

1 Katherine McBroom, CBN 223559
2 KAEDIAN LLP
3 280 S. Beverly Drive, Suite 209
4 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
5 Telephone: (310) 893-3372
6 Fax: (310) 935-0323
7 kmcbroom@kaedianllp.com

8 Attorney for Defendant
9 JONATHAN REDONDO-ROSALES

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 JONATHAN REDONDO-
16 ROSALES

17 Defendant.
18
19
20

CASE NO. CR 25-679-JLS

DEFENDANT JONATHAN
REDONDO-ROSALES' MOTION
IN LIMINE NO. 1 TO EXCLUDE
VIDEO EVIDENCE

Hearing Date: October 10, 2025

Hearing Time: 8:30 a.m.

Trial Date: October 21,

Location: Courtroom of the Hon.

Josephine L. Stanton

21
22 Defendant, Jonathan Redondo-Rosales, by and through his counsel of
23 record, Katherine C. McBroom, hereby files his Motion *in Limine* No. 1 to
24 Exclude video evidence. Mr. Redondo-Rosales requests that the Court exclude
25 from evidence at trial any and all video evidence which the government cannot
26 properly authenticate and/or for which the government cannot establish
27 foundation.
28

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. INTROCUCTION**

3 On August 2, 2025, Defendant Jonathan Redondo-Rosales (“Mr. Redondo-
4 Rosales”) was arrested by Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), Federal
5 Protective Services Inspectors (“FPSs”) while attending a protest in downtown
6 Los Angeles. Mr. Redondo-Rosales and others were protesting the actions of
7 Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE) as well as DHS in front of the
8 Edward R. Roybal Federal Building and the Metropolitan Detention Center on
9 North Alameda Street.

10 Mr. Redondo-Rosales caught officers’ attention when he stood in front of
11 and blocked a government vehicle attempting to turn onto Alameda Street. As the
12 car inched forward, Mr. Redondo-Rosales rolled on top of the hood. When the
13 car stopped, he stumbled off the hood and was approach by two officers. As he
14 backed away from the officers, complaining witness, Inspector Z.C., forcefully
15 shoved Mr. Redondo-Rosales causing him to fall backward violently onto the
16 ground. As he attempted to get to his feet, another officer grabbed Mr. Redondo-
17 Rosales from behind and threw him to the ground, for the second time. Finally, as
18 Mr. Redondo-Rosales was pinned to the ground by three officers, a fourth
19 sprayed mace in Mr. Redondo-Rosales’ face. Mr. Redondo-Rosales sustained
20 injuries to his head, left shoulder, left arm, and right palm.

21 The government disputes that Z.C. shoved Mr. Rosales-Rosales at any
22 time. They allege that Mr. Redondo-Rosales hit Z.C. while backing away from
23 the government vehicle and that he simply stumbled and fell backward on his
24 own accord. Further, they likely will claim that any injury Mr. Redondo-Rosales
25 sustained as result of this detention and arrest were due to his obstruction and
26 resisting arrest. This reasoning is typical where officers use excessive force and
27 seek to avoid the repercussions of their actions.

28

1 The government produced video evidence to the defense, consisting of
2 what appears to be clips downloaded or otherwise saved from social media
3 platforms. The government has not provided information as to who created the
4 videos, who posted the videos, or who extracted the videos from the internet and
5 when. Evidently, the government intends to present video evidence at trial but
6 does not intend to properly authenticate or lay the appropriate foundation for the
7 video(s). Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 901, this evidence must be
8 excluded from trial.

9 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

10 On August 2, 2025, Mr. Redondo-Rosales was arrested while protesting on
11 Alameda Street in front of the entrance to the Metropolitan Detention Center and
12 the Edward R. Roybal Federal Building. There are videos available online,
13 including on various social media platforms, purportedly depicting Mr. Redondo-
14 Rosales' encounter with DHS, FPS officers.

15 The defense has produced two videos to the government along with the
16 names and contact information for the individuals who took the videos at the
17 scene. Presumably, if the defense seeks to enter these videos into evidence, it will
18 call the witnesses who recorded them and inquire as to the circumstances of the
19 recording in order to authenticate and lay the appropriate foundation for the
20 videos.

21 The government, on the other hand, has provided videos which appear to
22 have been downloaded or otherwise saved from the internet. The government has
23 not disclosed the individuals who created the videos or the circumstances of the
24 recordings¹. Further, the government has not disclosed who procured the videos,
25

26 ¹ The defense referenced still images from one of the videos produced by
27 the government in Mr. Redondo-Rosales' Oppositions to the
28 government's Motions *in Limine* 2 and 3. The defense by no means
stipulates to the authenticity of the video. Should the government be

1 how they procured them and when.

2 The defense anticipates the government will seek to admit video evidence at
3 trial without properly authenticating it. The fact that the government opposes a
4 motion that unauthenticated evidence be excluded from seems to support this
5 notion.

6 **III. ARGUMENT**

7 **A. Legal Standard**

8 Under Federal Rule of Evidence 901(a), the proponent of evidence must
9 produce sufficient evidence to support a finding that the item is what the
10 proponent claims it to be. Examples of proper authentication include testimony
11 from a witness with knowledge of the item. Fed. R. Evid. 901(b).

12 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 602, a witness must testify to matter
13 only if evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has
14 personal knowledge of the matter.

15 **B. The Government Cannot Authenticate Video Evidence Proffered**

16 The government has not disclosed and presumably does not know who
17 created one or more of the videos it seeks to admit at trial. It appears the
18 government may rely on the testimony of Z.C. or other officers at the scene in
19 order to authenticate and/or the lay the foundation for admission of the video
20 evidence. Such testimony is not sufficient to authenticate and admit the videos.

21 First, the government is unable to demonstrate how the video was created
22 and whether its creator edited the recording. One of the recordings is in slow
23 motion. It is unknown whether the original recording was filmed in slow motion,
24 or the recording was edited afterward. Under Federal Rule of Evidence 901,

25
26 _____
27 unable to authenticate or lay the appropriate foundation for the video, the
28 video evidence, including any stills derived therefrom, should be
excluded at trial.

1 authentication of evidence requires sufficient proof that the item is what it is
2 claimed to be. *See Griffin v. Bell*, 694 F3d 817, 827 (7th Cir. 2012) (The court
3 emphasized that testimony from a witness with knowledge of how video was
4 made or whether it was altered is necessary to authenticate a video under Rule
5 901(b)(1).) The government has not disclosed a witness who can testify as to the
6 authenticity of the video they intend to admit. Additionally, they cannot establish
7 foundation for admission by other means – such as comparison with other
8 authenticated evidence. *See Diaz v. Cty. of Ventura*, 512 F. Supp. 3d 1030, 1035
9 (C.D. Cal. 2021). No such corroborating evidence exists.

10 Videos on the internet can be easily manipulated, edited, or faked. The
11 government cannot demonstrate that the video they intend to admit has not been
12 manipulated. Currently the prevalence of video editing software makes it
13 dangerously simple to manipulate videos. Not having a monitoring system to
14 track each change on a file means multiple ways to twist and complicate the truth
15 around a crime scene. The proffered evidence is unreliable.

16 Second, an officer does not have sufficient personal knowledge concerning
17 the recording to authenticate it. The fact that an officer was present at this scene
18 does not establish that the video accurately portrays what transpired.

19 Third, the video evidence proffered is more prejudicial than probative
20 under Federal Rule of Evidence 403. The slow motion video in particular
21 misrepresents what occurred in real time. The events at issue occurred in seconds.
22 A slow motion or altered video does not accurately capture the events as they
23 unfolded. A touching might appear intentional in a slow motion video, but
24 unintentional when viewed in real time. Because the video, particularly the slow
25 motion video, will mislead and the confuse the jury, it must be excluded from
26 evidence.

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Redondo-Rosales requests that the Court
3 exclude video evidence at trial which the government cannot appropriately
4 authenticate.

5 DATED: September 30, 2025

/s/

6 _____
7 Katherine McBroom
8 Attorney for JONATHAN
9 REDONDO-ROSALES
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28