

1 TODD BLANCHE
Deputy Attorney General
2 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
First Assistant United States Attorney
3 ALEXANDER B. SCHWAB
Assistant United States Attorney
4 Acting Chief, Criminal Division
LAUREN E. BORDER (Cal. Bar No. 327770)
5 Assistant United States Attorney
General Crimes Section
6 CLIFFORD D. MPARE (Cal. Bar No. 337818)
Assistant United States Attorney
7 Major Crimes Section
1200 United States Courthouse
8 312 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
9 Telephone: (213) 894-8231/4962
Facsimile: (213) 894-0141
10 E-mail: lauren.border@usdoj.gov
clifford.mpare@usdoj.gov

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

14 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 CYNTHIA RAYGOZA,
aka "Cynthia Curiel Curiel,"
19 ASHLEIGH BROWN,
aka "ice_out_ofla,"
20 aka "corn_maiden_design," and
SANDRA CARMONA SAMAME,
21 aka "Sandra Karmona,"
aka "Sandra Carolina Carmona
22 Samame,"
aka "Sandra Carmona Samane,"
23

24 Defendants.

No. 2:25-cr-00780-SVW

GOVERNMENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #1
TO PRECLUDE IRRELEVANT EVIDENCE
AND ARGUMENT SEEKING JURY
NULLIFICATION

Hearing Date: February 9, 2026 at
11:00 a.m.
Trial Date: February 24, 2026
Time: at 9:00 a.m.
Location: Courtroom of the
Hon. Stephen V.
Wilson

25
26 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel
27 of record, the Assistant United States Attorneys Clifford D. Mpare
28

1 and Lauren E. Border, hereby files its motion in limine to preclude
2 irrelevant evidence and argument aimed at jury nullification.

3 This motion in limine is based upon the attached memorandum of
4 points and authorities, the files and records in this case, and such
5 further evidence and argument as the Court may permit.

6 Dated: January 27, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

7 TODD BLANCHE
8 Deputy Attorney General

9 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
10 First Assistant United States
11 Attorney

12 ALEXANDER B. SCHWAB
13 Assistant United States Attorney
14 Acting Chief, Criminal Division

15 /s/

16 LAUREN E. BORDER
17 CLIFFORD D. MPARE
18 Assistant United States Attorneys

19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants CYNTHIA RAYGOZA ("Raygoza"), ASHLEIGH BROWN ("Brown"), and SANDRA SAMAME ("Samame") (collectively, "defendants") followed an ICE agent home from work, harassed him and his family, and live-streamed on social media an address approximately 100 feet from the agent's home, inviting viewers to "come on down." Defendants have been indicted for (1) conspiring to release restricted personal information of an ICE agent, and (2) stalking him.

The government anticipates that defendants may raise multiple issues at trial that are irrelevant to the charged offenses and aimed at jury nullification, including argument and testimony regarding: (1) immigration-related political tensions in the U.S.; (2) information regarding the ICE agent's employment history; and (3) legal arguments that the First Amendment prevents defendants' convictions. As the only purpose of this evidence and argument would be to elicit an emotional response from the jury or for jury nullification, they should be precluded under Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Defendants Follow R.H. Home from Work to Harass Him

On August 28, 2025, the three defendants in this case got into Brown's car and followed an ICE agent ("R.H.")¹ from the federal building located at 300 North Los Angeles Street to his home in

¹ The complaint in this action refers to the victim as "R.R.," whereas the indictment refers to him as "R.H." Before the events in this case, the victim changed his name from R.R. to R.H. to reflect a family name.

1 Baldwin Park -- approximately 15 miles and more than a 20-minute
2 drive. R.H. realized he was being followed, but believed he had lost
3 the car that was tailing him. When defendants reached R.H.'s home in
4 a residential neighborhood, wearing black masks, they yelled at him
5 in front of his wife and children and shouted to his neighbors while
6 walking up and down the block that he was an ICE agent.

7 Defendants live-streamed the events on social media accounts.
8 This live-stream captured defendants following R.H. to the street
9 where he lived and their subsequent confrontation with him. R.H.'s
10 wife, and a neighbor concerned by defendants' yelling and face
11 coverings, separately called 911. Shortly after their calls, Baldwin
12 Park Police Department ("BPPD") officers arrived. Defendants
13 announced on their live-stream a street name, residence number, and
14 city that identified R.H.'s block. They zoomed in on R.H.'s face,
15 saying: "There's the ICE agent. This is where he lives apparently,"
16 and "the neighbors didn't know - now they know." Defendants also
17 told the followers to "come on down" to the Baldwin Park
18 neighborhood. Minutes later, other individuals did indeed arrive
19 outside R.H.'s home. The individuals verbally accosted the BPPD
20 officers, and one individual exclaimed: "Let's dox them!"

21 **B. Procedural History**

22 For their conduct, a grand jury indicted defendants on September
23 23, 2025, in a two-count indictment charging defendants with
24 conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 371) and publicly disclosing the victim's
25 personal address (18 U.S.C. § 119(a)). The government ultimately
26 determined that defendants failed to state the victim's actual home
27 address, as required under 18 U.S.C. § 119(a), and instead said the
28 number of a neighbor's home approximately 100 feet from the victim's

1 home. (Dkt. 98 at 4 n.4.) Accordingly, the government moved to
2 dismiss, and the Court dismissed Count Two of the indictment. (Dkts.
3 97, 99.)

4 Then, on January 15, 2026, a grand jury returned a first
5 superseding indictment charging defendants with the same conspiracy
6 and adding a charge of stalking (18 U.S.C. § 2261A) (Dkt. 103). The
7 conspiracy charge in the superseding indictment amended the
8 allegation to indicate that defendants disclosed "an address
9 approximately 100 feet" from the victim's home.²

10 **III. ARGUMENT**

11 **A. Legal Standard**

12 Evidence must be relevant to defendant's guilt to be admissible.
13 The only evidence admissible at trial is evidence that relates to the
14 elements for the instant offense and that has a "tendency to make a
15 fact more or less probable." Fed. R. Evid. 401; see also Fed. R.
16 Evid. 402. The Court may also "exclude relevant evidence" if the
17 probative value is outweighed by a "danger" of "unfair prejudice,
18 confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay," or "wasting
19 time." Fed. R. Evid. 403.

20 It is also well-established that a defendant does not have a
21 right to a jury nullification instruction. United States v. Navarro-
22 Vargas, 408 F.3d 1184, 1198 (9th Cir. 2005) (citing cases and noting
23 that courts have "uniformly rejected" requests for jury nullification
24 instructions); United States v. Blixt, 548 F.3d 882, 890 (9th Cir.
25 2008) (finding it proper to instruct the jury to disregard
26

27
28 ² Counsel for Samame also informed the government that her true
and correct last name is "Samame" rather than "Samane," thus the
government corrected the indictment accordingly.

1 nullification argument). Having no right to seek jury nullification,
2 defendant has no right to make jury nullification arguments or
3 present evidence relevant only to such a strategy. See United States
4 v. Scarmazzo, 554 F. Supp. 2d 1102, 1107 (E.D. Cal. 2008) (“Neither a
5 [d]efendant nor his attorney has a right to present evidence that is
6 irrelevant to a legal defense to, or an element of, the crime
7 charged.”); see also Zal v. Steppe, 968 F.2d 924, 930 (9th Cir. 1992)
8 (Trott, J., concurring) (“Verdicts must be based on the law and the
9 evidence, not on jury nullification as urged by either litigant.”
10 (citing Chandler v. Florida, 449 U.S. 560, 574 (1981))). Indeed,
11 trial courts “have a duty to forestall or prevent” jury
12 nullification, including by preventing “impermissible” defense
13 questioning or argument. United States v. Lynch, 903 F.3d 1061,
14 1079–80 (9th Cir. 2018) (citation omitted).

15 **B. The Court Should Exclude Irrelevant and Unduly Prejudicial**
16 **Testimony and Argument that Invites the Jury to Nullify**

17 The government must prove three elements to establish
18 defendants’ guilt for conspiracy: First, that beginning and ending on
19 August 28, 2025, there was an agreement between defendants to commit
20 a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 119(a),³ which prohibits doxxing federal
21 agents; second, that defendants became members of the conspiracy
22 knowing of at least one of its objects and intending to help
23

24 ³ The anti-doxxing statute, in turn, makes it a crime to:
25 (1) knowingly make restricted personal information about a covered
26 person, or a member of the immediate family of that covered person,
27 publicly available; (2) with the intent to threaten, intimidate, or
28 incite the commission of a crime of violence against that covered
person, or a member of the immediate family of that covered person;
or with the intent and knowledge that the personal information will
be used to threaten, intimidate, or facilitate the commission of a
crime of violence against that covered person, or a member of the
immediate family of that covered person.

1 accomplish it; and third, that one of the defendants of the
2 conspiracy performed at least one overt act on or after August 28,
3 2025 for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy. Ninth Circuit
4 Model Criminal Jury Instructions, No. 11.1 (2024 ed.).

5 The government must also prove three elements to establish
6 defendants' guilt for stalking: that defendants (1) with the intent
7 to harass or intimidate another person, or placing under surveillance
8 with the intent to harass or intimidate another person, (2) used the
9 mail, any interactive computer service or electronic communication
10 service or electronic communication system of interstate commerce, or
11 any other facility of interstate or foreign commerce; (3) to engage
12 in a course of conduct that caused, attempted to cause, or would
13 reasonably be expected to cause, substantial emotional distress to
14 that person, or an immediate family member of that person, or a
15 spouse or intimate partner of that person. See 18 U.S.C.
16 § 2261A(2) (b).

17 Because questions and arguments relating to the enumerated
18 topics below are irrelevant, unduly prejudicial, would confuse the
19 issues, and waste time at trial, the Court should exclude them.

20 1. Immigration-related political tensions

21 The government anticipates defendants may seek to introduce at
22 trial evidence or argument regarding ongoing political tensions
23 between ICE agents and protestors of immigration enforcement
24 activities, including defendants themselves, as well as evidence of
25 defendants' prior activities protesting immigration enforcement in-
26 person or on social media. This is irrelevant to the conspiracy and
27 stalking charges in the indictment and thus inadmissible under Rules
28 401, 402, and 403. Introduction of evidence regarding tensions

1 between federal agents and protestors would also be highly
2 inflammatory -- particularly in light of ongoing demonstrations in
3 Minnesota and recent shootings involving ICE agents in Los Angeles --
4 and only serve to elicit sympathy from the jury to indirectly ask
5 them to acquit defendants because they are politically misaligned
6 with R.H.'s profession. R.H. does not have a personal connection to
7 the ongoing greater political discourse in this country, and such
8 evidence has no bearing on the elements of the offenses charged.
9 Similarly, defendants' own histories protesting ICE are not relevant
10 to whether they conspired to dox R.H. and stalked him on August 28,
11 2025. The Court should thus exclude any of this evidence at trial.
12 See, e.g., Yowan Yang v. ActioNet, Inc., No. 14-cv-792-AB, 2016 WL
13 8929250, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2016) (excluding "race-based
14 comments"); Clark v. Martinez, 295 F.3d 809, 814 (8th Cir. 2002)
15 (rejecting evidence of racial motivation because "hostile motive is
16 not an element" of the relevant charges).

17 2. Information regarding R.H.'s employment history

18 Defendant Brown has requested intrusive discovery into R.H.'s
19 employment, including: (1) a description of R.H.'s job title, rank,
20 and duties, how long he has held his current position, and his
21 employment history preceding this position; (2) R.H.'s timesheet for
22 the month of August 2025; (3) R.H.'s work hours and specific
23 assignment on August 28, 2025; (4) cell phone records for R.H. for
24 both his work phone and personal phone on August 28, 2025, including
25 call logs; and (5) a vehicle log of all government vehicles assigned
26 to and/or used by R.H. between June 1, 2025, and August 31, 2025.

27 None of this information is relevant to the elements of the two
28 charged offenses for conspiracy and stalking. Defendant's requests

1 for this information suggests some intent to use such information at
2 trial. There is no dispute that R.H. was an ICE agent on August 28,
3 2025, and thus covered by 18 U.S.C. § 119, which prohibits doxxing
4 federal agents.⁴ The inquiry ends there, and the Court should
5 exclude any evidence or argument regarding R.H.'s employment history
6 as irrelevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401 and 402.

7 3. Improper legal arguments

8 Finally, the government anticipates that defendants will attempt
9 to make improper legal arguments to the jury mirroring those made in
10 their motions to dismiss the indictment. Whether the anti-doxxing
11 statute, 18 U.S.C. § 119(a), violates the First Amendment on its face
12 and as applied to defendants' conduct is the subject of defendants'
13 pending motions. (See dkts. 92-93, 95.) Thus, the issue of whether
14 the anti-doxxing statute is inconsistent with the First Amendment
15 will be resolved pre-trial, and the jury instructions will adequately
16 inform the jurors of the necessary elements of the offenses.
17 Argument that the First Amendment permits defendants' alleged conduct
18 is a legal issue for the Court, not a fact issue for the jury. See
19 Sparf v. United States, 156 U.S. 51, 87 (1895) ("It would be absurd
20 to say that the determination of the law belongs to the jury, not
21 court, if the court has power to set aside that which the jury
22 determines.") (citation omitted). The Court should thus preclude any
23 argument that the crimes with which defendants are charged are
24 invalid under the First Amendment.

25
26
27

⁴ A "covered person" includes "any officer or employee of the
28 United States or of any agency in any branch of the United States
Government." 18 U.S.C. §§ 119(b)(2)(A) and 1114. R.H. is still
employed by ICE.

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 Defendants are free to argue that the evidence presented at
3 trial is insufficient to establish the elements of the crimes
4 charged. But defendants should not be permitted to make arguments or
5 introduce evidence irrelevant to the elements of the charged offenses
6 and instead designed to promote nullification or to otherwise invite
7 the jury to base its decision on emotion, as opposed to the facts and
8 the law. For the foregoing reasons, the government respectfully
9 requests that this Court grant its motion in limine.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28