

Memorandum on Juror 0374 (Jeremy W. Brinster): Undisclosed Background and Implications for Bias in United States v. Cindy Young (1:23-cr-00241)

Submitted by: Cindy Lou Young, Pro Se Defendant
Address: 20 Central Street-Unit 1, Bristol, NH 03222
Email: clyoung@breezeline.net
Phone: (603) 630-3195
Date: October 20, 2025

To: January 6th Historical Commission

Re: Juror Bias in J6 Prosecutions; Request for Investigation into Voir Dire Integrity and Judicial Oversight

I. Introduction

This memorandum details Juror 0374, identified as Jeremy W. Brinster, the foreperson in my trial (United States v. Young, No. 1:23-cr-00241-TSC-GMH, D.D.C., convicted August 2024). I identified Brinster as Juror 0374 through my trial notebook diagram, created during the trial to track jury configuration, designating him as foreperson (attached as EXHIBIT E), and confirmed his identity post-trial via public records and leaked DNC emails. His undisclosed affiliations with the Democratic National Committee (DNC) and WilmerHale, including his engagement with anti-Republican rhetoric (EXHIBIT C), combined with a repeat juror (Juror 0001) who served on a prior January 6th case (Trial Transcript, pp. 140-145, attached as EXHIBIT F), raise serious concerns about jury impartiality under the Sixth Amendment. These issues, not probed during voir dire (Trial Transcript, pp. 167-172, attached as EXHIBIT A), contributed to a biased jury in a case with a 95%+ conviction rate in D.C. J6 trials. The case docket (attached as EXHIBIT D) documents procedural irregularities, including denials of motions on juror misconduct and exculpatory evidence, violating federal jury selection standards (Fed. R. Crim. P. 24; Peña-Rodriguez v. Colorado, 580 U.S. 206 (2017)).

This submission supports my D.C. Circuit appeal (filed October 2025, EXHIBIT D), Texas Bar complaint (filed August 2025 under Rule 8.3), and judicial complaint against Magistrate Judge G. Michael Harvey (§ 28 U.S.C. 351). I request the Commission investigate Brinster's role, unseal juror records, and examine J6 jury selection patterns.

II. Professional Background

Jeremy W. Brinster is a Senior Associate at WilmerHale, specializing in litigation for Democratic-leaning clients like Harvard University (*Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard College*, 600 U.S. 181 (2023)). He clerked for Judge Gregg Costa (Fifth Circuit, 2019-2020) and holds a J.D. from NYU Law (2019) (EXHIBIT J).

Relevance to Bias: Brinster's WilmerHale role and prior partisan positions (EXHIBIT J) create prejudice. During voir dire, he omitted these affiliations despite Q30 probing "strong feelings about Trump/supporters," violating candor (*In re Snyder*, 472 U.S. 634 (1985)). My diagram (EXHIBIT E) confirms his foreperson role.

III. Political Affiliations with the Democratic National Committee (DNC)

Brinster served as DNC Video Research Associate (July 2014-January 2015) and Senior Research Associate (July 2014-January 2017), engaging in opposition research (EXHIBIT J). Leaked DNC emails (EXHIBIT C) show:

- **Email ID 26981 (April 27, 2016):** Strategy memos to brinsterj@dnc.org.
- **Email (April 25, 2016):** Summarized anti-Republican rhetoric: "I will do everything in my power to make sure no Republican gets into the WH."
- **Network Analysis (Medium, November 2016):** Key node in anti-Sanders strategies.

Relevance to Bias: His DNC role conflicts with impartiality in a J6 trial. Nondisclosure during voir dire (EXHIBIT A, pp. 167-172) despite Q32's pledge constitutes misconduct (*United States v. Darden*, 70 F.3d 719 (1st Cir. 1995)). EXHIBIT E underscores his influence.

IV. Involvement in Politically Sensitive Litigation

Brinster's WilmerHale work aligns with anti-Trump briefs (e.g., *Trump v. United States*, No. 23-939 (2024)). As foreperson (EXHIBIT E), he likely dismissed exculpatory evidence. FBI Agent Matthew Giftos testified I was "walking peacefully" (EXHIBIT B), with his 302 report (admitted under FRE 613(b)) confirming this, supporting my barred entrapment defense. This was sidelined by a biased jury, compounded by a repeat juror (EXHIBIT F).

Relevance to Bias: Brinster’s affiliations (EXHIBIT C, J) and a repeat juror (EXHIBIT F) skewed deliberations, overriding Giftos’s evidence (EXHIBIT B), per the docket (EXHIBIT D).

V. Suppressed MPD Witness and Sealing of Evidence

Pre-trial (July 2024), I sought an MPD officer to testify about officers directing crowds (“Go! Go! Go!”), corroborating excluded MPD footage (Opening Statement, p. 2). Judge Harvey denied this and sealed materials without Hubbard balancing (United States v. Hubbard, 650 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1980)). Public disclosure occurred in December 2023 via Rep. Barry Loudermilk’s interview with Laura Loomer, confirming plain-clothes MPD actions (EXHIBIT G). The prosecution and Harvey ignored Hubbard until my motion; they conceded unsealing (with name redaction) only after ECF 170 (EXHIBIT C).

Relevance to Bias: Sealing prevented confrontation, likely dismissed by Juror 0374 and Juror 0001 (EXHIBIT F), supporting J6 sealing scrutiny (EXHIBIT D).

VI. Rule 615 Invocation and Courtroom Manipulation

On August 5, 2024, the prosecution invoked Rule 615 to allow FBI Agents Garland, Giftos, and Paolino to remain during testimony (EXHIBIT H, pp. 7-8). Garland, initially the case agent, sat at the table, participated in sidebars and jury selection, despite my objection (EXHIBIT H, p. 8, lines 15-18). The court overruled this, citing their prior roles, risking testimony tailoring (EXHIBIT I, 2023 amendment). My attorney, Jonathan Gross, impeached Garland for inconsistency between his testimony (e.g., ongoing investigation, pp. 162-163) and an April 21, 2021, email stating, “We are not opening a case on Ms. Young” (EXHIBIT H, pp. 164-185), suggesting suppressed exculpatory evidence of no initial case intent. This compromised my confrontation rights, especially as Garland and Giftos testified, with Giftos later impeached via his FBI 302 report (EXHIBIT B).

Relevance to Bias: This manipulation, alongside Juror 0374’s bias (EXHIBIT C, J) and a repeat juror (EXHIBIT F), likely influenced the jury to dismiss exculpatory evidence (EXHIBIT B), warranting Rule 615 review (EXHIBIT D).

VII. Judicial Actions Amplifying Bias

Judge Harvey denied my motions on Brinster’s misconduct (ECF 170, EXHIBIT C), calling them “speculative,” yet mailed the opinion to Brinster (ECF 172, EXHIBIT C). Rule 615

exemptions (EXHIBIT H) and Sumrall's FBI visit (@HelpStopHate , October 9, 2025) further compromised fairness.

Relevance: These violate judicial impartiality (Canon 3), demanding scrutiny of J6 practices (EXHIBIT D).

VIII. Conclusion and Request for Relief

Brinster's ties (EXHIBITS C, E, J), a repeat juror (EXHIBIT F), suppressed MPD evidence (EXHIBIT G), Rule 615 issues (EXHIBITS H, I), and judicial actions tainted my conviction despite exculpatory evidence (EXHIBIT B). This reflects J6 overreach (EXHIBIT D).

I request the Commission:

- 1 Investigate Brinster's affiliations (EXHIBIT E, J).
- 2 Unseal records (EXHIBITS C, G).
- 3 Examine jury selection and Rule 615 (EXHIBITS F, H, I, D).
- 4 Review Giftos's evidence (EXHIBIT B).
- 5 Support my appeals (EXHIBIT D).

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Lou Young

clyoung@breezeline.net

(603)630-3195

20 Central Street, Unit 1

Bristol, NH. 03222

Attachments:

- **EXHIBIT A:** Voir Dire (pp. 167-172).
- **EXHIBIT B:** Giftos Testimony/302.
- **EXHIBIT C:** ECF 170/172, WikiLeaks.
- **EXHIBIT D:** Case Docket.
- **EXHIBIT E:** Juror Diagram.
- **EXHIBIT F:** Repeat Juror (pp. 140-145).
- **EXHIBIT G:** Loudermilk-Loomer Interview.

- **EXHIBIT H:** Rule 615 Invocation.
- **EXHIBIT I:** Rule 615 Text.
- **EXHIBIT J:** Brinster Resume.