24

25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Criminal Action No. 03-CR-23

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

SCOTT LEE KIMBALL,

Defendant.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

(Sentencing Hearing: Order)

Proceedings before the HONORABLE MARCIA S. KRIEGER, Judge, United States District Court for the District of Colorado, commencing at 11:53 a.m., on the 1st day of December, 2003, in Courtroom 12, United States Courthouse, Denver,

APPEARANCES

JOSEPH URBANIAK, Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1225 17th Street, Suite 700, Denver, Colorado, 80202, appearing for the plaintiff.

KENNETH EICHNER, Attorney at Law, 1776 Lincoln Street, Suite 1010, Denver, Colorado, 80203, appearing for the defendant.

Proceeding Recorded by Mechanical Stenography, Transcription Produced via Computer by Paul Zuckerman, 1929 Stout Street, P.O. Box 3563, Denver, Colorado, 80294, (303) 629-9285

(The following proceedings were had and entered of record after the Court heard the arguments of counsel and statement of defendant:)

THE COURT: Thank you.

The Court will announce the sentence it intends to impose at this time; but, Counsel, you will have a final chance to make any legal objections that you care to before I actually impose the sentence.

We begin with the presentence report; and as I have previously noted in the record, no finding is necessary as to dispute between the Government or the defense with regard to that report except as to the applicability of the enhancement provided by Section 2B1.1(b)(8) pertaining to an upward adjustment. And the Court has previously received an offer of proof with regard to that by both the defense and the prosecution and concluded based upon application of the definition of "sophisticated means" that the upward enhancement is not applicable in these circumstances.

with regard to all other aspects of the presentence report, it does not appear that any further findings are required; and the Court adopts the report with its various addenda as the Court's findings.

Based on that report and the representations made today, the Court finds that the Sentencing Commission guideline applicable to the counts in the information to which the

defendant has pled guilty is Section 2B1.1; and pursuant to Section 3D1.2(d), Counts 1 and 2 are placed in a one-count group.

The guideline for violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 513(a) is Section 2B1.1 with a base offense level of 6.

Because the amount involved in the fraudulent checks was more than \$5,000 but less than \$10,000, Section 2B1.1(b)(1)(B) provides for a two-level increase.

In this case, the loss was \$8,287.95; and the parties agree that that sum is currently being held by the Cordova Police Department in Cordova, Alaska.

There are no victim, role, or obstruction adjustments; and the Court has declined to make an upward adjustment in accordance with Section 2B1.1(b)(1)(B). Therefore, the adjusted offense level is 8. Actually, the declination that I made was not 2B1.1(b)(1)(B) but 2B1.1(b)(8).

The defendant has accepted responsibility for his conduct; and therefore, pursuant to section 3E1.1(a), the offense level is reduced by two levels. This results in a total offense level of 6.

The defendant's criminal history category is IV; and in accordance with the guidelines, this results in an imprisonment range of 6 to 12 months, a fine range of 500 to \$5,000 and a supervised release range of two to three years for each of Counts 1 and 2.

The Government has filed a motion for downward departure in accordance with section 5K1.1 and points to at least three instances in which the defendant has provided substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense. These include information with regard to charges brought against individuals in Alaska and also here in Colorado.

The Court is troubled with regard to this motion that the defendant seeks a downward departure based upon his acts in revealing information about other people but his blatant unwillingness to reveal information about his own financial affairs in preparation of the presentence report. And the Court is further troubled that his current financial circumstances about which he will not disclose information pertain to the fact that he has received substantial funds from the FBI in assisting the Government with regard to all of these actions.

This behavior smacks of an attitude of "I will do what benefits me but I have no obligation to be forthcoming in information that the Court requires in order to impose my sentence." In other words, "I'm happy to turn other people in, but I don't want to be held fully accountable for my own behavior."

There is no exception that I am aware of under section 5K1.1 for refusing a downward departure where there has been

substantial assistance, even under these circumstances. And therefore, the Court grants the motion for a downward departure as requested by the Government because an appropriate showing has been made.

That will reduce the period of incarceration from a range of 6 to 12 months to 3 months, which means that the defendant will serve no time because his presentence incarceration or detention in Alaska exceeds the three-month period.

But in light of the fact that Mr. Kimball is disinclined to reveal the information that is required for adequate evaluation of the appropriate sentence and in light of the fact that Mr. Kimball has funds in the sum of \$20,000 that are being held by third parties and in light of the fact that he has received \$20,000 from the FBI for assistance in his living expenses over the past months, the Court will impose the maximum fine to be paid immediately upon release of the funds by the third party.

The Court intends to impose an incarceration period consistent with granting the Government's motion of six months; to impose a fine in the amount of \$5,000, to be paid immediately upon the release of the \$20,000 from the party holding the \$20,000; to impose a restitution obligation to be paid from said funds in the amount of \$8,287.94, to be paid directly to Wells Fargo, and to further impose a supervised

release period of three years subject to the standard conditions imposed by the Court with a special condition that the defendant continue in his current course of mental health treatment until released by the treating physician.

The Court will authorize the probation officer to release psychological reports and the presentence report to the treating professional, but the probation officer shall have no role in determining the length, scope, or duration of the treatment.

The Court also declines to waive interest on the fine and is required to impose a mandatory assessment of \$100. I believe it's on each count.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes. That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So a total sum of \$200 to be paid immediately.

In evaluating what sentence is appropriate under these circumstances, the Court has taken into account the seriousness of the offense and attempted to tailor a sentence that promotes respect for law, not only the law that the defendant wants to comply with but all the laws; a sentence that provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protects the public from further crimes of the defendant, and provides the defendant with needed medical -- here psychological -- treatment in the most effective manner.

Is there any further argument that counsel desire to make?

MR. URBANIAK: No, your Honor.

MR. EICHNER: Court's indulgence.

(Discussion off the record between Mr. Eichner and defendant.)

only thing my client mentions is he wants to comply with everything as fast as possible. And would the order to the court -- or excuse me -- the order to go out that we would give to the police in Alaska be an order to release all the funds to the Clerk of the Court so they can immediately pay these things? We just want to make sure the order is correct to take care of your wishes as soon as possible.

THE COURT: No. It would not be an order directing payment to the clerk of this court. It will be an order directing payment directly to Wells Fargo.

MR. EICHNER: And for him to pay that \$5,000 fine would -- can you also put in the order to release the remaining funds to Mr. Kimball to pay the fine you just ordered?

THE COURT: We will -- I will direct in the judgment that the remaining funds are to be released -- and we can do this one of two ways. I can have the funds, the \$5,000 fine paid directly to the designated recipient of the fine amount from those funds, or they can be released to Mr. Kimball and he

can turn over the \$5,000.

Mr. Urbaniak, what's your position?

MR. URBANIAK: Probably the first option, your Honor, to save Mr. Kimball some trouble and possible mischief.

THE COURT: Mr. Eichner?

MR. EICHNER: We would ask for the second; that all remaining funds be turned over to Mr. Kimball. He's not going to get any mischief. There is a microscope over his behavior. He wouldn't do anything like that. But it would be easier to get the remaining funds to him so he can pay the \$5,000 and any other fines and costs.

THE COURT: And is the Cordova Police Department in possession of the remaining funds?

MR. EICHNER: They are indeed.

THE COURT: And the total of it is \$20,000?

MR. EICHNER: 19,700 is the more accurate amount, I believe.

MR. URBANIAK: I didn't mean to imply that he was going to do anything wrong with the money. It's just something could come up, like "all of a sudden my transportation broke down," or "my wife needed an operation," or just something like that, which could prevent it going --

MR. EICHNER: He'll pay that money within 24 hours that he receives it.

THE COURT: All right. Then when I enter the

judgment, what I will do is direct that the Cordova Police

Department release the \$8,287.94 directly to Wells Fargo, the

remainder to be released and paid to Mr. Kimball. And I will

direct that the police department within 48 hours of the

release of funds confirm that with the probation department and

within 48 hours of the release -- now, we better make it 48

hours after receipt of that payment, Mr. Kimball will pay the

fine --

MR. EICHNER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- failing which that will be a breach of a condition of supervised release which will require you to come back before me to determine whether I send you to jail.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any further argument?

MR. URBANIAK: No, your Honor.

MR. EICHNER: Nothing on behalf of the defense. Thank you, your Honor.

the Court has previously made and in accordance with the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court the defendant, Scott Lee Kimball, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of three months on each count, to be served concurrently. The Court notes that he has previously been detained in presentence confinement 412 days. The Court notes that although credit for time served is

determined by the Bureau of Prisons, it appears that the time served exceeds by some substantial degree the term of imprisonment imposed by this sentence.

The defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years on each of Counts 1 and 2, the terms to run concurrently.

while on supervised release, he shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime; shall not illegally possess any controlled substances; shall not possess a firearm or destructive device, and shall comply with the standard conditions adopted by this court.

It shall be a condition of supervised release that he pay the fine according to the terms I shall specify and that restitution be paid in accordance with the terms I shall specify.

He shall refrain from the unlawful use of a controlled substance and submit to one drug test within 15 days of beginning on supervised release and at least two periodic tests thereafter, and he shall continue in his current course of mental health treatment until he is released by the treating professional.

The Court authorizes the probation officer to release psychological reports and/or the presentence report to the treating professional for continuity of treatment.

It is the judgment of the Court that the Cordova

Police Department in Cordova, Alaska, who presently hold a sum of approximately \$19,700, shall within 10 days of the date of the judgment pay to Wells Fargo Bank of Alaska, Cordova Store, Post Office Box 1250, Cordova, Alaska, 99574, the sum of \$8,287.94 and that at such time the Cordova Police Department shall release the remaining balance of the sum currently held in their possession to the defendant, Scott Lee Kimball, and immediately notify, certainly no later than 48 hours after the release, that said sums have been disbursed in accordance with this judgment by contacting the probation officer supervising Mr. Kimball.

We will assume that 10 days is sufficient time from the disbursement by the Cordova Police Department to

Mr. Kimball for him to deposit and pay his fine of \$5,000, and that way we don't have to worry about when he precisely receives the money. So it shall be the order of this court that the Court imposes a fine on Count 1 and Count 2 treated as a single count -- a fine of \$5,000, which is the maximum fine that can be imposed here, and that this will be paid to -- is it the Clerk of the Court?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- Clerk of this Court no later than 10 days after disbursement of funds by the Cordova Police Department.

The fine shall bear interest, and it shall be a

б

condition of supervised release that the fine be paid in accordance with this judgment.

In addition, the Court imposes the mandatory assessment of \$100 per count, which is due immediately.

Have I missed anything?

MR. URBANIAK: Not that I can think of, your Honor.
Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Eichner?

MR. EICHNER: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Merlo?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: I believe that's fine, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. We crafted this as we went along; so if there is an error, I trust that Counsel and probAtion Department will file an appropriate motion to amend the judgment, if I've overlooked something.

Mr. Kimball, you are advised of your right to appeal this sentence. If you desire to appeal, a notice of appeal will be filed with the Clerk of the Court within ten days after the entry of judgment, or the right to appeal will be lost. If you are unable to afford an attorney for an appeal, I will appoint one to represent you. If you so request, the Clerk of the Court will immediately prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Is there any further business to bring before the

1 | Court?

MR. URBANIAK: No, your Honor. Thank you.

MR. EICHNER: Nothing on behalf of the defense.

THE COURT: All right. Then consistent with the manner in which we opened this proceeding, I'll direct Mr. Zuckerman to prepare a transcript of the Court's findings and judgment which ordinarily would be attached to the judgment that will be entered and to provide Mr. Eichner with a copy of those findings and conclusions so that he can determine whether he wishes to file a motion to seal any part of the judgment. That motion will be due to be filed with this court within 24 hours after Mr. Zuckerman's transmission of the transcript to you, Mr. Eichner.

MR. EICHNER: I understand. We'll comply. Thank you.

And I'll give Mr. Zuckerman my card to make sure he has my

address.

THE COURT: All right. Then that concludes this matter and we will stand in recess.

(Recess at 12:17 p.m.)

* * * * *

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Dated at Denver, Colorado, this 2d day of December, 2003.

Paul A. Zuckerman