

2019 Bias-Related Crimes Fact Sheet

U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia



- ❖ Total number of offenses committed between January 1, 2019, and December 31, 2019, that were supported by the Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) as potentially bias-related:¹ **203**
- ❖ Of the 203 total offenses supported by MPD as potentially bias-related, number of offenses presented by MPD to the U.S. Attorney’s Office (“USAO”) where MPD made an arrest: **58**²
- ❖ Of the 58 offenses presented to USAO where MPD made an arrest, number of cases in which USAO prosecuted the underlying offense: **49**
- ❖ Of the 49 cases in which USAO prosecuted the underlying offense, number of cases in which USAO charged a bias-related enhancement: **8**
 - United States v. Ermin Saavedra, 2019 CMD 4544
 - United States v. Kurt Madsen, 2019 CMD 9343
 - United States v. Manuel Franks, 2019 CMD 10985
 - United States v. Brian Simmons, 2019 CMD 11098
 - United States v. Besufikad Tujuba, 2019 CMD 12355
 - United States v. John Williams, 2019 CMD 12311
 - United States v. Luis Montsinos, 2019 CMD 15315
 - United States v. David Jackson, 2020 CF3 61
- ❖ In addition to the 8 cases initially supported as potentially bias-related by MPD in which USAO filed a bias-related enhancement, number of cases in which USAO charged a bias-related enhancement notwithstanding the fact that the case was not initially supported by MPD as potentially bias-related: **3**
 - United States v. Norman Graves, 2019 CF3 4317
 - United States v. Taylar Nuevelle, 2019 CMD 14733

¹ Whether an offense is classified as a bias-related offense is subject to change as an investigation proceeds. Indeed, 2 cases that were not initially supported by MPD as being potentially bias-related were later classified as supported by MPD as the investigations proceeded.

² This number does not include offenses that may have been presented by MPD to the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia where MPD made an arrest.

- United States v. Richard Williams, 2019 CMD 13135

- ❖ Total number of cases involving offenses committed between January 1, 2019, and December 31, 2019, in which USAO charged a bias-related enhancement in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia: 11

- ❖ Total number of cases involving offenses committed between January 1, 2019, and December 31, 2019, in which USAO charged a federal hate crime in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia: 1

- ❖ In the 11 cases in which USAO charged a bias-related enhancement in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, USAO charged that the underlying criminal act demonstrated the prejudice of the defendant based on the following actual or perceived characteristics of the victim:
 - United States v. Ermin Saavedra, 2019 CMD 4544 (sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression)
 - United States v. Kurt Madsen, 2019 CMD 9343 (race or national origin)
 - United States v. Manuel Franks, 2019 CMD 10985 (race, religion, or national origin)
 - United States v. Brian Simmons, 2019 CMD 11098 (gender identity or expression)
 - United States v. Besufikad Tujuba, 2019 CMD 12355 (sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression)
 - United States v. John Williams, 2019 CMD 12311 (gender identity or expression)
 - United States v. Luis Montsinos, 2019 CMD 15315 (religion)
 - United States v. David Jackson, 2020 CF3 61 (sexual orientation)
 - United States v. Norman Graves, 2019 CF3 4317 (race and color)
 - United States v. Tylar Nuevelle, 2019 CMD 14733 (sexual orientation)
 - United States v. Richard Williams, 2019 CMD 13135 (sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression)

- ❖ In addition to the 11 cases in which USAO charged a bias-related enhancement in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, USAO charged a federal hate crime in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in the following case:
 - United States v. Sonia Tabizada, 19-cr-00402 (Threat to Obstruct Religious Exercise, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 247(a)(2), and Transmitting Bomb Threat in Interstate Commerce, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 844(e))