

ROGER STONE POINTS TO EVIDENCE HIS WITNESS TAMPERING WORKED TO ARGUE SELECTIVE PROSECUTION

In an order rejecting most of Roger Stone's first frivolous efforts to throw out his prosecution, Amy Berman Jackson explains why Randy Credico is not similarly situated to Stone for the purposes of his selective prosecution claim.

Defendant also characterizes Randy Credico as a similarly situated individual. **In reliance upon a sealed transcript of Credico's July 6, 2017 grand jury testimony**, Stone identifies two statements Credico made about his communications with Stone that are inconsistent with the indictment and Stone's own text messages. First, according to the defendant's motion, Credico stated that he never discussed the head of Organization 1 with Stone, yet the Indictment in this case quotes an August 23, 2016 conversation between Stone and Credico in which they discuss the head of Organization 1.26 Disc. Mot. at 6; see Indictment ¶ 14(e). Second, Stone asserts that Credico provided information that he had never spoken to Stone about WikiLeaks prior to September 10, 2016, but Stone released text messages from August 19, 2016 in which Credico told Stone that he had a connection to Assange. Disc. Mem. at 7. [my emphasis]

What ABJ reveals – without saying so explicitly

– is that Stone is pointing to lies Credico told at a previously undisclosed grand jury appearance. Credico's previously known grand jury appearance was on September 7, 2018, over a year after the one in which Stone says he lied.

But that's the entire point: Stone is accused of issuing threats to induce Credico to lie. And he has just made public evidence that – at a time when he was making those threats – Credico risked perjury charges in order to do as Stone wanted him to.

It's a bad day for rat-fucking when in an attempt to mount a defense you make evidence public that your crimes were worse than previously known.