1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3	BEFORE HONORABLE CATHY ANN BENCIVENGO, JUDGE PRESIDING		
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,		
7	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. 18CR5260-CAB		
8	vs.)) SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA		
9	SALAM RAZUKI (1), SYLVIA) GONZALES (2), ELIZABETH JUAREZ (3),)		
10	Defendants.) MAY 15, 2020		
11)		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17	STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS TELEPHONIC STATUS HEARING PAGES 1-17		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	Proceedings reported by stenography, transcript produced by CA software		
23			
24	Mauralee Ramirez, RPR, CSR No. 11674 Federal Official Stenographic Reporter ordertranscript@gmail.com		
25			

1	COUNSEL APPEARING:	
2	For The Plaintiff:	United States Attorney's Office Southern District of California Fred Sheppard, AUSA 880 Front Street San Diego, CA 92101
3		
4		
5		
6	For The Defendant: Salam Razuki	
7		Thomas Warwick 101 W. Broadway, Suite 810 San Diego, CA 92101
8		Antonio Yoon Law Offices
9		Antonio Yoon
10		501 W. Broadway, Suite A-387 San Diego, CA 92101
11	December De Constants	Tara Office and Deliver Deliver
12	Sylvia Gonzales	
13		Brian Funk The Granger Building 964 Fifth Avenue, #214
14		San Diego, CA 92101
15	For The Defendant: Elizabeth Juarez	Allen Bloom Law Offices
16		Allen Bloom 550 W. C Street #1670
17		San Diego, CA 92101
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 San Diego, California; Friday, May 15, 2020; 1:30 p.m. 2 (Case 18CR5260-CAB called) 3 MR. WARWICK: Tom Warick who is on the call. And 4 Mr. Razuki is also in my office. 5 MR. YOON: And, good afternoon, your Honor. Antonio 6 Yoon, also appearing for Mr. Razuki. And I'm making a special 7 appearance for Brian Funk for Ms. Sylvia Gonzales. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 9 MR. BLOOM: Good afternoon, your Honor. This is Allen 10 Bloom on behalf of Elizabeth Jaurez. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. SHEPPARD: And Fred Sheppard on behalf of the 13 United States. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Thank you, 15 gentlemen. I was going to schedule something anyway because 16 of, obviously, the current situation to discuss the dates that 17 I had set in my order, but then I got the motions from defense 18 counsel regarding the government's disclosure that was made in response to the scheduling order that I entered back in January 19 20 that required that the government identify the witnesses and exhibits that they intended to use in their case in chief, and 21 a witness list of some 143 people was provided. Even taking 22 23 out the custodians of record, it's still about 137 individuals. 24 And in light of the fact that the government had indicated to

me they thought they could do this trial in three days, that's

25

about six and a half minutes a witness, Mr. Sheppard. So are you really going to call all those people?

MR. SHEPPARD: So, Your Honor, when we talked about this and when you set your order in court and in your order, you said that -- provide a witness list of witnesses you may call in your case in chief.

THE COURT: No. Sir, sir, I have the order right in front of me. It very specifically says: The government will make a final disclosure of the names of witnesses and evidence it intends to use in its case in chief at trial. It intends to use.

Now, you could have given them a list of the people you intend and had a supplemental list of people you may call, but giving them a list of 137 people you may call with no indication, because it's in alphabetical order, which of those witnesses are truly the people you think you are going to call totally ignores the point to my order.

MR. SHEPPARD: Well, that certainly wasn't the intention at all. We were trying to be all inclusive because Your Honor said if we had added a single name past that date, we had to provide good cause as to why that name wouldn't have been on the list to begin with back on that date. And we had not determined -- we have not been able, as I'm sure Your Honor is aware, to even sit down and have discussions with these witnesses to determine whether or not those witnesses would be

called at that particular point in time, and the trial was four months away. We're not trying to do gamesmanship with it. We just truly had -- we're trying to make sure that we -- we did not want to come back and provide additional witnesses and the Court and defense counsel say, You knew these individuals could have been witnesses before. You didn't include them on the list. You're barred from using them.

So we may -- then I will redo the list if Your Honor would like, but we have not had a chance to sit down and definitively talk with them. Some of those witnesses may be impeached with regards to this, and we would absolutely intend to call other witnesses on the list to prove up that impeachment to go forward with in our case in chief. I'm just-- I'm not --

THE COURT: All right. Fine. I understand your rationale. There would have been a better way to do it because, clearly, in this list, you have a top five, ten people that you know, I hope, by now are the people that are going to make up your case in chief. Whether or not you have a list of potential impeachment witnesses or people you might call on tangential issues if it's necessary, you can identify them separately.

But this is not a helpful list to the defendants, and it is not helpful to the purposes that the Court required it.

So I want you to provide them with an amended list that is --

has a better sense of who you really are going to be relying on in this case so that they can evaluate who those people are and what they might be testifying about. And the same thing with exhibits. They're rather broad descriptions.

And the one confirmed that I would like to have you address because it seems an inconsistency, but there may be a reasonable explanation is you had indicated you were not going to use post-arrest statements of any of these defendants, but then there's a list of exhibits that says: Recordings of interviews of the defendants. And I don't know what -- how you reconcile that.

MR. SHEPPARD: So, Your Honor, again, with regards to that, I also, and without going — I've had various individuals reach — one of these defendants reach out as to the possibility of a plea offer. If that were to be the case and come to fruition, and during the course of our case in chief, that person testifies, then that statement certainly may come into play in the case in chief in order to buttress that testimony on redirect if the credibility were attacked and said something that they had or had not said prior to it.

With regards to other exhibits, at the time that this order was due, as your Honor is aware, a lot of these exhibits and this evidence is contained in FBI headquarters, which is on absolute lockdown by national order. There was absolutely "no". Now, at this point in time, the FBI is starting to phase

in a third workaround to get into the building. I can ask whether or not additional TP and clearance would be provided to either myself, dependent upon what the safety conditions are there given some other personal issues I have at home with regards to it, and the same with regards to Mr. Thakkar.

But what exhibits specifically is in this photo is yes or this photo is not, in honesty, with a trial being four months away, it was -- we didn't know which photos specifically we were going to use, except that we would use photos from the search site. And so, again, so as not to be barred from being able to use them if we decided closer to trial, we identified all the photos. And if it comes down to then you have to introduce all the photos, then that is the path we would take so as not to be barred later on from them.

THE COURT: Does anybody on the defense side want to respond?

(Undiscernible crosstalk)

THE COURT: One at time. And identify yourself.

MR. BLOOM: All right. Let Mr. Yoon go first. That's okay.

MR. YOON: Well, your Honor, I feel the government's comments -- I think that the Court's January 21st order did take into account the government was supposed to make the final disclosure of the named witnesses they intend to use in trial, and then by July 17th, the government was allowed to file their

2.4

final exhibit and witness list. So that was my recollection of the hearing.

MR. BLOOM: Your Honor, Alan Bloom. It was clear that the intention of the Court was an attempt to require the government to do what the government now says it has not done, namely, to sit down, syphon through thousands of documents and hundreds of witnesses and make a decision so that a real trial can be prepared in a real way. And the government's response, except for the fact having to do with any complication for the Corona virus and the FBI shutdown, except for that, basically what I heard the government say is that they haven't done that.

MR. SHEPPARD: Your Honor --

MR. BLOOM: This case has been ongoing for a number of years, and it was clearly the direction or the request of the Court that the government do that.

MR. SHEPPARD: Your Honor.

MR. BLOOM: It only makes it fair so that we can have a level playing field so that we know when we get into trial what really is going to be presented.

And so, that's my impression of what the Court -- I mean, what the prosecution has just said with regards to their response to the court order. The court order is very clear. The government's response to it is basically just saying we don't know, so we have to keep every option open. And that's not in compliance with the order of the Court.

1 THE COURT: All right. 2 MR. SHEPPARD: Well --3 THE COURT: Go ahead. 4 MR. SHEPPARD: I'm sorry. 5 THE COURT: Go ahead. 6 MR. SHEPPARD: Sorry. Fred Sheppard. What I would 7 say is this, we absolutely were not in any way trying to 8 disrespect or play games or anything of this sort, Your Honor. 9 The fact of the matter is, in preparing for this trial in 10 addition to the multitude of other trials that have been set 11 before this one, it wasn't as if we were going to sit down with 12 all these witnesses five months ahead of time and then hope 13 that nothing had changed in the intervening four months between 14 that list and our case in chief. At that particular point in 15 time as we came closer to it, yes -- and, in fact, we were 16 still interviewing witnesses who were providing credible 17 information to us with regards to it up until a month or four 18 weeks at some point in time prior to the shutdown, in fact, to the point in time one of those witnesses lead in the week 19 20 leading up to that order had provided definitive information as 21 to where the payment provided to the informant as a down payment for the violent act had originated from. 22 23 And so, we were trying to go forward, but we had not

gotten through. A lot of those are employees on the witness

list, employees of Golden Bloom who had provided information as

24

25

to the activities and the duties of the defendants and whether or not they had specific duties or responsibilities or the ability to withdraw certain funds from Golden Bloom without the authority of (audio breaking up) but those are people that we had been making and still continuing to make strides to speak with because we hadn't intended to and weren't including on this list, and we full well -- I mean, it's not in the sense they were just on there and, you know, I'm trying to be up front that these people are potential witnesses in our case in chief. So I think ultimately until we speak with them and this particular person has a full understanding so that we don't need to call four other witnesses, we can't make that decision. And we're still trying to do that with the other cases that we've also got, and this the situation we find ourselves in. And so I -- that's where we're at.

THE COURT: All right. You need to get practical here. This case has a trial date in August. I have very little confidence, if any at all, I will be able to summon a venire panel for the first week of August. I don't see that happening. We're having conversations about how to do this, how to potentially bring in a jury, do social distances, and all of that, but we're a long way from really being able to implement anything along those lines.

Because there's a lot of dates in here that require that things get done with the expectation this case is going to

2.4

trial in August, I think it's best that I vacate all of that in my orders at docket, what is it? 80.

And part of the explanation, as I understand it, from the government is when I issued this scheduling order back in January and gave you an April date, this all preceded the complications of being able to meet with people. And, obviously, things went completely off the rails by March and so, when you filed your April disclosures that I required, you were over inclusive to make sure you would not be prejudiced by failing to identify somebody, but you have not had really a significant opportunity to meet and confer with all these potential witnesses to really narrow the field. And I suspect at this point, that it's still problematic for you; is that correct?

MR. SHEPPARD: It is, your Honor. And just -- I won't belabor it. We had been meeting with people up until we were shut down and then receiving lists of individuals, of potential witnesses up until that point and, in fact, had planned to meet with additional witnesses in those weeks. As it stands, Your Honor, we have a call with the FBI after this. I know that as of last week, federal agencies were being forbidden from interacting with the public except on an absolutely necessary national security matters because of --

(Court reporter interruption regarding audio breaking up)

THE COURT: That's fine, Mr. Sheppard. I get the gist

of it.

Your motion in limine hearing was scheduled for June 19th at 1:30. I'm converting that to another status conference in this case. I'm vacating all of the filing requirements that I previously set. I'd like the parties to, perhaps, meet and confer between now and then and file a joint statement as to what you think is a reasonable schedule going forward to be able to narrow this case to an appropriate witness list and exhibit identification that, yes, will be subject to modification if things change, but at least will let the defendants get a better sense of getting their arms around the foundational elements of the government's case.

And then we can -- I'm hoping to have a little more daylight into what our jury situation is going to be by mid-to-late June in terms of whether we're going to able to actually call panels in. But in the meantime, since I really have no prospect of doing that, it seems like an awful lot of work for people to do and then just sit on it.

And I appreciate the government's position that you're hampered by being able to collect and finalize documents and witness interviews when facilities are not available to you. So, again, I'm just vacating all the dates and requirements you have.

We will have a status conference on June 19th at 1:30, which was your original motion in limine date.

And the Court excludes time under the general order in light of the COVID-19 crisis, as well as the fact there are motions pending in this case.

And because two of the defendants are out on bond, the prejudice to them is less. I know that Mr. Funk is not on the phone. And, Mr. Yoon, I would encourage you to discuss with him and with counsel for the government any options to try to create a bond situation for Ms. Gonzales to minimize the delay prejudice to her of being unable to get a trial date as well as to facilitate her ability to meet with counsel, because while people are incarcerated right now, there's very limited access to counsel. But, obviously, there would have to be appropriate conditions.

I don't know what her situation is right now. I don't recall what it was when bond was set for her, if it was, but I'd like you to explore that because I'm concerned about having people indefinitely in custody when I can't set a trial date because I can't call a jury.

Alternatively, and it's always an option that the parties could consider if they want to get this matter done, is opting for a bench trial. We could certainly give you a much more date certain. I think the handling of witnesses with social distancing is going to be more manageable from a practical point of view earlier than bringing in, screening, and sitting a jury. So I would like you to, at least, discuss

that with your clients, think about it, and decide whether you think that might be an appropriate alternative here given the unknown amount of delay we have for a jury trial.

So with that, everything that has been filed: On the order to compel compliance, the Court is denying that without prejudice but I'm going to request that the government give a more substantial update on June 19th at the status hearing as to the true nature, who the witnesses and exhibits are going to be based on your ability between now and then to try to hone that field, and I would encourage you to try to have frank conversations with defense counsel, particularly as to the exhibits because I'm assuming, I hope correctly, that all this is from discovery that's been provided to the defendants, and so narrowing documents might be easier to do than perhaps identifying witnesses.

I do understand the complications, Mr. Sheppard, but I think the defendants need a little more transparency as to where the government is going specifically in this case in terms of the who, the what, the where, the when, et cetera.

So anything else from counsel?

MR. BLOOM: This is Alan Bloom, Your Honor. I understand the Court's order to remove all the dates except for June 19th. In terms of the meet and confer, while everybody is on the line since it's difficult to that, I'll take a moment of the Court's time, Fred and Tom and Mr. Yoon, it probably make

1 sense for us to use email to try to schedule a joint call so we 2 can all speak about the idea of availability and when the Court -- or when the government thinks it will be ready, and so 3 4 we can come back to that. So I'll try to send some emails to 5 try to do some scheduling with regards to having some sort of 6 joint conversation on that. 7 THE COURT: Thank you., Counsel. I appreciate you 8 taking that initiative. Anybody else? 9 MR. YOON: Your Honor, this is Antonio Yoon. I will 10 relay the message to Mr. Funk regarding Your Honor's request 11 for him to explore any bond situation with Mr. Sheppard and the 12 government. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Anything from government? 14 MR. SHEPPARD: No, your Honor. I was going on say I 15 would reach out to counsel as soon as we were done, but I'll 16 wait for Mr. Bloom to send an email. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, gentlemen. I'll talk you to in June, and, hopefully, we will have a better 18 19 sense of where we are in this whole unique and troubling 20 process. 21 MR. BLOOM: Your Honor. Your Honor, before you leave, this Alan Bloom. There is another question I have. I know 22 23 we -- obviously, we have the issue as to how can we maintain 24 social distancing and pull in a jury. Obviously, that deals

with this case, but can the Court give us any guidance as to

25

how you even plan on handling all the backlog of cases? Would you, for example, put this case somewhere in the mix, or is it -- is there an indication, perhaps, it's going to go -- I mean, obviously, this is not your first case that has been impacted by this and so you probably have, I don't know, two months of cases before this which has been impacted. Does the Court have any sense as to whether or not it's going to go -- when you recommence, whether you're going to go back and start with the March cases and then go forward, or you're going to pick up a case out of order or anything?

THE COURT: Actually, our backlog of criminal trials is not that bad. A lot of the matters that we had because they involve immigration issues, people have reached accommodations and resolved them to get people out of custody and out of the country. I have this case and one other case I can think of off the top of my head that will need to get scheduled. And criminal matters will, of course, have priority over my civil cases that have been disrupted by this.

So it's not going to be first come, first serve, and it's not necessarily going to be who was scheduled before we went dark, but we'll look at who's ready and set dates, and the length of trials and how long it will take to fit them in. So the sooner all the pieces are in place for any case, and I can actually line up a jury, then you'll get on the list.

MR. BLOOM: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. 2 (Court in recess at 2:30 p.m.) 3 *** End of requested transcript *** 4 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER 5 I, Mauralee Ramirez, Federal official stenographic 6 7 reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the 8 Southern District of California, do hereby certify that 9 pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code that the 10 foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the 11 stenographically reported proceedings held in the 12 above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in 13 conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of 14 the United States. 15 16 Dated this 23rd day of November 2020. 17 18 /S/ Mauralee Ramirez Mauralee Ramirez, CSR No. 11674, RPR 19 Federal Official Stenographic Reporter 20 21 22 23 2.4 25