

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAKE DELAHNEY TAYLOR,
Applicant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent .

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

David Isaak
Counsel of Record
Steptoe, LLP
717 Texas Avenue, Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 221-2300
disaak@steptoe.com
Counsel for Applicant

July 1, 2024

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Applicant Jake Delahney Taylor was the defendant in *United States v. Taylor*, No. 3:19-CR-23-1, in the Southern District of Texas, where he was convicted after a bench trial. He was then the appellant in the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The United States was the plaintiff in the criminal case and the appellee in the Fifth Circuit.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAKE DELAHNEY TAYLOR,
Applicant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent .

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

To the Honorable Samuel Alito, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court and Circuit Justice for the Fifth Circuit:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c) and Rules 13.5, 22, and 30.3 of the Rules of this Court, applicant Jake Delahney Taylor respectfully requests a a 60-day extension of time, to and including Friday, September 13, 2024, within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Mr. Taylor’s conviction on March 15, 2024. (Ex. A). On April 16, 2024, the Fifth Circuit denied Mr. Taylor’s timely filed Petition for Rehearing. (Ex. B). Mr. Taylor’s Petition for Certiorari is therefore presently due July 15, 2024. This application is therefore made at least 10 days before the petition is due. This Court’s jurisdiction would be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

1. This case presents an important issue concerning the interpretation of the child pornography statutes that has caused a circuit split. At issue is the scope of “sexually explicit conduct,” which is defined under 18 U.S.C. § 2256(2)(A) in part as the “lascivious exhibition of the anus, genitals, or pubic area of any person.” A finding that a depiction contains “sexually explicit conduct” is a necessary element for conviction under several federal child pornography statutes, including the two for which Mr. Taylor challenges his conviction here: (1) child sexual exploitation under 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a); and (2) distribution of child pornography under 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2)(B).

2. Petitioner Jake Taylor was convicted of these two offenses after a bench trial before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.¹ Most of the facts at trial were uncontested. The sole issue was whether photos and videos that Taylor surreptitiously took of his stepdaughter met the standard for “lascivious exhibition.” Mr. Taylor argued that in determining whether the images met that standard, the district court should analyze the images under the test set forth in *United States v. Hillie*, 39 F.4th 674 (D.C. Cir 2022). That standard requires the government to prove that “the minor displayed his or her anus, genitalia, or pubic area in a manner connoting that the minor, or any person or thing appearing with the minor in the image, exhibits sexual desire or an inclination to engage in any type of sexual activity.” *Id.* at 685. The photos and videos at issue depicting the minor

¹ Mr. Taylor also pled guilty to one count of possession of child pornography under 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(a)(5)(B) & 2252A(b)(2) and one count of destruction of evidence under 18 U.S.C. § 2232(a). Mr. Taylor does not challenge his convictions on these counts.

engaged in activities such as showering, toweling off, and dressing or undressing did not meet the *Hillie* standard.


3. While the district court noted that the D.C. Circuit in *Hillie* “made a persuasive case that it is more faithful to § 2256(2)(A)’s plain text,” the district court rejected *Hillie*’s analysis as foreclosed by the Fifth Circuit’s decisions in, *inter alia*, *United States v. McCall*, 833 F.3d 560, 564 (5th Cir. 2016), and *United States v. Steen*, 634 F.3d 822, 828 (5th Cir. 2011). (Ex. C. at 35). Under the Fifth Circuit’s standard, the question is not whether the minor (or someone or something else in the depiction) demonstrated a desire or inclination to engage in sexual activity, but whether the depiction “displays or brings forth to view in order to attract notice to the genitals or pubic area of children, in order to excite lustfulness or sexual stimulation in the viewer.” *Steen*, 634 F.3d at 828 (quoting *United States v. Grimes*, 244 F.3d 375, 381 (5th Cir. 2001)). In making this determination, the Fifth Circuit, along with several other circuits, applies the six-factor test set forth in *United States v. Dost*, 636 F. Supp. 828 (S.D. Cal. 1986). Applying the *Dost* test, the district court found that some of the images at issue met the Fifth Circuit standard for “lascivious exhibition” and therefore found Taylor guilty. (Ex. C at 35–36.)

4. After his conviction, Taylor filed an appeal in the Fifth Circuit, which affirmed his conviction under its prior precedents. Taylor filed a timely petition for rehearing *en banc*, which the Fifth Circuit also denied.

5. The undersigned has been appointed counsel for Mr. Taylor under the Criminal Justice Act. The undersigned has an international vacation planned for

July 1 to July 15 that has been booked since last year. Counsel also needs additional time to review the case law and record to ensure that the Petition fairly presents this important statutory construction issue, which also implicates this Court's First Amendment child pornography jurisprudence, and to consult with his client regarding same. Finally, counsel also has numerous other professional commitments, including a reply brief in support of a Motion for Summary Judgment due on July 23 in *Ensco Offshore LLC v. Cantium*, No. 2:24-CV-00371 in the Eastern District of Louisiana. Accordingly, Petitioner requests an additional 60 days to file the Petition for Certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,



David Isaak

Counsel of Record

Steptoe, LLP

717 Texas Avenue, Suite 2800

Houston, Texas 77002

(713) 221-3200

disaak@steptoe.com

Counsel for Applicant

July 1, 2024

EXHIBIT A

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-40273
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED
March 15, 2024
Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

JAKE DELAHNEY TAYLOR,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:19-CR-23-1

Before BARKSDALE, GRAVES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Following a bench trial on stipulated facts, Jake Delahney Taylor was convicted of, *inter alia*: sexual exploitation of a child, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a), (e); and distribution of child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2)(B), (b)(1). (He pleaded guilty to two other related counts, but does not contest those convictions.)

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 23-40273

First, Taylor renews his assertion made in district court that there was insufficient evidence to support the two convictions at issue because the surreptitiously recorded videos and images did not involve “lascivious exhibition” amounting to “sexually explicit conduct”, as required by the statutes. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2256(2)(A) (defining “sexually explicit conduct”). In that regard, he contends our court’s test for “lascivious exhibition” — weighing the *Dost* factors — is overly expansive, and the D.C. Circuit’s test is more in line with the statute. *See United States v. Hillie*, 39 F.4th 674, 684–90 (D.C. Cir. 2022). He correctly concedes his contention is foreclosed by our precedent but raises the issue to preserve it for possible further review. *See United States v. Steen*, 634 F.3d 822, 826–28 (5th Cir. 2011) (applying *Dost* factors); *United States v. McCall*, 833 F.3d 560, 563–64 (5th Cir. 2016) (concluding surreptitious recording of minor satisfied “lascivious exhibition” element).

Next, Taylor relatedly contends our court’s *Dost* test for “lascivious exhibition” renders the statutes of conviction overbroad under the First Amendment because it allows for convictions based on images not depicting minors in a sex act. *See New York v. Ferber*, 458 U.S. 747, 764 (1982) (requiring visual depiction of sexual conduct); *United States v. Williams*, 553 U.S. 285, 297 (2008) (explaining “[s]exually *explicit* conduct’ connotes actual depiction of the sex act rather than merely the suggestion that it is occurring” (emphasis in original)). Review of his preserved as-applied and facial constitutional challenges is *de novo*. *See, e.g., United States v. Arthur*, 51 F.4th 560, 568 (5th Cir. 2022). Our court, however, has previously rejected this contention. *E.g., United States v. Mecham*, 950 F.3d 257, 263–67 (5th Cir. 2020) (refusing to limit First Amendment’s categorical exclusion of child pornography to images depicting minors’ criminal abuse); *United States v. Trameek*, 707 F. App’x 213, 215 n.2 (5th Cir. 2017) (citing *Steen*, 634 F.3d at

No. 23-40273

826–28) (rejecting assertion that *Ferber* requires “minor affirmatively commit a sexual act or be sexually abused”).

Last, Taylor challenges, for the first time on appeal, two special conditions of his 10-year supervised release. The special conditions require him to, *inter alia*: “not possess and/or use computers or other electronic communications or data storage devices or media, without the prior approval of the probation officer”; and “not . . . access any Internet service during the length of [his] supervision, unless approved in advance in writing by the United States Probation Officer”. He contends: the conditions, read literally, require him to obtain permission before each computer or Internet use for the term of his supervised release; and, therefore, the conditions are unreasonably restrictive. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(d)(2) (requiring “no greater deprivation of liberty than is reasonably necessary”).

Because Taylor did not raise this issue in district court, review is only for plain error. *E.g.*, *United States v. Broussard*, 669 F.3d 537, 546 (5th Cir. 2012). Under that standard, Taylor must show a forfeited plain error (clear-or-obvious error, rather than one subject to reasonable dispute) that affected his substantial rights. *Puckett v. United States*, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009). If he makes that showing, we have the discretion to correct the reversible plain error, but generally should do so only if it “seriously affect[s] the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings”. *Id.* (citation omitted).

Our court has held special conditions requiring a defendant to obtain prior approval for *each use* of an electronic device to access the internet are “unreasonably restrictive”. *United States v. Naidoo*, 995 F.3d 367, 384 (5th Cir. 2021); *see also United States v. Sealed Juv.*, 781 F.3d 747, 756–57 (5th Cir. 2015). Pursuant to our precedent, and in the light of other unchallenged, imposed special conditions relating to the two at issue, we affirm Taylor’s two special conditions, but subject to the interpretation that individual

No. 23-40273

approval is not required for each instance of usage under the two conditions. *See Naidoo*, 995 F.3d at 384 (affirming condition subject to similar construction); *Sealed Juv.*, 781 F.3d at 756–57 (same).

AFFIRMED.

EXHIBIT B

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 16, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 23-40273

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

JAKE DELAHNEY TAYLOR,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:19-CR-23-1

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC

Before BARKSDALE, GRAVES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

Treating the petition for rehearing en banc as a petition for panel rehearing (5TH CIR. R. 35 I.O.P.), the petition for panel rehearing is DENIED. Because no member of the panel or judge in regular active service requested that the court be polled on rehearing en banc (FED. R. APP. P. 35 and 5TH CIR. R. 35), the petition for rehearing en banc is DENIED.

EXHIBIT C

ENTERED

December 14, 2022

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**In the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas**

GALVESTON DIVISION

No. 3:19-cr-23-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JAKE DELAHNEY TAYLOR

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
ENTERING FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

JEFFREY VINCENT BROWN, *UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE*:

Jake Delahney Taylor was indicted on four counts: Count One charges him with sexual exploitation of a child in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a) & (e); Count Two charges him with distribution of child pornography in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(a)(2)(B), 2252A(b)(1); Count Three charges him with possession of child pornography in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(a)(5)(B), 2252A(b)(2); and Count Four charges him with destruction of property in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2232(a). Dkt. 16. Taylor pleaded guilty to Counts Three and Four. As to Counts One and Two, Taylor waived his right to a jury trial under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure

23(c), with the Government's consent and the court's approval. On January 20, 2022, the court held a one-day bench trial to determine Taylor's culpability as to Counts One and Two.

After careful consideration of the record, including exhibits and testimony, the parties' arguments, and the applicable law, the court submits the following findings of fact and conclusions of law under Rule 23(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.¹ Based on these findings and conclusions, the court finds the defendant, Jake Delahney Taylor, guilty of Counts One and Two.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. The Bench Trial

At the outset of the bench trial the parties filed a list of stipulated facts. Dkt. 43. Before proceeding with the bench trial as to Counts One and Two, the court accepted Taylor's guilty plea as to Counts Three and Four based partially on those stipulated facts. Dkt. 47 (Trial Tr.) at 8:16–17:16.

During its case in chief, the Government introduced nineteen exhibits, which were admitted without objection. *Id.* at 17:17–18:19; Dkt. 44 (Government's Ex. List). After reading the stipulated facts into evidence, the Government called its only witness, Detective James Staton.

¹ Any findings of fact that are also, or only, conclusions of law are so deemed. Any conclusions of law that are also, or only, findings of fact are so deemed.

Detective Staton, an officer with the Pearland Police Department, is an experienced peace officer. He is currently assigned to the department's crime-scene unit. As part of his responsibilities, Staton gathers items such as computers, cell phones, video records, and other electronics and then forensically examines the evidence found on those devices.

Detective Staton, who was present at the scene when the search warrant was executed at Taylor's residence, performed the digital forensics for the evidence obtained at the scene. He testified that he extracted evidence from several mobile devices found at the scene, including a Samsung Note 8 marked as Government's Exhibit 7. His investigation revealed that Taylor owned and was the main user of the device. Detective Staton testified that he found 48 images of Minor Victim 1 ("MV1") on the Samsung Note 8. Staton testified that the images appeared to be MV1 getting undressed and toweling off in the shower. He testified that the images appeared to be cropped so that the focal point of the pictures were MV1's vaginal and pubic areas, and sometimes her breasts.

Detective Staton's investigation also revealed that Taylor had uninstalled an app called "Calculator+." The app, while at first glance appearing to be a calculator, actually facilitates the hiding of images, videos, and other content for the user. Though the app had been uninstalled,

Detective Staton was able to locate its file system because it was still present on the device.

Detective Staton next testified as to a second device found at the scene, a Galaxy S5 marked as Government's Exhibit 5. His investigation revealed that the device contained eight videos of child pornography that depicted a minor other than MV1. *See* Government's Ex. 8.

Detective Staton then testified as to a third cell phone found at the scene, a Galaxy S5 without a case marked as Government's Exhibit 6. His investigation revealed that this cell phone also belonged to Taylor and contained 70 images and approximate 134 videos of MV1. Staton also found approximately 24 images and 78 videos of child pornography depicting subjects other than MV1. Of the images depicting MV1, Detective Staton testified that they showed her in the shower, getting out of the shower, and toweling off. *See* Government's Ex. 9B1–9B5. Of the videos of MV1, Staton testified that some of the videos appeared to be slow-motion or cropped versions of a handful of longer videos. For example, in an approximately seven-minute video, Taylor is seen adjusting some type of recording device while sitting on the toilet. He then leaves the room and, about six minutes into the video, MV1 appears and takes a shower. *See* Government's Ex. 9B6. In another video about 11 minutes long, after MV1 takes a shower, Taylor is

seen retrieving the recording device from the bathroom after MV1 leaves. *See* Government's Ex. 9B7.

Detective Staton further testified as to four other videos of MV1 in the bathroom, either using the toilet, getting in and out of the shower, or toweling off. *See* Government's Ex. 9B8–9B11. One of the videos, nearly ten minutes long, was in slow motion. *See* Government's Ex. 9B8. In that video, MV1 is seen undressing, her pubic area visible and her buttocks showing as she gets into the shower. Another video was a slow-motion version of another video depicting MV1's pubic region and vagina. *Compare* Government's Ex. 9B6, *with* Government's Ex. 9B9.

Detective Staton further testified that both photo- and video-editing apps were found on Government Exhibit 6, as well as still images that had been extracted from longer videos. *See* Government's Ex. 19A–19G (comparing still images to video clips).

At the conclusion of Detective Staton's testimony, the Government rested.

The defendant did not call any witnesses nor offer any evidence. Instead, he moved for a judgment of acquittal as to Counts One and Two arguing that none of the videos nor photographs depicted a child engaged in sexual conduct as required by the statute. The court denied the defendant's

motion. Thereafter, the defense rested. The court then heard argument from both the Government and the defendant. The court took the case under advisement.

B. Stipulated Facts

The parties stipulated to the following:²

1. The Defendant is charged by Superseding Indictment in Count One with Sexual Exploitation of a Child, in Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a) & (e). The Defendant is charged by Superseding Indictment in Count Two with Distribution of Child Pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(a)(2)(B) and 2252A(b)(1). The Defendant is charged by Superseding Indictment in Count Three with Possession of Child Pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(a)(5)(B) and 2252A(b)(2). The Defendant is charged by Superseding Indictment in Count Four with Destruction of Property, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2232(a).
2. For purposes of this stipulation, the terms “minors,” “child pornography,” “sexually explicit conduct,” “computer,” “producing,” and “visual depiction” have the statutory definitions as referenced in the introduction to the indictment.

² The stipulated findings are taken verbatim from the parties’ joint filing. *See* Dkt. 43.

3. On or about August 14, 2018, Courtnie Taylor went to the Brazoria County District Attorney's Office to report that she found pictures and videos of her 14-year-old daughter MV1 taking showers hidden on a "calculator app" on her husband Jake Delahney Taylor's phone. Mrs. Taylor also saw other images and videos of naked juvenile females approximately the same age. Mrs. Taylor stated that she was able to take pictures of the images in the calculator app. Mrs. Taylor also discovered that Jake Taylor had been chatting on KIK messenger and trading the pictures of MV1 with others on KIK. Mrs. Taylor provided Jake Taylor's KIK usernames as jim_parker22 and jimmyt8484. The KIK chats included Jake Taylor talking about having a "peep hole" in the bathroom of their residence and installing hidden cameras. Mrs. Taylor stated she was able to locate what she believed to be a peephole in the bathroom at their residence but did not see any cameras. Mrs. Taylor was further able to verify that the naked pictures on Jake Taylor's cell phone were of MV1.
4. The Brazoria County District Attorney's Office Investigator relayed this information to Detective Cecil Arnold with Pearland Police Department and brought Mrs. Taylor's cell phone to Pearland PD

to be processed. *See* Government's Exhibits 1, 1A, 1B. Detective Staton was able to perform a forensic analysis of the Mrs. Taylor's cell phone. *See* Government's Exhibit 1C. After looking at the forensic analysis, Detective Arnold found the images and KIK chats described by Mrs. Taylor on her cell phone. *See* Government's Exhibit 1D.

5. One of the KIK chats was with a username "Burning Gundam" which took place between June 13, 2018 and June 14, 2018. In this chat, "Burning Gundam" asks if the Defendant's stepdaughter plays any sports to which the Defendant responded that she plays all sports. "Burning Gundam" then asks what the name of that calculator app was and the Defendant responds, "Calculator+". "Burning Gundam" asks, "Do you sniff her panties?" to which the Defendant responds, "Yes, wonderful". "Burning Gundam" states that he hopes that his stepdaughter has a sleepover and that they stay in an apartment "so there are so many girls to choose from" to which the Defendant responded, "lol awesome." *See* Government's Exhibit 1D, pages 2-5.
6. There is another chat between the Defendant and "Chuck Richards" in which "Chuck Richards" sends an image of a girl and under that

image states, “My step, 16.” The Defendant then sends an image of MV1 wearing a red t-shirt and a visor. “Chuck Richards” sends an image of a female, wearing some sort of top and underwear, laying on her stomach on a bed. The Defendant then sends an image of MV1 naked with her buttock and anus as the focal point. *See* Government’s Exhibit 1D at 6–7.

7. There is a chat between the Defendant and “Crave Man”. “Crave Man” asks if he has ever “played with her?” The Defendant responds, “Not yet. Working on it.” The Defendant then sends an image of MV1 in which she is naked with her buttock and anus as the focal point. “Crave Man” responds, “Wow” and “How’d you get that?” The Defendant replies, “Camera in clothes hamper.” “Crave Man” asks if the Defendant has “any of the front?” to which the Defendant sends an image of MV1’s vagina. The Defendant asks “Crave Man” if he has any pictures and “Crave Man” sends an image of a minor female. “Crave Man” tells the Defendant that was the only image he had on his phone because he had to move them because the minor female was using his phone the other day and that “freaked” him out. “Crave Man” also told the Defendant that the minor female was 16 years old. The Defendant responded that

he had gotten a “calculator app that hides them. It’s a real calculator tell you hit passcode. I started mine with a 0 cause no one ever hits 0 first on a calculator.” The Defendant also sends “Crave Man” two more images of MV1; one in which she is wearing a red shirt and visor and another that is just of her face. *See* Government’s Exhibit 1D at 8–11.

8. There is a KIK chat between the Defendant and “Miss My Texas PYT” on June 14, 2018. During that chat, the Defendant sends an image of MV1 wearing a red shirt and visor. “Miss My Texas PYT” asks if the Defendant is active with her. The Defendant responds, “[w]orking on it”. “Miss My Texas PTY” asks if he has any sexy pics of hers and that he has a few for trade. The Defendant then sends an image of MV1 naked with her buttock and anus as the focal point. “Miss My Texas PYT” states that he spies on his too from under the bathroom door. The Defendant responds, “camera in clothes hamper.” *See* Government’s Exhibit 1D at 12–16.
9. There is a KIK chat between the Defendant and “play time.” The Defendant sends an image of MV1 in which she is naked and it depicts her torso which includes her breasts as well as her vagina. “Play time” sends an image of what appears to be a minor female’s

face, neck and décolletage. The Defendant sends an image of MV1 which depicts MV1 naked with her leg up. From the image, one can see her breasts and what appears to be a towel over her lap. “Play time” sends an image which is blurry but seems to depict a naked female. The Defendant sends an image of MV1 which is a picture of her naked torso which includes her breasts and vagina and states “...just my spy cam” and then sends another image of MV1 which is a closeup image of MV1’s vagina. *See* Government’s Exhibit 1D at 17–19.

10. There is a KIK chat between the Defendant and “Sand Storm” between June 13, 2018 and June 14, 2018. “Sand Storm” asks if he wants to share and the Defendant responds back “sure.” “Sand Storm” states, “Go for it, ill match.” The Defendant sends an image of MV1 naked with her buttock and anus as the focal point. “Sand Storm” asks how the Defendant got that image and then sends an image of a naked buttocks. The Defendant responds, “spy cam.” “Sand Storm” asks if he wants to share more and the Defendant then sends another image of MV1’s naked torso in which her breasts and vagina are visible. *See* Government’s Exhibit 1D at 20–22.

11. There is a KIK chat between the Defendant and “Tit Lover” in which the Defendant tells “Tit Lover” that he is going to Colorado for work and the family is also going. The Defendant states that he should be able to get some good pictures. The Defendant tells “Tit Lover” that he wishes that he wasn’t working so much because the summer is the “best pic time and I been missing it.” The Defendant further states that he is redoing his spare bathroom and it’s backed up to his master so he put in a peephole so when he gets back, he should get great pictures. *See* Government’s Exhibit 1D at 23–24.
12. Based on this information, Detective Arnold drafted a search warrant and executed at 605 Ave. A, Sweeny, Texas on August 17, 2018. *See* Government’s Exhibit 2. Detective Arnold made contact with the Defendant, Jake Taylor. The Defendant was read his Miranda warnings and stated he understood those rights. The Defendant stated that he knew what KIK messenger was, but that he hadn’t used it in several years. The Defendant denied knowledge of the usernames jim_parker22 and jimmyt8484. The Defendant initially denied taking any naked pictures of MV1 and said that there would be none on his phone. As the interview continued, the Defendant stated that he did see naked pictures of MV1 on his

phone, but that she probably took these herself to send to other people. When confronted with the fact that MV1 was not facing the camera or have a cell phone in her hand in the image, the Defendant stated that MV1 may have set up a camera with a timer. When Detective Arnold stated that he would need to speak with MV1 about this, the Defendant stated that he did not want the detective to speak with MV1. The Defendant then stated that he was the one who took the naked pictures of MV1. During the interview, Detective Staton brought the Defendant his cell phone so that he could unlock it with his fingerprint pattern that was stored. *See* Government's Exhibit 18.

13. The Defendant went on to admit that he made the videos and took pictures of MV1 by using the camera on his cell phone. The Defendant stated that MV1 had no idea that he was doing this. The Defendant stated that he would put his cell phone on the vanity before MV1 would go into the bathroom and hit record. When MV1 finished showering, he would go in and get his cell phone. The Defendant went on to admit that he got involved in a KIK chat group about dads and daughters. He stated that he received images of child pornography from other KIK users and that he sent out

some of the naked images of MV1. The Defendant then confirmed the usernames jim_parker22 and jimmyt8484, were his KIK messenger usernames. *See* Government's Exhibit 18.

14. Detective Arnold was able to confirm with the on-scene forensic analyst, Detective Jonathan Cox that there was, what he believed to be, child pornography (of MV1 and other children) located in the Defendant's "calculator app" on the Defendant's cell phone. Detective Cox relayed to Detective Arnold that the cell phone had a swipe pattern to unlock the phone in order to download from the phone. The Defendant agreed to enter the swipe pattern. When Detective Staton handed the Defendant the phone, the Defendant immediately deleted the "calculator app." The phone was retrieved from the Defendant, who stated that he thought the detective wanted him to delete the pictures for him. At the time that the Defendant deleted the child pornography, the Defendant was well aware of the criminal investigation concerning child pornography and where it was located on his phone.
15. Multiple cell phones, to include a Samsung Note 8, ESN 352078091092999 (*See* Government's Exhibit 4); a Samsung Galaxy S5, IMEI 353502068684974 (*See* Government's Exhibit 6);

and a Samsung Galaxy S5, IMEI 353502064604661 (*See* Government's Exhibit 5) as well as a shower curtain (*See* Government's Exhibit 13), backpack (*See* Government's Exhibit 14), t-shirt (*See* Government's Exhibit 15) and visor (*See* Government's Exhibit 16) that all matched items in the images were collected as evidence.

16. Detective Staton performed a forensic analysis on the three cell phones. *See* Government's Exhibit 4D (phone extraction of Samsung Note 8); Government's Exhibit 5D (phone extraction of the Galaxy S5 in a case); and Government's Exhibit 6D (phone extraction of the Galaxy S5 not in case).
17. On the Samsung Note 8, Detective Staton found 48 images of MV1. *See* Government's Exhibit 7. The images appear to be still shots or cropped images from videos. 19 images depict MV1's naked vagina, buttocks and anus. 5 of the images show MV1 in the bathroom.
18. On the Samsung Galaxy S5 which was in a case, IMEI 353502064604661, Detective Staton found 8 videos of child pornography. The child pornography was of a prepubescent female who was displaying her genitals in a lewd and lascivious manner

and who was masturbating with a plastic object. *See* Government's Exhibit 8. None of these videos were of MV1.

19. On the Samsung Galaxy S5 which was not in a case, IMEI 353502068684974, Detective Staton found images and videos of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct as well as images and videos of MV1. Detective Staton found 24 images and 78 videos that meet the federal definition of child pornography not involving MV1. *See* Government's Exhibit 9A. These images and videos depicted a minor female child being orally penetrated by the erect penis of an adult male, a prepubescent minor female being vaginally penetrated by the erect penis of an adult male, a prepubescent minor female masturbating with an object, and a prepubescent minor female displaying her genitals in a lewd and lascivious manner. *See* Government's Exhibit 9A.

20. Also on the Samsung Galaxy S5 which was not in a case, Detective Staton found 70 images and 134 videos of MV1. *See* Government's Exhibit 9B. The images and videos appear to be taken in the bathroom. The images appear to be still shots or cropped images from the videos. The images depict MV1's naked vagina, buttocks and anus. Some of the videos appear to be edited and to have been

in a slower motion. There is one video, approximately 7 minutes in length, in which the Defendant's face is seen in the beginning of the video setting up the recording device in the bathroom. The Defendant leaves and MV1 comes into the bathroom wearing a white top and a pink and purple striped pajama bottoms. The video captures MV1 taking off her clothing before showering. There is a second video, which is approximately 11 minutes in length. MV1 is seen going into the bathroom wearing a black shirt and white and black shorts. MV1 undresses, utilizes the toilet, gets into the shower, gets out of the shower, towels off and then gets dressed. At the end of the video, the Defendant is seen going into the bathroom and taking down the recording device. There is a third video, which is approximately 17 minutes in length, in which MV1 is seen in the bathroom wearing a pink sweatshirt and black pants. MV1 gets undressed, showers, towels off, and gets out of the shower. The Defendant is then seen at the end of the video going into the bathroom. There is a fourth video, which is approximately 9 minutes in length, in which MV1 is wearing a blue sports uniform. MV1 undresses, utilizes the toilet, and showers. This video appears to be in slow motion. In all of the videos, the recording device was

positioned to capture MV1 when she is undressing, utilizing the toilet, utilizing the shower, toweling off or getting dressed; no other activity by her was recorded. MV1 was unaware that her actions were being observed or recorded. *See* Government's Exhibit 9B.

21. MV1's date of birth is July 21, 2004. MV1 would have been 13 years old at the time that the images and videos were produced of her.
22. The Samsung Note 8 and both Samsung Galaxy S5 cell phones were manufactured outside of the state of Texas. *See* Government's Exhibits 4C; 5C; 6C. Consequently, the cell phone media and the materials used in this offense traveled in foreign or interstate commerce. Further, the Defendant utilized the Internet when he was utilizing his KIK account which is a means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce.

C. Admitted Exhibits

The following are descriptions of the exhibits admitted at trial:

1. Exhibit 7 contains the 48 images of MV1 that were found in the defendant's Samsung Note 8. The images appear to be still shots or cropped images from videos. Nineteen images depict MV1's naked vagina, buttocks, and anus. Five of the images show MV1 in the bathroom.

2. Exhibit 7A is an image of MV1 from the neck down in which MV1 is naked with her right knee bent. MV1's breasts are visible and there appears to be a towel over her lap. This image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B11.
3. Exhibit 7B is an image of MV1 in which the shower, drying herself with a towel. The image appears to be taken at an upward angle with something covering the recording device because the view is partially obstructed. This image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B10.
4. Exhibit 7C is an image of MV1 in which MV1 is naked with her right knee bent. MV1's breasts are visible and there appears to be a towel over her lap. This image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B11.
5. Exhibit 7D is an image of MV1's naked torso which shows her breasts and genitals. The image is from an upward angle and MV1 is standing in front of the shower curtain. This image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B8.
6. Exhibit 7E is an image of MV1's nude vagina. The focal point of the image is MV1's genitals. It appears that MV1's hips are angled

towards the camera. The image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B11.

7. Exhibit 9B contains the 70 images and 134 videos of MV1 found on the defendant's Galaxy S5, which was not in a case. The images and videos appear to be taken in a bathroom. The images appear to be still shots or screenshots cropped from the videos. The images depict MV1's naked vagina, buttocks, and anus. Some of the videos are edited to play in slow motion.
8. Exhibit 9B1 is an image of MV1's naked buttocks and genitals. The image appears to be taken at an upward angle from a recording device which was covered because the view is partially obstructed. MV1 is in front of the shower curtain. This image appears to have been cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B11.
9. Exhibit 9B2 is an image of MV1's nude vagina. The focal point of this image is MV1's genitals. It appears that MV1's hips are angled towards the camera. This image appears to have been cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B11. This image appears to be similar to Exhibit 7E.
10. Exhibit 9B3 is an image of MV1 naked in the shower. MV's body is arched backward, and she is holding a towel behind her back. MV1's

breasts and genitals are clearly visible. This image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B11.

11. Exhibit 9B4 is an image of MV1 naked. MV1's leg is lifted and her genitals are visible and is the focal point of the image. The image appears to be taken at an upward angle. This image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B6.
12. Exhibit 9B5 is an image of MV1 naked from her chin down to right below her pubic area. MV1's breasts and genitals are clearly visible. MV1 appears to be standing in front of the shower curtain. The image appears to be taken at an upward angle. This image appears to be cropped from the video offered as Exhibit 9B8.
13. Exhibit 9B6 is a video that is 6 minutes and 52 seconds in length in which the defendant's face is seen at the beginning of the video setting up the recording device in the bathroom. The defendant leaves after setting up the hidden camera. MV1 enters the bathroom after some time wearing a white top and pink and purple striped pajama bottoms. The video captures MV1 taking off her clothes. MV1's genitals are visible on the video for approximately 15 seconds throughout the video. This video was recorded from an upward

angle, and the camera appears to have been hidden because part of the view is obstructed.

14. Exhibit 9B7 is a video that is 11 minutes and 18 seconds in length in which MV1 is seen going into the bathroom wearing a black shirt and white and black shorts. MV1 undresses, uses the toilet, gets into the shower, gets out of the shower, towels off and then gets dressed. During this video, MV1's genitals are visible for approximately 13 seconds and buttocks are visible for approximately 6 seconds. At the end of the video, the defendant is seen going into the bathroom and taking down the recording device. This video was recorded from an upward angle, and the camera appears to have been hidden because part of the view is obstructed.
15. Exhibit 9B8 is a video which is approximately 9 minutes and 55 seconds in length, in which MV1 is wearing a blue sports uniform. MV1 undresses, uses the toilet, and showers. This video appears to be in slow motion. MV1's genitals are visible for approximately 15 seconds and her buttocks is visible for approximately 23 seconds throughout the recording. This video was recorded from an upward angle, and the camera appears to have been hidden because the view is partially obstructed.

16. Exhibit 9B9 is a video which is approximately 1 minute and 21 seconds in length, in which MV1 is nude from the waist down and wearing a white tank top. MV1 takes both her white tank top and bra off. This video appears to be in slow motion and appears to be edited from the video offered as Exhibit 9B6. During this clip, MV1's genitals are visible for approximately 1 minute and 7 seconds. This video was recorded from an upward angle and the camera appears to have been hidden because the view is partially obstructed.
17. Exhibit 9B10 is a video which is approximately 17 minutes and 8 seconds in length, in which MV1 is seen in the bathroom wearing a pink sweatshirt and black pants. MV1 gets undressed, showers, towels off, and gets out of the shower. The defendant is seen at the end of the video going into the bathroom. MV1's genitals are visible for approximately 8 seconds during the video and her buttocks is visible for approximately 4 seconds. This video was recorded from an upward angle, and the camera appears to have been hidden because the view is partially obstructed.
18. Exhibit 9B11 is a video which is approximately 9 minutes and 20 seconds in length, in which MV1 is seen in the bathroom wearing a

black top and black and white shorts. MV1 pulls the shower curtain over, turns on the water, uses the toilet, undresses, showers, towels off, and puts on underwear. MV1's genitals are visible for approximately 38 seconds throughout the video. This video was recorded from an upward angle, and the camera appears to have been hidden because the view is partially obstructed.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

Count One charges Taylor with the sexual exploitation of a child in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a) & (e). Section 2251(a) prohibits “[a]ny person who employs, uses, persuades, induces, entices, or coerces any minor to engage in . . . any sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing any visual depiction of such conduct or for the purpose of transmitting a live visual depiction of such conduct.” 18 U.S.C. 2251(a).

To find Taylor guilty of Count One, the Government had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that:

- (1) Taylor used a minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct;
- (2) Taylor acted with the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct; and
- (3) the visual depiction was produced using material that have been transported in interstate commerce by any means, including by computer.

United States v. Traweek, No. 4:13–CR–712, 2015 U.S. 5972461, at*8 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 14, 2015) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a), *aff’d*, 707 F. App’x 213 (5th Cir. 2017) (per curiam); Fifth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions (Criminal Cases) 2.84 (2015)).

Count Two charges Taylor with distribution of child pornography in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(a)(2)(B) & 2252A(b)(1). Section 2252A(a)(2)(B) makes it a crime for any person to “knowingly distribute[] any material that contains child pornography using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce . . . including by computer.” 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2)(B).

To find Taylor guilty of Count Two, the Government had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that:

- (1) Taylor knowingly distributed material that contained child pornography;
- (2) That the material containing child pornography was transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer; and
- (3) That when Taylor distributed the material, he knew it contained child pornography.

18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2)(B); Fifth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions (Criminal Cases) 2.85E (2019).

“Child pornography” as charged in Count Two is defined as:

any visual depiction, including any photograph, film, video, picture, or computer or computer-generated image or picture, whether made or produced by electronic, mechanical, or other means, of sexually explicit conduct, where –

- (A) the production of such visual depiction involves the use of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

18 U.S.C. § 2256(8)(A).

“Sexually explicit conduct,” as applied to both Counts One and Two, is defined as “actual or simulated –

- (i) sexual intercourse, including genital-genital, oral-genital, anal-genital, or oral-anal, whether between persons of the same or opposite sex;
- (ii) bestiality;
- (iii) masturbation;
- (iv) sadistic or masochistic abuse; or
- (v) lascivious exhibition of the anus, genitals, or pubic area of any person.”

18 U.S.C. § 2256(2)(A). The parties agree that only subsection (v) is at issue in this case.

A. Stipulated Elements

The parties’ stipulations establish certain elements of the Government’s case.

1. Count One

For Count One, it is undisputed that MV1 was a minor when the images and videos of her were made. It is also undisputed that Taylor, using materials transported in interstate commerce, knowingly produced 19 images of MV1 on his Samsung Note 8, each of which appears to be a still shot or cropped image from a video and depicts MV1's naked vagina, buttocks, or anus.

It is likewise undisputed that Taylor, using materials transported in interstate commerce, knowingly produced 70 images and 134 videos of MV1 on his "Samsung Galaxy S5 which was not in a case," each of which depicted her naked vagina, buttocks, or anus. "The images appear to be still shots or cropped images from the videos." Stipulation No. 20, *supra*. Some of the videos appear to have been edited and set in slow-motion. "In all of the videos, the recording device was positioned to capture MV1 when she is undressing, utilizing the toilet, utilizing the shower, toweling off or getting dressed; no other activity by her was recorded." *Id.*

Through the stipulations, the defendant has conceded—and the court accordingly finds—that the Government has proven all the elements of Count One save one fundamental piece—the parties have *not* stipulated to "sexually explicit conduct."

2. Count Two

For Count Two, it is again undisputed that MV1 was a minor when the images and videos of her were made. It is also undisputed that Taylor, using his KIK messenger accounts, distributed images and videos of MV1 that included:

- (1) “an image of MV1 naked with her buttock and anus as the focal point” sent to a KIK chatter identified as “Chuck Richards,” Stipulation No. 6, *supra*;
- (2) “an image of MV1 naked with her buttock and anus as the focal point” sent to a KIK chatter identified as “Miss My Texas PYT,” Stipulation No. 8, *supra*;
- (3) “an image of MV1 in which she is naked and it depicts her torso which includes her breasts as well as her vagina,” “an image of MV1 which depicts MV1 naked with her leg up,” and “an image of MV1 which is a picture of her naked torso which includes her breasts and vagina” sent to a KIK chatter identified as “play time,” Stipulation No. 9, *supra*; and
- (4) “an image of MV1 naked with her buttock and anus as the focal point” and “an image of MV1’s naked torso in which her breasts and vagina are visible” sent to a KIK chatter identified as “Sand Storm,” Stipulation No. 10, *supra*.

It is also undisputed that Taylor “utilized the Internet when he was utilizing his KIK account which is a means and facility of interstate and foreign commerce.” Stipulation No. 22, *supra*. As with Count One, through the stipulations the defendant has conceded, and the court finds, that the

Government has proven all the elements of Count Two except the presence of “sexually explicit conduct.”

B. Sexually Explicit Conduct

The one outstanding issue not covered by the parties’ stipulations is whether the images and videos made the basis of Counts One and Two depict “sexually explicit conduct,” specifically, whether they depict “lascivious exhibition of the anus, genitals, or pubic area” of MV1.

It is undisputed that Taylor created and shared images and videos of MV1 he derived from hidden cameras in their family’s bathroom. The videos feature MV1 undressing, showering, toweling off, and using the toilet. Taylor used various video-editing techniques to make MV1’s genitals, anus, and breasts the focal point of his videos and excerpted images. Nevertheless, Taylor argues that the material depicts no “sexually explicit conduct” because MV1 is not engaging in overt sexual conduct in the videos and images. Instead, he argues that they show her engaging in “mundane, non-sexual activities.” Dkt. 45 at 4. Taylor argues that engaging in mundane private conduct such as undressing and bathing do not meet the definition of sexually explicit conduct regardless of whether the videos were later edited to focus on the minor’s genitals.

The Fifth Circuit defines “lascivious exhibition” as “a depiction which displays or brings forth to view in order to attract notice to the genitals or pubic area of children, in order to excite lustfulness or sexual stimulation in the viewer.” *United States v. Steen*, 634 F.3d 822, 828 (5th Cir. 2011) (quoting *United States v. Grimes*, 244 F.3d 375, 381 (5th Cir. 2001)). The Fifth Circuit has also employed the six factors from *United States v. Dost*, 636 F. Supp. 828 (S.D. Cal. 1986), to aid in determining whether a particular depiction is lascivious:

- 1) whether the focal point of the visual depiction is on the child’s genitalia or pubic area;
- 2) whether the setting of the visual depiction is sexually suggestive, i.e., in a place or pose generally associated with sexual activity;
- 3) whether the child is depicted in an unnatural pose, or in inappropriate attire, considering the age of the child;
- 4) whether the child is full or partially clothed, or nude;
- 5) whether the visual depiction suggests sexual coyness or a willingness to engage in sexual activity; [and]
- 6) whether the visual depiction is intended or designed to elicit a sexual response in the viewer.

Steen, 634 F.3d at 826 (quoting *Dost*, 636 F. Supp. at 832). These so-called *Dost* factors are not exhaustive and no one factor is dispositive in determining whether a certain display is “lascivious.” *Id.*

The images and videos at issue here trigger at least four of the *Dost* factors:

- (1) the focal point of many of the images and edited videos is MV1's genitalia or pubic area (the first *Dost* factor);
- (2) some images have been cropped to depict MV1 in an unnatural pose, considering her age, such as moments when MV1's hips are angled toward the camera (Exhibits 7E and 9B2) and her naked body is arched backward (Exhibit 9B3) (the third *Dost* factor).
- (3) MV1 is nude in many of the images and videos (the fourth *Dost* factor); and
- (4) the communications on KIK messenger, to which Taylor has stipulated, demonstrate that he intended the visual depictions to elicit a sexual response from those who viewed them (the sixth *Dost* factor).³

Moreover, the Fifth Circuit has held that just because a minor victim does not know she was being recorded, did not intend to display herself, and did not engage in any affirmative sexual act does not mean that a surreptitiously recorded video does not depict "lascivious exhibition." *United*

³ The stipulated evidence supporting the sixth *Dost* factor includes: (1) Taylor's conversation with KIK chatter "Burning Gundam" about sniffing MV1's panties, Stipulation No. 5, *supra*; (2) Taylor's conversation with KIK chatter "Crave Man" about whether Taylor had ever "played with" MV1 as Taylor sends "Crave Man" nude photos of her, Stipulation No. 7, *supra*; (3) Taylor's conversation with KIK chatter "Miss My Texas PYT" about whether Taylor was "active with" MV1, Stipulation No. 8, *supra*; (4) Taylor sending an image of MV1 naked focusing on her buttocks and anus to "Miss My Texas PYT" after "Miss My Texas PYT" requested "sexy pics" of her, Stipulation No. 8, *supra*; and (5) the fact that one of the KIK chatters Taylor communicates with goes by the name "Tit Lover," Stipulation No. 11, *supra*.

States v. McCall, 833 F.3d 560, 564 (5th Cir. 2016). Under Fifth Circuit precedent as it currently stands, the court finds that at least some of the images and videos at issue in this case depict the lascivious exhibition of MV1’s genitals or pubic area.

Indeed, the defendant concedes as much. Dkt. 45 at 6–7 (“Taylor concedes that this motion is foreclosed by current Fifth Circuit law.”) But he has urged the court to depart from Fifth Circuit precedent and instead adopt the reasoning from a recent case in the D.C. Circuit: *United States v. Hillie*, 39 F.4th 674 (D.C. Cir. 2022) (on reh’g). See Dkt. 45 at 7.⁴ In *Hillie*, the defendant was convicted of various child-pornography offenses, including two counts of sexual exploitation of a minor under § 2251(a), and one count of possession of images of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct under § 2252(a)(4)(B). 39 F.4th at 677. The evidence supporting Hillie’s convictions were hidden-camera videos he obtained of his then-girlfriend’s two daughters. *Id.* at 677-78. Two videos were relevant to the *Hillie* court’s analysis. *Id.* In the first, a minor, identified as “JAA,” is walking around her bedroom, clothed, dancing and singing to herself. *Id.* at 678.

⁴ Since the bench trial in this case, the D.C. Circuit has granted rehearing and issued an amended opinion. *United States v. Hillie*, 37 F.4th 680 (D.C. Cir. 2022) (per curiam). The original opinion can be found at 14 F.4th 677. The holding and analysis did not change from the original to the amended opinion.

She proceeds to undress, standing almost directly in front of the camera. While undressing, she bends over in front of the camera, exposing her genitals to the camera for approximately nine seconds. After she has undressed, she sits slightly to the left of the camera and appears to clean her genitals and legs with a towel. While she does this, her breasts and pubic hair are visible but her genitals are not. She proceeds to apply lotion to her body for approximately 11 minutes. While she does this, her breasts are visible and her pubic hair is occasionally visible but her genitals are not. She proceeds to stand up and walk naked around the room. While she walks, her pubic area is intermittently visible for periods of approximately one or two seconds. She then dresses and exits the room.

Id.

The second video is seen from a bathroom ceiling. *Id.* In it, JAA and a second minor, “KA,” enter a bathroom. *Id.*

JAA proceeds to sit on the toilet. The upper part of JAA's buttocks is visible for approximately 20 seconds while she sits on the toilet. Because the camera is directly above the toilet, JAA's genitals are not visible. JAA stands up and KA proceeds to sit on the toilet. The upper part of KA's buttocks is visible for approximately 20 seconds, but her genitals are not visible. JAA proceeds to wipe KA's pubic area with a washcloth. KA's pubic area is not visible while she does this, although occasionally the upper part of KA's buttocks is visible. KA proceeds to leave the bathroom. After she has left, JAA removes her pants and underwear and proceeds to wipe her pubic area with a washcloth. JAA's pubic area is visible for approximately 16 seconds while she does this. JAA proceeds to dress and exit the bathroom.

Id.

Addressing the same statutory language at issue here, the *Hillie* court construed “lascivious exhibition” of the genitals as used in § 2256(2)(A)(v)

“to mean that the minor displayed his or her anus, genitalia, or pubic area in a manner connoting that the minor, or any person or thing appearing with the minor in the image, exhibits sexual desire or an inclination to engage in *any* type of sexual activity.” *Id.* at 685.

“Applying this construction to the evidence introduced at trial,” the *Hillie* court “conclude[d] that no rational trier of fact could find JAA’s conduct depicted in the videos . . . to be a ‘lascivious exhibition of the anus, genitals, or pubic area of any person,’ as defined by § 2256(2)(A).” *Id.* at 686. The court continued: “To fall within the definition of ‘lascivious exhibition of the . . . genitals,’ JAA’s conduct depicted in the videos must consist of her displaying her anus, genitalia or pubic area in a lustful manner that connotes the commission of a sexual act.” *Id.* As “none of the conduct in which JAA engages in the two videos at issue comes close” to such behavior, but instead consisted of just “ordinary grooming activities, some dancing, and nothing more,” the court that vacated the defendant’s convictions on the counts associated with the two videos and directed the trial court “to enter a judgment of acquittal on those counts.” *Id.* Moreover, the *Hillie* court expressly declined to adopt or apply the *Dost* factors. *Id.* at 686–90.

In *Hillie*, the D.C. Circuit makes a persuasive case that it is more faithful to § 2256(2)(A)’s plain text than courts applying the *Dost* factors.⁵ But even if this court were inclined to adopt *Hillie*’s construction of the statute, it is not free to do so. “It is well established that a federal district court must generally apply an interpretation of law articulated by its circuit court of appeals.” *Hulsey v. Am. Brands, Inc.*, No. C-97-003, 1997 WL 271755, at *3 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 7, 1997) (citing *Gacy v. Welborn*, 994 F.2d 305, 309 (7th Cir. 1993) (noting that “[o]urs is a hierarchical judiciary”)); *see also* Bryan A. Garner et al., *The Law of Judicial Precedent* 27 (2016) (“Federal . . . courts are absolutely bound by vertical precedents—those delivered by higher courts within the same jurisdiction.”).

As set forth above, this court has determined that under current Fifth Circuit precedent, the images and videos made the basis of Counts One and Two depict “sexually explicit conduct” as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2256(2)(A)


⁵ *See Hillie*, 39 F.4th at 688 (noting, in response to the dissent’s contention that the majority’s construction of § 2256(2)(A) is contrary to the statute’s purpose, that “a broadly stated legislative purpose cannot trump more narrowly worded statutory text”) (citing *Nichols v. United States*, 578 U.S. 104, 112 (2016) (“Yet ‘even the most formidable argument concerning the statute’s purposes could not overcome the clarity we find in the statute’s text.’”) (quoting *Kloeckner v. Solis*, 568 U.S. 41, 55 n.4 (2012)); *West Virginia Univ. Hospitals, Inc. v. Casey*, 499 U.S. 83, 98 (1991) (“best evidence of . . . [legislative purpose] is the statutory text”)); *see also Hillie*, 39 F.4th at 692 (holding “the Government produced no evidence that JAA engaged in ‘sexually explicit conduct[.]’ as defined by the plain text of the statute”).

because they portray “lascivious exhibition” of MV1’s “anus, genitals, or pubic area.” The defendant does not dispute this. Dkt. 45 at 6–7. Accordingly, the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt all the elements necessary to find the defendant guilty of both 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a) and 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2)(B).

* * *

The court finds the defendant, Jake Delahney Taylor, GUILTY of Counts One and Two.

SIGNED on Galveston Island this 14th day of December, 2022.



JEFFREY VINCENT BROWN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE