

FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-11009

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

SAMUEL ARTHUR THOMPSON,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 3:20-cr-00026-BJD-LLL-1

Before ROSENBAUM, BRANCH, and GRANT, Circuit Judges.

GRANT, Circuit Judge:

When the Jacksonville Jaguars’ jumbotrons glitched during the first home game of the 2018 season, the Jaguars thought it was just that—a glitch. After it happened two more times, though, all heads turned to Samuel Thompson, the stadium’s former control

room engineer. He had both the skills and the motive to cause trouble: earlier that year, the Jaguars had fired him when his conviction for child sodomy came to light.

The jumbotron investigation that followed revealed that Thompson had also committed a host of other serious crimes, including possessing and producing child pornography. Once Thompson knew the FBI was on to him, he drained his bank account and fled to the Philippines. But when all was said and done, he was forced back to the United States to face a ten-count indictment.

Thompson opted to represent himself at trial, and was convicted on all counts. He now appeals, arguing that he did not validly waive his right to counsel; that his Sixth Amendment rights were infringed by a child victim testifying using two-way closed-circuit television; and that the district court wrongly denied his motions to compel discovery, to continue trial, and to suppress evidence. We are unpersuaded, and affirm his convictions.

I.

Thompson has a knack for computers. In 2013, he helped the Jaguars with the design and installation of their stadium's new state-of-the-art videoboard system. He stayed on the Jaguars' payroll for the next few years, completing various technical projects and operating the jumbotrons on game days.

But Thompson's time with the team came to an end when an anonymous letter revealed new information about his past—he had served time in prison for sodomizing a young boy he had

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

3

“befriended” while working as a church youth leader in Alabama. He had guessed—correctly, as it turned out—that because he was an independent contractor, not an employee, the Jaguars would not look into his background too closely. But once the truth came out, his contractor status also made it easy for the team to sever ties with him.

With Thompson out of the picture, the Jaguars brought in a new engineer to run the video control room for the 2018 season. Things got off to a rocky start. During the first home game, one of the jumbotron screens inexplicably went blank and then displayed color bars across the screen. Thompson soon sent texts to his former coworkers, saying that he saw the disruption, knew “exactly what the problem” was, and could have fixed it in “less than a minute.”

The Jaguars scrambled to find the source of the disruptions, but their efforts kept coming up short. By the second or third outage, the team started to suspect that someone outside the stadium was interfering with the videoboards. When Jaguars staff discovered that someone had been remotely accessing a decommissioned computer to break into the videoboard network, they set up a “honeypot” to catch the intruder in the act. And it worked: when the would-be hacker tried (and failed) to access the videoboard network during the next home game, the team was able to capture information that led investigators to the intruder’s IP address.

The FBI then traced that address to Thompson, who had not covered his tracks. FBI Special Agent Frank Norris obtained a

search warrant and executed it at Thompson's home. Agents found and seized his gun, iPhone, iPad, laptops, hard drives, and a desktop computer.

Thompson was relatively forthcoming during the search, telling agents that he had another computer in a storage unit and giving his consent for them to seize it. He also told agents that he had recently returned home from a trip to the Bahamas, though investigators later learned that he had not reported that trip in accordance with his sex offender registration obligations. As for the jumbotron disruptions, he denied any involvement—but became “evasive” after the agents showed him the evidence they had on him. About ten days later, Thompson emptied his bank account and fled to the Philippines, again failing to report the trip.

In the meantime, investigators searched Thompson's devices, and the data they obtained corroborated his involvement in the jumbotron intrusions. The search also uncovered something else—a staggering amount of child pornography.

A grand jury returned a six-count indictment against Thompson. And Thompson returned to the United States (under pressure from both the American and Philippine governments to do so), where he pleaded not guilty to all charges. Another grand jury returned a nearly identical superseding indictment against Thompson about a year later, again charging him with six counts:

- Possessing child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(4)(B) and (b)(2);

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

5

- Receiving child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(2) and (b)(1);
- Intentionally causing damage to protected computers, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5)(A) and (c)(4)(B)(i);
- Failing to comply with sex offender registration obligations regarding travel to the Bahamas, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2250(b);
- Possessing a firearm as a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1) and 924(a)(2);
- Failing to comply with sex offender registration obligations regarding travel to the Republic of Korea and the Philippines, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2250(b).

After that indictment came down, Thompson told his court-appointed counsel that he wished to represent himself.

A magistrate judge held a *Faretta* hearing in February 2022 to probe Thompson’s desire to waive his right to counsel. The magistrate judge, with the government’s help, catalogued the nature of the charges and the potential penalties Thompson faced, as well as the risks associated with self-representation. Thompson stood firm in his decision, but agreed to have standby counsel. Finding that Thompson knew and understood the risks, the magistrate judge accepted his decision to proceed pro se.

In early 2023, the FBI finally managed to “crack the password” on Thompson’s iPad. Agents discovered still more child pornography—around 280 videos and 3,000 images. And Thompson appeared to have produced some of the materials

himself, taking advantage of visits from several of his eight-year-old stepson's friends. That new evidence led to the return of a ten-count, second superseding indictment against Thompson, which included four additional counts:

- Enticing minors to engage in sexually explicit conduct for the purposes of producing a visual depiction, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2251(a) and (e);
- Committing the above offense while being required to register as a sex offender, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2260A;
- Receiving child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(2) and (b)(1);
- Possessing child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(4)(B) and (b)(2).

Five days later, Thompson appeared before a magistrate judge—the same one that had conducted his *Faretta* hearing—for an arraignment. During the arraignment, the government summarized all the charges in the new indictment and detailed the potential penalties. Thompson confirmed that he understood the nature of the charges and their associated penalties.

Meanwhile, he set his sights on suppressing the evidence obtained from the search of his home. He challenged the search warrant's execution, arguing that the FBI agents who conducted the search failed to leave behind a copy of the attachments to the warrant. He also argued that the warrant lacked probable cause, and requested an evidentiary hearing under *Franks v. Delaware* to challenge the search warrant's truthfulness. *See* 438 U.S. 154 (1978).

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

7

And after a preliminary evidentiary hearing—at which the agent who executed the warrant testified—the district court adopted the magistrate judge’s recommendation to deny Thompson’s motion to suppress and his request for a full-blown *Franks* hearing.

As trial approached, Thompson grew increasingly frustrated by the government’s refusal to hand over certain devices in what he called their “native form.” But the district court denied his motions to compel, agreeing with the government that it was statutorily barred from giving him unfettered control over any devices alleged to contain child pornography. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3509(m). And in any event, the court reasoned, Thompson had been given more than enough opportunities to inspect the devices’ data. Thompson also complained that he needed a continuance to adequately prepare his expert for trial, but that motion met a similar fate: the district court denied it on the ground that Thompson had “ample access to the relevant discovery materials and to any required experts.”

The government, for its part, sought to examine the three child witnesses by closed-circuit television, rather than in front of Thompson, as provided by 18 U.S.C. § 3509(b)(1). The court held a hearing, and after questioning each child, decided that one would be unable to testify in Thompson’s physical presence. During trial, the court ruled, the child would testify in the courtroom while Thompson listened and observed from another room.

With that, the case proceeded to trial. It lasted nine days, after which the jury found Thompson guilty on all counts. The

district court subsequently sentenced him to 2,640 months' imprisonment, followed by a life term of supervised release. Thompson, now represented by counsel, timely appealed.

II.

Thompson first contends that he did not knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waive his Sixth Amendment right to counsel—a mixed question of law and fact that we review *de novo*. *United States v. Shamsid-Deen*, 61 F.4th 935, 945 (11th Cir. 2023).

The Sixth Amendment guarantees not only the “right to assistance of counsel,” but also “the correlative right to dispense with a lawyer’s help.” *Adams v. U.S. ex rel. McCann*, 317 U.S. 269, 279 (1942); *see* U.S. Const. amend. VI. Those rights cannot be simultaneously enjoyed—opting *in* to self-representation necessarily requires opting *out* of the right to counsel. *See United States v. Hakim*, 30 F.4th 1310, 1322 (11th Cir. 2022). Defendants are free to make that choice, but doing so is not without consequence: they must give up “many of the traditional benefits associated with the right to counsel.” *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 835 (1975).

Before allowing a defendant to waive the right to counsel, the trial court must be sure that “his choice is made with eyes open.” *Id.* (quotation omitted). The best way to assure a waiver is valid is to conduct a pretrial session—known as a *Faretta* hearing—“at which the accused is informed of the charges, basic trial procedures, and hazards of self-representation.” *United States v. Owen*, 963 F.3d 1040, 1049 (11th Cir. 2020) (quotation omitted); *see*

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

9

Faretta, 422 U.S. at 835–36. That said, a defendant can make a valid waiver even without a formal *Faretta* hearing, so long as the record shows that he “understood the risks of self-representation and freely chose to face them.” *Owen*, 963 F.3d at 1049 (quotation omitted); *see also United States v. Stanley*, 739 F.3d 633, 645 (11th Cir. 2014).

Thompson initially waived his right to counsel at the 2022 *Faretta* hearing. During that proceeding, the magistrate judge touched on each of the eight factors that this Court usually consults when assessing a waiver’s validity—including, as relevant here, Thompson’s knowledge of the nature of the charges and possible penalties.¹ *See Owen*, 963 F.3d at 1049. Despite the magistrate judge’s warnings about “the dangers and disadvantages of self-representation,” Thompson remained steadfast in his decision to go it alone. Satisfied that he made that decision with a full understanding of the risks, the magistrate judge accepted the waiver and allowed him to proceed in his own defense.

¹ The eight factors are “(1) the defendant’s age, educational background, and physical and mental health; (2) the extent of the defendant’s contact with lawyers prior to trial; (3) the defendant’s knowledge of the nature of the charges, possible defenses, and penalties; (4) the defendant’s understanding of rules of procedure, evidence, and courtroom decorum; (5) the defendant’s experience in criminal trials; (6) whether standby counsel was appointed, and the extent to which that counsel aided the defendant; (7) mistreatment or coercion of the defendant; and (8) whether the defendant was trying to manipulate the events of the trial.” *Owen*, 963 F.3d at 1049.

That's all fine with Thompson, who cites no problem with the validity of his initial waiver. Instead, he challenges the continued validity of that waiver after the second superseding indictment. He contends that his waiver was no longer valid after the new indictment, because it added four additional counts and increased his sentencing exposure.

No—nothing changed in the risk calculus except the new charges, and the record is clear that Thompson understood the nature of those charges and the possible penalties. Shortly after the return of the new indictment, Thompson appeared for an arraignment. The same magistrate judge as before asked the government to “discuss the superseding indictment,” giving “specific attention to the new charges and possible penalties.” The government proceeded to explain, for each of the ten counts, the alleged offense and Thompson’s sentencing exposure—including maximum and minimum terms of imprisonment, supervised release, and fines. Thompson then confirmed that he understood the nature of the charges and the possible penalties, and that he received a copy of the indictment.

If that wasn’t enough (it was), Thompson reaffirmed over the next days and months that he wished to continue representing himself. At a suppression hearing three days after the arraignment, for example, the magistrate judge asked if he was “able to move forward” with self-representation, and he replied, “I am.” He was ordered to “alert the Court” if that changed, and he affirmed that he would. He never did. The magistrate judge brought the issue

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

11

up three more times over the next day, and each time, Thompson affirmed that his mind was made up. And three months later, when the magistrate judge asked him whether he was “prepared to continue to represent” himself, he again replied, “Yes, Your Honor.” So although Thompson now claims that the court “moved forward without careful consideration of Thompson’s Sixth Amendment rights,” there is simply no support for that assertion in the record.

Thompson presses the matter, asserting that a brand-new *Faretta* hearing is required each time a superseding indictment increases a defendant’s potential minimum or maximum sentence. Our answer is a resounding no: *Faretta* requires no such mechanical repetition. Even Thompson cannot explain what else needed to happen at a new *Faretta* hearing, other than vague assertions that a careful inquiry is needed. But here, as elsewhere, “matters of reality, and not mere ritual, should be controlling.” *McCarthy v. United States*, 394 U.S. 459, 467 n.20 (1969) (alteration adopted and quotation omitted).

In fact, it is not entirely clear why the colloquy at the rearraignment did not, in substance, constitute a second *Faretta* hearing. The only difference that Thompson could identify is that the magistrate judge did not walk through each of the new charges on an element-by-element basis, as was done during the initial hearing. But again, no such formality is required. And when he was given the choice between receiving more or less detail during the arraignment, Thompson opted for less—allowing the

government to present a “summary” of the charges as opposed to a “formal reading of the indictment.” So we see no reason to second-guess his understanding just because it was not confirmed during a separate proceeding held purely for formality’s sake.

This is all the more true considering that *Faretta* hearings are “preferred,” but “not required,” for a valid waiver. *United States v. Cash*, 47 F.3d 1083, 1088 (11th Cir. 1995). At the end of the day, what matters is “not the trial court’s express advice, but rather the defendant’s understanding.” *Owen*, 963 F.3d at 1049 (quotation omitted). Here, the record is flush with evidence that Thompson understood the risks of self-representation, both before and after the second superseding indictment came down. The fact that some of those risks were realized does not change that fact, and we reject his contention that the district court violated his Sixth Amendment right to counsel.

III.

Thompson next challenges the district court’s denial of his pretrial motions to compel discovery and to continue trial. Although we typically review denials of motions to compel discovery and to continue trial for abuse of discretion, here Thompson attacks these rulings primarily on due process grounds. *See Holloman v. Mail-Well Corp.*, 443 F.3d 832, 837 (11th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Valladares*, 544 F.3d 1257, 1261 (11th Cir. 2008). We review that constitutional argument de novo. *See United States v. Watkins*, 147 F.3d 1294, 1296 (11th Cir. 1998).

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

13

Longstanding precedent tells us that several constitutional provisions, taken together, guarantee that criminal defendants have “a meaningful opportunity to present a complete defense.” *Crane v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 683, 690 (1986) (quotation omitted). “The right of an accused in a criminal trial to due process is, in essence, the right to a fair opportunity to defend against the State’s accusations.” *Chambers v. Mississippi*, 410 U.S. 284, 294 (1973). Thompson contends that the district court’s decisions, whether standing alone or taken together, denied him a “meaningful opportunity to prepare his case on an equal footing with the United States.” He is incorrect.

A.

First up is the district court’s denial of Thompson’s motion to compel discovery. On this front, his due process argument falters right out of the gate: “There is no general constitutional right to discovery in a criminal case.” *Weatherford v. Bursey*, 429 U.S. 545, 559 (1977). Outside certain well-defined exceptions for exculpatory material, “the Due Process Clause has little to say regarding the amount of discovery which the parties must be afforded.” *Wardius v. Oregon*, 412 U.S. 470, 474 (1973); *see also Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963); *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150, 154 (1972). Thompson does not contend that any exception applies here, so his due process challenge fails.

In any event, the district court acted well within its discretion in denying Thompson’s motion to compel. The federal rules require, as a general matter, that defendants have a chance

“to inspect and to copy” any devices or data in the government’s possession. Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(E). But that opportunity is not absolute—and for good reason. Section 3509(m) of Title 18, for example, bars the government from relinquishing control over “any property or material that constitutes child pornography,” so long as it is made “reasonably available” for the defendant’s inspection or review. 18 U.S.C. § 3509(m)(1)–(2). And above all, the district court retains “broad authority” to “deny, restrict, or defer discovery” upon a finding of good cause. *United States v. Campa*, 529 F.3d 980, 995 (11th Cir. 2008); Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(d)(1).

Thompson claims that the government denied him meaningful access to the data on his electronic devices. But from day one, the government made his iPhone and other devices, including those containing child sexual abuse material, available for his review at the jail. The government also complied with Thompson’s requests for copies of specific files on various devices—at one point, reviewing 74,000 files on a hard drive to ensure they were free from contraband before handing them over. And all devices were made available for his inspection; Thompson does not identify a single one that wasn’t. So the record supports the district court’s finding that he “had more than an ample opportunity to inspect all data” and that the government “provided copies of that data when allowed by statute.”

Thompson pushes back, arguing that he was entitled to receive personal, sanitized copies of entire devices so that he could review them “without FBI oversight.” No. It bears emphasis that

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

15

the devices he sought to copy either contained child pornography or “facts strongly indicative of its presence,” which means the government would have first needed to review each and every file to ensure that contraband was not present. When feasible, the government went to great lengths to do just that; otherwise, it gave him ample access to the devices and granted his narrowed requests for copies of specific files. On these facts, the district court reasonably denied his request for access to sanitized versions of his devices and hard drives.

Thompson also complains that rather than reviewing “the data in its native format,” as he would have preferred, he was forced to do so through a forensic program “with an FBI agent looking over his shoulder.” That, to him, meant that the data was not made “reasonably available” under § 3509(m)(2). Again, we disagree. To start, the law does not demand that an alleged child pornographer have unsupervised access to devices that contain or likely contain child sexual abuse material. The statute requires that Thompson be allowed “ample opportunity for inspection, viewing, and examination” at a government facility, not that he be given access to the data alone or in his preferred format. 18 U.S.C. § 3509(m)(2)(B). We accordingly reject his contention that the district court’s discovery rulings deprived him of a “meaningful” or “fair” opportunity to prepare his defense.

B.

Next is Thompson’s request for a continuance. District courts are afforded “great latitude” on scheduling, which includes

requests to continue trial. *United States v. Garmany*, 762 F.2d 929, 936 (11th Cir. 1985). For that reason, only those rulings that are “so arbitrary as to violate due process” will be disturbed on appeal. *United States v. Verderame*, 51 F.3d 249, 251 (11th Cir. 1995) (quotation omitted). No “mechanical tests” apply to that determination; instead, the answer depends on the unique facts in every case. *Id.* (quotation omitted). Considerations include “the time available for preparation, the likelihood of prejudice from denial, the accused’s role in shortening the effective preparation time, the degree of complexity of the case, and the availability of discovery from the prosecution.” *United States v. Pendergrass*, 995 F.3d 858, 870 (11th Cir. 2021) (quotation omitted). And to succeed on appeal, a criminal defendant must always show “specific substantial prejudice” by identifying the relevant evidence he would have presented had a continuance been granted. *Valladares*, 544 F.3d at 1262 (quotation omitted).

The district court’s decision not to continue trial was not arbitrary—far from it. Thompson made no effort to identify the specific evidence that he would have presented had his motion been granted. He matter-of-factly stated that this is a “complex cyber case,” and that he would benefit from an expert’s help in reviewing the data. To get even a vague idea of the evidence that he hoped to present requires piecing together stray lines from his prior filings, the gist of which seems to be that an expert’s forensic review would reveal evidence that someone within the Jaguars organization had planted child pornography on his devices. Yet to this day, he has pointed to nothing—nothing—in the record that

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

17

supports that theory. In fact, the evidence outright refutes it. Just to name an example, investigators uncovered child pornography filmed in Thompson’s own home, with his own voice audible in the background. Thompson’s request for a continuance fails for the simple reason that he failed to show any “specific substantial prejudice” caused by the denial. *Id.* (quotation omitted).

But that is not the only reason. The district court also found that Thompson alone was responsible for any delays in preparing his expert for trial. He had access to forensic experts for years—since at least the fall of 2021, when he requested (and received) funding to hire Roloff Digital Forensics. From then on, Thompson had authorization to work with Roloff, which provided him with preliminary forensic analysis. For reasons unknown, Thompson decided to switch to a second digital forensics expert in August 2022, and then a third several months later. The district court approved the final change in September 2023, more than a month before trial was set to begin.

Thompson did not use that time wisely. Although he visited the federal courthouse to review his data several times that month, his expert never accompanied him, and he did not schedule any time for the expert to review the evidence he sought to challenge. He points the finger at the government, claiming that discovery delays got in the way. But again, he has only himself to blame—on several occasions, he refused to review the data unless and until the government provided it in his preferred format. These facts drove the district court’s reasonable conclusion that the delays

Thompson experienced were nothing more than “a consequence of the manner in which he chose to conduct his defense.”

★ ★ ★

Thompson had a fair opportunity to present his defense. The district court’s orders denying his motions to compel and to continue trial—whether considered alone or taken together—did not change that. His due process argument fails.

IV.

Thompson also argues that the district court’s decision to allow a child witness to testify by closed-circuit television violated his Sixth Amendment rights twice over: *first*, by curbing his right to confront the witnesses against him, and *second*, by impairing his right to self-representation. Because he made only the Confrontation Clause objection in the trial court, we review his first argument de novo and his second for plain error. *See United States v. Yates*, 438 F.3d 1307, 1311 (11th Cir. 2006) (en banc); *United States v. Alfonso*, 104 F.4th 815, 828 (11th Cir. 2024). The plain error standard requires “that (1) an error occurred, (2) the error was obvious, and (3) the error affected his substantial rights.” *United States v. Tovar*, 146 F.4th 1318, 1325 (11th Cir. 2025). “Even then, we exercise our discretion to correct the error only if it seriously impaired the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” *Id.* (quotation omitted).

A.

The Sixth Amendment’s Confrontation Clause ordinarily “guarantees the defendant a face-to-face meeting with witnesses appearing before the trier of fact.” *Pitts v. Mississippi*, 607 U.S. 1, 2 (2025) (quotation omitted). But as the Supreme Court recognized in *Maryland v. Craig*, that promise “must occasionally give way” to protect “child witnesses from the trauma of testifying.” 497 U.S. 836, 849, 855 (1990) (quotation omitted). The *Craig* Court approved a state statute that allowed child witnesses to testify by closed-circuit television, but only with a case-specific finding that the procedure is “necessary to protect the welfare of the particular child witness who seeks to testify.” *Id.* at 855.

The Court laid out the ground rules for that determination: The government must present evidence, and the trial court must find, “that the child witness would be traumatized, not by the courtroom generally, but by the presence of the defendant.” *Id.* at 856. The emotional distress the child would suffer must be “more than *de minimis*”—that is, “more than mere nervousness or excitement or some reluctance to testify.” *Id.* (quotation omitted). And during trial, the court must ensure that other essential elements of the confrontation right—“oath, cross-examination, and observation of the witness’ demeanor”—are “otherwise assured.” *Id.* at 851, 850.

Congress passed the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 following the Court’s decision in *Craig*. The Act allows child victims to testify by two-way closed-circuit television in federal

trials upon a finding that they are “unable to testify in open court in the presence of the defendant . . . because of fear.” 18 U.S.C. § 3509(b)(1)(B)(i). That “fear” must come from testifying in the defendant’s presence—not from the ordinary stress associated with testifying in court. See *Craig*, 497 U.S. at 856–57. And though the Supreme Court in *Craig* expressly declined to specify the minimum finding of emotional distress needed to dispense with the face-to-face requirement, it held that the state statute challenged in that case—which required that the child be unable to “reasonably communicate”—“clearly” sufficed. *Id.* at 856 (quotation omitted).

The federal statute sets a similar standard, requiring that a child be “unable to testify” because of fear or trauma. That does “not mean that the child must be traumatized to the extent of being unable to utter any responses to questions whatsoever.” *United States v. Garcia*, 7 F.3d 885, 889 n.1 (9th Cir. 1993). “Rather, as was the case with the child witness in *Craig*, the child’s emotional trauma must be such that he or she ‘cannot reasonably communicate’ in the defendant’s presence.” *Id.* So it is enough for the trial court to find that testifying in the same room as the defendant “would *impair*”—not completely subdue—“the child’s ability to communicate.” *Craig*, 497 U.S. at 857 (emphasis added).

The record here provides more than enough support for the district court’s conclusion that one of the child witnesses—who was eight years old at the time of the abuse and once so close to Thompson that he considered himself Thompson’s “son”—needed to testify by two-way television. In response to the court’s

questioning before trial, the then eleven-year-old estimated that he faced a “50/50” chance of having an anxiety attack on the stand and “would probably lock up” in Thompson’s presence. Given his history of anxiety attacks, he explained that testifying before Thompson—who had “exploited” him and made him “really nervous”—might trigger an attack on the stand. That risk, he said, would be diminished if he could testify without Thompson in the room.

The district court, after observing the child on the stand, found it credible that he “would experience paralyzing and traumatic anxiety when faced with recounting his abuse” in Thompson’s presence.² Based on that finding, using a two-way monitoring system was appropriate for this child’s testimony. Cf. *United States v. Cox*, 871 F.3d 479, 485 (6th Cir. 2017). And when it came time for trial, there is no doubt that other essential elements of the confrontation right were satisfied—the child “testified under oath,” was subject to “full cross-examination,” and was “able to be observed by the judge, jury, and defendant.” *Craig*, 497 U.S. at 857. Thompson’s rights under the Confrontation Clause were not infringed when the child testified as provided by § 3509(b)(1).

² Thompson’s self-representation made this problem even worse. Not only would he have been present in the courtroom, but he would have personally conducted the child’s cross-examination. Although the district court did not discuss this fact with the child, one can reasonably infer from the pretrial testimony that it would make it significantly harder for the child to communicate on the stand. That would, in turn, undermine “the truth-finding function of the trial itself.” *Craig*, 497 U.S. at 857 (quotation omitted).

B.

Nor has Thompson shown that the district court's application of § 3509(b)(1)(D) violated his right to self-representation—much less plainly so. See *Tovar*, 146 F.4th at 1325. As we have discussed, the Sixth Amendment includes the “right to self-representation for criminal defendants.” *Barnes v. Sec’y, Dep’t of Corr.*, 888 F.3d 1148, 1159 (11th Cir. 2018); see *Faretta*, 422 U.S. at 819. But “the right is not absolute”—in some circumstances the court may appoint standby counsel to aid a defendant even over the defendant’s objection. *Barnes*, 888 F.3d at 1159. And that may even include allowing standby counsel to participate at trial, so long as that participation “does not seriously interfere” with the “core” of the self-representation right: the defendant’s ability “to preserve actual control over the case he chooses to present to the jury.” *Id.*; *McKaskle v. Wiggins*, 465 U.S. 168, 178 (1984).

Thompson contends that his right to self-representation was hampered during the child witness’s closed-circuit television testimony, because he was excluded from the courtroom and prevented from “directly examining” the child. But that fact does not show that his right was obviously and erroneously infringed. *Tovar*, 146 F.4th at 1325. Thompson contemporaneously watched and listened to the child victim’s testimony from another room. And standby counsel conferred with Thompson and asked questions as he directed during the cross-examination. In fact, the record reflects that throughout the trial Thompson exercised control over all “significant tactical decisions” and “the questioning

24-11009

Opinion of the Court

23

of witnesses”—even when he was sequestered for the child witness. *Wiggins*, 465 U.S. at 178.

We are thus not convinced that the district court plainly erred in applying § 3509(b)(1)(D) to Thompson as a pro se defendant. Because he was given the opportunity to direct standby counsel’s questioning of the witness, the “core” of his Sixth Amendment right remained intact. *Id.* at 178.

V.

Thompson’s final set of arguments relates to the search warrant issued for his home.

First, Thompson challenges the denial of his request to issue Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 17(b) subpoenas to certain witnesses in support of his motion for a *Franks v. Delaware* evidentiary hearing. *See* 438 U.S. at 154. We review this decision for abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Muho*, 978 F.3d 1212, 1219 (11th Cir. 2020).

A *Franks* hearing is required “when a defendant makes a substantial preliminary showing that statements or omissions made in an affidavit supporting a [search warrant] are deliberately false or made with reckless disregard for the truth,” and that those statements or omissions are “necessary to the finding of probable cause.” *United States v. Goldstein*, 989 F.3d 1178, 1197 (11th Cir. 2021) (quotation omitted). Rule 17(b), in turn, allows an indigent defendant to subpoena witnesses at the government’s expense, but only if those witnesses are a “necessity” for an “adequate defense.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 17(b); *see Muho*, 978 F.3d at 1219.

Thompson claims that the magistrate judge erred in declining to subpoena five witnesses who would have testified, on his telling, that he had permission to access the Jaguars' computer network at the time of the jumbotron outages. If so, Thompson says, the warrant was misleading when it catalogued his supposedly unauthorized intrusions.

The district court reasonably concluded that witness testimony was not a “necessity” for Thompson to show his entitlement to a *Franks* hearing. Fed. R. Crim. P. 17(b). None of his subpoena applications claimed that the witnesses would testify that he had access to the Jaguars' computer network at all relevant times, or that Agent Norris knew about his purported access or recklessly disregarded that fact.³

Those claims were not enough: Rule 17(b) is not a “discovery device.” *United States v. Rinchack*, 820 F.2d 1557, 1567 (11th Cir. 1987). It requires “facts that show the relevancy and the necessity” of the testimony—not just “a feeling” that a witness could “shed some light” on the relevant subject. *United States v. Hegwood*, 562 F.2d 946, 952, 953 (5th Cir. 1977) (quotations

³ In fact, the Chief Legal Officer later testified at trial that Thompson had no right to access the Jaguars' stadium after the termination of his contract in March 2018—he had no continuing duties, and nothing else required his presence there. And other testimony at trial established that Thompson had no right to access the Jaguars' computer systems, either.

omitted).⁴ So although Thompson speculates that the requested witnesses might “shed some light” on his motion for a *Franks* hearing, the Rule demands more. *Id.* (quotation omitted). The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying his subpoena requests.

Second, Thompson challenges the denial of his motion to suppress, for which we review the district court’s legal conclusions de novo and its factual findings for clear error, while construing the facts in the light most favorable to the government as the prevailing party. See *United States v. Rivers*, 134 F.4th 1292, 1302 (11th Cir. 2025).

Thompson contends that the evidence obtained from the execution of the search warrant should be suppressed because the warrant was unsupported by probable cause. “Probable cause requires a fair probability that contraband or evidence of a crime will be found in a particular place.” *United States v. McCall*, 84 F.4th 1317, 1324 (11th Cir. 2023) (quotation omitted). It deals with “probabilities,” not “hard certainties,” and thus turns on a “common-sense” reading of the supporting affidavit. *Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213, 231 (1983) (quotation omitted). For that reason, we “give great deference” to the issuing magistrate judge’s

⁴ This Court has adopted as binding precedent all decisions of the Fifth Circuit issued before October 1, 1981. *Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc).

probable cause determination. *United States v. Carroll*, 886 F.3d 1347, 1351 (11th Cir. 2018) (quotation omitted).

Here, the warrant was supported by a “fair probability” that a search of Thompson’s home would yield evidence that he violated 18 U.S.C. § 1030. *McCall*, 84 F.4th at 1324 (quotation omitted). Section 1030(a)(5)(C) makes it unlawful to intentionally access a computer “without authorization, and as a result of such conduct, cause[] damage and loss.” In Thompson’s view, the magistrate judge had no reason to believe that the disruption of the Jaguars’ jumbotrons during three NFL games caused “damage and loss.” But that argument defies common sense: outage to a sports stadium’s jumbotrons during a live game with thousands of fans in attendance surely amounts to “damage and loss.” The statute makes this explicit, defining “loss” to include “any revenue lost, cost incurred, or other consequential damages incurred because of interruption of service.” 18 U.S.C. § 1030(e)(11).

The statute also defines “loss” as “any reasonable cost to any victim, including the cost of responding to an offense.” *Id.* The affidavit sufficiently identified such loss, as it detailed the internal response and investigation to the jumbotron disruptions within the Jaguars organization. From there, the magistrate judge could reasonably infer that the Jaguars spent time and money responding

to the offense. *See id.* We therefore reject Thompson’s argument that the warrant was unsupported by probable cause.⁵

Thompson also argues that the evidence should be suppressed because the search warrant violated the Fourth Amendment’s requirement that warrants “particularly describ[e] the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.” U.S. Const. amend. IV. The application for a search warrant included two attachments, Attachment A and Attachment B, which respectively identified the location to be searched and the items to be seized, and the magistrate judge incorporated the attachments by reference when issuing the warrant.

Thompson concedes that the attachments were “properly referenced in the warrant.” But according to him, the copy he received on the day of the search did not include the attachments, rendering the warrant invalid. The district court rejected that contention, crediting Agent Norris’s competing account: he testified that the copy given to Thompson included both Attachments A and B, in accordance with FBI policy.

When a law enforcement officer’s testimony conflicts with a defendant’s, “the trial judge’s choice of whom to believe is conclusive on this Court.” *United States v. Grushko*, 50 F.4th 1, 11 (11th Cir. 2022) (alterations adopted and quotation omitted). That

⁵ Given our determination that probable cause existed for a violation of § 1030(a)(5)(C), we need not consider Thompson’s alternative argument that it was lacking for § 1030(a)(2)(C).

is, of course, “unless the judge credits exceedingly improbable testimony.” *Id.* (quotation omitted). Here, the magistrate judge found Agent Norris’s testimony “credible.” Because that finding was not clearly erroneous, suppression was not warranted on this basis.

* * *

What began with a disgruntled ex-contractor interfering with the jumbotrons in the middle of several NFL games turned out to be much more—a case about child pornography possession and production, unlawful possession of a firearm, sex-offender registration obligations, and of course, computer hacking. Because none of Thompson’s arguments warrant a reversal of his conviction on appeal, we **AFFIRM** the judgment of the district court.