Case 1:19-cr-00254-ALC Document 50 Filed 02/03/20 Page 1 of 26

K1HHFOWC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 19 Cr. 254 (ALC) v. REGINALD FOWLER, 5 6 Conference Defendant. 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. 9 January 17, 2020 2:20 p.m. 10 Before: 11 12 HON. ANDREW L. CARTER, JR., 13 District Judge 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York SEBASTIAN SWETT 17 JESSICA FENDER SAMUEL ROTHSCHILD 18 Assistant United States Attorneys HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 19 Attorneys for Defendant 20 BY: JAMES McGOVERN SAMUEL RACKEAR 21 -and-ROSENBLUM SCHWARTZ & FRY P.C. 22 BY: SCOTT ROSENBLUM 23 Also Present: Todd McGee, FBI 24 25

1

(Case called)

2

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your

3

appearance. For the government?

4

MR. SWETT: Good afternoon, your Honor. Sheb Swett,

5

Jessica Fender, and Sam Rothschild for the United States.

6

We're joined at counsel table by Special Agent Todd McGee.

7

THE DEPUTY CLERK: And for the defendant?

8

MR. McGOVERN: James McGovern from Hogan Lovells on

9

behalf of the defendant, Mr. Reginald Fowler, who's present, as

10

well Scott Rosenblum and Scott Rackear from my office. Good

11

afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

13

12

All right. My understanding is that Mr. Fowler would

14

like to withdraw his previously entered plea of not guilty and

15

enter a plea of guilty to Count Four of the indictment pursuant

16

to an agreement with the government. Is that correct?

17

MR. McGOVERN: That's correct.

18

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Fowler, I want to ask you

19

some questions. I'm going to require that your answers be under oath, so I'll ask my wonderful and talented deputy to

2021

administer the oath.

22

(Defendant sworn)

23

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Fowler, I want to make

24

sure that you understand that now that you've taken an oath to

25

tell the truth, if you were to deliberately lie in response to

24

25

any of my questions, you could face criminal prosecution for 1 2 perjury, obstruction of justice, or related offenses. Do you understand? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: OK. Make sure -- you don't need to stand Just bring that mic close to you. The acoustics aren't 6 7 great. 8 Do you understand? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: How old are you? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Sixty. 12 THE COURT: How far did you go in school? 13 THE DEFENDANT: I got a master's degree. 14 THE COURT: Are you currently under the care of a doctor? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 17 THE COURT: Are you currently taking any medication? 18 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 19 THE COURT: In the last 24 hours, have you had any 20 medication, pills, drugs, or alcoholic beverages? 21 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 22 THE COURT: Are you in any pain right now, physical 23 pain?

THE COURT: Is your mind clear as you sit here today?

No, sir.

THE DEFENDANT:

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: Are you under the care of a psychologist or psychiatrist for any reason currently? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 5 THE COURT: Defense counsel, have you discussed the matter of pleading quilty with your client? 6 7 MR. McGOVERN: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you feel that he understands the nature 8 of the rights he'd be waiving by pleading guilty? 9 10 MR. McGOVERN: Yes, he does. 11 THE COURT: Do you have any doubts about his 12 competence to proceed? 13 MR. McGOVERN: No, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. I will state for the record 15 for the record that Mr. Fowler appears alert. He's answered the questions appropriately. I find that he's competent to 16 17 proceed, and we will continue. 18 Mr. Fowler, you have a constitutional right to 19 continue to plead not quilty to Count Four of the superseding 20 indictment. Do you understand? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: If you persist in that right, you have the 23 right to a speedy and public trial by a jury. Do you 24 understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

1 THE COURT: At that trial you'd be presumed innocent. 2 You would not have to prove that you're innocent. Do you 3 understand? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: At that trial and at every stage of this 6 criminal litigation, you have the right to be represented by an 7 attorney. Do you understand? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: If you could not afford to hire an 10 attorney, the Court would give you an attorney for free. 11 you understand? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: Counsel, are you retained or appointed on 14 this matter? 15 MR. McGOVERN: We are retained, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: At trial you'd be presumed innocent. You 17 would not have to prove that you're innocent, and the burden of 18 proof would be on the government. The government would be 19 required to prove each and every element of the crime charged 20 to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: All right. Let's turn to those elements 23 for Count Four. Just to recap, Count Four charges operation of

from at least in or about February 2018, up to and in or about

an unlicensed money transmitting business. It charges that

24

October 2018, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, that Reginald Fowler and others, known and unknown, did knowingly conduct, control, manage, supervise, direct, and own all or part of an unlicensed money transmitting business affecting interstate and foreign commerce, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1960. Do you understand that charge, Mr. Fowler?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: For Count Four, the government would be required to prove the following elements beyond a reasonable That you knowingly conducted an unlicensed money transmitting business. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And that that unlicensed money transmitting business affected interstate and foreign commerce. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Again, the government would be required to prove that you conducted this business knowingly. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you plead quilty, you'll be giving up your right to challenge the venue of the prosecution. Do you understand?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

1 THE COURT: Counsel for the government, have I left 2 out any elements of the offense? 3 MR. SWETT: Your Honor, I would just note that the 4 money transmitting business registration requirements are contained in 31 U.S.C. Section 5330. So an unlicensed money 5 6 transmitting business is one that has not registered under that 7 provision. 8 THE COURT: OK. Did you hear that, Mr. Fowler? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: So, again, the government would have to 11 prove that this was, in fact, an unlicensed money transmitting 12 business. Do you understand? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: An unlicensed money transmitting business 15 means a money transmitting business which affects interstate or foreign commerce. You understand? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 18 THE COURT: And is operated without an appropriate 19 money transmitting license in a state where such operation is 20 punishable as a misdemeanor or a felony under state law, 21 whether or not you knew that the operation was required to be 22 licensed or that the operation was so punishable. Do you 23 understand? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

25

THE COURT: Or that the unlicensed money transmitting

business was a business which failed to comply with the money transmitting business registration requirements under Section 5330 of Title 31, United States Code, or regulations prescribed under such sections. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

2.2

THE COURT: Or that the business otherwise involved the transportation or transmission of funds that are known to you to have been derived from a criminal offense or are intended to be used to promote or support unlawful activity. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So the government would have to prove this was an unlicensed money transmitting business in one of those three ways. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: As counsel for the government just indicated in court, the government's theory in this case is that this business was an unlicensed money transmitting business in that the business failed to comply with the money transmitting business registration requirements under Section 5330 of Title 31, United States Code. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Any other elements of the offense for Count Four from the government?

1 MR. SWETT: No, your Honor. Thank you. 2 Are there any other elements of the THE COURT: offense that I left out under Count Four, counsel for the 3 4 defense? 5 MR. McGOVERN: No, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Fowler, the government would be 7 required to prove each and every one of those elements to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: The government would not be required to 11 prove venue beyond a reasonable doubt, but as I told you 12 before, if you plead quilty, you'll be giving up your right to 13 challenge the venue of the prosecution. Do you understand? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: Venue means that the government is required to normally bring the case in the judicial district 16 where the crime took place. If you plead guilty, you'll be 17 18 giving up your right to challenge the venue of this 19 prosecution. Do you understand? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: In order to attempt to prove these 22 elements beyond a reasonable doubt, the government would call 23 witnesses. Your lawyer could question those witnesses. 24 understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: In order to attempt to prove those 1 2 elements, the government would introduce evidence. Your lawyer would have a right to object to that evidence. Do you 3 4 understand? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: You'd have a right to call witnesses on 7 your own behalf at trial, and your lawyer would have the 8 subpoena power of the United States to make witnesses come to court for you. Do you understand? 9 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: You could testify in your own behalf at 12 trial, but at the same time, you could not be forced to testify 13 because you have a right, or privilege, against 14 self-incrimination. Do you understand? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 16 THE COURT: All right. I see you're coughing a little 17 bit. Would you like some water or cough drop or anything? THE DEFENDANT: I'm OK, sir. Thank you. Appreciate 18 19 it. 20 THE COURT: All right. The right or privilege against 21 self-incrimination means that you cannot be required to say 22 anything out of your own mouth that makes you appear guilty. 23 Do you understand?

THE COURT: So even if you are guilty, you're not

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

24

required to plead quilty. Do you understand? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 2 3 THE COURT: You could remain silent and force the 4 government to attempt to prove each and every element of the 5 crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 7 THE COURT: If the government could not prove each and every element of the crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt, 8 9 the jury would have an obligation to find you not quilty. Do 10 you understand? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: So, again, even if you are guilty, you're 13 not required to plead quilty. Do you understand? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: On the other hand, if you decide to plead quilty, I'll have to ask you what you did that makes you quilty 16 17 of the crime charged in Count Four of the superseding 18 indictment, and when you answer that question, you'll be saying 19 things out of your own mouth making you appear guilty, thereby 20 giving up your right, or privilege, against self-incrimination. 21 Do you understand? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: All right. Let's talk about the 24 sentencing process. If I accept your plea of quilty, you'll

meet with the probation department, and they'll prepare a

presentence report, or a probation report. That report will have information about you and the crime that you're alleged to have committed. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That report will also have the probation department's sentencing guideline calculation.

Have you and your attorney discussed the sentencing guidelines and how they might apply to your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The sentencing guidelines are advisory. What that means is, although I'm required to determine the guideline range that applies to your case, once I make that determination, I am not required to sentence you within that range. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I will determine the guideline range that applies to your case, and I will determine the sentence which may be inside or outside of that range. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Since I will be making that determination and I have not made that determination yet, as you sit here today, there is no promise as to what your guideline range will be, nor is there a promise as to what your sentence will be.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

1 THE COURT: If the guideline range that I determine is 2 different than what you were hoping for, that will not be a ground for you to take your plea back. Do you understand? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: If the sentence I impose is different than what you are hoping for, that will not be a ground for you to 6 7 take your plea back. Do you understand? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. Let's turn to your agreement 10 with the government. I believe you have that in front of you. 11 Is that your signature on the last page of that document? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: Before signing this, did you read it? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: Do you understand it? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: Does that agreement constitute the 20 entirety of your agreement with the government? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Counsel for the government and the 23 defense, is that correct? 24 MR. SWETT: Yes, your Honor. 25 MR. McGOVERN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's talk about the statutory penalties that apply, and then we'll go over some portions of the agreement. We're not going to go over the entire agreement.

Starting, first, with the statutory penalties, Count Four has a maximum term of imprisonment of five years. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: There's a maximum term of supervised release of three years. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Supervised release is like a term of probation you'd serve after a term of custody. You'd be subject to drug testing, visits to a probation officer's office, and other limitations on your freedom. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you were to violate the condition of supervised release, you could be sentenced to an additional term of custody and an additional term of supervised release without credit for time previously served in custody or on supervised release. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You'd be subject to the possibility of a fine which would be based on your ability to pay it. For Count

Four, the maximum fine is the greatest of \$250,000 or twice the 1 2 gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than you resulting from 3 4 the offense. Do you understand? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: There's also a \$100 special assessment 7 which is like a fine, except it is mandatory. I must impose that whether you can afford to pay it or not. Do you 8 9 understand? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: Count Four has a requirement that you pay 12 restitution. Do you understand? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: I want to make sure that you understand that if you are not a United States citizen, your guilty plea 15 and conviction make it very likely that you'd be removed from 16 17 or deported from the United States. Do you understand? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: Have you discussed that with your 20 attorney? 21 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 22 THE COURT: OK. Go ahead and discuss that briefly 23 with your attorney.

MR. McGOVERN: We're prepared to proceed, your Honor.

(Counsel conferred with defendant)

24

1 THE COURT: OK. Have you discussed that with your 2 attorney, Mr. Fowler? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 4 THE COURT: And defense counsel, have you discussed 5 that with your client? 6 MR. McGOVERN: We have, your Honor. Mr. Fowler is a 7 U.S. citizen, so I apologize. It never really came up. THE COURT: OK. I want to make sure that you 8 9 understand, though, Mr. Fowler, that if you are not a United 10 States citizen, your quilty plea and conviction make it very 11 likely that you'd be removed from the United States. Do you 12 understand? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: All right. You have a statutory right to 15 appeal. Do you understand? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: All right. Now turning more specifically 18 to the agreement, while you have a statutory right to appeal 19 under your agreement, you have agreed not to file a direct 20 appeal, nor bring a collateral challenge of any sentence at or 21 below a sentence of 60 months' imprisonment. Do you 22 understand? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 24 THE COURT: Under your agreement, you have agreed to 25

admit the forfeiture allegations with respect to Count Four of

1 the indictment. Do you understand? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: I have before me a consent preliminary 3 4 order of forfeiture which appears to have your signature on the 5 last page. Is this your signature on the last page of this 6 document? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: OK. Before signing it, did you read it? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: Do you understand it? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: By signing this document, are you consenting to a preliminary order of forfeiture? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: In the amount of \$371 million? 18 MR. McGOVERN: Your Honor, generally, that is the 19 agreement, that we're consenting to that forfeiture. You'll 20 see that there are numerous bank accounts cited. So Mr. Fowler 21 at this point is not in a position to accurately state how much 22 is in any one of those bank accounts. I think the government 23 has those balances and has done the math that brings us to the 24 371 million. So the agreement, by virtue of this forfeiture

order, is that we're going to forfeit all interest in those

bank accounts, and based on what we've learned from the government, the expectation is that they contain approximately \$371 million.

THE COURT: Anything from the government on this?

MR. SWETT: Your Honor, the forfeiture order includes
a money judgment of \$371 million that is to be satisfied, in
part, through the 50-some-odd accounts that are contained in
the preliminary order of forfeiture. But to be clear, the
difference between what's in those accounts and 371 million,
Mr. Fowler would still be on the hook for that as well.

THE COURT: OK. Do you understand that, Mr. Fowler?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I did not hear what he said.

THE COURT: OK. He basically said that -- and correct me if I'm wrong, counsel for the government -- that this forfeiture order, this preliminary order of forfeiture, by signing this you're agreeing to forfeit a sum of money equal to \$371 million. If the money in those bank accounts that's listed in this order, if that doesn't add up to \$371 million, you're still going to be on the hook for the balance. You're going to be on the hook for \$371 million regardless. Do you understand that?

MR. McGOVERN: If I may, your Honor. Our understanding of the agreement is that the sum total of what was in the accounts amounted to \$371 million. In other words, we were not advised that there was a specific, let's say, line

between some conduct and the number 371. It was our understanding that these accounts added up to \$371 million. If that was not the government's intention, that was not what was communicated to us. Perhaps the answer is to hammer out this in a more specific way, separately from the plea agreement, but I'd just like some clarification from the government on that issue.

THE COURT: It may be that what we're talking about is a distinction without a difference, but let me hear from the government.

What's the government's view on this? Let me just make sure I understand where we are, but let me hear from the government.

MR. SWETT: Your Honor, may I just have one moment, please?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Counsel confer)

MR. SWETT: Your Honor, we're not in a position to represent that these accounts have \$371 million, nor did we ever communicate that to defense counsel. I think the plea agreement and the forfeiture order are quite clear that the sum total is \$371 million, and whether or not those bank accounts contain that amount, he is required to consent to forfeiture up to that amount.

THE COURT: Hold on a second.

MR. SWETT: Your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. I will note that it appears to me that, again, under the agreement, he's admitting to the forfeiture allegation with respect to Count Four of the superseding indictment. The forfeiture allegations that I see — hold on a second.

It may not be necessary to work this out now, but it seems that, unless I'm looking at the wrong document, the forfeiture allegations that I see attached to the superseding indictment, first, do not have a specific amount in them, and they also seem to — in the first sentence of that seem to be talking about Counts One and Two of the indictment and not specifically naming Count Four, but perhaps this is something that can be ironed out later.

MR. SWETT: Your Honor, can I have a moment to confer with defense counsel?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Counsel confer)

MR. SWETT: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SWETT: If the Court may indulge us, I think 15 minutes to discuss this with defense counsel might be beneficial. There are things here that we need to work out, and we don't want to keep the Court waiting while we do that. If it's possible, could we have a 15-minute adjournment to

discuss this matter?

THE COURT: OK. That's fine. In addition, I just want to make sure that -- I want to clarify something not related to that.

Looking at the agreement and the accounts that we were just talking about, I notice there are a couple of accounts here at JPMorgan Chase Bank. My wife is an attorney up until recently worked at JPMorgan Chase Bank. We still own stock in JPMorgan Chase Bank. I want to make sure there's no conflict. My wife is also now employed at Bank of New York. I don't see them listed, but I just wanted to make counsel aware of that.

It seems to me that if this is just simply a matter of the accounts are at JPMorgan Chase, it seems to me there's no conflict. But if JPMorgan Chase is somehow a victim, then that may be a different thing, and perhaps a different judge should handle this. This may be the sort of thing where it still might be OK for me to take the plea, but then perhaps another judge should handle this on sentencing.

Does the government have any view on this at this point?

MR. SWETT: Your Honor, I will say as for the 1960 charge for which the defendant is pleading guilty, JPMorgan would not be a victim, so I don't think it's an issue, but I'm happy to hear defense counsel's view on this as well.

MR. McGOVERN: We have no objection to your Honor

continuing as the judge of this case. As you'll see once you 1 2 learn more about the case from the investigation, these banks all -- none of these banks lost any money as a result of the 3 4 money being there. In fact, they probably made money on it. 5 THE COURT: All right. I'll give counsel 15 minutes. Thank you, your Honor. 6 MR. SWETT: 7 Thank you. MR. McGOVERN: 8 (Recess) 9 THE COURT: OK. 10 MR. SWETT: Your Honor, we have some work to do on the 11 forfeiture piece of this. 12 THE COURT: OK. 13 MR. SWETT: We're not going to continue the plea 14 today. 15 OK. THE COURT: MR. SWETT: This case has been on for some months now. 16 17 We've been trying to work this out, and we may still work it 18 out. But given where we are and given that all the parties are 19 here, the government would request at this time that the Court 20 set a reasonable trial date for this so we have some sense of 21 certainty as to when this case will go forward to trial if we 22 can't work it out. 23 THE COURT: OK. Defense counsel?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

agree with the government's position. I will say, for the

MR. McGOVERN: We have really little choice but to

24

record, that we have made it clear that it's been Mr. Fowler's intention to plead guilty in the manner that we described today. For quite some time we really were dealing with more of the calculation issues and those types of issues. So we're still optimistic that the case will be resolved.

The issue with respect to the forfeiture that became an issue for us today stems from the fact that none of the parties seem to have an idea of how much money is at play here in the forfeiture order because these accounts that have all been frozen by one entity or another have an amount of money that nobody seems to know how much is in there. So our issue is how much actual exposure under the forfeiture order after the accounts are liquidated is Mr. Fowler looking at. That's kind of the heart of the issue.

So if the government wants to set a trial date as a point for us to work toward and hopefully resolve the matter in very short order, then that's the option that we're presented, and if we're going to proceed to trial, we may have to file some motions as well, but I think if the government wants a trial date at this point, then we'll certainly endeavor to dispose of the case before then.

THE COURT: How long would this trial take?

MR. SWETT: Two weeks, your Honor.

THE COURT: From defense counsel's perspective?

MR. McGOVERN: Probably two or three days.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. McGOVERN: Of a defense case.

Perhaps as an option, your Honor, we'd ask for another status maybe while we sort this out. Perhaps that's an option. I mean, as you saw, Mr. Fowler was fully intending to take a plea here just now. Perhaps it would be wiser for us to set a status in the near term, and then that way we can be in a more prepared position if we're going to set a trial schedule.

THE COURT: Government, what's your view on that?

MR. SWETT: Your Honor, we've set numerous status

conferences in this case. I don't see the harm in setting a

trial date. It doesn't need to be in a month or two months,

but it does give us an endpoint. And we agree that we're going

to try to work out a resolution here, and we're hopeful that it

will happen, but we don't want to come back in a month and be

in the same position when we can set a date today that will

focus everyone's minds on getting this wrapped up.

THE COURT: All right. How about April 27 as a trial date? Does that work for the government and the defense?

MR. SWETT: Yes, your Honor.

MR. McGOVERN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So we'll schedule this matter for trial.

Jury selection and trial on Monday, April 27. Any motions in

limine should be filed by April 14, that Tuesday. Any response should be filed by April 21.

And let's do this: Let's have jury selection and trial start on April 28. Let's have the final pretrial conference on Monday, April 27, at 12 noon. Let's have proposed jury instructions filed by April the 16th, and any voir dire requests also by Tuesday, April 16.

Hold on. I'm sorry. I've got the wrong. I misspoke.

April 14 for the jury instructions and April 14 for any voir dire requests.

OK. It might make sense -- well, first, let's do
this: It seems to me that it makes sense to exclude time under
the Speedy Trial Act between today's date and April the 28th
because the parties are engaged in active plea negotiations,
and defense counsel will need time to be better prepared for
trial. Anyone object to that?

MR. SWETT: No, your Honor.

MR. McGOVERN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I find it is in the interest of justice and in the interest of Mr. Fowler to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act from today's date until April 28. I further find that those interests outweigh the public's interest in a speedy trial, and I will enter an order to that effect.

Perhaps it may make sense to get a joint status report from the parties in a couple of weeks to see where we are, if the parties have resolved this forfeiture issue, but what's

counsel's thoughts on that?

MR. SWETT: That's fine, your Honor. Obviously, the moment we have an agreement, we will contact the Court to get this on the calendar for plea, but we're happy to put in a letter in two weeks if there's no -- if we haven't come to a resolution at that point.

THE COURT: Obviously, if you come to a resolution, you don't need to file that letter. We'll get it scheduled quickly.

MR. McGOVERN: Judge, I just wanted to put on the record, in the unlikely event this proceeds to trial, we may have some other suppression-type motions — there were search warrants that were conducted in this case — and we may file those, but we'll file those in the nearer term.

THE COURT: All right. Can we get a date two weeks from now, Tara.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: The 31st, January 31.

THE COURT: OK. Let's get a joint status report on January 31.

Anything else from the government?

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

THE COURT: Anything else from the defense?

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

THE COURT: OK. We're adjourned.

(Adjourned)