

JASON DANIEL GANDY
DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE PACKET
Prepared September 2026

Case website and source-document repository:
<https://judgemisconduct.com/>

PURPOSE

This packet is a roadmap for an independent filmmaker, journalist, innocence organization, or human-rights investigator. It identifies the records and witnesses needed to test the family's claims. It does not ask a reviewer to accept allegations without verification.

CASE AT A GLANCE

Jason Daniel Gandy was arrested in Houston, Texas, in July 2012. His jury trial occurred in July 2018—six years after his arrest—while he remained a pretrial detainee legally presumed innocent. He rejected a ten-year plea offer, maintained his innocence, was convicted after trial, and received a thirty-year sentence.

The proposed documentary would investigate five questions:

1. Why did a federal defendant remain in pretrial detention for six years?
2. Why did Docket Entries 34 and 46 remain unresolved for four years?
3. What occurred during the April 27, 2017 ex parte proceeding reflected in DE 98, and why did Jason not obtain that transcript until approximately June 2025?
4. Were statements or evidence obtained through challenged interrogations used directly or derivatively to develop witnesses and evidence?
5. Did prolonged isolation, assaults, alleged rape, restraints, deprivation, and mental-health deterioration impair Jason's ability to participate in his defense?

VERIFICATION STANDARD

The family's legal conclusions and allegations must be distinguished from facts established by primary records. A credible film should obtain the complete federal docket, all unsealed and sealed materials available through proper legal process, hearing and trial transcripts, interrogation recordings, detention and medical records, attorney files, investigative reports, and responses from the court, prosecutors, former defense counsel, investigators, witnesses, and the Bureau of Prisons.

CORE CHRONOLOGY

July 2012
Jason was arrested and detained before trial.

July 20, 2012

Jason says he was interrogated while represented and exhausted. The defense later challenged statements and resulting evidence.

July 25–26, 2012

Jason alleges information obtained during interrogation and transport was used when investigators questioned K.V. This claimed derivative-evidence chain must be tested against videos, recordings, notes, reports, and transportation records.

November 26, 2013

DE 46 was filed. Page 5 states that the initial airport inspection of the computer found “NO IMAGES CHARACTERISTIC OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.” The filing also addresses the later browser-cache images found by a different examiner and seeks suppression of Gandy’s statements and their fruits. The documentary should present that complete forensic sequence.

2013–2017

DE 34 and DE 46 remained without a full, open suppression hearing or definitive ruling for four years. DE 89 records counsel stating that the defense was “still waiting on a response to our motions.”

April 27, 2017

DE 98 is the transcript of the April 27, 2017 ex parte proceeding concerning suppression, counsel withdrawal, and a possible plea. It records the court treating an open suppression hearing as “not needed.” It also records Jason opposing counsel’s withdrawal: “I did oppose him quitting. I did not want him to quit,” and “I don’t want them to quit. I would like them to stay on and go to trial.”

July 2018

Jason received a jury trial after six years of pretrial detention.

December 2018

He was sentenced to thirty years after rejecting a ten-year plea agreement.

April 23, 2019

At the April 23, 2019 civil hearing in *Alfaro v. Gandy*, No. H-18-1761, J.A. testified under oath: “I was 17 when I met him.” That sworn testimony conflicts with the charged August 1–November 3, 2007 period. The documentary should place the civil transcript beside the indictment and the criminal-trial testimony.

2019–2025

Jason and his family repeatedly sought records, including DE 98. On January 8, 2024, court reporter Kathy Metzger described the proceeding as “sealed EX PARTE” and stated that an order from the judge was required before it could be released.

April–June 2025

DE 98 was transcribed on April 21, 2025. Jason received it approximately in June 2025 after years of requests.

PRIMARY DOCUMENTS TO OBTAIN FIRST

DE 34

Suppression motion. Determine every constitutional and evidentiary issue raised, requested relief, filing date, response, hearing history, and disposition.

DE 46

Sealed suppression-related filing dated November 26, 2013. Review the complete document, especially page 5 and the statement “NO IMAGES CHARACTERISTIC OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.” Determine what devices and forensic examination that statement concerned and how later testimony treated the evidence.

DE 89

DE 89 records retained counsel stating that the defense was “still waiting on a response to our motions.”

DE 98

Transcript of the April 27, 2017 ex parte proceeding. Examine what the judge and counsel said about a suppression hearing, counsel withdrawal, Jason’s desire to retain paid counsel, and a possible plea.

DE 141

July 9, 2018 speedy-trial-related transcript. Compare any description that Jason “fired” lawyers with DE 98 and counsel-withdrawal orders.

DE 174

Gandy’s Rule 29(c) Motion for Judgment of Acquittal challenges Counts 1, 2, 3, and 6. It is the necessary source for comparing the arguments Sean Buckley actually made with the court’s descriptions in DE 178. The authentic six-page motion and proposed order have been found in Drive and must be uploaded to JudgeMisconduct.

DE 178

Rule 29(c) decision. Compare the court’s account of the defense arguments with the actual motion and trial record count by count.

DE 190–192

Trial transcripts, including testimony, forensic evidence, witness reluctance, cross-examination, jury instructions, and closing arguments.

DE 239, DE 277, DE 287, DE 289, DE 302, DE 305, DE 315, and DE 316

These later filings and orders concern record access, sealing, alleged derivative use, requests for recordings, and post-conviction procedural disputes. Review them chronologically and avoid treating allegations in a motion as adjudicated facts.

Direct appeal

United States v. Gandy, Fifth Circuit No. 18-20823. Obtain briefs, record excerpts, oral-argument materials if any, and the decision.

Civil hearing

Alfaro v. Gandy, No. H-18-1761, April 23, 2019 transcript, filed April 21, 2021 as Document 33. J.A. testified at page 11, lines 8–11: “I was 17 when I met him.” Compare that sworn testimony with the indictment’s charged period and the criminal-trial testimony.

INNOCENCE AND EVIDENTIARY LEADS

1. J.A. timing

J.A. testified under oath in 2019 that he was 17 when he met Jason. Investigators should compare his birth date, the charged August 1–November 3, 2007 window, the civil testimony, trial testimony, travel records, photographs, communications, and other corroboration.

2. San Diego alibi

The family says Jason was in San Diego during relevant periods and identifies Kevin Buenosuceso and Julie Gandy as potential sources of testimony, photographs, and records. Verify exact dates using original metadata, permits, leases, bank records, phone records, travel records, vehicle records, and independent witnesses.

3. Forensic computer evidence

Compare DE 46, forensic reports, evidence logs, expert reports, and Sean Buckley’s cross-examination of the government’s computer expert. Determine whether the disputed material was downloaded, cached, viewed, or characterized as nudist imagery, and how those distinctions relate to each count.

4. Witness-statement corrections

The family maintains that K.V., K.D., J.A., and Gary Stone corrected or contradicted statements attributed to them in government investigative summaries. Place each original report beside the recording, transcript, or later sworn testimony and identify exact differences.

5. Interrogation and derivative evidence

Obtain the complete July 20 and July 25, 2012 recordings, transport records, agent notes, K.V.’s July 26 questioning, later interviews, and the recorded jail call. Build a minute-by-minute information-flow chart showing what investigators knew independently, what they learned from Jason, what they told witnesses, and what evidence followed.

6. Plea and trial penalty

Obtain the written plea offer, plea correspondence, counsel notes, sentencing submissions, and sentencing transcript. Verify the ten-year offer, rejection, reasons for rejection, and the thirty-year post-trial sentence.

DETENTION AND HUMAN-RIGHTS INVESTIGATION

Jason reports that during six years of pretrial detention he was assaulted and raped, spent more than half the period in solitary confinement, and was subjected to Behavioral Management and Suicide Risk Management Plans. He says he was at times without running water, a spoon, or a toothbrush and was twice placed in four-point restraints. He associates the restraints and claustrophobic terror with more serious suicide attempts.

These are serious allegations requiring careful corroboration. Request:

- facility housing records and segregation logs;
- incident, assault, use-of-force, and restraint reports;
- PREA reports and related investigative files;
- suicide-watch and psychological records;
- Behavioral Management and Suicide Risk Management Plans;
- water-maintenance and cell-condition records;
- grievance, medical-request, and administrative-remedy files;
- attorney and family correspondence from the relevant periods;
- testimony from cellmates, staff, medical providers, and visitors.

Jason also reports reactions or allergies involving wheat, yeast, milk, corn, and cheese. Obtain diagnoses, allergy testing, diet orders, commissary records, medical complaints, weight history, and the institution's available meal accommodations.

THE HUMAN STORY

Jason's family says he was abruptly removed from the world, lost his freedom and property, and faced severely restricted communication while trying to prove innocence from custody. They say he spent his life savings on respected lawyers and investigators who uncovered substantial favorable evidence.

Jason says that if he is freed and the full record establishes that witnesses participated in a false prosecutorial narrative, he will cry tears of joy and forgive them rather than seek revenge. His family describes him as compassionate, empathetic, and forgiving. A film should test this portrayal through interviews with people who knew him before arrest, during detention, and throughout the legal struggle.

INTERVIEW PRIORITIES

- Jason Daniel Gandy
- Joe Gandy and Julie Gandy
- Jayson Williams, family advocate
- former defense attorneys Dan Cogdell, Nicole DeBorde, Charles Flood, Sean Buckley, and other counsel
- investigators and forensic experts
- K.V., K.D., J.A., D.V., Gary Stone, Kevin Buenosuceso, and other relevant witnesses
- prosecutors and former agents, including the officers identified in reports
- detention officials, medical personnel, former cellmates, and PREA investigators
- independent federal criminal-procedure, speedy-trial, forensic-computer, prison-conditions, and trauma experts
- representatives of the court, invited to respond to specific record-based questions

QUESTIONS FOR THE FILMMAKER

- Is the case suitable for a short documentary, feature documentary, episodic investigation, or podcast-first project?
- What independent verification is required before development?
- What is the cost of an initial case assessment, and what work product would it produce?
- Who would control editorial decisions and legal review?
- How would victim privacy and sensitive medical information be protected?
- Where could the project realistically be shown: film festivals, broadcasters, streaming platforms, universities, legal conferences, human-rights forums, or international outlets?
- What releases, prison-filming permissions, archival licenses, insurance, and distribution clearances would be required?
- Can development begin with a proof-of-concept trailer or ten-minute investigative short?

IMMEDIATE PRODUCTION PLAN

Phase 1: Record authentication

Do not begin by rebuilding the record. Begin with the source documents already published on JudgeMisconduct.

Website source map:

- [JudgeMisconduct home page](#) — entry point for the complete case archive.
- [Complete court docket](#) — filing dates and docket-entry numbers from 2012 through 2026.
- [DE 46](#) — sealed motion to suppress, including the airport computer inspection and fruits-of-the-poisonous-tree argument.
- [DE 98](#) — fifteen-page transcript of the ex parte proceeding.
- [Final pretrial conference transcript](#).
- [Jury trial transcript — Day 1](#).
- [Jury trial transcript — Day 2](#).
- [Jury trial transcript — Day 3](#).

- [Sentencing hearing transcript](#).
- [Earlier filings and court orders](#) — Rule 60(b), return-of-property filings, the amended judgment, and other record materials.
- [Newest filings](#) — current Rule 52(b), § 2255(h), Rule 60(b)(6), unsealing, recusal, and judicial-conduct filings.

DE 174 status: the authentic six-page Rule 29(c) motion and proposed order have been found in Drive. It challenges Counts 1, 2, 3, and 6. Upload it to JudgeMisconduct and place it immediately before DE 178 so reviewers can compare the motion with the ruling.

 DE 174 - Gandy Rule 29(c) Motion for Judgment of Acquittal.pdf .

After downloading these records, authenticate them against the complete docket and PACER copies.

Phase 2: Evidence matrix

For every claim, list the supporting record, contrary evidence, unresolved question, verification status, and potential interview source.

Phase 3: Recorded interviews

Begin with family and advocates, then seek responses from attorneys, witnesses, prosecutors, investigators, detention officials, and the court.

Phase 4: Expert review

Commission independent reviews of suppression procedure, speedy-trial history, forensic computer evidence, detention conditions, and trauma.

Phase 5: Proof of concept

Produce a short, carefully sourced film centered on the six-year pretrial detention, four-year suppression dispute, DE 98, and the unresolved demand for an independent evidentiary review.

CONTACT

Jayson Williams
 Advocate for Jason Daniel Gandy
 713-398-9455

Case website:
<https://judgemisconduct.com/>