

Exhibit B

Federal Indictment and

Affidavit in Support of Arrest

FILED IN OPEN COURT

JUN 24 2026

JDR / GFM

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER L. EKMAN, CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II

* CRIM. NO. 26-112-KD
* MAG. NO. 26-200
* USAO NO. 24R00450
* HSTF NO. MOB-ALS-0126
*
* VIOLATIONS: 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a)
* 18 U.S.C. § 241
* 18 U.S.C. § 242
* 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1) & (j)
* 18 U.S.C. § 371
* 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B)
*
* FORFEITURE NOTICE

INDICTMENT

THE GRAND JURY CHARGES:

INTRODUCTION

At times material to this Indictment:

1. The City of Prichard, Alabama ("Prichard") was a local government within the Southern District of Alabama. Prichard received, in any one-year period material to this Indictment, benefits in excess of \$10,000 under a Federal program involving a grant, contract, subsidy, loan, guarantee, insurance, and other form of Federal assistance.

2. The Prichard Police Department ("PPD") was an agency of Prichard. PPD employed police officers who were agents of Prichard. PPD officers held positions of public trust and were responsible for several functions within Prichard, including providing patrol, responding to calls for service, conducting traffic stops, investigating criminal incidents, arresting suspected criminals, and maintaining public safety.

3. From in or about 2017, and continuing to in or about June 2026, the defendant, **EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II**, was employed by PPD as a police officer.

COUNT ONE
Conspiracy to Commit Extortion Under Color of Official Right
Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951(a)

4. The allegations in Paragraphs 1–3 of this Indictment are realleged for Count One as though fully set forth herein.

5. Beginning on or about a date uncertain, but at least in or about 2020, and continuing to on or about June 16, 2026, the exact dates being unknown, in the Southern District of Alabama, and elsewhere, the defendant,

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II,

did willfully, knowingly, and unlawfully combine, conspire, confederate, and agree together with others, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to obstruct, delay, interrupt, and affect in any way and degree commerce and the movement of articles and commodities in commerce by extortion, as those terms are defined in Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951; that is, the defendant obtained property, namely, United States currency, from other persons, not otherwise due the defendant or PPD, with the other persons' consent, while the defendant was acting as a PPD officer under color of official right.

In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951(a).

COUNT TWO
Conspiracy Against Rights
Title 18, United States Code, Section 241

6. The allegations in Paragraphs 1–3 of this Indictment are realleged for Count Two as though fully set forth herein.

7. On or about November 15, 2025, in the Southern District of Alabama, and elsewhere, the defendant,

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II,

did willfully, knowingly, and unlawfully combine, conspire, confederate, and agree together with others, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to injure, oppress, threaten, and intimidate Victim-1 and Victim-2, whose identities are known to the Grand Jury, in the free exercise and enjoyment of a right and privilege secured to them by the Constitution and laws of the United States, namely, the right to be free from unlawful search and seizure pursuant to the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, the right to bear arms pursuant to the Second Amendment to the Constitution, and the right to be free from deprivation of liberty and property without due process of law pursuant to the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, by executing an unlawful traffic stop of a vehicle occupied by Victim-1 and Victim-2, an unlawful seizure of Victim-1's and Victim-2's firearms, and unlawful arrests of Victim-1 and Victim-2 by PPD.

In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 241.

COUNT THREE
Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law
Title 18, United States Code, Section 242

8. The allegations in Paragraphs 1–3 of this Indictment are realleged for Count Three as though fully set forth herein.

9. On or about November 15, 2025, in the Southern District of Alabama, and elsewhere, the defendant,

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II,

aided and abetted by other persons, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, while acting under color of law as a PPD officer, did willfully deprive Victim-1 and Victim-2, whose identities are known to the Grand Jury, of rights and privileges secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, namely, the right to be free from unlawful search and seizure pursuant to the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, the right to bear arms pursuant to the Second Amendment to the Constitution, and the right to be free from deprivation of liberty and property without due process of law pursuant to the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, by participating in the execution of an unlawful traffic stop of a vehicle occupied by Victim-1 and Victim-2, an unlawful seizure of Victim-1's and Victim-2's firearms, and unlawful arrests of Victim-1 and Victim-2 by PPD.

In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 242 and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

COUNT FOUR
Tampering with Evidence
Title 18, United States Code, Section 1512(c)(1) & (j)

10. The allegations in Paragraphs 1–3 of this Indictment are realleged for Count Four as though fully set forth herein.

11. From in or about May 2021, and continuing to on or about June 16, 2026, the exact dates being unknown, in the Southern District of Alabama, and elsewhere, the defendant,

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II,

aided and abetted by other persons, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, did corruptly conceal a record, document, and other object, namely, audio recordings, photographs, and surveillance videos, with the intent to impair their integrity and availability for use in an official proceeding, namely, the investigation and prosecution of a federal murder-for-hire conspiracy case, *United States v. John Fitzgerald McCarroll, Jr., et al.*, case number 23-cr-00169-TFM, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama.

In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1512(c)(1) & (j), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

The defendant's offense occurred in connection with a trial of a criminal case, namely, *United States v. John Fitzgerald McCarroll, Jr., et al.*, case number 23-cr-00169-TFM, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama; therefore, the defendant is subject to the penalty provisions of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1512(j).

COUNT FIVE
Conspiracy to Commit Bribery
Title 18, United States Code, Section 371

12. The allegations in Paragraphs 1–3 of this Indictment are realleged for Count Five as though fully set forth herein.

THE CONSPIRACY AND ITS OBJECTS

13. From on or about May 16, 2026, and continuing to on or about May 26, 2026, the exact dates being unknown, in the Southern District of Alabama, the defendant,

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II,

did willfully, knowingly, and unlawfully combine, conspire, confederate, and agree together with others, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to commit an offense against the United States, namely, bribery concerning a program receiving Federal funds in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(B). The purpose of the conspiracy was for the defendant to achieve personal financial gain by abusing his position as a PPD officer to allow individuals to go free from arrest in exchange for United States currency.

MANNER AND MEANS OF THE CONSPIRACY

14. It was a part of the conspiracy that the defendant, **EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II**, while working as a PPD officer, would corruptly accept and agree to accept a thing of value, namely, United States currency, from a person, intending to be influenced and rewarded in connection with a transaction and series of transactions of PPD involving \$5,000 or more.

OVERT ACTS

15. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to effect the objects of the conspiracy, the defendant, **EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II**, did perform the following overt acts:

- a. On or about May 16, 2026, the defendant, **EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II**, while working as a PPD officer, accepted a bribe of approximately \$1,000 in United States currency from Individual-1, whose identity is known to the Grand Jury, in exchange for letting Individual-1 and Individual-2, whose identity is known to the Grand Jury, go free from arrest.
- b. On or about May 19, 2026, the defendant, **EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II**, made a phone call to Individual-1 to request an additional bribe payment in exchange for Individual-1 and Individual-2 not being arrested and taken to jail.
- c. On or about May 26, 2026, the defendant, **EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II**, accepted a bribe of approximately \$400 in United States currency from Individual-1 in exchange for letting Individual-1 and Individual-2 go free from arrest.

In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

COUNT SIX
Bribery Concerning a Program Receiving Federal Funds
Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(B)

16. The allegations in Paragraphs 1–3 of this Indictment are realleged for Count Six as though fully set forth herein.

17. From on or about May 16, 2026, and continuing to on or about May 26, 2026, in the Southern District of Alabama, the defendant,

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II,

aided and abetted by other persons, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, being an agent of Prichard, did corruptly accept and agree to accept a thing of value, namely, United States currency, from Individual-1, whose identity is known to the Grand Jury, intending to be influenced and rewarded in connection with a transaction and series of transactions of Prichard involving \$5,000 or more.

In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(B) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

COUNT SEVEN
Extortion Under Color of Official Right
Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951(a)

18. The allegations in Paragraphs 1–3 of this Indictment are realleged for Count Seven as though fully set forth herein.

19. From on or about May 16, 2026, and continuing to on or about May 26, 2026, in the Southern District of Alabama, the defendant,

EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II,

aided and abetted by other persons, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, did knowingly obstruct, delay, interrupt, and affect, and attempt to obstruct, delay, interrupt, and affect in any way

and degree commerce and the movement of articles and commodities in commerce by extortion, as those terms are defined in Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951; that is, the defendant obtained property, namely, United States currency, not due the defendant or PPD, from Individual-1, whose identity is known to the Grand Jury, with Individual-1's consent, while the defendant was acting as a PPD officer under color of official right.

In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1951(a) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

FORFEITURE NOTICE AND FINDING OF PROBABLE CAUSE

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.2, notice is hereby given of Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c). Under Section 2461(c), criminal forfeiture is applicable to any offenses for which forfeiture is authorized by any other statute, including, but not limited to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981 and all specified unlawful activities listed or referenced in Title 18, United States Code, Section 1956(c)(7), which are incorporated as to proceeds by Section 981(a)(1)(C). The following property is subject to forfeiture in accordance with Section 2461(c):

- (a) All property which constitutes or is derived from proceeds of the violations set forth in Counts One, Five, Six, and Seven of the Indictment; and
- (b) If, as set forth in Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p), any property described in (a) cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence, has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party, has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court, has been substantially diminished in value, or has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty, all other property of the defendants to the extent of the value of the property described in (a).

The Grand Jury finds probable cause to believe that the following property is subject to forfeiture on one or more of the grounds stated above:

1. A forfeiture money judgment in the amount of the proceeds of the violations set forth in this Indictment.


A TRUE BILL


FOREPERSON ~~UNITED~~ STATES GRAND JURY
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

SEAN P. COSTELLO
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By:


JUSTIN D. ROLLER
Deputy Chief, Criminal Division


GEORGE F. MAY
Assistant United States Attorney


KASEE S. HEISTERHAGEN
Chief, Criminal Division

JUNE 2026

(15)

PENALTY PAGE**CASE STYLE:** UNITED STATES v. EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II**DEFENDANT:** EMANUEL NAMAN DOTCH, II (ALL COUNTS)

FILED IN OPEN COURT

MAG NUMBER: 26-200

JUN 24 2026

USAO NUMBER: 24R00450

CHRISTOPHER L. EKMAN, CLERK

HSTF NUMBER: MOB-ALS-0126**AUSAs:** Justin D. Roller
George F. May**CODE VIOLATIONS:****COUNT 1:** 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a), Conspiracy to Commit Extortion Under Color of Official Right**COUNT 2:** 18 U.S.C. § 241, Conspiracy Against Rights**COUNT 3:** 18 U.S.C. § 242, Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law**COUNT 4:** 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1) & (j), Tampering with Evidence**COUNT 5:** 18 U.S.C. § 371, Conspiracy to Commit Bribery**COUNT 6:** 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B), Bribery Concerning a Program Receiving Federal Funds**COUNT 7:** 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a), Extortion Under Color of Official Right**PENALTIES:****COUNTS 1 & 7:** 20 yrs/\$250,000/3 yrs SRT/\$100 SA**COUNTS 2 & 6:** 10 yrs/\$250,000/3 yrs SRT/\$100 SA**COUNT 3:** 1 yr/\$100,000/1 yr SRT/\$25 SA**COUNT 4:** 20 yrs/\$250,000/3 yrs SRT/\$100 SA
(if 18 U.S.C. § 1512(j) applies, death or life imprisonment (for death resulting); 20 yrs (for personal injury resulting)/\$250,000/5 yrs SRT/\$100 SA)**COUNT 5:** 5 yrs/\$250,000/3 yrs SRT/\$100 SA**FORFEITURE NOTICE:** Forfeiture of property

26-mj-200

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

I, Evan Fischer, being first duly sworn, hereby depose and state as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND AGENT BACKGROUND

1. I make this affidavit, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 4, in support of an application for a criminal complaint and an accompanying arrest warrant for **Emanuel Naman DOTCH, II (“DOTCH”)**.

2. I have been a law enforcement officer since 2011. Currently, I am employed with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) as a Special Agent (“SA”) and have been since July 31, 2022. I am currently assigned to the Gulf of America Homeland Security Task Force (“HSTF”) as a federal partner conducting investigations into Transnational Criminal Organizations and the distribution of narcotics in the United States with Homeland Security Investigations (“HSI”), the Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”), and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (“ATF”). Prior to the FBI, I was employed as an officer with the Austin Police Department (“PD”) in Austin, Texas, and prior to Austin PD, I was employed as an officer with United States Customs and Border Protection. I am also a certified Master Peace Officer through Texas Commission on Law Enforcement. As such, I am an investigative or law enforcement officer of the United States within the meaning of Title 18, United States Code 2510(7), that is, an officer of the United States who is empowered by law to conduct investigations of and to make arrests for offenses enumerated in Title 18, United States Code, Section 2516(1).

3. As a law enforcement officer since 2011, I have been involved in numerous violent crime investigations to include gangs, firearms possession and trafficking investigations and controlled substance-related investigations involving various illegal substances, including heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine, fentanyl, ecstasy, and marijuana. I am familiar with the ways in which cocaine, methamphetamine, heroin, fentanyl, ecstasy, and marijuana traffickers conduct their

SEALED

business, including but not limited to their methods of importing and distributing controlled substances, their use of cellular telephones, and their use of numerical codes and code words to conduct their transactions. My primary duties as an FBI agent also afford me the authority to investigate public corruption with the capabilities of the FBI to conduct complex and sensitive investigations into corrupt public officials.

4. Except where otherwise noted, the information set forth in this affidavit has been provided to me directly or indirectly by SAs of FBI, HSI, ATF, DEA, or other law enforcement officers. Unless otherwise noted, wherever in this affidavit I assert that a statement was made, the information was provided by another law enforcement officer (who may have either direct or hearsay knowledge of the statement) to whom I have spoken, or whose report I have read and reviewed. Such statements are among many statements made by others and are stated in substance, unless otherwise indicated. Similarly, information resulting from surveillance, except where indicated, does not necessarily set forth my personal observations, but may have been provided directly or indirectly by other law enforcement officers who conducted such surveillance.

5. The facts in this affidavit come from my personal observations, my training and experience, and information obtained from other agents and witnesses. This affidavit is intended to show merely that there is sufficient probable cause for the requested complaint and warrant, and does not set forth all my knowledge about this matter. All dates, times, locations, and amounts listed in my affidavit are approximations.

OFFENSES AND ELEMENTS

6. Based on the facts set forth in this affidavit, there is probable cause to believe that **DOTCH** has violated 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 (conspiracy against rights); 242 (deprivation of rights under color of law); 371 (conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States); 666(a)(1)(B)

(bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds); 1512(c)(1) (tampering with evidence); and 1951(a) (conspiracy to commit extortion under color of official right and extortion under color of official right).

7. The elements of 18 U.S.C. § 241 are as follows: (1) a conspiracy to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate one or more persons existed; (2) the defendant knowingly became a member of the conspiracy with an intent to further the conspiracy; (3) the defendant intended to deprive the victim of the free exercise or enjoyment of his right to be free from deprivation of liberty and/or property without due process of law, which is secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States; and (4) one or more of the intended victims was present in a State of the United States. Fed. Crim. Jury Instr. 7th Cir. 18 U.S.C. § 241 (2023 ed.).¹

8. The elements of 18 U.S.C. § 242 are as follows: (1) the defendant deprived the victim of the right to be free from deprivation of liberty and/or property without due process of law; (2) the defendant acted or claimed to act under color of state law; and (3) the defendant willfully exceeded and misused or abused the defendant's authority under state law. Pattern Crim. Jury Instr. 11th Cir. OI O8 (Dec. 2025).

9. The elements of 18 U.S.C. § 371 are as follows: (1) two or more persons in some way agreed to try to accomplish a shared and unlawful plan; (2) the defendant knew the unlawful purpose of the plan and willfully joined in it; (3) during the conspiracy, one of the conspirators knowingly engaged in at least one overt act as described in the indictment; and (4) the overt act

¹ The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit has not published a pattern jury instruction for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 241. Accordingly, I have provided a citation to a pattern jury instruction for Section 241 published by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

was committed at or about the time alleged and with the purpose of carrying out or accomplishing some object of the conspiracy. Pattern Crim. Jury Instr. 11th Cir. OI O13.1 (Dec. 2025).

10. The elements of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B) are as follows: (1) the defendant was an agent of the City of Prichard, Alabama; (2) the City of Prichard, Alabama was a local government that received in any one-year period benefits in excess of \$10,000 under a Federal program involving a grant, a contract, a subsidy, a loan, a guarantee, insurance, or other form of Federal assistance; (3) during the one-year period, the defendant solicited or demanded, accepted, or agreed to accept a thing of value from someone other than the City of Prichard, Alabama; (4) in return for the acceptance or agreement, the defendant intended to be influenced or rewarded for a transaction or series of transactions of the City of Prichard, Alabama involving something worth \$5,000 or more; and (5) the defendant acted corruptly. Pattern Crim. Jury Instr. 11th Cir. OI O24.2 (Dec. 2025).

11. The elements of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1) are as follows: (1) the defendant concealed a record, document, or other object; (2) the defendant acted knowingly; (3) the defendant acted corruptly; and (4) the defendant acted with the intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding. Fed. Crim. Jury Instr. 7th Cir. 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1) (2023 ed.).²

12. The elements of 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a) are as follows: (1) the defendant caused an individual to part with property; (2) the defendant did so knowingly by using extortion under color

² The Eleventh Circuit has not published a pattern jury instruction for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1). Accordingly, I have provided a citation to a pattern jury instruction for Section 1512(c)(1) published by the Seventh Circuit.

of official right; and (3) the extortionate transaction delayed, interrupted, or affected interstate commerce. Pattern Crim. Jury Instr. 11th Cir. OI O70.2 (Dec. 2025).

PROBABLE CAUSE

13. This case involves public corruption by **DOTCH**, who has been a sworn police officer with the Prichard Police Department (“PPD”) in Prichard, Alabama, since 2014.³ As detailed below, HSTF agents investigating **DOTCH**’s crimes have interviewed several cooperating defendants and confidential sources, conducted a Court-authorized Title III wiretap of **DOTCH**’s phone, and executed search warrants and issued subpoenas for electronic data and other records, among other investigative measures. As a result, agents have confirmed that **DOTCH** is participating in criminal activity for financial gain and is abusing his position as a police officer to achieve his criminal aims.

14. The investigation has revealed that **DOTCH** associates with and assists violent criminals and drug dealers in the Prichard and Mobile, Alabama areas. Agents have determined that **DOTCH** has covered up crimes and concealed evidence for individuals after they committed crimes of violence to assist those individuals in avoiding prosecution. **DOTCH** also has conspired with other PPD officers to conduct unlawful traffic stops and other detentions of victims to deprive them of rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Finally, **DOTCH** has

³ PPD is an agency of the City of Prichard, Alabama, which is a local government as described in 18 U.S.C. § 666. Open-source public records indicate that the City of Prichard, Alabama has received more than \$10,000 annually in benefits under Federal programs involving grants, contracts, subsidies, loans, guarantees, insurance, and other forms of Federal assistance at all relevant times referenced in my affidavit. *See id.* § 666(b); <https://www.usaspending.gov/> (last accessed June 11, 2026).

extorted individuals for bribes in exchange for letting them go free from arrest, and has agreed to accept corrupt payments to commit illegal acts while acting under color of law as a police officer.

A. DOTCH conceals evidence in a federal murder-for-hire investigation while acting as a PPD officer.

15. A cooperating defendant (“CD-2”) provided information regarding **DOTCH’s** concealment of evidence in a federal murder-for-hire investigation of John Fitzgerald McCarroll, Jr. (“McCarroll”) and others. CD-2 pleaded guilty to a cocaine-trafficking conspiracy in the Southern District of Alabama in 2023 and cooperated for potential consideration in CD-2’s case. CD-2 has provided substantial assistance in the investigation and prosecution of others by offering corroborated and reliable information.⁴

16. CD-2 informed agents that McCarroll tasked **DOTCH** with retrieving video surveillance of a shooting in which McCarroll was involved on St. Stephens Road in Prichard in May 2021. During that incident, McCarroll was shot at and allegedly returned fire at his assailants in a gang-related incident. CD-2 stated that gas stations near the shooting would have caught the shooting on video surveillance. CD-2 further stated that after the shooting, CD-2 received a phone call from an unidentified male who was calling on McCarroll’s behalf. The caller requested **DOTCH’s** phone number and stated that they needed to get **DOTCH** to retrieve the video surveillance from the gas stations and “make it disappear.” McCarroll was the main suspect of a

⁴ A review of CD-2’s criminal history revealed the following: in September 2007, CD-2 was arrested in Prichard, Alabama for unlawful distribution of a controlled substance; also in September 2007, CD-2 was arrested in Mobile, Alabama for possession of a controlled substance by fraud; in April 2017, CD-2 was arrested in Mobile, Alabama for unlawful distribution of a controlled substance; and in February 2025, CD-2 was sentenced to 90 months in prison in CD-2’s federal cocaine-trafficking case in the Southern District of Alabama.

federal murder-for-hire investigation in the months following the shooting and investigators worked diligently to recover evidence of McCarroll's criminal conspiracy to murder Milton Carter ("Carter"), also known as "Milt Milt."

17. One evidentiary item of interest to federal agents investigating McCarroll's murder-for-hire plot was the video of the May 2021 shooting, which agents understood would depict one of Carter's associates shooting at McCarroll, and McCarroll firing back at the shooter. McCarroll's BMW i8 vehicle was hit by gunfire during this incident as well, and investigators were unable to locate any documentation of the shooting, including surveillance videos, during the murder-for-hire investigation. Federal agents sent a request to PPD for any records and evidence in PPD's possession associated with this incident. PPD responded with a single, basic Alabama Peace Officer's Report, which was devoid of any reference to attached evidence exhibits (such as surveillance video or recorded interviews), did not identify McCarroll or Carter as subjects, and did not list a BMW i8 as being involved in the incident.

18. On March 25, 2026, investigators received data from **DOTCH's** iCloud account pursuant to a federal search warrant. The data in **DOTCH's** iCloud account revealed video recordings of the May 2021 shooting that **DOTCH** captured from the surveillance cameras located at the gas stations on St. Stephens Road, corroborating CD-2's account of **DOTCH's** effort to conceal the videos at McCarroll's request. **DOTCH's** iCloud account also contained photographs taken by **DOTCH** of McCarroll's BMW i8 vehicle with several areas of damage caused by gunfire and several spent shell casings depicted inside the vehicle. **DOTCH's** reflection, while dressed in his PPD uniform, was captured in some of the photographs. Figure 1 below includes a still shot from the video located in **DOTCH's** iCloud account and the photographs depicting **DOTCH's** reflection while he was taking pictures of the damage to McCarroll's BMW i8.



Fig. 1 (still shot from surveillance video of the May 2021 shooting, and photographs depicting damage to McCarroll's BMW i8 vehicle and capturing **DOTCH**'s reflection).

19. Agents also located several audio recordings of interviews conducted by **DOTCH** regarding the May 2021 shooting that were saved in his iCloud account. On one recording timestamped and dated May 29, 2021, **DOTCH** purported to interview McCarroll as a victim of a shooting. McCarroll stated that he had just exited the interstate to attend a block party, but when

McCarroll began to talk about what happened when he got in front of the gas station, the interview recording stopped. Neither **DOTCH** nor PPD turned this interview file over to federal investigators who followed up on the shooting incident with PPD as part of a federal murder-for-hire investigation.

20. On another recording timestamped and dated June 3, 2021, **DOTCH** interviewed McCarroll's girlfriend and coconspirator, Lyteria Isheeia Hollis ("Hollis"), at PPD regarding the May 2021 shooting incident involving McCarroll. Hollis stated that McCarroll was shot at and confirmed he returned fire as an act of self-defense. Hollis stated she knew the shooter as "Tyler or Taylor." Hollis did not know what kind of relationship McCarroll and "Tyler" or "Taylor" had, but she knew "Tyler" or "Taylor" hung around with Carter, to whom she referred as "Milt Milt." Hollis said she did not know why, but Carter had been trying to "do something" to McCarroll.

21. These concealed pieces of evidence—*i.e.*, the above-referenced recordings and photographs—would significantly have aided investigators in the federal murder-for-hire investigation. Due to **DOTCH's** concealment of evidence at McCarroll's behest, however, investigators were unable to locate this evidence to further a federal investigation. The murder-for-hire case against McCarroll, Hollis, and other coconspirators ultimately proceeded to a federal jury trial in October 2024. *See United States v. McCarroll, et al.*, No. 23-cr-169-TFM (S.D. Ala.). The case was heavily covered in Mobile-area media outlets and was well known by local and federal law enforcement partners in the Southern District of Alabama. Based on the evidence detailed above, I believe probable cause exists that **DOTCH** has violated 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1) (tampering with evidence).

B. DOTCH agrees to accept an illicit cash payment to transport bulk marijuana while acting as a PPD officer.

22. On January 5, 2024, **DOTCH** met with another cooperating defendant (“CD-1”), who was to solicit **DOTCH** with an opportunity to transport bulk marijuana for CD-1 in exchange for an illicit cash payment. That day, CD-1 contacted **DOTCH** and both parties agreed to meet. Investigators installed an audio recording device in CD-1’s vehicle prior to CD-1 meeting **DOTCH**. During the meeting, **DOTCH** was in person with CD-1 as CD-1 drove **DOTCH** around showing him the route to take while the drugs were in **DOTCH**’s possession. At the end of the recording, **DOTCH** agreed to transport drugs for CD-1 in exchange for a cash payment of \$2,500. When solicited for an “agreeable number” by CD-1, **DOTCH** responded, “What we already do.” CD-1 confirmed, “Alright we stay at 25 [\$2,500] then.” **DOTCH** again replied, “I ain’t gonna change nothing up, if the wheel ain’t broke, don’t try to fix it.” A timeline of relevant portions of the recorded conversation follows:

Timestamp 2:27 – **DOTCH** inquired as to how many times CD-1 expected him to run the route, to which CD-1 responded indicating that **DOTCH** would drive the route two to three times per month. CD-1 also clarified that **DOTCH** would be utilizing a normal vehicle and not an 18-wheeler to make the trips.

Timestamp 2:46 – CD-1 inquired whether **DOTCH**’s PPD police car had a tracker on it, which **DOTCH** affirmed that it did.

Timestamp 3:43 – CD-1 showed **DOTCH** the destination as well as the hiding spot for the marijuana **DOTCH** was to transport. CD-1 propositioned **DOTCH** with an offer to transport shipments of marijuana in exchange for \$2,500 per trip. **DOTCH** acknowledged the proposition and indicated that he would think about it. **DOTCH** was showed a specific route of transportation for the drugs along with the final destination of the drugs. **DOTCH** specifically inquired as to how large the load would be. **DOTCH** was informed that he would be transporting 15 to 20 pounds of marijuana from Prichard, Alabama to the designated drop-off area. After the drop off, CD-1 informed **DOTCH** that he would then come back to Mobile, Alabama, and someone near Jackson, Alabama would pick up the marijuana to illicitly sell it in the Jackson area.

Timestamp 3:45 – **DOTCH** stated that he had to do his research and did not want to give CD-1 a price right now. CD-1 told **DOTCH** that on some occasions, **DOTCH** may have to pick up bulk U.S. currency and transport it back to the Mobile area.

Timestamp 3:52 – **DOTCH** stated that seven times out of ten, a police officer will lie about smelling weed in a vehicle in order to search the vehicle.

Timestamp 4:08 – CD-1 stated that he made \$40,000 to \$50,000 a month selling weed. CD-1 stated that the customers loved the weed.

Timestamp 4:22 – CD-1 stated that **DOTCH** did not need to counteroffer CD-1 with a high price to make the drug transports.

Timestamp 5:55 – CD-1 stated that “Steve” was in the cocaine field, indicating that an individual named “Steve” was selling cocaine in the Jackson, Alabama area.

Timestamp 6:50 – CD-1 stated that the “old driver” had been running the route for three years without any issues. CD-1 indicated that once **DOTCH** dropped the package, he could leave and head back to Mobile. CD-1 reiterated that **DOTCH** may have to bring money back down the highway.

Timestamp 7:43 – CD-1 inquired again as to how much **DOTCH** was going to charge him to make the trip. **DOTCH** responded by indicating that he was not going to change the price and CD-1 could keep it at \$2,500. **DOTCH** made statements indicating that he was not going to change anything up and if the “wheel ain’t broke, don’t try to fix it.”

23. CD-1 pleaded guilty to a cocaine-trafficking conspiracy and possession with intent to distribute cocaine in the Southern District of Alabama in 2024 and cooperated for potential consideration in CD-1’s case. CD-1 has provided substantial assistance in the investigation and prosecution of others by offering corroborated and reliable information. CD-1 has provided information to investigative team members in the past that led to the arrest and conviction of numerous drug traffickers and the seizure of multiple kilograms of illegal drugs, including cocaine, methamphetamine, and fentanyl.⁵

⁵ A review of CD-1’s criminal history revealed the following: in February 1997, the Mobile County Sheriff’s Office (“MCSO”) arrested CD-1 for possession of dangerous drugs; in May 1997, CD-1

C. **DOTCH conspires to effectuate the unlawful search, seizure, and arrests of two victims, depriving the victims of their civil rights, while acting as a PPD officer.**

24. On the evening of November 15, 2025, **DOTCH** contacted on-duty PPD officers in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy to manufacture probable cause for an illegal search and seizure, and to deprive the civil rights of two victims, “Victim-1” and “Victim-2,” during an unlawful traffic stop of a vehicle occupied by the victims near Lotus Gentlemen’s Club, located at 312 South Wilson Avenue in Prichard, Alabama.

25. Prior to the traffic stop, **DOTCH** contacted a PPD officer (“Officer-1”) to tell him to stop the vehicle occupied by Victim-1 and Victim-2. Officer-1 told agents he did everything he could to “stall” because although **DOTCH** told Officer-1 narcotics and firearms were inside the vehicle, **DOTCH** would not tell Officer-1 how he knew this information.⁶ Because Officer-1 did

was arrested for third-degree assault by the Saraland Police Department (“SPD”); in December 1997, SPD arrested CD-1 for second-degree possession of forged instruments; in July 1998, SPD arrested CD-1 for obstruction/bail jumping; in January 1999, CD-1 was arrested by the Mobile Police Department (“MPD”) for third-degree assault; in October 2000, CD-1 was arrested for trafficking cocaine by the Coweta County Sheriff’s Office (Georgia); in August 2000, CD-1 was arrested by PPD for carrying a concealed weapon; in January 2001, MCSO arrested CD-1 for third-degree domestic violence; in May 2001, MPD arrested CD-1 for third-degree domestic violence; in January 2007, CD-1 was arrested by MCSO for receiving stolen property; in December 2008, CD-1 was arrested for possession of cocaine by DEA in Atlanta, Georgia; in December 2008, CD-1 was arrested for trafficking in cocaine and possession with intent to distribute cocaine by the Georgia State Patrol in Lagrange, Georgia; in February 2010, CD-1 was arrested by MCSO for a noise ordinance violation; in December 2010, MCSO arrested CD-1 for flight/escape safekeeping (USMS); and in December 2023, CD-1 was arrested by HSI Mobile for possession with intent to distribute cocaine, conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute fentanyl, marijuana, and cocaine, and international money laundering. CD-1 is awaiting sentencing in the Southern District of Alabama.

⁶ In May 2026, Officer-1 pleaded guilty to possession of a stolen firearm in the Southern District of Alabama. Officer-1 is awaiting sentencing in that case.

not immediately act on **DOTCH**'s demand to have the vehicle pulled over, **DOTCH** reached out to another PPD officer ("Officer-2") and had him make contact with Victim-1's and Victim-2's vehicle. Officer-1 overheard Officer-2 on the radio with the vehicle, and responded to back Officer-2 up on the traffic stop.

26. Specifically, after the traffic stop began, Officer-2 turned on his body-worn camera, got into his PPD police vehicle, and was on an already-in-progress phone call with **DOTCH**, *see* Figure 2 below. The timestamp on Officer-2's body-worn camera (6:04 pm) aligns with the toll records for **DOTCH**'s phone, which reflect a seven-minute, thirty-second call between Officer-2 and **DOTCH** beginning at 6:01 pm. Body-worn camera footage from on-scene officers depicts **DOTCH** directing and instructing officers to fabricate probable cause to enter Victim-1's and Victim-2's vehicle, where agents believe that a bag filled with narcotics (methamphetamine and fentanyl) had been purposefully stashed unbeknownst to Victim-1 and Victim-2.



Fig. 2 (screenshot of Officer-2's body-worn camera video depicting call with **DOTCH**).

27. During the above-described incident, PPD officers, including Officer-1 and Officer-2, were in constant contact with **DOTCH**. Officer-2 informed Victim-1 and Victim-2 of the purported reason for their detention, telling them their vehicle was “supposed to be straighter in the lines” where it was parked on South Wilson Avenue. Agents reviewed the body-worn camera footage, however, which clearly depicts a lawfully parked vehicle. Specifically, the vehicle was well within the marked white lines, parallel to the curbline, and did not present any hazard to passing motorists. Officer-2 nonetheless told Victim-1 and Victim-2 that they were detained, restricting the victims’ freedom of movement from the scene, as they submitted to the officers’ authority.

28. Officer-2 attempted to get a narcotics K-9 to run on Victim-1’s and Victim-2’s vehicle, as advised by **DOTCH**, but none were available. Body-worn camera video depicts officers discussing bags visible in the backseat of the victims’ vehicle, as if they already knew what they were looking for. After an extended amount of time, Officer-2 approached Officer-1 and other PPD officers on-scene, and asked the group, “Did y’all smell the odor of marijuana?” Initially, Officer-1 and another officer (“Officer-3”) reported they did not smell anything, but then Officer-2 turned around and looked at Officer-3, at which point Officer-1 said, “Okay, I see.” Officer-2 stated that he thought he smelled the odor of marijuana, and Officer-1 stated that he was not as close to the vehicle as Officer-2 was. Officers approached Victim-1 and Victim-2 about the purported odor of marijuana, and the victims disagreed, explaining that they did not smoke marijuana and describing the vehicle as a rental. Officer-2 contradicted his own articulable probable cause by stating, “it may be passing vehicles,” but still ordered Victim-1 and Victim-2 out of the vehicle. Officers then unlawfully searched the vehicle and recovered a bag containing

methamphetamine and fentanyl from the back seat of the vehicle, as well as firearms from Victim-1 and Victim-2.

29. An MCSO Narcotics Deputy met with PPD officers on-scene after PPD sent out a call for a narcotics K-9. By the time the MCSO Deputy arrived, however, PPD already had searched the victims' vehicle and had taken custody of the narcotics and firearms. The MCSO Deputy requested that Victim-1 and Victim-2 be transported to HSI Mobile for interviews. PPD transported the victims, along with the seized evidence, to HSI to be interviewed. MCSO retrieved the following items from PPD: 19 grams of fentanyl, 124.3 grams of methamphetamine, 11 grams of Oxycodone pills, and six amphetamine pills with no documented weight, as well as a Sig Sauer 9mm pistol, a Polymer80 9mm pistol, and a Beretta 9mm pistol. PPD reported that the evidence had been seized from Victim-1 and Victim-2 during the traffic stop in front of Lotus Gentleman's Club on November 15, 2025.

30. As part of an investigative agreement between MCSO and the City of Prichard, MCSO retrieved the body-worn camera footage of the PPD officers on-scene to conduct a preliminary investigation and determine whether narcotics charges were viable. After reviewing the footage, the investigation was closed and the Mobile County District Attorney's Office declined to prosecute Victim-1 or Victim-2 due to an apparent civil rights violation with the search and seizure conducted by PPD officers, who appeared to have consulted with **DOTCH** to manufacture nonexistent probable cause to conduct a search of the victims' vehicle. As a result of this incident, Victim-1 was in custody at Mobile County Metro Jail ("Metro") for three days. Victim-2 was in custody at Metro for 14 days.

31. Agents conducted a toll analysis of **DOTCH**'s phone, which revealed that during the timeframe of the unlawful traffic stop involving Victim-1 and Victim-2, **DOTCH** was in

contact with each of the above-referenced officers, as well as with an individual identified herein as “Conspirator-1,” who is a well-known drug dealer in the Mobile and Prichard areas.⁷ Based on my training and experience and knowledge of this investigation, I believe **DOTCH** had reached out to the on-duty PPD officers to intercept Victim-1’s and Victim-2’s vehicle, which **DOTCH** was to target for enforcement action either as a favor or payment, or for some other illegal purpose. I believe **DOTCH** was made aware of this vehicle and its contents by Conspirator-1, as **DOTCH** called Conspirator-1 at the same time the vehicle had been stopped by Officer-2. Based on the timestamps of the toll records, Officer-2 may have been linked to a conference call with **DOTCH** and Conspirator-1 (or placed on hold), as the times overlap. In other words, **DOTCH**’s seven-minute, thirty-second call with Officer-2 began at 6:01 pm, while another one-minute, fifty-three-second call between **DOTCH** and Conspirator-1 began at 6:03 pm. Officer-2 and **DOTCH** spoke for seven and a half minutes at the initial interaction with Victim-1 and Victim-2. As noted above, Officer-2’s conversation with **DOTCH** was already in progress when Officer-2 activated his body-worn camera, so the entire conversation was not captured on video.

32. Based on the contemporaneous toll data and the events that led up to the violation of Victim-1’s and Victim-2’s civil rights, I believe Conspirator-1 was providing information to **DOTCH** that was relayed to Officer-2 during the encounter to influence the fabrication of probable

⁷ Agents have intercepted numerous calls between **DOTCH** and Conspirator-1 during a Court-authorized Title III wiretap between April and June 2026, corroborating that a close relationship exists between **DOTCH** and Conspirator-1. On certain intercepted calls, for example, **DOTCH** and Conspirator-1 have discussed the importance of keeping their 18-wheelers looking clean to avoid interdiction stops on interstate highways. Agents also have intercepted drug trafficking-related communications between Conspirator-1 and other drug traffickers on Court-authorized wiretaps in the Southern District of Alabama.

cause needed to search the vehicle, which had traveled from Georgia to Alabama before PPD officers illegally stopped it. When Officer-2 spoke with the other PPD officers to get them to agree with him about the alleged smell of marijuana coming from the vehicle, Officer-2 conspired with them to come up with a “valid” reason to search the vehicle, knowing they would find narcotics and/or firearms because **DOTCH** told them those items would be in the vehicle. Officer-1 told agents he knew the stop would be bad because **DOTCH** would not tell him how he knew narcotics and firearms would be in the vehicle.

33. Officer-2 and the other PPD officers on-scene knew they were violating Victim-1’s and Victim-2’s civil rights by unlawfully detaining them and illegally searching their vehicle based on fabricated probable cause. It was unreasonable for PPD officers to continue the detention for as long as they did for a minor parking offense, which Victim-1 and Victim-2 did not appear to have committed based on the body-worn camera footage. Moreover, the odor of marijuana would have been immediately recognizable upon officers’ initial contact with the victims the moment they rolled down their windows, but the contemporaneous video evidence does not reflect that officers on-scene actually smelled marijuana emanating from the victims’ vehicle. The fabrication of probable cause led to a clear violation of Victim-1’s and Victim-2’s civil rights, including but not limited to their (1) Fourth Amendment rights to be free from unlawful search and seizure, when PPD unlawfully searched their vehicle; (2) Second Amendment rights to bear arms, when PPD unlawfully seized their firearms; and (3) Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment rights to be free from deprivation of liberty and property without due process of law, when PPD caused them to be unlawfully detained in custody at Metro for several days. **DOTCH**, in concert with Officer-1, Officer-2, and other officers, used the color of law to initiate an illegal search and seizure of the victims’ vehicle, and to effectuate the victims’ unlawful arrests.

34. Following this incident, HSTF investigators interviewed Victim-1, who stated that his wife was in a custody battle with her ex-husband, “C.B.” Victim-1 believes he was set up so that C.B. could win custody in that case. Victim-1 stated that on November 15, 2025, he was to drive from Atlanta, Georgia to Prichard, Alabama to look at a club as a potential investment for a client. According to Victim-1, the client requested that Victim-1 take another male named “Tre” with him on the trip and drop “Tre” off in Prichard. Agents identified “Tre” by his real name, “L.L.” Before traveling to Prichard, Victim-1 and Victim-2 picked up L.L. at a Target in Atlanta. According to a Flock camera,⁸ the license plate for C.B.’s SUV was captured in the vicinity of the Target parking lot near Atlantic Station around the time Victim-1 and Victim-2 picked L.L. up to ride with them to Prichard.

35. After dropping L.L. off in Prichard, PPD stopped Victim-1 and Victim-2 while they were parked lawfully along the curblineline of Lotus Gentleman’s Club, as detailed above. Victim-1 noticed that L.L. had left a bag in the back seat of the rental vehicle, which was the bag that contained narcotics. Victim-1 also provided investigators with evidence discovered by his private investigator that corroborates Victim-1’s statements about the incident. This includes contacts and phone numbers of the individuals involved in the plan to set him up. Toll records from L.L.’s phone and Conspirator-1’s phone show a common contact who was frequently in contact with C.B., including before and after the unlawful traffic stop. **DOTCH’s** calls with Conspirator-1 show that the unlawful stop of the victims’ vehicle, and the seizure of L.L.’s bag of narcotics planted in

⁸ A Flock camera is a fixed, solar-powered surveillance device used by police departments, private businesses, and homeowners associations, primarily as an automated license plate reader. It is designed to capture vehicle details rather than to identify people.

the vehicle, was planned prior to Victim-1 and Victim-2 leaving Atlanta with L.L., and **DOTCH** and others conspired to effectuate the illegal traffic stop and seizure of narcotics.

36. Based on my training and experience, my knowledge of the HSTF investigation into **DOTCH**, and **DOTCH's** history of misusing his position as a police officer for his own financial gain, in conjunction with the toll records and information received during the interview of Victim-1, I believe **DOTCH** may have received payment for his role in the set-up of Victim-1 and Victim-2, and/or was attempting to intercept the narcotics to skim part of or steal the entire load of narcotics. The body-worn camera footage revealed a plainly unlawful detention of the victims, ultimately leading to their arrest after PPD officers conducted an unlawful search of their vehicle. MCSO responded due to the drug aspect of the investigation and the request for a narcotics K-9, which would hinder **DOTCH's** common practice of tampering with evidence; however, agents cannot be certain about the amounts of narcotics discovered in Victim-1's and Victim-2's vehicle, as MCSO responded to the scene only after-the-fact and did not obtain custody of the narcotics until PPD officers brought them to HSI Mobile.

37. Based on the evidence detailed above, I believe probable cause exists that **DOTCH** has violated 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 (conspiracy against rights) and 242 (deprivation of rights under color of law).

D. DOTCH solicits and accepts bribes in exchange for letting individuals go free from arrest while acting as a PPD officer.

38. On May 16, 2026, **DOTCH** was working a security contract in his official capacity as a uniformed PPD officer at the Tree Bar-B-Que and Lounge, located at 125 East Lovejoy Loop in Prichard. That evening, **DOTCH** and other PPD officers responded to an altercation between a younger crowd of individuals and another cooperating defendant ("CD-3"). During that incident,

PPD officers encountered CD-3 and CD-3's cousin, "M.W." At the time of the incident, CD-3 was on federal pretrial conditions of release in the Southern District of Alabama and M.W. had active felony warrants for violating his bond conditions while released on charges of chemical endangerment of a child and second-degree marijuana possession in the Mobile County Circuit Court. **DOTCH** and another PPD officer ("Officer-4") detained CD-3 and M.W. in a PPD vehicle such that CD-3's and M.W.'s freedom of movement was restricted.

39. According to CD-3, CD-3 paid **DOTCH** and Officer-4 \$1,000 as a cash bribe to let CD-3 and M.W. go free, when they both should have gone to jail. M.W.'s original bonds on his pending state charges were set at total of \$10,000, and if those bonds had been revoked based on a new arrest by PPD, M.W.'s arrest would have resulted in a "no-bond" hold. Additionally, any arrest of CD-3 by PPD could have resulted in the revocation of CD-3's federal pretrial release conditions. Accordingly, **DOTCH's** interactions with CD-3 and M.W. as a PPD officer on May 16, 2026, involved "any business, transaction, or series of transactions of [the City of Prichard] . . . involving anything of value of \$5,000 or more." 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B).⁹

40. On May 19, 2026, as captured on a Court-authorized Title III wiretap, **DOTCH** made an unsolicited phone call to CD-3 and requested more money from CD-3 in exchange for CD-3 and M.W. not being arrested and taken to jail. On the recorded call, **DOTCH** told CD-3 that

⁹ The Eleventh Circuit has noted that "[t]he \$5,000 in § 666(a)(1)(B) . . . refers to the value of the 'business, transaction, or series of transactions,' not the value of the bribe." *United States v. McNair*, 605 F.3d 1152, 1185 n.38 (11th Cir. 2010). The phrase "anything of value" in the bribery statute includes "intangibles, such as freedom from jail." *United States v. Townsend*, 630 F.3d 1003, 1011 (11th Cir. 2011). The Court has noted that the fact that a corrupt police officer "actually received only \$1,000 is immaterial to determining the market value of the intangible benefit." *United States v. Ryans*, 709 F. App'x 611, 618 (11th Cir. 2017) (unpublished).

another PPD officer was complaining about the incident on May 16, 2026, and CD-3 needed to give “him something” to placate him. CD-3 and **DOTCH** agreed to meet so that CD-3 could make another payment to **DOTCH** in exchange for not being arrested. CD-3 notified HSTF agents of the incident and the unsolicited call CD-3 had received from **DOTCH** seeking another bribe.

41. On May 26, 2026, CD-3 assisted agents with a controlled delivery of a bribe payment to **DOTCH**. Agents monitored the interaction, which was captured on audio and video recordings. During a meeting that day, CD-3 gave \$400 in additional bribe money to **DOTCH** to avoid being arrested and taken to jail. **DOTCH** accepted the money and left the meeting. As noted above, CD-3 is under indictment for a cocaine-trafficking conspiracy in the Southern District of Alabama, is on pretrial release conditions, and is cooperating for potential consideration in CD-3’s case. To date, CD-3 has provided substantial assistance in the investigation and prosecution of others by offering corroborated and reliable information.¹⁰

¹⁰ A review of CD-3’s criminal history revealed the following: in July 2002, PPD arrested CD-3 for third-degree assault and resisting arrest; in January 2003, PPD arrested CD-3 on several outstanding traffic warrants; in March 2005, PPD arrested CD-3 for discharging a firearm into an occupied/unoccupied building or vehicle; also in March 2005, PPD arrested CD-3 for third-degree assault and first-degree theft of property; in November 2006, MCSO arrested CD-3 on two counts of possession of a controlled substance and first-degree manufacturing of a controlled substance; also in November 2006, PPD arrested CD-3 for trafficking cocaine; in October 2007, PPD arrested CD-3 for possession of a controlled substance and carrying a pistol without a permit; in November 2007, MCSO arrested CD-3 for possession of a controlled substance; in November 2009, MPD arrested CD-3 for trafficking cocaine, first-degree possession of marijuana, third-degree receiving stolen property, and a traffic offense; in October 2012, MPD arrested CD-3 for trafficking cocaine; in 2014, CD-3 was convicted of a cocaine-trafficking conspiracy in the Southern District of Alabama and sentenced to serve 60 months in federal prison; in July 2018, MPD arrested CD-3 for first-degree assault; and in December 2021, SPD arrested CD-3 for third-degree domestic violence and resisting arrest. CD-3 has a currently pending cocaine-trafficking conspiracy charge in the Southern District of Alabama.

42. As noted above, the City of Prichard, Alabama is a local government, and PPD officers are agents of that local government as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 666(d). As such, any actions that **DOTCH** took while acting as a PPD officer occurred as an agent of a local government who was acting under color of law.

43. Based on the evidence detailed above, I believe probable cause exists that **DOTCH** has violated 18 U.S.C. §§ 371 (conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States), 666(a)(1)(B) (bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds), and 1951(a) (conspiracy to commit extortion under color of official right and extortion under color of official right).

CONCLUSION

44. Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Court issue a criminal complaint and an accompanying arrest warrant for **Emanuel Naman DOTCH, II**.

Respectfully submitted,


Evan Fischer
Special Agent
Federal Bureau of Investigation

THE ABOVE AGENT HAD ATTESTED
TO THIS AFFIDAVIT PURSUANT TO
FED. R. CRIM. P. 4.1(b)(2)(B) THIS _____
12th DAY OF JUNE 2026.

P. Bradley Murray Digitally signed by P. Bradley Murray
Date: 2026.06.12 11:19:15 -05'00'

P. BRADLEY MURRAY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE