REBECCA G. CHURCH 1 Attorney for the United States Acting Under Authority Conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 515 Nicholas W. Pilchak 3 CA State Bar No. 331711 Andrew R. Haden CA State Bar No. 258436 Assistant U.S. Attorneys 880 Front Street, Room 6293 San Diego, CA 92101 6 Tel: (619)546-9709 / 6961 7 Email: nicholas.pilchak@usdoj.gov 8 Attorneys for the United States 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 13 Plaintiff, 14 v. 15

aka "Gio Tilotta,"

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No.: 19-CR-4768-GPC

Trial: August 30, 2022

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Honorable Gonzalo P. Curiel

UNITED STATES' AMENDED TRIAL

BRIEF

The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by and through its counsel, REBECCA G. CHURCH, Attorney for the United States Acting Under Authority Conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 515, and Nicholas W. Pilchak and Andrew R. Haden, Assistant U.S. Attorneys, hereby files its Amended Trial Brief.

I.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Indictment & Superseding Indictment

GIOVANNI VINCENZO TILOTTA (3),

Defendant.

On November 21, 2019, a federal grand jury in the Southern District of California returned a 23-count indictment charging five defendants with firearms and drug trafficking offenses. Defendant Giovanni Vincenzo Tilotta (3) was arraigned on the indictment on November 25, 2019, and also pleaded not guilty. A federal grand jury returned an eight-count superseding indictment against Tilotta and Defendant Waiel Yousif Anton (5) on April 2, 2021. Tilotta has pleaded not guilty to those charges, as well. Anton pleaded guilty to attempted obstruction of justice on July 15, 2022. ECF 290, 291.

The Court dismissed counts 3 and 6 of the superseding indictment on January 12, 2022. ECF 243. Tilotta remains charged in Counts 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7.

B. Trial Status

Trial is set for August 30, 2022 at 8:30 a.m. before the Honorable Gonzalo P. Curiel. The United States anticipates that its case-in-chief will last roughly six or seven full trial days. A status hearing regarding the trial is presently set for August 29, 2022.

C. Status of Counsel

Defendant Tilotta is represented by appointed counsel Jeremy Warren, assisted by Katie Jenkins.

D. Custody Status

Defendant Tilotta is released on a \$25,000 personal surety bond secured by his signature and the signature of one financially responsible adult. ECF 31.

E. Interpreter

The United States does not require an interpreter for any of its witnesses.

F. Jury Trial

Defendant has not submitted a jury waiver.

G. Pretrial Motions

Defendant Tilotta filed a motion to dismiss Count 13 of the original indictment which was mooted by the filing of the superseding indictment. ECF 111, 152. Tilotta also filed motions to dismiss Counts 3 and Counts 5 or 6 of the superseding indictment, which were granted on January 12, 2022. ECF 225, 226, 243. Tilotta filed a motion to dismiss the indictment based on a purported violation of the Second Amendment, ECF 295, which the Court denied orally at a hearing on August 19, 2022.

The United States filed a variety of motions *in limine*. ECF 224. Tilotta filed no written motions. At a hearing on January 12, 2022, the Court deferred ruling on most of the United States' motions, except: (1) it found the motion to preclude unnoticed defense expert witnesses moot, as the defense indicated they will not call experts; and (2) it denied the United States' motion to admit physical firearms in court. ECF 243.

The Court also granted several oral motions from Tilotta's counsel: (1) to allow attorney-conducted *voir dire*; (2) to keep the indictment from the jury room; and (3) to provide each juror with a copy of jury instructions. The Court denied Tilotta's oral motion for extra peremptory challenges for the defense. <u>Id.</u>

H. Stipulations

To streamline the proof at trial, the United States has proposed a series of stipulations since June 2021. ECF 224-1 at 16. Although the United States awaits the return of signed stipulations, the parties have recently agreed to stipulate that (1) all firearms referenced during the trial were firearms within the meaning of federal law; (2) Tilotta had an FFL during all events referenced at trial, while Marco Garmo did not; and (3) all text and voice messages, as well as emails, produced in discovery in this case are authentic copies of actual text messages, voice messages, and emails.

I. Discovery

The United States has produced extensive discovery in this case, estimated at a total of roughly 155,829 pages of written discovery and over 278 gigabytes of data. The United States has complied with its discovery obligations. To date, the United States has received zero pages of reciprocal discovery.

II.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Former Sheriff's Captain M. Marco Garmo (1) engaged in the business of dealing in firearms without a license for years.¹ In particular, he specialized in obtaining "off-

This is a summary statement of facts for purposes of this brief only.

roster" handguns by falsely claiming to be their true buyer while intending to furnish them to private citizens prohibited by California law from directly obtaining the weapons themselves.² As part of that endeavor, Garmo repeatedly bought and sold (and straw-purchased) smaller and newer-model off-roster handguns especially well-suited for concealed carry.

Mr. Tilotta assisted Garmo in this illegal enterprise. Tilotta acted as Garmo's willing federal firearms licensee ("FFL")—a licensed gun dealer willing to bend and break the laws for firearms transfers involving Garmo and his close associates. Tilotta knowingly processed straw transfers in which Garmo and Fred Magana (4)—Garmo's immediate subordinate at the San Diego County Sheriff's Department ("SDCSD")—acquired desirable new off-roster handguns for others, including especially Leo Joseph Hamel (2).³ Tilotta unlawfully processed transfer paperwork for firearms transactions that had not properly speaking even begun, because the parties hadn't yet appeared at his dealer (Honey Badger Firearms) to begin the paperwork, and then allowed the parties to backdate the required forms after the fact. Tilotta also processed a firearms transaction at an unlawful location: a firearms transfer for defense attorney Vikas Bajaj inside Garmo's Captain's office at the SDCSD Rancho San Diego station.⁴

III.

WITNESSES

In advance of the current trial date, the United States has provided the defense with a revised draft witness list, which includes the following potential witnesses:

On September 15, 2020, Garmo pleaded guilty to engaging in the business of dealing in firearms without a license. ECF 108, 110.

On November 22, 2019, Hamel pleaded guilty to aiding and abetting Garmo's unlicensed dealing in firearms. ECF 8, 13.

On December 9, 2020, Bajaj entered a guilty plea to aiding and abetting the false entry of dealer records by Mr. Tilotta in related case no. 20-cr-3905-JLB; see ECF 5, 7.

1	1.	Vikas Bajaj
2	2.	ATF SSA/CFI Matthew Beals
3	3.	ATF SA Sean Becker
4	4.	ATF IOI Thomas Chimileski
5	5.	Jesus R. Diaz
6	6.	Leo J. Hamel
7	7.	Bronner Handwerger
8	8.	FBI SA Christina Hokenson
9	9.	Jason Khoury
10	10.	Renee Lewis
11	11.	SDCSD Deputy Derek Llanes
12	12.	Fred Magana
13	13.	ATF SA Joseph Nazareno
14	14.	ATF SA James Sanders
15	15.	ATF IOI Robert Sison
16	16.	ATF SA Joseph Stearns
17	17.	FBI SA Ashley Townsend
18		IV.
19		EXHIBITS
20	The United States has provided the defense with a revised draft exhibit list and	
21	will tender a final exhibit list the morning of trial. Presently, the United States intends	
22	to offer in evidence the following categories of exhibits:	
23	1.	Firearms transaction records for relevant transactions, including transfers
24		processed at Honey Badger Firearms
25	2.	Acquisition and disposition logs for Honey Badger Firearms and Leo
26		Hamel Fine Jewelers
27		

- 1
 2
 3
- 4
- •
- 5
- 6
- 7

8

9

1011

12

13 14

15

16

1718

19 20

21

23

22

24

2526

27

28

- 3. Photographs of relevant firearms, including firearms transferred at Honey Badger Firearms; physical locations and items seized; and Defendants and their associates at certain events
- 4. Email messages
- 5. Text messages
- 6. Audio and video recordings, and associated English-language transcripts
- 7. Cellular telephones

V.

PERTINENT LAW

The United States submitted proposed jury instructions setting out the elements of the charged crimes on February 21, 2022. ECF 256. Tilotta filed proposed instructions the next day. ECF 258. The United States will file roughly concurrently with this brief a set of amended proposed jury instructions, tailored to the upcoming trial involving only a single defendant.

VI.

VOIR DIRE

The United States respectfully requests that the Court make the following inquiries of the members of the jury venire.

- 1. Has anyone had an unpleasant experience with local law enforcement, including the San Diego County Sheriff's Department?
- 2. Is anyone a current or former member of the Honorary Deputy Sheriff's Association? What about the San Diego County Gun Owner's Association?
- 3. Has anyone had an unpleasant experience with federal law enforcement, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives ("ATF")?
- 4. Does anyone own a firearm, or live in the same household with someone who does? Does anyone own more than ten firearms, or live with someone who does?

24

- 5. Has anyone ever conducted a private party transfer (or "PPT") of a firearm? Has anyone conducted more than five PPTs?
- 6. Has anyone ever applied with ATF to be a Federal Firearms Licensee, otherwise known as an FFL, to obtain a license to deal in firearms? Has anyone ever applied to the California Department of Justice to become a California Firearms Dealer, otherwise known as a CFD?
- 7. Does anyone have strong beliefs about the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which safeguards the right to keep and bear arms? Does anyone believe that the Second Amendment means that the State of California should not be able to regulate the ownership or transfer of firearms?
- 8. Does anyone think they will have trouble deciding whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty, regardless of the strength of the evidence? Does anyone have any religious or moral beliefs that would prevent them from finding the Defendant guilty or not guilty in this case?
- 9. Agreeing and disagreeing with our society's laws is fundamental to the concept of a democracy. Nevertheless, if selected as jurors, you will be instructed that this trial is not a forum for you to express your agreement or disagreement with the firearms laws of the United States or the State of California. The jurors selected in this case must be prepared to take an oath to follow the law as I instruct you. Does anyone think they would be unable or unwilling to follow the law because of their personal beliefs about firearms laws?
- 10. The indictment in this case charges the Defendant, who is presumed innocent unless and until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. During this trial, you will hear evidence about this Defendant, but you will also hear evidence about other individuals who may have been involved in some of the conduct but are not facing charges at this trial. You may also hear evidence about the consequences of this case for some of those other individuals. Regardless, if selected as a juror for this case, you would be required to take an oath to follow the law as I instruct you. Does anyone think

that they may be unable or unwilling to follow the law in deciding whether the Defendant in this case is guilty or not guilty because of concerns about other individuals who are not charged in this trial?

- 11. Some of the individuals you may hear about during this trial may have been the subject of attention in the media, including former Sheriff's Captain Marco Garmo, jeweler Leo Hamel, defense attorney Vikas Bajaj, and others. Does anyone here think they may have heard or read anything about this case in the media? What have you heard or read? Do you believe you will be able to set that aside if selected as a juror in this case and consider only the evidence admitted during this trial?
- 12. This trial may involve testimony from federal agents who investigated in an undercover capacity, which means that they did not reveal that they were law enforcement agents and instead posed as someone else. Although this investigative technique is permitted by law, does anyone feel that their personal views about this technique would make it hard for them to evaluate such an agent's testimony fairly and consistent with my instructions?
- 13. This trial may involve testimony from individuals who have made an agreement with the United States and hope to receive a benefit under that agreement. Other individuals may discuss their participation in potentially criminal conduct, but may not have been personally charged with a crime. I will give an instruction on weighing and evaluating the credibility of witnesses, including how to evaluate the testimony of someone who may have received a benefit in connection with their testimony. Does anyone have strong personal views about someone who would

cooperate with law enforcement in exchange for a benefit that may make them unable or unwilling to follow my instructions in considering such a witness's testimony? DATED: August 23, 2022 REBECCA G. CHURCH Attorney for the United States Acting Under Authority Conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 515 /s/ Nicholas W. Pilchak NICHOLAS W. PILCHAK Assistant United States Attorney /s/ Andrew R. Haden ANDREW R. HADEN Assistant United States Attorney