

The single paw, ripped off by the snow removal vehicle, remained on defendant's lawn. The next day, the defendant told federal agents that they could take the polar bear's paw because it would "save me [the defendant] a trip to the dump."



At some point soon after the defendant killed the polar bear, a Kaktovik resident, T.S., posted a video on Facebook showing the dead polar bear and expressing her concern about the defendant's practices—both in killing the polar bear and his treatment of the whale meat.¹ The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC), an organization in which Gordon is a Captain, pressured T.S. to remove the Facebook post. The AEWC explained that her post, "...could potentially harm their subsistence and whaling rights." Additionally, T.S. and other Kaktovik residents told agents that this was not the first time

¹ The government plans to present this video to the Court at sentencing.

the defendant had wasted an animal for which he was responsible. T.S. and other residents explained that over a period of two to three years, the defendant, in his role as a Whaling Captain, wasted large portions of two bowhead whales due to his failure to properly store and monitor the whale meat. One whale was lost to polar bears because the defendant failed to store it properly. The second whale was lost when a freezer that the defendant was responsible for monitoring stopped running.

When agents interviewed the defendant, he admitted that he shot the polar bear because it was attempting to eat the whale meat located in his yard. The defendant stated, “[the polar bear] just came back a couple of times before I shot it . . . I got tired of going out and chasing him off.” When agents asked the defendant whether he harvested the polar bear, the defendant explained that he was unable to harvest the bear because he did not want to “...spill the [polar bear’s] blood around the muktuk and the meat.” The defendant further admitted that, on the day he shot the polar bear, a villager provided him with a tool capable of removing the bear’s teeth. Agents asked the defendant why he did not use the tool and the defendant responded, “...I did what I wanted to do to stop it from eating my muktuk. I asked a few people if they wanted it, they said no... Understand?” The defendant also told federal agents that he “didn’t even know if [the polar bear] was pregnant or not” prior to shooting it. At the conclusion of the interview, agents searched the defendant’s yard where they located a section of the polar bear’s leg. The defendant signed a property receipt acknowledging the bear’s remains were found on his property.