UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION

HONORABLE STEPHEN V. WILSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, PRESIDING

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff (s),

Vs.

CR 02-884-SVW

SHERMAN MARTIN AUSTIN,

Defendant (s),

SENTENCING HEARING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 2003 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

LENA VILLEGAS

FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
ROOM 435 UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
312 NORTH SPRING STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
Ph. (213) 680-1265
FAX (213) 680-1954

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2	ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF:
3	DEBORAH W. YANG
4	United States Attorney JACQUELINE CHOOLJIAN
5	Assistant United States Attorney CHIEF, CRIMINAL DIVISION
6	BY: ROD A. CASTRO-SILVA Assistant United States Attorney
7	Room 1507 United States Courthouse 312 North Spring Street
8	Los Angeles, California 90012 Ph. (213) 894-2262
9	
10	er.
11	
12	ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT:
13	MARIA E. STRATTON
14	Federal Public Defender MARILYN E. BEDNARSKI
15	Chief Deputy Federal Defender BY: RONALD KAYE
16	Deputy Federal Public Defender 321 East Second Street
17	Los Angeles, Californía 90012-4206 Ph. (213) 894-4298
18	-
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, JUNE 30, 2003 2 (COURT IN SESSION at 11:00 a.m.) 3 THE CLERK: Item number seven, CR 02-884-SVW, 4 5 United States of America versus Sherman Martin Austin. Counsel, please state your appearances. 6 MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Good morning, your Honor. Rod Castro-Silva, for the United States. 9 MR. KAYE: Good morning, your Honor. 10 Ron Kaye, appearing on behalf of Mr. Austin, 11 present before the Court. THE COURT: This is the time for sentencing. 12 13 Has the defendant read the presentence report? 14 MR. KAYE: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Okay. I'll hear from you and/or 16 your client. MR. KAYE: Thank you, your Honor. 17 Your Honor, Mr. Austin committed this offense 18 19 when he was 18 years old. Now, he's 20 years old. 20 Since his commission of this offense, he has engaged in 21 nothing that remotely resembles it. 22 In fact, the government's complaint was 23 dismissed in February of 2002 and we entered into plea 24 negotiations in August of 2002. The government --25 during that time, when he was not supervised, similarly, Interned dialogue that would promote violence,
whatsoever.

As part of those negotiations, the government was introduced to his mother. His entire family is here, including one of the writers, Ms. Bolton, who wrote a letter to your Honor.

His mother was involved in those negotiations. We met with the government several times, and as a result, the government had offered a plea agreement under 11 (c) (1) (c), which essentially gives the Court discretion within the range that has been proposed in the presentence report.

But, your Honor, the government, the Probation Office, and the defense are all in agreement that the Court should impose a sentence of -- essentially, the most lenient sentence possible within that range, which, at this juncture, is four months in custody and four months in a community correction center.

Your Honor, we provided the Court with a very detailed report from a Dr. Evelyn McGinnis, who works for the California Department of Corrections in Lancaster. Her analysis focuses on the dangerousness of individuals and whether criminal inmates are -- should

be eligible for parole, whether they constitute a risk of danger to society.

Dr. McGinnis, after a thorough examination, applied her experience and found that Mr. Austin does not represent a risk to society, whatsoever.

Objectively, she used the HARE Personality

Dangerousness Test and made this conclusion: That on
the contrary, Mr. Austin is a very, very peaceful,
mild-mannered man who is much more inclined to act in a
very peaceful, non-aggressive manner.

In addition, a critical component of determining an individual's dangerousness is personal history. Ms. Bolton is here. She was a mentor/teacher in the LA Unified School District. She knows -- she's known Mr. Austin for 18 years, 18 years of his 20 years of living.

We provided a letter from Mr. Russo who was a Big Brother to Mr. Austin through the Big Brother Program. He did not have this mentoring from his father. He was pretty much raised by his mother, who's present in court.

And the Big Brother also responded that

Mr. Austin was somebody who was -- his characteristics

were the kind of person that would avoid all conflict.

He was not engaged in aggressive sports. He would go

hiking, collect butterflies, things to that effect.

And finally, we presented the letters of John Perlstein and Ms. Greentree, also, who have also known Mr. Austin all of his young life, who just emphatically relate to the Court how this individual does not resemble someone that society should be concerned with.

The government has been very, very cooperative and has taken a close look at this case. I'm sure

Mr. Castro-Silva will be addressing the Court, as well.

And the last thing the government would do at a time like this, with the acts of aggression that have been perpetrated on a global level, is recommend a low sentence when they perceive someone to be a danger.

Mr. Austin is someone who, in the future, will comply completely with the tems of supervision.

Everyone who has analyzed this case has sensed that this came about as a result of his immaturity.

He was very computer literate from the early days of his high school. His mother is a computer instructor at a private school.

And he didn't realize the impact. He didn't, like, have a sense that what he was doing could trigger such possible violent conduct.

And in her report, Dr. McGinnis states that if someone did in fact commit a violent conduct, it was

contrary to this young man. 3 The probation officer recommends a three-year 4 period of supervised release. And they state that they 5 want to give this much time for the defendant to mature. 6 And we're not in opposition to a three-year period of 7 supervised release; nor is the government. 8 He's -- there's very invasive requirements 9 with regard to computer monitoring. We're not going to 10 oppose those, as well. 11 The only issue that we'd ask the Court to 12 13 modify with regard to the supervised release is the -there's a condition that he cannot knowingly be engaged 14 in any -- or associate with any groups that are 15 professing any violence. And in my papers to the Court, 16 17 I explained the possibility of this having unintended affect. 18 And what I would ask the Court to do is have 19 the probation officer first have a preliminary meeting 20 with Mr. Austin, a meet and confer, before any kind of 21 violation has been assessed by the probation officer. 22

Because Mr. Austin as been engaged in all kinds

of progressive campaigns. But, overwhelmingly, they

have been for feeding the homeless, objecting to housing

more than likely that he would have been appalled, that

he would have been shocked, because violence is so

1

2

23

24

conditions, things like that. And there may be meetings where he's involved with people who may espouse some kind of violence but it's not really of a serious nature. I think to have him be under a condition where he cannot engage in -associate with anyone who espouses some violence I think is too broad. I know it's constitutional from my reading of the case law. But it's too broad for the activities of this young man. If the probation officer senses that he's involved in touchy territory, then he should meet with Mr. Austin and if necessary bring it before the Court for a hearing and not to chill his ability to associate with others as he's entitled to under the First 15 Amendment. Your Honor, initially, the government -- and they placed him -- they described him in a -- in one of the footnotes in their pleadings, they were not adverse 19 to one month in custody and the rest of the time in a half-way house. But since there was a driving with a suspended 22 license, the criminal history got kicked to criminal 23 history category two and, therefore, a split sentence is 24 25 what was available under Zone B under the sentencing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

1 table.

Я

But, your Honor, the driving with a suspended license conviction was without counsel.

And we'd ask the Court to sentence Mr. Austin to the one month in custody. We're not looking for a departure.

THE COURT: What is the sentencing range without the driving conviction?

MR. KAYE: Without the driving conviction, your Honor?

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: It's 6-to-12 months, your Honor.

MR. KAYE: Your Honor, 6-to-12 months.

So the range that the parties were in agreement with initially was one month in custody and five months in a half-way house.

And we'd ask the Court to not count that one driving with a suspended license based on the fact that it was without counsel and sentence him to the -- to one month and five -- one month in custody and five months in a half-way house.

And to make up for that, if the Court thinks that there should be further -- a further need to impress upon Mr. Austin that he needs to head in a direction that everyone condones, we would not be

adverse to community service.

The expert from the Department of Corrections stated that Mr. Austin needs to have an understanding what about violence really means. Because he was so theoretical on the Internet.

THE COURT: What's theoretical about teaching people how to make explosives?

MR. KAYE: Well, your Honor, it wasn't theoretical in the sense that the language, itself, was very -- was very literal. But from --

THE COURT: You know, I must tell you, I see this case much differently. And I know you're not finished, and I'll allow you to make a complete presentation, but I don't want you to think as I sit here, I'm accepting everything you say.

I'm rather surprised at the government's view of the case, too, because the case seems to me to be a very serious case. And the emphasis seems to be on some psychological profile of this young defendant.

That certainly is relevant and certainly is something that ought to be considered. But on the other hand, what also ought to be considered is the conduct and its potential, especially in the world that we now live in.

And I don't view the case simply as one where I

have to make some psychological analysis of this
defendant and try to gauge whether or not he fully
appreciates the potential of his conduct. It's obvious
that his conduct is very hurtful and dangerous.

And I think there ought to be a deterrent. And my inclination is not what the recommendation is. I haven't reached a judgment, but it is not.

MR. KAYE: I understand.

THE COURT: I'm just really surprised that the government so often brings such nonsense cases and when it has a case that has some seriousness to it, becomes Freudian. That's my preliminary view.

And I'll hear further from you and/or your client. And you can continue.

MR. KAYE: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, I understand the Court's concern.

And that's -- and -- and the period of supervised release with the rigid monitoring will prove our position to be true.

THE COURT: You're missing the point.

He may very well comply with the conditions of supervised release. He may very well turn around and not do this sort of thing or appreciate the seriousness of his conduct. But he did something that was very serious. And it seems to me that there ought to be some

societal response, some deterrence. And if there isn't, we ought not to bring these kinds of cases. We ought to send defendants to psychiatrists, not to courts of law.

. 14

MR. KAYE: The only -- the only issue that causes this case to be somewhat -- somewhat more ameliorated than the Court is emphasizing, I think is the fact that it was on -- on the Internet and that it was part of this very volatile political website.

And so, although the Court -- the content absolutely deserves the concern, what I gather the government has realized from extensive meetings with Mr. Austin, personally, and understanding his family, and the FBI agent is here, is that there was -- there is that phenomena when you have somebody's who's young and immature and he's involved in this thrust of this political movement to get a little carried away.

It's not -- not that he -- what he did is at all -- should be -- should be condoned.

THE COURT: A little carried away? I mean, I just don't understand the argument. A little carried away? Teaching people how to make incendiary devices to defensively protect themselves from the police. I just don't get it. Maybe I'm living in a different world. I just don't get it. But you can continue on.

MR. KAYE: Well, your Honor, I think the points

1	I have made are are I think the Court has heard
2	them and understands them. I don't want to belabor it.
3	THE COURT: I don't want to limit your
4	argument.
5	And as I said, I haven't reached a conclusion,
6	but what you say so far is not consistent with my view.
7	Is your view of the case that it ought to be a
8	one-month sentence?
9	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Your Honor, initially, that
10	was our view. The defendant, based on
11	THE COURT: Is that the FBI's view, too?
12	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: The initial plea agreement
13	that was brought before the Court was vetted with the
14	FBI and it was with the agreement of FBI, as well.
15	Since the subsequent conviction of defendant
16	for driving without a license and the kick-up of the
17	criminal history
18	THE COURT: From 8-to-14 months as opposed to
19	6-to-12?
20	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Right.
21	THE COURT: And that altered your
22	recommendation to four months in jail instead of one
23	month?
24	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Correct.
25	In other words, the minimum was still

1 recommended.

В

THE COURT: I'm not moved by that.

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Just to give you some background, your Honor, the -- there is no question that the defendant was involved from a very young age with a very volatile political ideology.

THE COURT: What does that have to do with anything?

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Well, it gives context to his website. And it gives context to his conduct.

There's no question that his conduct --

THE COURT: Does it explain it? It makes it worse, doesn't it?

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Well, it gives -- it gives context to it, your Honor.

And -- and the -- there's no question that his conduct deserves to be punished. And I believe presently the way to punish the defendant is to give him four months in custody, or to give him the minimum, however the Court wants to do that.

My recommendation is four months in custody with a four-month period of CCC. Probation agrees with that.

And to teach the defendant that that conduct is conduct that is inappropriate, that is wrong, and that

he will be punished for that. And I think that he
understands that.

And that for the following three years -THE COURT: Why is the emphasis solely or so
much on what he understands, what he appreciates?

Isn't there another part to sentencing other than customizing a sentence to what is predictable about the future conduct of this defendant? Isn't there a deterrence?

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: · I think that -- that--

THE COURT: You think giving this sentence -this defendant four months or a month is supposed to be
a deterrence to some other revolutionary who wants to
change the world according to his or her own views by
the use of websites and teaching people how to blow up
other people?

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: I think that for a person similarly situated to the defendant, it would serve some sense of deterrence. I think that if he has some --

THE COURT: Has your recommendation been cleared with the Justice Department?

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: My -- the recommendation did not have to be cleared with the Justice Department, your Honor.

THE COURT: I just find it shocking.

MR. CASTRO-SILVA: The recommendation has been 1 2 vetted with -- through all levels in my section and in the office. 3 4 THE COURT: Well --MR. CASTRO-SILVA: And it has been -- without 5 getting into the -- obviously, the discussions of our 6 office, you know, all of the factors that we looked to 7 in determining what kind of recommendation, what kind of 8 9 plea agreement. THE COURT: Well, I tell you what, I want to 10 put this sentencing off for a few weeks. I want to know 11 12 what the recommendation is of the Justice Department. 13 I want you to send this case to the Justice 14 Department in Washington. I want to get their 15 recommendation. This is a case that has national, international overtones. I want the FBI's view of this 16 17 case. I respect your view. You're obviously an 18 honorable person but -- how old are you? 19 MR. CASTRO-SILVA: I'm 38, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: You're older than most. Most of 21 22 the assistants are 26 or 27. 23 MR. CASTRO-SILVA: I take it that as a 24 compliment. 25 THE COURT: It is.

1 MR. CASTRO-SILVA: I guess you think I look 2 young. THE COURT: You do look young, which is not a 3 4 bad thing. And this is a serious matter. Every sentence 5 My inclination, just to let you know, is to impose 6 7 a much greater jail sentence than that recommended. MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Can I ask this of the Court, 8 your Honor, the parties are -- did enter into a binding 9 plea agreement. At the change of plea, the Court 10 indicated it was going to accept. That binding plea 11 agreement has a sentencing range of 6-to-12 months. 12 13 THE COURT: Well, I would -- my inclination would be to impose a jail sentence of 8-to-10 months. 14 15 And I actually wish I had more discretion. That's my inclination. And I want to know what the view is of the 16 17 Justice Department. MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Very well, your Honor. 18 will discuss it with my supervisors and let the Court 19 20 know. 21 THE COURT: And I would be interested. If you 22 don't want to give it to me, that would be okay, too. It may be helpful to the defendant, I don't know. 23

THE COURT: I also want to know what FBI's view

24

25

is, not the agent's view.

1	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Your Honor, when you say
2	the FBI
3	THE COURT: I mean Justice. Headquarters. I
4	mean Mr. Mueller's view.
5	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: I'll see what I can do, your
6	Honor.
7	THE COURT: Thank you.
8	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: When shall we continue it
9	to, your Honor?
10	THE COURT: I'll give you till the 28th of
11	July. And I'll hear further argument, at that time.
12	This is an important matter.
13	MR. KAYE: And that's at 11:00, your Honor?
14	THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
15	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Thank you, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: I'm not suggesting that I'm going
17	to be at all bound by the suggestion of what they said,
18	but I am interested. And if they're in agreement with
19	your view, that might very well be persuasive.
20	But my inclination here is that there's
21	something wrong with the recommendation. All right.
22	Thank you.
23	MR. CASTRO-SILVA: Very well, your Honor.
24	(END OF PROCEEDINGS.)
25	-

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

I, LENA VILLEGAS, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, IN AND

FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL

DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I REPORTED

STENOGRAPHICALLY THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS AT THE TIME AND

PLACE HEREINBEFORE SET FORTH; THAT THE SAME WAS THEREAFTER

REDUCED TO TYPEWRITTEN FORM BY MEANS OF COMPUTER-AIDED

TRANSCRIPTION; AND I DO FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE

AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES SO TAKEN.

LENA VILLEGAS, CSR, RPR, CP FEDERAL OFFICIAL/COURT REPORTER DATED: July 9, 2003