

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
600 West Capitol Ave, Suite A149
Little Rock, AR 72201**

REED K CHRISTENSEN

PLAINTIFF

v.

No: 2:24-cv-00229-DPM-PSH

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE and
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF D.C.**

DEFENDANTS

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff REED CHRISTENSEN, acting pro se, hereby brings this Amended Complaint against
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE and U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF D.C.

I. Nature of the Action	Page 1
II. Jurisdiction and Venue	Page 2
III. Parties	Page 3
IV. Statement of Facts	Page 3
a) <i>Background and Character</i>	Page 3
b) <i>Beliefs on Elections</i>	Page 6
c) <i>Actions on January 6, 2021</i>	Page 7
d) <i>Arrest and Pre-trial Period</i>	Page 11
e) <i>Run for Oregon Governor</i>	Page 13
f) <i>Trial in U.S. District Court D.C.</i>	Page 14
g) <i>Detention in D.C.</i>	Page 21
h) <i>Sentencing in U.S. District Court D.C.</i> ...	Page 22
i) <i>Detention in Federal Prison</i>	Page 23
j) <i>Life After Prison</i>	Page 28
V. Causes of Action	Page 29
VI. Prayer for Relief	Page 34
Signature	Page 35

I. Nature of the Action

1. On December 30, 2024, the plaintiff's wife Myra Christensen filed a *pro se* complaint (2:24-cv-00229) on behalf of herself and her husband Reed Christensen, then an inmate at the Federal

Correctional Institution – Forrest City Low (“FCI Forrest City Low”). The court allowed the complaint to proceed. The complaint dealt with the conditions under which Reed was being held in the Forrest City Low prison. The complaint was put on hold when Reed was released from prison on January 20, 2025 due to a pardon by President Trump.

2. Soon after the pardon, the court on January 31, 2025, issued an order stating that Mr. Christensen would be allowed to file an amended complaint on his own behalf. In reply to that order, Reed and Myra responded to the court that the original complaint would not be pursued and that Reed would file an amended complaint. This complaint is a *pro se* filing by Reed in fulfillment of that objective.

3. This complaint tells the behavior of the DOJ of the Executive branch in relation to Reed's actions on January 6th, 2021. The behavior of the U.S. District Court of D.C. is also told since it is a part of this entire story. The court is asked to render a Declaratory Judgment about the justice of the government's actions.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

4. This Court has jurisdiction over the matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 which grants Federal district courts the authority to hear civil cases where the plaintiff's claim is based on the U.S. Constitution.

5. The venue is properly in this district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b), because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred in FCI Forrest City Low, Arkansas.

6. This Federal district court has the authority and jurisdiction to review a challenge to the behavior of the Executive branch of the U.S. Government. The argument for this authority and jurisdiction is presented in the accompanying brief.

7. The court is able to rule in this matter since it is not being asked to overturn the sentence of another

court, or to punish anyone by the award of monetary damages. Rather the court is only asked to use the principles of Americans justice and equity to consider the entirety of this case and make a wise and moral judgment.

III. Parties

8. Plaintiff REED CHRISTENSEN is an adult living in the state of Idaho. He participated in the January 6, 2021 'Stop the Steal' rally and was subsequently arrested, prosecuted, and incarcerated in Federal prison. He was pardoned by President Trump on January 20, 2025.
9. Defendant DOJ is an agency of the Executive branch of the U.S. government.
10. Defendant U.S. District Court of D.C. is part of the U.S. government.

IV. Statement of Facts

Background and Character

11. A significant portion of rendering a just judgment about the saga I have endured at the hands of the Federal government for my actions at the January 6, 2021 rally/protest, requires having a proper understanding of who I am - my beliefs and motivations, as proven by my actions during my lifetime. Otherwise, how can a proper judgment be made? If a man is killed, the law distinguishes between manslaughter and various degrees of murder depending on motive and intent. Similarly, what judge or jury would convict a man charged with jaywalking if he left the sidewalk mid-block to snatch a child out of the way of an oncoming bus? This section takes a few paragraphs to establish a clear record of who I really am.

12. I was born to goodly parents, Gary and Lorene Christensen. At the time of my birth the family was living in Texas as my father was in pilot training for the U.S. Air Force. From my earliest memories my father was my hero – handsome, strong, trim, flying jets, and fighting communists in the

Cold War – who could ask for a better hero! [Exhibit 1] My first and earliest goal in life was to fly in the Air Force to protect America like my father. All three boys in the family followed my father's example of serving in the military due to a love of country instilled in us by my father's love, goodness, and honorable life.

13. My childhood home was not only loving and patriotic, it was a devoutly religious one. All in the family were active members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). There never was a time, either as child, youth, or adult, when I did not have faith in God and did not fully participate in Church services and activities - feeling the warmth, sincerity, and love of a devout religious community. My Church record shows constant activity, with ordinations from Deacon to Elder, leading to serving as a full-time missionary in South Korea from 1977 to 1979. After our five children were born I was ordained a High Priest at the young age of 29 and subsequently served in Bishoprics and as a Stake (similar to diocese) Clerk. [Exhibit 2]

14. I met my wife Myra at a Church dance when we were both 17 years old and seniors in high school. It is no mystery why I fell in love with her at first sight and why 50 years later we are still married: she is a natural beauty, full of happiness and light, virtuous, and a woman without guile. Our relationship kicked off immediately, as she also fell in love with me at first sight. We dated for two years, including our freshman year at college, until I was old enough at age 19 to serve a mission. I had always wanted to attend the Air Force Academy and had always orientated my high school activities to achieve that goal. But the President of our Church had asked all young men who were worthy to serve a mission, and at the time the Air Force Academy would not allow a two year break. That, along with meeting Myra at an early age, changed my plans. At the age of 21, after being overseas for two years, I got home from my mission on Thursday evening, drove with Myra to the temple on Friday, and on Saturday morning July 14, 1979 our marriage was sealed for time and all eternity. [Exhibits 3 and 4]

15. We raised our five children the way we were raised – our home was that of an active LDS

family. Our first four children were boys, and as they reached age eight the Church's program for boys and young men at the time was Scouting. Myra was their Cub Scouting den mother and when they advanced into Boy Scouts, I supported them by being a scoutmaster. For seven years I worked to provide a rich scouting experience for our sons with meaningful weekly troop meetings, monthly campouts, and a yearly Scout camp. Scouting was a big part of my life growing up, myself and my brothers all were Eagle Scouts, so it was natural for me to do Scouting with our sons. All four of our sons attained the highest Scouting rank of Eagle. This is a picture I had taken of all of the men in the family wearing out Scout uniforms with their Eagle rank. [Exhibit 5]

16. For the years I worked as a scoutmaster, I taught our sons and dozens of other young men the principles of the Scout oath:

A scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

To me, trying to model these principles was not particularly difficult as I had been raised in a home that lived them. However, I did fail the scouts on at least one occasion. One Friday night on a campout, I was roused from sleep due to some boys being out of their tent and frolicking noisily around the camp site at 2 AM. I was not happy. In my indignation I used the word “hell” outside of a theological context, as in, “What the h--- do you think you're doing!” Our Scout troop was sponsored by our LDS congregation. That next Sunday in church I rose to apologize to the church members for my language and for failing to be a role model for their sons as a scoutmaster. Using the word “hell” two times in a context of anger are the only times in my life I have ever used any type of expletive. I mention this to bring home the point that for my entire life I been dedicated to living in a disciplined and honorable manner.

17. After Myra and I finished college in 1983, I was commissioned into the U.S. Army as a 2nd Lieutenant. Our first assignment was to Germany, where we lived for four years. At the end of our

time in Germany, all four of our boys had been born. Military life at the time, at least in Germany during the Cold War, was that of constant field exercises and being away from family. I had thought I would have a 20+ year career in the military like my father, but we decided that Army life would require too much sacrifice and place too much stress on our family. After leaving full time Army life I would do four more years of Army Reserve. When we came back to the U.S., I went back to school to obtain a Master's Degree in electrical engineering. During this time our fifth child, a girl, was born. After school we moved to Oregon where I worked at Intel on microprocessor design teams for 30 years.

Beliefs on Elections

18. With the above personal background it is now possible for one to have a better understanding of my politics. Although I have always been an avid reader of history, my beliefs about politics and governments are not based just on the opinions and thoughts of men. It is guided by my faith in God and His word as found in the canonized scripture of my faith, as the following quotes illustrate. From the Book of Mormon, Ether 2:12,

Behold, this is a choice land [America] and whatsoever nation shall possess it shall be free from bondage, and from captivity, and from all other nations under heaven, if they will but serve the God of the land, who is Jesus Christ, who had been manifested by the things which we have written.

And in the Doctrine and Covenants, Section 98:4-7,

And now, verily I say unto you concerning the laws of the land, it is my will that my people should observe all things whatsoever I command them.

And that law of the land which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges, belongs to all mankind, and is justifiable before me.

Therefore, I, the Lord, justify you and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land;

And as pertaining to law of man, whatsoever is more or less than this, cometh of evil.

To me, the Constitution and the founding of the American Republic, is not some fortunate happenstance or some accidental alignment of political progress. The Founders were men inspired of God who were helped and protected by Heaven as they ushered in a new era of freedom. This freedom took root not only in America, but influenced all the world's view of what government should be.

Actions on January 6, 2021

19. During the 2020 election, I was living in the Portland, Oregon area. I attended the January 6, 2021 'Stop the Steal' rally in Washington DC. I made one attempt to cross a police line at the bottom of the Capitol steps. I was blocked by officers and pushed back after progressing only a few feet. After this exchange I left the Capitol area. These couple of minutes were captured on government video, and were presented as a defense video at my trial. [Exhibit 6]

20. I originally came to the Jan6 rally hoping to be one of a million plus Americans who would show up and help inspire some backbone into our representatives who were supposed to be stewards of our Constitution. By this date it was clear that both our political and judicial class had decided that they would do nothing about a stolen Federal election. And it *was* stolen. I may have been born at night, but it wasn't *last* night. According to the non-stolen election narrative, I was supposed to believe:

- a 40-year Washington insider who had never expressed an original idea,
- who was already showing signs of geriatric decline,
- who hardly left his basement to campaign,
- who could not draw a crowd as large as a Sunday school class to his few rallies,
- who said on camera not to worry because he had a great fraud apparatus in place,
- in an election system corrupted by use of vote-by-mail pushed due to COVID,
- that Biden beat Trump and won more presidential votes than the populist Obama.

Right.

21. To this day, I still find it astounding that so many politicians and pundits pompously pontificate on the “crimes” of protesters on Jan6. Yet the horrendous crime of a corrupted and stolen Federal election is met with indifferent silence – no Congressional investigation into *that*. Hundreds of Jan6 protesters rounded up and their lives crushed for *complaining* about election fraud, but has there been a single arrest by the DOJ for *actual* election fraud? Sure, the 2024 election seemed relatively clean, at least for the office of president, but if the corruption is not eradicated why would it not reappear?

22. To me it seemed obvious that November 3, 2020 would go down in history as the official date of the death of the American Republic. This date may be just as momentous as January 10, 49 BC - the death of the Roman Republic when Caesar crossed the Rubicon. Like Rome, America will continue to exist, but it will not be a republic controlled by the people. And just as the legions of the dictatorial Roman Empire continued to carry their 'SPQR' (The Senate and People of Rome) banners, Americans may continue to shoot off fireworks on the 4th of July, but such celebrations of liberty will be a farce, a comforting delusion embraced by people for whom reality is too unpleasant to face.

23. After President Trump's speech near the Washington Monument, I moved with the crowd as it headed eastward up the Mall toward the Capitol Building. When I arrived, the bottom of the steps on the west side of the Capitol was packed with people tussling with a police line. Wanting to avoid the noise and pepper spray in the air, I moved to the south side of the steps where things were more quiet. As I approached this area, a couple of things caused me to transition from my original mindset of supporting a “rally,” to participating in a “protest” (neither of which I had ever done before).

24. The first thing was “Keep off the Grass” signs and barriers set up for the protest. It struck me as absurd – a million agitated citizens, seriously concerned about the death of their Republic, come to D.C. and the powers of our government are concerned about the lawn. It seemed to me like a perfect 'elite vs masses' dichotomy from the book *Les Misérables*.

25. The second thing leading to my rally-to-protest conversion were two of the officers manning the police line at the bottom of the stairs, which was formed by bicycle racks fastened end to end. These two officers looked to be Capitol Hill tour guides. They were a couple of 5'2" young ladies with pony tails wearing blue bomber jackets. Again, I was struck by the glaring dichotomy between the rulers and the ruled. To me, it looked like powerful shadowy cabals could shred our most sacred laws regarding the rule of the people via elections, and our political and judicial classes were totally unconcerned. Yet, they ordered average people to stay off the grass and to keep away from their (the rulers) Capitol building. And while doing this hypocrisy, they expected American patriots to be so obedient and law-abiding that only tour guides were needed to control them¹. This struck me as the worst condition a nation can be in – a two-tier system with no consequence for unlawful behavior of the powerful, while average people are expected to be obedient to every law and regulation.

26. These two thoughts turned me from rally attendee into patriot protester. I came to understand why the protesters at the bottom of the steps were tussling with the police to get up the steps of the Capitol. They were intent on sending a message by crossing the police line and waving the American flag on the steps of the Capitol. Most people there on Jan6 were only in rally mode. But those in protest mode had decided that a message needed to be sent to the arrogant ruling class – you mess with our elections, our Constitution, and our Republic, and we will not obey you.

27. Let me be clear here about what the nature of the disobedience of the majority of the protesters that day. The disobedience was crossing police lines to wave the flag on the Capitol steps. This seems to be pretty tame “law breaking” compared to nationwide election fraud. But though it was pretty tame behavior, the message it sent was definitely received by the Biden administration. It became imperative to them to ensure more Americans did not openly question their legitimacy to govern. Pushing the nonsensical “insurrection” narrative was the charade that they used to flex their police

¹ At my trial I learned that these two women were Capitol Hill police officers.

power and round up hundreds of patriots as a warning shot to others to stay on the fence.

28. After making my decision to become a protester, I started pushing and pulling on the bicycle racks that marked the police line in my area south of the stairs. This was a fruitless activity as the racks were fastened together and held in place by several young officers. During this time I was hit point blank in the face by a torrent of pepper spray. The officer who did this was not on the line, but was prowling up and down behind it with his harness supported, high volume, crowd control pepper spray delivery system. His pepper spray “SuperSoaker” produces a burst of spray ten times greater than a hand-held device. [Exhibit 7] Although suffering burning and tearing from the affects of the SuperSoaker, when some protesters down the line hooked up a line and pulled the connected bicycle racks out of the way, I tried to make a dash past the police line. I barely made it a few feet before bumping into officers who blocked my way and pushed me back behind the line.

29. After this one attempt, I was hurting and disabled enough by the pepper spray that I left the area. I sat on a pile of cinder blocks near a construction site, and then on the curb of a street as I tried to clean off pepper spray and to recover enough to travel back to the hotel. Every so often a cheer would rise up as the protesters pushed the police further and further up the Capitol steps. I felt my individual effort had been worthless, but I also felt privileged to be witnessing an event that seemed to me as significant as the Boston Tea Party. After the tearing and pain subsided, I took the subway back to my hotel.

30. After returning home I had to stop watching and listening to the media talk about the events of Jan6. It seemed to me that no one had a correct interpretation of that day. The leftist media could not stop hyperventilating about an insurrection, and the media on the right condemned it as a riot. Even today, a common media summary of that day is “the Capitol Hill riot, where five people died.”

[Exhibit 8] Not once in the four years since Jan6 have I heard any media put a subject in that passive tense sentence. The use of passive voice allows the reader's mind to insert his own subject, and most

people will assume the protesters caused the deaths. But if you insert a subject, that sentence would more accurately read, “where the police killed four protesters.” Most people know about Ashli Babbitt who was shot, but have never heard of Rosanne Boylan who was beat to death by police², and Benjamin Phillips and Kevin Greeson who were men in the 50's who died from trauma after being subjected to flash-bang grenades tossed into the crowd. The fifth person who died was officer Bryan Sicknick who the media reported for months as being killed by a protester wielding a fire extinguisher. The truth finally came out that he died the next day of a stroke.

Arrest and Pre-trial Period

31. Less than two weeks after returning home to Portland, I too suffered a massive stroke. I spent three weeks in the hospital and ten days at rehabilitation in order to learn to walk again. In the month of February 2021 we started hearing from friends that I was wanted by the FBI. I did not take this too seriously. I had not done anything important, and the FBI by this point had become a discredited agency and I figured that they had also become incompetent. I did not have a social media presence and I was skeptical of their ability to locate me from video captures. It did not even occur to me that people who knew me would turn me in to their tip hotline.

32. I was arrested on April 25, 2021 as my wife and I drove to church on Sunday afternoon. A line of police and FBI vehicles were parked on a side road waiting for us to pass by. I later learned that they knew by surveillance, including using drones, that I would be in a car headed to church at 1:30 PM on Sunday. (I would love to have been a fly on the wall to hear the safety/danger briefing on that police operation - “subject is known to be unarmed, a pillar of his community, and a follower of the Prince of Peace.”)

33. I spent the night in the county jail, stripped of my clothing in a concrete cell devoid of any

² Later in the J6 Gulag, most of the men I met who were jailed for violence against police were attempting to save Rosanne.

furniture or bedding. My mug shot at the county jail has a shirt thrown around my neck as I was naked except for a smock with non-functioning velcro shoulder straps that I was grasping around my waist to use for a skirt. [Exhibit 9] The next morning I was taken to the downtown Portland Federal building. That same day I was granted pre-trial release by a Portland, Oregon Federal judge. For the next two plus years, I and my lawyer had regular Zoom conferences with D.C. based judges.

34. The affects of my arrest, and the dissemination of an FBI Wanted video and a Most Wanted List naming me, were devastating to my family. Several of our children cut off ties with me to protect their children from a man who the Federal government had identified as dangerous and radical enough to be hunted by a national police force. This separation removed ten out of sixteen grandchildren from contact with their grandparents. The affect of this family breakup was especially destructive on my wife Myra. She often was reduced to uncontrollable sobbing and panic attacks, many times to the point where she had trouble breathing. For many weeks the only way she could be calmed down enough to sleep was by her and me singing together bright and hopeful church hymns at bedtime.

35. I wrote a book called "Save the Kid!" which covers this period of time. [Exhibit 10] (The "kid" that needs saving is America.)

36. During the first pre-trial hearing, after I had been granted pre-trial release, the prosecuting DOJ attorneys asked the judge to order me to D.C. to have a mental health examination and, if so ordered, to be committed to a mental facility. Their "evidence" for making such an astounding and severe charge against a man who was fully functional in society, as evidenced by:

being happily married for 42 years (at that time),

raising five children in the family, all of whom were wonderful adults, married and raising their own children,

being active in his church community,

serving in the executive committee of his county political party,

maintaining a 16 acre rural farm property,

while working full time in one of the most advanced technical jobs in the country,

was that when I was arrested, my wife had been agitated about me getting my medications. This was “proof” that I was mentally unstable. Yet, the DOJ knew that I had just suffered a severe stroke and that my medications were related to that. When the FBI was searching our home, Myra insisted they deliver my medications to the jail, and they made out a receipt for the pills they took. [Exhibit 11]

37. My lawyer pointed out to the judge I had suffered a massive stroke just a few months previously, and that was the purpose of the medications. The prosecution backed off. Frankly, I was a bit surprised they did not try to use the old foolproof Soviet indictment, “He opposed the government, so he must be crazy.”

Run for Oregon Governor

38. On the first anniversary of Jan6, I decided to throw my hat in the ring for the Republican primary for Oregon governor. I had been active in my local county politics and had some experience sharing my Jan6 experience with Republican groups around the state. There were at least four other candidates that could be classified as good “MAGA” candidates. But the main reason I decided to run is that none of them were addressing the elephant in the room, namely, that the state of Oregon had vote-by-mail for 30 years. If there was one thing any sentient person should have learned from the 2020 presidential election, it was that vote-by-mail is ripe for fraud. While on the road during the campaign I made a short video discussing what could be done in the face of this disastrous potential for corruption of the state's elections. [Exhibit 12]

39. For several months my wife and I traveled around the state attending Republican county governor forums, participating with the many other primary contenders in debates. During one of the weeks in May when we were not on the road I suffered a second stroke. I had almost completely

recovered from the first stroke, but this stroke hit me differently. It was not just a matter of impeded walking or lost function of a limb. It left me with constant severe pain and torpedoed my strength and stamina. I did a press release withdrawing from the race, but I appeared on the ballot because it was too late to remove my name. (I received around the same number of votes as the other MAGA candidates.)

Trial in U.S. District Court D.C.

40. In September 2023, I flew to Washington D.C. for my long awaited jury trial. This was my first experience with the American legal system, other than 15 minutes arguing in traffic court about a traffic ticket I felt was unjust. Myra and I agreed that she should not attend. She was sure she would have a mental and physical breakdown if she were to see her beloved husband and best friend for 46 years attacked and berated in a courtroom. Fortunately I was not alone, my brother Brett came to D.C. and spent the week with me, providing moral and logistical support.

41. The first two days of the trial were spent trying to seat a jury. This was tedious process because so many of them required “rehabilitation” by the judge. Washington D.C. is a company town of people who work for the Federal government and there was a tedious lack of diversity among the jury pool. All but a handful were government workers, lived on Capitol Hill, and said they had been directly affected by the Jan6 protest. The exact percentage of government workers cannot be known exactly since the jury questionnaire results are not preserved in the court record. However, from what can be gleaned from the court transcript, it can be shown that six government workers ended up on the jury. [Exhibit 13]

42. Furthermore, of the 43 jurors who came to the stand for follow-up questions, 20 of them had answered on the jury questionnaire that they could not be impartial toward a Trump supporter. [Exhibit 14] The judge spent a lot of time giving lectures to potential jurors about how I was innocent until

proven guilty. Right. Just like in the western where the judge starts the trial by calling out to the sheriff, “Bring in the guilty bum.” Despite my lawyer’s best efforts, five of these admittedly biased jurors ended up on my jury.

43. There was one potential juror who was not an ideological clone, who had answered in the negative on the question about his opinion of the FBI. When the judge asked why, the man started listing off news stories of FBI scandals and cover-ups. The prosecution did not even have to use one of their six “strikes” on this man. The judge, without even a request by the prosecution, struck him from consideration as being too biased. [Exhibit 15]

44. When the trial finally started on the third day, I was absolutely astounded at the first words coming from the mouth of one of the prosecutors (I had three: two active, and one coach). I had no idea that in the American legal system a prosecutor was allowed to spew forth bald-faced lies. Especially a Federal prosecutor or assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) who was representing the majesty and integrity of the mighty U.S. government. The prosecutor used a quote from my book, entered as trial exhibit 1, to inform the jury that I had come to Washington D.C. not just to rally, but to protest and cause trouble. [Exhibit 16]

45. I believe this narrative was pushed at the very beginning of their case in order to establish that I was a member of the “insurrection.” Otherwise my benign actions of that day, compared to the millions of dollars spent and three years of prosecution by the DOJ might appear a tad overblown. There is just one problem with this quote. It is proceeded in the book by a couple of pages explaining how protests have been a tool of the *left*, the book explaining why *they* cause trouble at protests. [Exhibit 17] I have seen this protest behavior from the left for my entire lifetime. So unless you believe an AUSA has a reading comprehension less than a third-grader, this was a deliberate lie. It would not be the prosecution’s last.

46. My judge spent a lot of time reading noble words about justice, but his true attitude toward Jan6

defenders came through in one memorable exchange. As I have said, this was my first jury trial experience, other than Perry Mason shows, but this struck me at the time as bizarre. A police officer was being examined by the prosecution and was asked if he perceived a unified goal or intent in the crowd. The officer indicated that they wanted to move forward (closer to the Capitol). Suddenly, the judge interrupted, in a voice of correction, asking, "The goal was to get into the building wasn't it or not?" The officer seemed embarrassed as he pointed out that did not perceive that at the time because he had not been told yet about the "insurrection." The judge continued to question the officer about his statement that the protesters just wanted to get past the police line. [Exhibit 18]

47. A very large part of the trial was spent by the prosecution proving the three charges of felony assault against me by examining police officers who did not remember me. The three charges were under 18 U.S.C. § 111a "impeding, resisting, or assaulting an officer" and each charge carries a maximum penalty of eight years. The AUSA examination was done by laboriously playing short 2-3 second video clips, showing still capture pictures, asking the officer what he just saw, and leading the officer along until he finally testified that I *impeded* his work.

48. Here is a summary of what the officers said about my interactions with them:

Officer One: [Exhibit 19]

- "I was kind of rushed at by an individual" Sep 14, p20, line 16
- "a gloved hand grabbing onto my right arm" Sep 14, p21 line 23
- "he kind of like reached for me ... grabbed my body" Sep 14 p22 line 17
- "*it prevented me from doing the job*" Sep 14, p23, line 17

Officer Two: [Exhibit 20]

- "do you recall the contact ... No" Sep 14, p63, line 6
- "I don't recall the particular shoving" Sep 14, p68, line 4
- "*this individual ... is ... getting in my way*" Sep 14, p68, line 10

Officer Three: [Exhibit 21]

- "they were wanting to get past us" Sep 14, p76, line 1
- "[Reed] appears to be trying to get past me" Sep 14, p80, line 11
- "he puts his hands on me" Sep 14, p81, line 4

- “he went towards the officer and is pushing against him” Sep 14, p83, line 7
- “*Did the interaction occupy you? Yes*” Sep 14, p81, line 0

The witness quotes above are representational summary, not cherry picked in isolation – as can be seen by reading the entire witness testimonies. Even after being “reminded” by the prosecution, no officer ever used words such as “assault, struck, or attack” to describe my actions. Only one time did an officer use the word “hit,” while saying “trying to hit” but he immediately backtracked to “trying to touch.” [Exhibit 21.1] The best (worst?) the prosecution could do was to get the officers to declare that I had *impeded* them from doing their jobs. These are the italicized quotes in the lists above.

49. There were times when the prosecutor tried to lead the officers toward declaring a physical assault by saying what was *about* to occur or to conjecture about what I *could* do:

Prosecutor: [Exhibit 22]

- “where he could swing a strike at you” Sep 14, page 87, line 9
- “he would fight if need be” Sep 14, page 91, line 11

50. But even without any testimony of assault from an officer, that word *impede*, coming from an officer of the law is a clear and direct statement that this serious 18 U.S.C. 111a felony law was violated. This law says you are guilty if you “impede, resist, or assault” a Federal officer. As an engineer who spent 30 years working on logic circuits, my favorite quote is from Officer One who said he was impeded because the time he spent controlling me, a member of the crowd, prevented him from doing his job of controlling the crowd.

51. During the trial I did not get on the witness stand to testify. My lawyer advised against it. Even though I had nothing to hide and I think I would have come across as an honorable and reliable witness, I had one big problem – I had gaps in my memory. After I arrived home from Jan6, the last thing I remembered was holding onto the bicycle rack and being hit in the face by a deluge of pepper spray from the SuperSoaker. I had no recollection of trying to breach the police line and being shoved back by the officers until I saw the video clips. Thus, I was quite pleased when the prosecution entered as an

exhibit a portion of an interview that I gave in spring 2021. [Exhibit 23] It was one of my best interviews, and I was happy to have some of my own words presented at the trial.

52. But the prosecution did not play that clip to show the jury that I was a reasonable and articulate person. The prosecution was setting up a couple of carefully crafted lies in order to denigrate my character and to paint me as a liar. Both of these lies were executed during the testimony of my FBI case agent. Yes, little old me, who had nary a traffic ticket on his legal record and who had never so much as littered, had my own FBI agent assigned during the three years the Federal government prosecuted me.

53. The first FBI-and-prosecutor lie was about my arrest warrant. In that interview clip I told an incredible story from my arrest. While I was behind the car being handcuffed, my wife was contending with several FBI officers and demanding to see an arrest warrant. At first the FBI agents refused, saying that they did not have to show one. (They said the same thing about not needing a warrant when they came with her to search the house.) But finally one of the female FBI agents came with a stack of papers and showed the arrest warrant. My wife was astounded to see several counts of “walking on the grass.” She made a statement like, “You have come all the way across the country to arrest my husband for *walking on the grass!*” The female FBI agent was too embarrassed to come up with a reply.

54. With the FBI agent on the stand, the prosecution asked him if there were any inconsistencies in my interview. The agent solemnly intoned, “that he was charged with walking on the grass was one.” [Exhibit 24] By this time I had been through the legal system enough to catch that this was a carefully crafted deception. Notice that the agent used the verb *charged*. My story was about an *arrest warrant*, which enables the apprehension of the suspect but does not initiate the criminal prosecution. The formal charge comes later, typically when the suspect is brought before a court for an arraignment or

preliminary hearing. A layman sitting on a jury would not notice that subtle misdirection³. So the prosecution was able to use a [sarc] reputable and honorable [\sarc] FBI agent to testify that I was a liar.

55. There was another FBI-and-prosecutor lie setup from something I said in the interview clip. In the interview I told about the surreal experience of friends telling me that I was shown on an FBI Top Ten most wanted poster. The prosecutor asked the FBI agent, “Was Mr. Christensen ever placed on the FBI top 10 most wanted list?” The agent answered, “No.” [Exhibit 25] Again, this question was too subtle for this not to have been a purposeful deception. Note the careful wording so that the question is asking about a very specific list, “*the* FBI top 10 most wanted list.” I never looked at FBI wanted posters and it was other people who told me I was on a “Top Ten” list. But even if I wasn't numbered one through ten, I was indeed on an FBI wanted poster for *Jan6 protesters*. [Exhibit 26] In my interview statement I may have talked about an FBI Top Ten list, but any thinking adult would know I was talking about a wanted list for Jan6 protesters, not referring to the list of murderers and thugs on the Post Office bulletin board. Again the honorable AUSA officer of the court and the FBI agent carefully worked together to craft a lie to promote the cause of justice [sarc].

56. As I think about my trial, I have sometimes wondered why my lawyer did not challenge patently false witness statements, like when the FBI agent said that I “participated in yelling, shouting, and taunting officers.” [Exhibit 27] One can watch on video my entire sojourn at the police line in a couple of minutes and see I did no such thing. Why did not my lawyer cross-examine and demand some proof of a statement like that? But as I thought about this I realized the problem. Officers are sworn agents of the law. Their testimony *is* proof, and juries tend to believe them over a normal citizen. That is why the American legal system asks officers to uphold legal, ethical, and professional standards, and why it is so terrible when they do not.

Note: I have used submitted a couple of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to the

³ The warrant currently on the case docket does not mention “walking on the grass.” Yet, the subtle misdirection crafted by using the verb “charged” suggests that the original did. (Not to mention the word of my godly and honest wife.)

FBI for any documents they have related to me. [Exhibit 28] (I was hoping to get an original arrest warrant, and their BOLO⁴ Jan6 wanted poster of me.) So far no response.

57. During the trial I was charged with the crime of disrupting interstate commerce. A document was produced declaring that the local Safeway on Capitol Hill had its business affected. Yes, the Safeway had lost a million dollars in business the week of the Jan6 protest, and it was my fault. Somehow staying at a hotel for one night, and riding the subway to and from the Mall caused shoppers to stay away. (It certainly could not have been due to the government throwing up barriers and fences for weeks after the protest as they performed insurrection theater.)

58. Another ridiculous charge was that I was found guilt of scaring Vice-President Mike Pence. A Secret Service agent testified that during the protest they had to whisk VP Pence away for his safety. As my lawyer pointed out, I was not within half a mile of VP Pence.

59. I have testimony to give that relates to the topic of safety of officials during the protest. It not only shows the ludicrous nature of this VP Pence charge, but it disproves the entire narrative of the insurrection. The vice-president being hustled out of the building, and Congress people running out the back door in fear of their lives was nothing but insurrection theater. The protesters that day were middle-class, Constitution-loving patriots, who were not there to hurt anyone - they were there to protest a stolen election. Any politician, from either side, could have come out and talked to the crowd and the most they would have gotten was to be booed and jeered. For evidence of this, during the time when I was sitting down trying to recover from the affects of pepper spray, while the crowd was pushing its way up the Capitol stairs, individuals and small groups of officers were going and coming without concern among the masses of people. They obviously had no concern about *their* safety. I would ask you to compare and contrast that to a protest by Anit-Fa in Portland, Oregon. No officer, in fear of his life, would dare to venture alone into that crowd of protesters.

4 BOLO – be on the lookout for

60. This VP charge, the Safeway charge, and the constant prosecution descriptions of the “weapons, chaos, obscenities” of that day were all part of the insurrection narrative. It was a while into the trial before I understood what the prosecutor was talking about in her opening statement when she described protesters being “armed with weapons.” [Exhibit 29.1] No Jan6 protester was ever convicted of any violation of D.C. gun law and video of the day confirms there was no brandishing of guns. An officer even testified at my trial that he never saw weapons in the hands of protesters. [Exhibit 29.2] I finally figure out that the “weapons” the prosecution was referencing were flag poles - most of which were American flags.

61. On Monday morning September 18, 2023, the jury came in and announced me guilty on all counts. One of the prosecutors jumped up to remind the judge that vicious felons such as myself (who spent less than two minutes bumping into police officers at a protest) were too dangerous to be let on the streets. The judge thanked the prosecutor for reminding him of his sacred duty to protect society by keeping a felony impeder (one who impedes) off the streets and he remanded me immediately to jail.

Detention in D.C.

62. Two Federal marshals took me out the backdoor of the courtroom and down to the warren of holding cells in the basement. My suit coat and tie were thrown on a table, I was strip searched, shackled hand and foot, and trundled off to the D.C. Department of Corrections jail. I was placed with another Jan6-er in a cell in the in-processing unit. Within a few days at the jail I had begun to think I would not survive my incarceration. This unit was a living nightmare. We were on 23x7 lock down – locked in a small cell except for one hour a day. You had one hour when you could exit your cell to do anything useful, such as to wait in line for the phone and take a shower.

63. The din was extraordinary all hours of the day and night, as most prisoners were held one to a cell, and the men yelled through the food-slot in the doors in order to communicate with other prisoners

in the unit. The bunks were sheet metal and the first night I had nothing but a thin blanket to sleep on and to cover me. The next day we received a worn two-inch thick mattress, but no pillow.

64. As a 65 year old man who had constant limb pain after suffering two strokes, I soon felt that the sleep depredation was causing my health to crash. I had headaches, felt groggy, and struggled to recall common words. Both my cellmate and I had heard about terrible conditions in the Jan6 cell-block, but we figured it could not be worse than this. No one would give us a definitive answer as to when we get out of this unit and be transferred to the cell-block reserved for Jan6 protesters (i.e. the J6 Gulag). So in desperation, after ten days in the intake unit, we both went on a hunger strike until we were moved.

65. The next day we were transferred to the J6 unit. The J6 Gulag was a welcome relief. The early terrible conditions of the D.C. jail had been exposed by political supporters of the J6 prisoners, and the jail had been shaped up and several officers fired by the time I arrived. The J6 cell-block was marked for “special handling” so we were banned from the barber shop, library, and chapel. But I never felt that I was subject to any cruel and unusual conditions during my stay there.

Sentencing in U.S. District Court D.C.

66. After four months in the D.C. Jan6 Gulag, on January 12, 2024, I was shackled and taken in my orange convict clothing for my sentencing hearing at the court house. During my four months in the D.C. jail my “impedes” had become “assaults” and the prosecution used the assault word 26 times as they asked for the judge to throw the book at me. [Exhibit 30] They were asking for a 60 month (5 year) sentence. My lawyer got up and gave some indication of my background and character to show why I deserved leniency.

67. During the listing of my dastardly crimes and my unrepentant nature, one of the prosecutors took a quote from something I said to a parole officer who wrote my Pre-sentencing Report (PSR). At the end of the interview, the parole officer asked if I had anything else to say. A bit lightheartedly, I

gave the famous quote from the Revolutionary War martyr Nathan Hale. I replied, “My only regret is I have but one life to give for my country.” The prosecutor recited this quote to the judge as evidence that I was an unrepentant insurrectionist. [Exhibit 31]

68. My lawyer told the judge of my two strokes. The judge asked no follow-on questions about how the strokes affected my health as a 65 year old senior citizen. [Exhibit 32]

69. My lawyer also spent some time making sure that the court knew that in no way was my book helping me to profit off my Jan6 notoriety. In fact, in the two years before my trial the book made \$50, and the months I was in the D.C. jail it made \$800. [Exhibit 33] Considering that my Jan6 legal costs were over \$360,000 this was not exactly a positive return on investment.

70. As the judge got ready to announce my sentence, he said, “this court [has] to deter anything like that day from ever happening again.” [Exhibit 34]

71. I was sentenced to 4 years incarceration, 3 years probation, and a \$22,260 penalty.

Detention in Federal Prison

72. Just days after my sentencing I was told of my transfer to the Federal prison system. On the day before my transfer I completely abstained from food and water since I had been warned that the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) does not believe in bathroom stops during transportation. I was quite worried about this since as an older man with a swollen prostate I had to urinate more often than a young man. During our day long bus ride to the Philadelphia Federal Detention Center (FDC) and stops en route, I got to see how this had been good advice. Fortunately, I had no problem during the ten hours or so on the bus, but a young man who pleaded with the guards that his medicine gave him loose bowels had no such luck.

73. My stay in Philly FDC which was supposed to be a few weeks, stretched into a few months. The Philly FDC is a “medium” security level facility, which means it includes all Federal prisoners who are

not considered the most dangerous, who are at the high or penitentiary level. I was blessed not to have any dangerous incidents, the closest thing being a robbery when a man came in to my cell demanding commissary food in the name of his gang. There was no repeat however, as the same day a guard caught the man with a concealed knife and he was taken to the punishment cell block.

74. Receiving my stroke medication and pain medication was a hit and miss activity in Philly FDC. Upon my reception processing I was informed that Gabopentin, a common pain medication for nerve damage that I had been using for a couple of years, was not handled by the BOP. The way that my new pain medication was dispensed was that a nurse would bring a cart to the unit sometime in the afternoon. The theory was that an announcement would be made, usually by the nurse yelling "Pill Call!" But the prison block was a noisy place and not every nurse knew how to yell over it. Many times I would sit outside my cell in the common area in the afternoon listening, but I would still miss the nurse.

75. On the day of my transfer to my final designated prison in Arkansas, over 100 prisoners were crowded into a large holding cell. I knew it would take hours for each prisoner to be called out and shackled for the trip, so I was quite pleased when I was the very first name called. My pleasure was short lived when I got to the shackling station. Of the hundred plus men who would be shackled that morning, there were only four "boxes" set aside to be used, and I was one of the four, thus the reason for me being called early.

76. A "box" is a torture device used by the BOP – it has no other purpose. When traveling, a prisoner is put in leg-cuffs and handcuffs, and a chain that goes around the waist. The waist chain is then pulled snug and passed through the handcuffs, which keeps the hands tight against the torso. The "box" is used by being placed over the handcuffs which holds the handcuffs straight which in turns forces the arms to be parallel. The torture occurs when the box-handcuff combo is pulled toward the torso to be fastened to the waist chain. Pulling the cuffed wrists toward the body would naturally cause

the elbows to splay out, but the box is holding the arms parallel. The end result is a terrible gouging and digging of the cuffs into the wrists. During my final day of transfer to Arkansas I spent six hours in the “box.” After I arrived it took a week before the bruises and gouges in my wrists went away.

77. I arrived at the Forrest City, Arkansas Low prison in early May 2025. Even though I had low enough points to be eligible for a camp (due to my clean record and life background - my recidivism score was actually negative), the Jan6 prisoners were marked for “special” handling so I was assigned to a Low security facility. The Low prison had a campus layout and prisoners had the freedom to move around the campus during the day. The hardest part of this campus layout for me was the half-mile round trip to and from the chow hall three times per day. My second stroke had left a lot of pain in my legs so that walking or standing for anything length of time caused severe pain. After I was able to buy food on the commissary I bought cold cereal and powered milk so I could have breakfast in the cell block and avoid that walk in the morning.

78. I had a number of medical challenges in prison. The first was losing the big toenail on my left foot due to the camp-issued heavy boots which were the only shoes I could wear until I was able to buy sneakers on the commissary. Because of the stroke after affects in my left leg, I did not feel the pain as the too short left boot tore off the toenail on by big toe. After being rejected at a couple morning sick calls (at 7am, Mon-Fri), I had the idea of wearing a shower shoe on my left foot. After being rejected the third time by the screening nurse, I held up my left foot to show the pussy mess of the nail-less big toe and I was finally granted permission to see a nurse.

79. Pain medication was also a problem in Forrest City. Again, in order to have a strong pain medication, I could not keep it myself, I had to go to “pill call” everyday at 2pm. This entailed standing in line usually for an hour. This meant that in order to get a pain pill, I had to be in excruciating pain for an hour. After a few weeks of this I gave up, deciding it was not worth it. After some time, I was able to get an appointment in order to ask for a pain medicine that I could keep in a

pill bottle in my locker.

80. Another health problem I had was five months of diarrhea. Up to ten times a day I would have loose bowels. The prison issued each prisoner four rolls of toilet paper per week. In a typical two week period I would go through twelve rolls of toilet paper. Fortunately, there were young men who did not use all their allotment who were willing to help me out with extra rolls. I made several sick call trips, and my wife worked to initiate a Congressional Inquiry by our Senator, but the problem was never figured out. I believe the prison medical staff did their best, but they were really just a clinic designed to help young men who occasionally got hurt. The problem was that the prison was chocked full of old men (60s, 70s) who had chronic health problems which were exacerbated by the harsh prison living conditions. When I first arrived at the prison I was astounded by the number of wheelchairs, walkers, and canes being used by old men getting to chow. One man in his 70s not only used a walker, but was blind, his walker was led by another prisoner. I still had the diarrhea when I was pardoned by President Trump. Two days later, after being home and having home cooked food, the chronic diarrhea stopped.

81. Another condition that bears mentioning about the Forrest City prison is that I was always hungry. In order for me not to lose weight I could not depend just on the food provided by the chow hall. In order to maintain my weight it required me to buy about \$150 per month of extra food at the commissary. I only had one meal the eight months I was in Forrest City when I left the table full, that was the 4th of July holiday meal. Many of the meals were woefully short of calories, and this was for an old guy with a metabolism much lower than the young men. Even with purchasing commissary food to add another meal per day, my weight loss was severe enough while I was in Federal custody that it shocked my wife when she saw me change out of my prison clothes after my pardon. She described my appearance to being similar to “concentration camp” prisoners and insisted on taking a photo. [Exhibit 36]

82. While I was in the D.C. jail, I had been told that the Federal system was so much better when it came to food. They had all-you-can-eat salad and pasta bars, grilled food for breakfast, etc. None of this was true at Forrest City. The inmates who had been there a while said all that stopped with COVID and had never been started up again. I believe another reason for lack of food was corruption. During Thanksgiving 2024 a man in my cell block who worked in the chow hall cleanup crew told me that he had seen 35 cases of pies in the kitchen. No pie was served for Thanksgiving in the chow hall. Nor did any pie show up for sale in the black market in the cell block. Prisoners would steal and sell a lot of food, some of which hardly ever made it to the dinner plates in the chow hall – things like ground beef, cheese, and eggs. But prisoner theft did not account for the pies as they never showed up for sale.

83. I never encountered any conditions where I felt threatened or unsafe while in Forrest City prison. There were a few “beat downs” in my cell block, but I was not around when they happened. They were always over contraband, such as tobacco, drugs, and cell-phones. Since I was not around these items I was never around any violence. I had a young man tell me that it was easier for him to get off drugs when he was outside than when in prison. If he was outside he could go to his mother's house for a drug-free environment. He said that in prison every and any type of drug was available.

84. While in Forrest City I worked at the Education Center as a GED tutor. When I started I tried working a full day, but I soon realized that my second stroke left me too weak and that was too difficult a schedule. I should note that my pay was 40 cents per hour, but it was cut to 12 cents per hour when the Education Center decided they need to cut inmate employee expenses. This is the same pay scale for the inmates who worked in the prison factory making furniture for the Federal government. (BOP to the CCP and its slave labor industries - “hold my beer.”) The items that an inmate can buy in the commissary were not reduced in price. The prices there are comparable to a corner market or service station market.

85. One frustration with the Education Center was that they had a Computer Classroom that had

many stations with new computer hardware, but which was never used. I offered my services, pointing out that I had worked in the computer industry for 30 years and that I would be happy to setup any number of useful classes on computer topics. I was given a number of excuses why that would not happen, but the most common excuse was that a couple of years ago someone did something bad in there so the inmates were being punished.

86. Myra made regular visits to come and visit me in Forrest City Low, coming all the way from Idaho. [Exhibit 37] Twice she drove our RV the 1,627 miles so that she could afford to stay longer and visit on multiple consecutive weekends. The longest stay she had planned was to stay in Arkansas at a private campsite close to the prison the entire month of October 2024. She was already on the road for this long stay when the warden announced that the Visitation Room would be closed for two weeks. The reason given for the closure was that drugs had been found in the room – so therefore the entire prison would be punished. This closure meant that Myra was forced to sit idly for two weeks in the campsite, as well as having our visit time cut into.

87. On December 24, 2024 I was transferred to the prison's punishment block (Special Handling Unit – SHU) for trying to climb the fence and take an unauthorized two-day furlough for Christmas. This transfer cut off all communication with my wife Myra. I had been calling her everyday but that was cut off with no notification when I sent to the SHU. Myra had grave concerns about my health as I was 66 years old and had previously suffered two strokes. She feared the worse due to the sudden loss of communication. She severely distrusted the words of prison officials due to previous encounters. It was during this time that she came to Arkansas and filed the original motion 2:24-cv-00229 with this Court.

Life After Prison

88. During the years of DOJ persecution, Reed and Myra have incurred numerous damages:

imprisonment (with attending hunger, weight loss, and chronic diarrhea), separation, loneliness, stress, family division, loss of employment, loss of their dream property, and \$366,00 in legal fees. [Exhibit 38 and 39]

89. Even after his pardon, punishment continues to plague Reed. His brokerage and IRA accounts held by Fidelity and Charles Schwab were de-banked while he was in prison. Specifically, although the accounts still exist, he can no longer participate in the market since he is blocked from buying securities. He is currently stymied in his effort to transfer the accounts. He has been rejected by two other brokerage firms and is still working to regain to gain access to the markets.

(Note: Fidelity sent an internal account message on April 23, 2025 removing restrictions.)

90. At this point, after Reed and Myra have reassembled some of the broken pieces of their lives, the plaintiff is not seeking monetary damages. Reed and Myra know how to live with the new reality of a limited income - they married young, went to four years of college together, and started their family while living on the income of their part-time work. The main loss they feel now is the loss of companionship of the children and grandchildren who were estranged when he was arrested by the FBI.

V. Causes of Action

COUNT I: *Violation of 1st Amendment by the DOJ against Reed Christensen*

**** The DOJ targeted Reed to suppress dissent rather than enforce a neutral law. ****

91. Reed's actions on Jan6 were minor, he made one attempt to cross a police line. The prosecution knew his actions were benign, at most misdemeanor level, and did not consist of any real assault. This is why during examination the prosecution only attempted to show that Reed "impeded" the officers. So why did the prosecution chose to make three serious felony charges, each with an eight year sentence? There is no reason under justice or equity for this to be done. Nor can the case be made that this was a case of "throwing the book" at a career criminal. In fact, the

evidence of malfeasance during the trial shows that the government knew they would have trouble painting Reed in a bad light. Thus, the patently misused quote from his book (see para. 44), and used the lies setup between the prosecutor and the FBI agent (see para. 53-55).

92. The real reason for the sledgehammer prosecution response of the DOJ was verbalized by the judge, when he said that he had to deter that day from happening again (see para. 70). There is no doubt that by “it” he meant “insurrection.” The government created the insurrection narrative, and targeted Reed because of it wanted to send a message of crackdown to anyone who questioned it's legitimacy after a sketchy election.

COUNT II: *Violation of 5th Amendment by the DOJ against Reed Christensen*

**** The DOJ targeted Reed with vague laws because of his political beliefs. ****

93. If there is anything in Reed's trial that shows the mindset of his jury, it is that they found him guilty of obstructing interstate commerce. The notion that a single individual staying one night in a hotel, riding the subway to and from the Mall, and spending the one day at a protest, interfered with interstate commerce and caused Safeway to lose money is nonsensical. If the case was being made that an insurrection caused these loses, it would require a number of points to be made and proven at trial:

- 1) a planned and organized rebellion or insurrection existed,
- 2) the actions of the insurrection caused commerce to be blocked,
- 3) Reed was part of the insurrection.

None of these points were even attempted to be made. The best the prosecution could do is a blatantly misleading quote from his book to falsely paint him as a troublemaker (see para. 44,45).

94. How can an individual who is not within half a mile of VP Mike Pence be guilty of threatening the safety of the vice-president? (see para. 58) The evidence of the trial shows that as an individual Reed posed a threat to no one, as he was not guilty of causing property damage or

bodily harm. Since all he was doing was protesting, the conclusion must be drawn that this is the reason for this charge.

95. The observation of small groups of officers moving freely among the crowd shows that there were no safety concerns at all (see para. 59). The charges of violence by protesters against police officers occurred in places like the tunnel after the police were ordered to forcefully and violently clear the area.

COUNT III: *Violation of 6th and 14th Amendment by DOJ against Reed Christensen*

**** Reed did not receive a fair trial or due process because of lying prosecutors. ****

96. No government prosecutor is legally or ethically allowed to use purposeful lies to push a case to successful conclusion. Doing so violates legal, ethical, and professional standards. Prosecutors are court officers and are considered “ministers of justice,” with a duty to seek truth and justice, not just convictions. These are the lies of the prosecution specifically called out in this document:

- 1) the purposely misused book quote (see para. 44),
- 2) the deceptive wording about the arrest warrant (see para. 54),
- 3) and the deceptive wording about the wanted poster (see para. 55).

Taken together, these lies show a pattern of willful and continual attempt to deceive on the part of the DOJ.

97. This type of prosecutorial misconduct is more egregious than simply giving false testimony on the witness stand and thus corrupting a single trial. If officers of the court and officers of the law cannot be trusted to tell the truth, then the entire edifice of the legal system is undermined.

COUNT IV: *Violation of 6th Amendment by U.S. District of D.C. against Reed Christensen*

**** Reed did not have an impartial jury and faced a biased court. ****

98. Reed faced a jury pool that was predominantly government workers. It can be seen by the charges against Reed (e.g. Safeway and Mike Pence) that the prosecution considered Reed part of an

insurrection against the government. The judge's comments during the trial indicate that he too held this view. How could the court allow on the jury so many people whose livelihood depend on the government that was claiming to be the aggrieved party? (see para. 41)

99. Reed faced a biased jury because the judge did not strike jurors who admitted bias against the defendant, while automatically striking a juror who expressed bias against the government (see para. 43). Five of these admittedly biased jurors ended up on Reed's jury.

100. In front of the jury, the judge challenged witness testimony, when the testimony did not conform with the prosecution narrative of an “insurrection” (see para. 46).

101. Since the prosecution kept harping on the dreadful insurrection at my trial, the jury was conditioned to believe that I was part of the insurrection. I didn't have to specifically do anything - I was guilty by association (see para. 56).

COUNT V: *Violation of 8th Amendment by DOJ against Reed Christensen*

**** Reed was punished with excessive persecution because of his political beliefs. ****

102. The prosecution knew exactly what Reed did and didn't do on Jan6. There were probably ten or more cameras that captured his time at the police line and their trial exhibits used pictures and videos from most of them. The notion that a man who had not caused any bodily harm, who had been a model citizen his entire life, should be immediately remanded to jail has no basis in justice or equity. This action left Reed's wife alone on a country property where she had to clear off and prepare the property for sale on her own. The only reason for this type of cruelty was so that the government could send a message to political opponents.

103. During sentencing, the prosecutor used Reed's quote from Nathan Hale as an indication that he was not remorseful and continued to “convey his political beliefs” (see para. 67). It is beyond ironic that a Federal prosecutor would use that patriotic quote as an example of political fanaticism that needs to be crushed.

COUNT VI: *Violation of Eighth Amendment by DOJ against Reed Christensen*

**** Unacceptable prison system conditions exacerbated Reed's punishment. ****

104. The BOP, operating the Forrest City Low prison, was unable to operate a safe and healthy environment which would allow Reed to maintain his health as evidenced by his suffering five months of continual diarrhea (see para. 80).
105. The BOP, operating the Forrest City Low prison did not provide sufficient food and nutrition so that Reed could maintain a healthy body weight (see para. 81, 82).
106. Forrest City Low prison sending Reed to the SHU without any notification of his wife caused Reed and her cruel emotional distress. Because the prison did not allow a notification phone call to be made, and she had to come to Arkansas and file a lawsuit in order to have a phone call and know that he was still alive.

COUNT VII: *Violation of 8th Amendment by U.S. District Court D.C. against Reed Christensen*

**** Reed received excessive punishment because of his political beliefs. ****

107. Reed received a 4 years of incarceration, with 3 years probation for what was simply misdemeanor behavior. The prosecution used a statute that linked “impeding” with “assault” in order to get a felony conviction. But the judge was there the entire trial, he knew there was no property destruction or bodily harm done, yet he still gave a multi-year sentence. The reason for this severity was expressed when he said, “this court [has] to to deter anything like that day from ever happening again” (see para. 70). In other words, the sentence had nothing to do with what Reed did, it was given to send a political message about challenging the legitimacy of the government.
108. Nearly every Jan6 defendant was ordered to pay a \$2,500 restitution, which was each defendant's share of the damage done during the protest - two windows broken in the Capitol. Reed was given that penalty, as well as an additional \$20,000 fine. No other Jan6 prisoner that Reed encountered in the J6 Gulag was given such an additional penalty. Since it was never even alleged

that Reed damaged property or caused bodily injury, the only reason for this penalty is that it is a punishment for him writing a political book. Reed wrote the book “Save the Kid!” which combines memoir, political commentary, and self-help. It offers his perspective on developing an inner moral compass to navigate America's challenges, inspired by his Jan6 ordeals and his belief in the nation's founding principles. The judge knew at sentencing that Reed was not making big money off his book (see para. 69).

109. During sentencing Reed's lawyer told the judge that Reed had suffered two strokes. Reed was already a senior citizen, yet the judge never asked about how these strokes affected his physical condition and his ability to handle the harsh environment of prison. Without considering these physical limitations the judge was sentencing Reed not only to incarceration, but also to accompanying pain and suffering (see para. 68).

VI. Prayer for Relief

WHEREAS, this complaint outlines a case of actual controversy about the Jan6 protest, which is a real dispute and not a hypothetical question, and

WHEREAS, this court has jurisdiction over this matter because it raises Federal questions of violations of Amendment rights, and the court has precedence to review actions of the Executive branch as argued in the accompanying legal brief, and

WHEREAS the court is not being asked to overturn the sentence of another court, or to punish anyone by the award of monetary damages, but rather only to use the principles of Americans justice and equity to consider this case and make a wise and moral judgment,

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff requests that this court render a Declaratory Judgment concerning the Counts listed in this motion, and asks the court to send a copy of this motion and this court's ruling

to the Plaintiff's estranged children.

Signature

Signed: _____ Dated: _____
Reed K. Christensen

Address: _____

Phone: _____

DECLARATIONS OF PLAINTIFF

I Reed Christensen hereby attest that the facts contained in the above Complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed: _____ Dated: _____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing was entered with the Clerk of the Court who informed me that he/she would enter the foregoing into the court's ECF system that would then electronically serve the documents on all parties.

Signed: _____ Dated: _____