

1 GARY M. RESTAINO  
United States Attorney  
2 District of Arizona

3 KEVIN M. RAPP (Ariz. Bar No. 014249, [kevin.rapp@usdoj.gov](mailto:kevin.rapp@usdoj.gov))  
MARGARET PERLMETER (Ariz. Bar No. 024805, [margaret.perlmeter@usdoj.gov](mailto:margaret.perlmeter@usdoj.gov))  
4 PETER S. KOZINETS (Ariz. Bar No. 019856, [peter.kozinets@usdoj.gov](mailto:peter.kozinets@usdoj.gov))  
ANDREW C. STONE (Ariz. Bar No. 026543, [andrew.stone@usdoj.gov](mailto:andrew.stone@usdoj.gov))  
5 Assistant U.S. Attorneys  
40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1800  
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4408  
Telephone (602) 514-7500  
7

8 DAN G. BOYLE (N.Y. Bar No. 5216825, [daniel.boyle2@usdoj.gov](mailto:daniel.boyle2@usdoj.gov))  
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney  
312 N. Spring Street, Suite 1400  
9 Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Telephone (213) 894-2426  
10

11 KENNETH POLITE  
Assistant Attorney General  
Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice  
12

AUSTIN M. BERRY (Texas Bar No. 24062615, [austin.berry2@usdoj.gov](mailto:austin.berry2@usdoj.gov))  
13 U.S. Department of Justice  
Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section  
14 1301 New York Avenue, NW, 11th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
15 Telephone (202) 412-4136  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
16

17 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

19 United States of America,  
20  
21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 Michael Lacey, et al.,  
24 Defendants.  
25

CR-18-422-PHX-DJH

**UNITED STATES' MOTION  
IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE  
DEFENSE FROM INTRODUCING  
NON-WITNESSES OR NON-  
EVIDENCE**

26  
27  
28

1           The United States moves *in limine* to preclude Defendants, their counsel, and their  
2 witnesses from commenting, during opening statements or closing argument, on any facts  
3 or evidence or individuals that are not anticipated to be introduced into evidence at the trial.  
4 For example, during opening statements on September 8, 2021, defense counsel asked the  
5 wife and children of one of the defendants to rise in the audience so that he could show  
6 them to the jury. (Doc. 1342 at 29:18-22 (“He’s got six children. I’m going to ask if they  
7 can stand up. And his wife Molly. We have several here. He raised six children. You’re  
8 looking at his wife Molly and four of them. You guys can all have a seat.”).) Similarly,  
9 defense counsel mentioned facts that are not anticipated to be introduced through any  
10 witness because they are irrelevant. For example, the defense mentioned that Defendant  
11 Larkin “[w]ent to Catholic high school here. Went to Phoenix Community College.” (Doc.  
12 1342 at 29:15-16.) Likewise, defense counsel offered that “[i]n [Larkin’s] personal life, he  
13 does not participate or partake in the kind of activities that you are going to hear about  
14 today, much like he never participated or partook in many of the activities that his  
15 newspaper allowed to be printed about, or people to send in advertisements.” (Doc. 1342  
16 at 29:23 to 30:2.) In yet another example, defense counsel told the jury, “to show you the  
17 genuineness of these gentlemen as newspaper people, they won over 3,800 awards  
18 including the xxx [sic] Pulitzer Prize for a critical article. That’s the real deal. These are  
19 real newspaper people, and that’s where Mike lives. He’s a newspaper man.” (Doc. 1343  
20 at 33:7-12.)

21           Additionally, Defendants discussed a civil lawsuit in which Defendants Lacey and  
22 Larkin sued a Maricopa County law enforcement official and won a money judgment.  
23 (Doc. 1343 at 28:17-29:5.) This information lacks any relevance to the conspiracy, Travel  
24 Act, and money laundering charges at issue. On the other hand, discussing this separate  
25 litigation—which has no connection whatsoever to the instant prosecution of the former  
26 owners and operators of the internet’s largest (until 2018) source of prostitution  
27 advertising—presents a serious risk of confusing the issues, wasting time, and misleading  
28 the jury. If Defendants are permitted to discuss how one local law enforcement official

1 violated the law by retaliating against them for something they published in a newspaper,  
2 the United States will have to explain the difference between the publishing of an article  
3 critical of an elected public official and the range of criminal conduct alleged in the 100-  
4 count Superseding Indictment here. (Doc. 230.)

5 All of these comments and theatrics are irrelevant to the issues before the jury and  
6 are unfairly prejudicial inasmuch as they attempt to present evidence of Defendants'  
7 character and general likeability as a person (local, religious, family oriented, successful),  
8 rather than on Defendants' actions and intent concerning the charged offenses.  
9 Accordingly, all such comments should be precluded under Fed. R. Evid. 401-403.<sup>1</sup>

10 **Conclusion**

11 The Court should preclude Defense counsel from:

- 12 1. Introducing any Defendant's family or friends in the audience during opening  
13 statements or closing arguments;
- 14 2. Referencing or discussing any awards received by any of Defendants;
- 15 3. Stating facts or opinions in opening statement that are not anticipated to be  
16 introduced at trial, e.g., personal history, religious affiliation, family members, etc.;;  
17 and
- 18 4. Referencing any prior case or litigation involving any of Defendants, including, but  
19 not limited to Defendant Lacey and Larkin's retaliation lawsuit against a local  
20 Maricopa County law enforcement official.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  

---

27 <sup>1</sup> **Certification:** On June 5, 2023, counsel for the United States met and conferred in good  
28 faith with Defendants' counsel regarding the relief requested in this motion, and the parties  
could not reach agreement. The Court has not previously considered or ruled on the motion.

1 Respectfully submitted this 8th day of June, 2023.

2  
3 GARY M. RESTAINO  
4 United States Attorney  
5 District of Arizona

6 KENNETH POLITE  
7 Assistant Attorney General  
8 Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice

9 *s/Kevin M. Rapp*  
10 KEVIN M. RAPP  
11 MARGARET PERLMETER  
12 PETER KOZINETS  
13 ANDREW STONE  
14 DANIEL BOYLE  
15 Assistant U.S. Attorneys

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
AUSTIN M. BERRY  
Trial Attorney

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on June 8, 2023, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk’s Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF registrants who have entered their appearance as counsel of record.

s/ Daniel Parke  
Daniel Parke  
U.S. Attorney’s Office