir*, 2020 WL 6545894, at \*4 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 6, 2020) (same). Mr. Blake’s reply brief confirms that subparagraphs (b) and (c) are also directed at grand jurors serving during the pandemic. Docket No. 189 at 3. To the extent that these requests seek information about jurors serving on grand juries selected during the pandemic, they will be denied for the same reason as the request in subparagraph (a). To the extent that these requests seek information about grand jurors from grand juries selected pre-pandemic, but serving during the pandemic, including his grand jury, the

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.