| 1   | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR<br>THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA      |
|-----|--|
| 2   | MACON DIVISION   |
| 3   | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  |
| 4   | )  |
| 5   | Plaintiff, )<br>Vs. ) Case No. 02-CR-27-1                                      |
| 6   | DWIGHT D. YORK, )  |
| 7   | a/k/a MALAKAI Z. YORK, ) June 30, 2003<br>a/k/a ISA MUHAMMAD, ) Macon, Georgia |
| 8   | a/k/a ISA ALIHAD MAHDI, )<br>a/k/a BABA, )                                     |
| 9   | ) 1:35 p.m. Defendant.   |
| - ! | Delenaunt ,  |
| 10  |  |
| 11  | HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE HUGH LAWSON                                       |
| 12  | United States District Judge presiding   |
| 13  | APPEARANCES:   |
| 14  | For the Government: MAX WOODS RICHARD MOULTRIE                                 |
| 15  | OFFICE OF U.S. ATTORNEY  |
| 16  | P. O. Box 1702<br>Macon, GA 31202  |
| 17  | For the Defendant: EDWARD T.M. GARLAND   |
| 18  | MANUBIR SINGH ARORA<br>Garland, Samuel & Loeb                                  |
| 19  | 3151 Maple Drive, NE<br>Atlanta, GA 30305                                      |
| 20  |  |
|     |  |
| 21  | W. CRAIG DELOACH   |
| 22  | Official U.S. Court Reporter Post Office Box 124                               |
| 23  | Macon, Georgia 31202<br>(478) 741-3005   |
| 24  | 1  |
| 25  | Computer-Assisted Transcription  |

## (IN OPEN COURT)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1 A

19

20

21

23

24

25

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Be seated, please.

We're here this afternoon in the matter of the United States against Dwight York. Mr. York is present, is he not?

MR. GARLAND: Yes, he is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. As all of you know -- well, before I go into that, let me say this, I want the record to reflect that sometime between 11:00 and 12:00 this morning. I received three men came to my office and asked to see me. them in my chamber, and they told me that they wished to present to me certain documents on behalf of the defendant. me that they wanted me to have Mr. York brought to my office so that they could make the presentation -- so that he could be present while they made the presentation. I told them that that could not be done and that I would not receive any presentation from them there, that whatever presentations would be made in the case would be made here in the courtroom and on the record. I told them that the hearing would be held at 1:30 and that they were welcome to attend the hearing, but I also told them that the fact that they could attend the hearing did not in and of itself mean that they would be allowed to speak or to address the Court in any way, and I suggested to them that if they had any information they wished to impart to the Court, they should either take that matter up with defense counsel or, if not by that route, then they should consult their own attorneys and

have counsel to speak for them here in this proceeding.

They gave me their names, and I regret that, with the passage of years, my memory has become so decrepit that I don't remember what the names were. It was -- it was a pleasant exchange, but I wanted the record to reflect that that exchange had taken place.

As you all know, on January 23rd, 2003, Mr. York entered a plea of guilty to a 2-count superceding information.

That plea was entered into based on a plea agreement between the government and the defendant.

As we all know, that plea agreement was subject to the approval of the Court based on various factors, including the receipt by the Court of the presentence report from the Probation Office. I have received the presentence report and have read and studied it carefully. The plea, as I -- I entered an order on June the 25th, which rejected the plea agreement in writing. I want to elaborate on that rejection at this time.

The plea agreement entered into between the government and the defendant is rejected for the following reasons. The stipulated sentence is not within the applicable guideline range. The stipulated sentence does not depart from the applicable guideline range for justifiable reasons found at 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(b).

Moreover, the Court has considered the charges contained in the indictment, the admissions made by the  defendant when he entered his plea of guilty on January the 23rd, the nature and the details of the offenses contained in the presentence report, the post-plea behavior and indications of true acceptance of responsibility of the defendant as shown by the presentence report, and the impact of the conduct of the defendant on the victims.

Based on these factors, the Court finds that the stipulated sentence does not adequately address the severity and admitted and alleged -- the severity of the admitted and alleged criminal conduct of the defendant.

So the presentence report -- I mean the plea agreement is rejected for those reasons.

Now, Mr. York, did you understand what the Court just said about the rejection of the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: With all due respect to your court and your government, I'm sovereign; I'm a Native American; I'm indigenous; I'm on record as 215/1993. We're recognized with the United Nations as a sovereign nation.

I'm supposed to be put into custody of my own tribe, the Yamassee Native Americans, Creek Cherokees, and held in their courts, which is the Morris Cherokee Court Council (phonetic).

Sir, these proceedings --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you -- I want to interrupt you a minute, if you will.

THE DEFENDANT: Uh-huh (affirmatively). 1 THE COURT: If you will, simply answer my questions, 2 3 and then I'll be glad to hear you. Did you understand what I said about the rejection of the plea agreement? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand what you said about 5 6 the rejection --7 All right. THE COURT: 8 THE DEFENDANT: -- but the rejection is within the 9 grounds of this court --THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 10 -- not my court. THE DEFENDANT: 11 THE COURT: Let me finish. Then I will hear you. 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: All right. Now, I want to advise you that 14 having rejected the plea agreement, as I've just said, that I am 15 not required or bound to follow that plea agreement, and I want 16 to at this time give you an opportunity, if you wish to do so, 17 to withdraw your plea of quilty. Can you tell me if you wish to 18 do that? 19 MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, before he answers --20 I'm not answering. THE DEFENDANT: Of course, 21 according to public venue, the Judge is the one who withdrew the 22 23 plea. Mr. Garland? THE COURT: 24 Isn't that what happened on May 29th of THE DEFENDANT: 25

```
this month -- last month? You said the Judge withdrew the plea
1
   in a private --
2
            THE COURT: Mr. York, your lawyer -- your lawyer is on
3
   his feet. Let me hear him, please.
4
                          May it please the Court, before Mr. York
            MR. GARLAND:
5
   is called upon for that decision, he has requested that there be
6
   placed in the record certain positions that he has. We would
7
   like the opportunity to place that position in the record. It's
8
   Mr. York's position -- we are his counsel, and we have been
9
   asked to place that position on the record.
10
             THE COURT: I'm not sure that I follow you, Mr.
11
12
   Garland.
            MR. GARLAND: All I'm asking is that his position --
13
             THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Is this a statement
14
   of position that you are going to make?
15
            MR. GARLAND:
16
             THE COURT: Mr. York wants to make it?
17
             MR. GARLAND: He wants it made. It is not a position
18
    that I am presenting and making a legal argument about.
19
             THE COURT: Well --
20
             MR. GARLAND: But I have a client who wants to put on
21
    the record his position on certain matters.
22
             THE COURT: I will hear Mr. York's position at
23
    reasonable length when we have concluded the formalities that
24
    the statute requires, and the first thing that is going to
25
```

entail is whether or not he wishes to withdraw his plea of 1 2 quilty. Now, you have a duty to the Court as well as your 3 client. You can help me with this or not as you see fit. So 4 let's go back to my question. 5 MR. GARLAND: Yes, sir. I intend to see that that ઇ 7 question is answered, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Then I want it answered now. 8 Let me repeat the question. 9 I want to know if Mr. York wishes to withdraw his plea 10 of guilty; yes or no. 11 MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, Mr. York --12 THE COURT: You told me that. I understand your 13 position. You need to understand mine. I want the question 14 15 answered now. MR. GARLAND: And I'm going to give you an answer, Your 16 17 Honor. THE COURT: All right, sir. 18 MR. GARLAND: But first, before I give that answer, it 19 will be -- it is the position of the defendant to request this Court to reconsider its position, this Court's position on the 21 22 plea agreement. It is not the desire of Mr. York to withdraw that plea 23 if the Court could be persuaded to accept the recommended plea. 24

So our position is, at first, before the question is answered,

that the decision by the Court not to accept the plea agreement is a position that we submit the Court should not take, and we ask the Court to reconsider that position on whether you would accept the plea agreement.

In support of that request for reconsideration, though this Court has passed an order and you have placed in the record today your reasoning, it is our position that the information obtained in the presentence report is not accurate.

We filed objections to the presentence report. There has been no determination judicially of the accuracy or inaccuracy of the contentions in the presentence report or the application of the guidelines in the presentence report.

Since the Court is basing his decision -- your decision upon a presentence report which by its nature has a process that has not been litigated in any respect, then the Court may well be basing your decision based on inaccuracies that you might find were there a litigated contested hearing on the application of the presentence report to Mr. York.

On that basis, I move the Court to reconsider your decision not to accept the proposed plea agreement that has been supported by the United States, to conduct a full hearing on the presentence report and the contentions and allegations in that, including the issue of the application of the guidelines and whether or not Mr. York has, pursuant to his conduct and actions, accepted responsibility, and every other contested

issue as set forth in our objections to the presentence report at this point. That would be my motion before Mr. York answers the question. THE COURT: All right. The Court's rejection of the plea agreement is based in part on the plea agreement -- I mean on the presentence report, not altogether. Your motion to reconsider is overruled. MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, in light of that motion and in light of our desire and the Court's ruling, I wish a moment now to confer with Mr. York before this question is answered. THE COURT: Very good. (COUNSEL AND DEFENDANT CONFERRING) MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, could I have a recess to confer with my client? 15 THE COURT: Would you like to take your client back to the jury room? 17 MR. GARLAND: Yes, I would, Your Honor. THE COURT: Can you all arrange that, Marshal? everyone else remain in place. (THE DEFENDANT AND HIS COUNSEL WITHDREW FROM THE COURTROOM) THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess for 1.5 I'd like for everyone to remain in their seats. minutes. 23 (WHEREUPON, THE COURT RECESSED FROM 1:45 P.M. UNTIL 2:15 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

25

P.M.)

THE COURT: Be seated please.

Mr. Garland, let me make this observation before you begin. I'm sure you see this, but perhaps the record is not clear.

The only decision that the Court is seeking today is a satisfaction of the requirement of the statute that the defendant exercise his option to withdraw or proceed with the quilty plea.

In either event, whether he proceeds with the plea that was entered in January or whether he proceeds to trial and is convicted and is then sentenced, the defendant will have a full opportunity to have a full evidentiary hearing on any timely objections to the presentence report that he may file. I don't want it to appear that that was not to be; and the law requires that, as you and I both know.

on the other hand, to grant the motion that you made before the recess, to allow you to inquire into and to attack the contents of the presentence report as submitted, would be in effect to allow the defense to prosecute not only the Probation Office but all of the witnesses and the victims of the defendant before the trial, or before he made a decision as to whether to go to trial; and that I will not permit. The law does not require that, and I won't do it.

I don't know of any requirement in the law really that I give you any reason for rejecting the plea agreement. The

statute makes no provision for that. But I want to record to be clear on that point.

Now, someone has suggested to me that perhaps the other motions in the case ought to be addressed before Mr. York is put upon to make the decision that we've been discussing, one of those motions being, of course, the motion for a competency examination; and I'm agreeable to that, if you wish.

MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, at this time, before Mr. York answers the question posed by the Court, whether he withdraws his plea or does not withdraw his plea, I would move the Court to deal with the motion on competency to assist counsel and to proceed under these proceedings.

I would ask the Court for an indulgence for a moment, if I may, before going into that motion, and allow a process to take place, if Your Honor would; and that is to allow me to place into the record Mr. York's position about these proceedings, simply make a statement of his position.

MR. GARLAND: I will make the position known that he requested me to make known to the Court.

THE COURT: Are you going to make it or is he?

THE COURT: How long is that going to take?

MR. GARLAND: That will take about, I would say, 90 seconds.

THE COURT: All right. Proceed.

MR. GARLAND: Secondly, them Mr. York would like to

briefly be heard from.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I will not hear Mr. York on that point.

MR. GARLAND: All right. Your Honor --

THE COURT: Now, as I said earlier -- listen to me -- I told him earlier that I would hear him reasonably when the business of the court with respect to these questions is concluded. I'm not going to deviate from that.

Go ahead.

MR. GARLAND: Before Mr. York is, called upon to make his decision as to the withdrawal of the plea, we wish to place on the record the caveat and objection to the proceedings of the Court, and that is that the defendant is a member of a sovereign nation under United States Resolution 215/1993, quote, (READING) The declaration -- the draft declarations of Rights of Indigenous People cited in E slash CN point 4 slash sub 2 slash 1994 slash 2 slash edition point 1, 1994, page 1, which states recognizing the urgent need to respect and promote the indigenous rights and characteristics of indigenous peoples, especially their rights to their lands, territories and resources which derive from their political, economic and social structures, and from their cultural, spiritual traditions, histories and philosophies, convinced they're controlled by indigenous peoples over developments affecting them and their lands, territories and resources, will enable them to maintain and strengthen their institutions, cultures and traditions, and

to promote their development in accordance with the aspirations and needs. Having placed that position of the defendant in the record of the court, my client wishes to know whether or not a document which he has furnished to me has been sent to or filed with the court. It is a document, if I may pass it up to the Court, if I could determine that on the record. THE COURT: I don't have the file before me. I don't know what's been filed and what has not. Let me ask you this -- just a minute; let me ask you this: Is this a document that that you are submitting as counsel? MR. GARLAND: No, Your Honor. I am just inquiring whether or not --14 THE COURT: Are you tendering this document? MR. GARLAND: I'm trying -- my client wishes to know whether this document has been filed in the record in his case. THE COURT: Well, you're a member of the bar of the Court --19 Yes, Your Honor. MR. GARLAND: 20 THE COURT: -- you have a license to practice law; you 21 know where the Clerk's Office is; you know where the files are 22 Why don't you make that investigation on your own time? kept. 23

Let's move forward.

MR. GARLAND: All right, Your Honor,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

24

```
My client requests to know whether the Court has seen a
   particular document which I --
            THE COURT: I'm not even going to address that right
   now, Mr. Garland.
            MR. GARLAND: I understand the Court's ruling.
            THE COURT: All right.
            MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, in light of that, at this
   time we would ask the Court to take up the issue of the
8
9
   competency hearing.
            THE COURT: Very good.
10
                          Mr. Arcra will make that presentation.
            MR. GARLAND:
11
            THE COURT: Mr. Arora?
12
            MR. ARORA: Judge, based on your initial statements
13
   that you're receptive to it, do you need argument or is that
14
   something that the Court is inclined to do based on its
15
   observation?
16
             THE COURT: I'll be glad to hear anything you wish to
17
    reasonably present.
18
                         Judge, we filed a brief with regards to the
19
             MR. ARORA:
    competency issue; about a week or so ago presented a copy --
20
             THE COURT: That is the earlier brief you filed?
21
             MR. ARORA: Yes, Your Honor.
22
                        All right.
             THE COURT:
23
             MR. ARORA: And it deals with regards to -- under
24
    Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 12.2(c), outlines all the
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

portions that I've listed in my brief.

Basically, there's an issue with regards to competency, but also the assistance of counsel, based on my client's positions, as far as not being subjected to the jurisdiction of this court, therefore not proceeding with these -- or going forward with these proceedings as far as assisting counsel if and when there is a trial in this matter.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I don't understand.

MR. ARORA: Your Honor, you've already heard with regard to what my client's position is.

THE COURT: To be honest with you, I did not understand it. I heard what Mr. Garland said, but I'm not sure that I understand it.

MR. ARORA: Basically, my client says that he is his own sovereign nation based on his membership with a tribal American Indian nation. He cited some of the provisions that they've filed with the United Nations' charters; and, therefore, his contention is not only is he a sovereign person, he's also a secured party under state law of Georgia.

Those are the pleadings that Mr. Garland was trying to show the Court. I don't know if they've been filed with this court or not.

And as such, his contention is that he should be transferred over to the Native American tribe that he's a member of where he can be tried for his alleged crimes there and not

here.

Since he feels that he is not subjected to the laws of the United States or this Court, he's not going forward as far as assisting counsel with regards to his preparation in this trial before this Court, because his position is that he's not subjected to the jurisdiction of this Court.

The positions that he's made are one of the reasons we've asked for the competency issue. We're also asking -- the second prong is he is completely unable or unwilling to assist counsel based on his positions.

Whether those make him competent to stand trial or not, I'm not clear, and that is why we're asking for the competency issue.

And those are the positions I put forward in my brief,
Your Honor, and I think --

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this, Mr. Arora: Are you telling me, as counsel for this man and as an officer of this Court, that you believe these positions you are presenting to the Court have legal merit?

MR. ARORA: Judge, based on what I've seen in my limited time reviewing these documents, I know the Court made us aware of some of these documents. A lot of them deal with UCC and common-law type issues that I'm not familiar with. I do not know if there's merit or not merit with these positions. The --

THE COURT: Mr. Arora --

1 MR. ARORA: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- you have a duty to this Court not to present frivolous or spurious matters in support of the position of your client -- I'm warning you you're going to be in serious trouble with the Court if you violate that rule.

I will hear anything that you want to argue to me about the law in this case, provided you tell me in good faith as a member of the bar of this court that you believe it has legal merit.

MR. ARORA: I don't believe at this point that there is legal merit, Judge.

THE COURT: All right, sir. I'm not interested in hearing you make an argument that you know is not with legal merit.

MR. ARORA: Judge, I'm not making that argument as part of --

THE COURT: Then what are you doing? You're on your feet arguing to the Court.

MR. ARORA: That's the underlying basis for the reason we requested a competency hearing, is based on his belief system, which isn't necessarily a legal issue. It's the factual basis that makes up my request to ask for a competency hearing, to see if he's able to stand trial competently at this point based on his views that he's trying to present forward to the Court. I'm not saying I agree with those or disagree with those

or arguing it legally. I'm saying that is what makes up the request for the competency. That is my foundation for the competency.

THE COURT: All right. Is that the only foundation?

MR. ARORA: That is the only foundation. The second prong, obviously, with the statute is based on his beliefs. He is not able to assist counsel. We can't have meaningful discussions as far as going forward on the charges that we have here.

THE COURT: Well, let's separate the two now.

Bear in mind that many cases are tried in which defendants are out of touch with their lawyers. I mean, whether or not he chooses to cooperate with counsel is a decision he's got to make. He can go forward without counsel if he wishes. He's got two excellent lawyers, as we all know, but nothing in the law requires him to cooperate with them.

MR. ARORA: I understand that, Judge. But the reason that it's two-pronged argument is the competency stems from his belief system, and that's why he's refusing to cooperate. It's not just "we don't like each other" or "we don't agree." He feels if he cooperates with us, he's violating his jurisdictional argument by complying to the jurisdiction of this Court by saying "I'm now working under this system that I disagree with."

THE COURT: Have you told him that you disagree with

his jurisdictional argument?

MR. ARORA: We've talked about it and had heated discussions, and I'm sure several of the marshals today could tell you that we were yelling and screaming, relatively speaking, or having a heated discussion. Here they can tell you that. The deputies from Jones County can tell you that. We've had issues with regards to phone calls where, you know, he won't to speak with us with regards to these issues.

I respect his position. I'm not arguing it legally, but that position make up the competency request, and it goes hand-in-hand with his participation.

THE COURT: What is it about his believing that that brings his competency into question? Is he the only person that believes that?

MR. ARORA: As far as sitting at this table, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I mean, is this -- is this a belief that is unique to him?

MR. ARORA: I'm not aware of who else is out there or any case law supporting this position at this point, Judge.

THE COURT: Well, I've seen a number of things that have come through the Clerk's Office that have to do with his membership in the tribe that's been mentioned. A lot of people apparently have signed these papers. Do they all believe that? Are they all incompetent?

MR. ARORA: Judge, I haven't interviewed those folks. But with regards to standing --THE COURT: I mean, what do you think? MR. ARORA: Judge, I understand what their belief system is, but just because you believe something that is so far from what our laws dictate, at least to my understanding, I don't know if that makes you competent or not competent. THE COURT: All right. Well, that's a matter for the Court to determine. MR. ARORA: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. What else? MR. ARORA: That's all. Those are the issues we raised forward. The citations are in the brief itself. THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Have you raised the question of this man's competency in the State Court 16 proceedings? MR. ARORA: No, Your Honor, because we didn't have a lot of these issues that came up. There were one or two occasions, and we discussed the secured party issue, but Mr. York was always cooperative, understood what was going on, and was interviewed. We talked about the facts of the case itself. The jurisdiction issue, at least with me, did not come up --THE COURT: Are you telling me that, in your place as counsel, you do not believe that your client understands what's 24

ļ

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

qoing on now?

MR. ARORA: I don't know if he does or not, Judge.

The fact that he believes what he's purported to the Court causes me concern before we go forward on such a serious case. It's just a matter of a few weeks. The statute allows, I believe, 30/up to 45 days to have it reviewed. I say, please, let's have that evaluation so there's no taint with regard to a trial if there is going to be one.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else you'd like to say?

MR. ARORA: No, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Moultrie, would you like to respond?

MR. MOULTRIE: Yes, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the government, out of an abundance of caution, does not object to the motion for psychological evaluation. However, I think it would be appropriate for the defense to address an earlier evaluation that was done at their behest with respect to Mr. York.

My understanding is that it was some sort of trial preparation evaluation that was conducted by a psychologist,

Nancy Aldridge in DeKalb County. And I can't really speak very intelligently about the extent of the evaluation, but the defense has assured me that the evaluation did not involve an address concerning Mr. York's competency. But I do think that it would be appropriate, Your Honor, for the defense to state on the record the extent of the evaluation that was done and what

it involved --

б

THE COURT: Mr. Arora?

MR. MOULTRIE: -- before the Court makes an order.

MR. ARORA: Judge, with regard to Dr. Aldridge, I defend a lot of child abuse type cases such as the ones here, and whenever a child makes an allegation of sexual abuse, there's usually an interview done by the DFACS protocol, which is the Department of the Family and Children Services. We have experts retained that review those, either videotapes or the interview summations, to see if there's any suggestibility or improper interview techniques being done.

Dr. Aldridge interviewed several children in this case, reviewed the files for us, and prior to trial agreed to meet with Dr. York to get a full background and understanding of what the life was like with regards to the area known as 404 Shady Dale Road. It was in no way, shape, or form supposed to be a competency request. We never filed a request for that, because I did not have a good faith basis at that point like I do now.

That was simply to prepare to contradict what the State psychiatric experts would say; in other words, their social workers, other counselors, as well as psychologists, that have been treating the children over the course of time since this case first began.

And that is what she does. She is licensed to do that. She was the Director for the Georgia Center of Children prior to

going into private practice, and she's an expert in that area, and that's why she met with him for about a day or two.

I think the presentence investigation, paragraph 298, states she met with him for six days, which is incorrect. I think she only met with him for two days or so, about a week and a-half before the trial was supposed to begin. Then the plea agreement worked out, and we cut off any further evaluations as far as that goes. And that was our understanding with regards to the evaluation.

> All right. Anything else, Mr. Moultrie? THE COURT: MR. MOULTRIE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. What other motions are pending?

MR. ARORA: Judge, at this point we filed a venue request, and this afternoon I filed the first suppression motion.

I'm of the understanding that there's going to be a superceding indictment. That same issue is addressed on the State Court case with regards to the search at 404 Shady Dale Road and the sufficiency of the warrant. I filed that today in anticipation of a superceding indictment coming up, and Mr. Moultrie is aware of that I believe.

THE COURT: Mr. Moultrie, are you going to seek a superceding indictment?

MR. MOULTRIE: Yes, Your Honor; only to add a forfeiture count, a count that is not substantive in terms of

23 24

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the substantive criminal counts. It will not involve any requirement of providing the defense with any additional discovery, any additional evidence. So I do not believe and am fairly certain that adding the superceding counts in the superceding indictment with respect to forfeiture will not involve any need to continue the case further on that basis.

MR. GARLAND: We don't join that. We haven't seen what our new indictment would be, Your Honor, or its substantive -- I couldn't address it, but except to say we fully intend to assert every right on behalf of this defendant that is available under the law.

MR. MOULTRIE: If I may, Your Honor.

The original indictment includes four substantive criminal counts. The superceding indictment will involve the same four substantive criminal counts. The only addition will be a Count 5 that is a forfeiture count. That's it.

THE COURT: To forfeit what?

MR. MOULTRIE: Perhaps the Putnam County property and the Athens, Georgia, property.

(PAUSE)

l

THE COURT: All right. Let's talk about the motion for change of venue.

MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, in light of the pretrial publicity that has occurred in this case, we feel that in order to ensure a fair and impartial jury, that the interests of

justice require a transfer to another location other than here in Macon. And at this point, we've been looking at what has been the impact, the publicity in other areas, and it is our feeling that perhaps Columbus would be a better jurisdiction.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. MOULTRIE: Your Honor, it certainly is true that there has been a great deal of pretrial publicity about this case, and specifically about Mr. York's entry of a plea of guilty both here in the Macon Division and also in the Northern Division, which was the alternative division for trial that Mr. Arora and Mr. Garland originally mentioned in their motion for a change of venue. I understand that the defense's position is that Columbus might provide a better venue for the trial; and, certainly, that might be true. There is also Thomasville, Albany, and Valdosta.

I would mention, Your Honor, that in terms of which of those locations would prove most appropriate, that Valdosta might be that location for these reasons. One is, the Court is already set up technically to try this type of case. Second, the Court has previously tried cases there and routinely tries cases in Valdosta. Third, the Marshal's Service operates an office at that location. And, four, the issues of security. Certainly, having the trial moved to Valdosta would alleviate those concerns. Finally, moving to Valdosta would not require that another District Court Judge be displaced, since there is

```
not a District Court Judge that sits in Valdosta permanently.
 1
             So, for all those reasons, the government would suggest
 2
 3
    that Valdosta might be a better location than Columbus. But,
    again, certainly, Your Honor, Columbus, Thomasville, Albany, and
    Valdosta don't appear to offer the same kinds of pretrial
 5
    publicity challenges that would be involved if the case were
    tried here in Macon.
 8
             THE COURT: So the government does not object to a
    change of venue?
 9
10
             MR. MOULTRIE: Not from this division, Your Honor; but
    we would object to moving it outside the district.
11
             THE COURT: Is a trial within the district satisfactory
12
    with the defendant?
13
             MR. GARLAND: Your Honor, it depends on what the
14
15
    publicity saturation has been in --
             THE COURT: Well, it's not going to be Athens; it's not
16
17
    going to be Macon. You suggested Columbus.
                           Yes, sir. We would agree with Columbus.
18
             MR. GARLAND:
             THE COURT: Valdosta or Thomasville or Albany?
19
20
             MR. GARLAND: I don't believe -- just a minute; let me
    determine the amount of our research on that.
21
22
        (PAUSE)
             MR. GARLAND: Would you hear from Mr. Arora on the
23
    statistics, Your Honor?
24
25
             THE COURT:
                         Surely.
```

MR. ARORA: Judge, we filed a brief on this matter back on the 24th, last week, and I believe I faxed a copy over to the Court. I dealt with the Middle District exclusively in that brief, going over the viewership of the T-V stations, the subscription rates of the newspapers within the Middle District.

б

The reason we've asked for Columbus, Judge, is based on it has the greatest populations between the Thomasville, the Albany, the Valdosta, and the Athens Division; Athens obviously having other issues as far as the defendant's publicity goes there. But under the law that I cited within my brief, Your Honor · and I know you've had a chance to read it, so I won't go into excruciating detail, but it deals a lot with percentages. The bottom line is "how much media affects how many people," and there's a certain ratio that those case law has gone over.

In the Macon Division, I addressed that case law specifically by going into the specific numbers. Columbus, the total division, with the different counties in Columbus, comes up to 265,348 based on the last census data we have. Obviously, once this trial -- if it gets moved, there's going to be a tremendous amount of publicity, but with all of the divisions within the Middle District, that's got the greatest population center. So if there is going to be an issue, I think it would be the least harmful in the Columbus Division versus Thomasville which only has 162,000 and some. Valdosta has 196,000 and some;

and Albany has about 20,000 less than what Columbus does. So found that Columbus would probably be the best jurisdiction. Since the prosecution didn't want to move it out of the district, in order to try to move this process along, I think Columbus would be the best choice.

Like we said in our brief, we'd prefer the Northern District based on the pure percentage ratio, which is what's mandated by the case law, as far as being the critical factor. So that's why we've come with Columbus, to try to have some consensus between the parties as far as that goes.

MR. MOULTRIE: Your Honor, my only confusion around moving the case to Columbus is that the defense's -- the crux of the defense's argument for a change of venue is the amount of prejudicial pretrial publicity. Columbus is within the Atlanta news market. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution has heavily reported the circumstances of Mr. York's case and his entry of a plea of guilty and, most recently, the change in the circumstances as it relates to his case. And for those reasons, I would question whether Columbus would be the most appropriate jurisdiction, given that Columbus is within the Atlanta news market. And I'm not sure if the defense has considered that issue, but I think it might be behoove the defense to do so.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. ARORA: Your Honor, may I be heard for one second?

THE COURT: Surely.

MR. ARORA: Judge, the reason we asked for Atlanta, it's a percentage issue. I understand that there's been a lot of publicity with the Atlanta Journal, but it's not front-page necessarily. It was about a year ago when the case first broke, but now it's back in the metro section in an occasional news blurb. My fear with these smaller divisions within the Middle District is when they have the small either weeklies or dailies, this is going to be the biggest news there is.

We went through this process when we moved jurisdiction out of Putnam County to another other county, and the first thing, the very next day, it was on the front page as big as day, is that this trial was coming there. So the idea is if something like that were to happen, it would be most diluted in the Columbus market versus some of these other smaller markets where people pretty much focus in on the dailies and the subscription rates.

I can go into the specific subscription rates if I could have a few more days with the Court, but I tried to put forward an intelligent basis based on populations and the newspaper coverage that's out there in most of those jurisdictions. Most of them have weeklies in the smaller counties, but some of the bigger counties within each division have a higher rate, and the percentage rates would be far greater in excess of what we would get in Atlanta or Columbus, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. What else? Nothing else on these motions?

MR. GARLAND: On these motions, nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else generally?

MR. GARLAND: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. York would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: I'll hear him briefly.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, with all due respects to your government, your nation, and your court, we the indigenous people of this land have our own rights, excepted sovereign, our own governments. We are a sovereign people, Yamassee, Native American Creeks, Seminole, Washitaw Mound Builders. And all I'm asking is that the Court recognize that I am an indigenous person. Your court does not have jurisdiction over me. I should be transferred to the Moors Cherokee Council Court in which I will get a trial by juries of my peers. I cannot get a fair trial, Your Honor, if I'm being tried by the settlers or the confederates. I have to be tried by Native Americans as a Native American. That's my inalienable rights, and it's on record.

Your Honor, one other question. I recognize that when you received this document from the State of Georgia with the Governor, Sonny Purdue, and Ms. Cathy Cox, I -- I recognize that any document -- you are one of the officers of the court that

received it. Did you receive this document, sir?

THE COURT: Just make your statement.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm just trying to find out whether you received this so I'll know -- so I can know how to answer you next.

THE COURT: I'm not going to answer questions. If you'd like to make a statement, go on.

THE DEFENDANT: I will assume for the record that you received this document. Well, this document clearly states that we are recognized by the government. We're recognized as indigenous people in Washington, DC, as well as in Geneva. We have an indigenous number, which is on record, which 215-1993, drafted in June 26, 1992, and went into motion. We do exist. We went to Washington, DC, sir, and we spoke to the people in Washington, DC, to verify our existence as a tribe.

I don't see why the Court or the government, this government that's opposing our government, does not acknowledge my inalienable rights to be tried as a Native American amongst my own people. This is -- it's been accepted by the government of the United States. It's on record. And we have -- you know, we have rights, and I don't understand why my rights are being -- why I'm being put under duress. I've been subject, since May 8th of last year to now, to be tortured, inhumane treatment, abused mentally and physically.

I understand the competence test is being set up, for

б

my opinion, to make me look like I'm incompetent or to make me look like I'm some kind of a kook because of my rights. It's not a belief -- this is not a -- this not a belief or a religion. This is something that our government -- your government recognizes and has recognized over the peace treaties between sovereign nations, Native Americans. We have governments, and we have -- respect each other's inalienable rights. I know that Mr. Garland knows it's real. I know that Mr. Moultrie knows it's real. I know -- I know all the officers of the court recognize Native Americans. I don't understand why in my case -- is it because I'm dark-skinned and don't have straight hair? Is it that I appear to be an African? But I have inalienable rights. I just happen to be a Native American. I'm a Yamassee. Do you understand, Your Honor?

And all I'm asking is that my rights be respected and I be transferred immediately, as it says on record, into the custody of Native Americans where I will be tried of a jury of own peers and there will get what I consider a fair trial.

There's no way I can get a fair trial now because a -- another oversight, while we're talking about jurisdiction and courts, is that computers exist today. Computers didn't exist when y'all made the law on jurisdiction or transfer of venues. Those laws are outdated. People now have computers, and they've heard this case all across the country. My cellmate is from Valdosta right now. You can check it. And he was telling me all about the

case, and you can verify to see if I'm lying. Just coincidently God works in his own ways; that you brought up a venue that T have a cellmate who's from Valdosta, and he knows all about the case. The Nuwaubians are all over the doggone country, and computers have made it possible -- if it wasn't for -- I think if it wasn't for our illustrious Sheriff Sills, he put it in the paper this week. Most people didn't even know this was going on until it was put in the paper about sovereignty.

Another correction, sir, I'd like to make, in all due respect, is when Mr. Arora tied in common law and made it frivolous. Like, common law is -- this is not common law. This has nothing to do with common law. This is Native American. This is on record. Common law -- I understand about all the paperwork and all that jargon that might have been passed on to the Court without me there, but this is not common law. This is -- there are Native American tribes existing. We are sovereign.

And the land which they propose to confiscate is by right sovereign land. And, thus, when -- when Sheriff Howard Sills, sir -- when he went there and snatched these children off the land with the assistance of Mr. Noel Lee Wilson, who by the way has recently been arrested for drug abuse, when he did this, he took children who were sovereign off of a reservation that is legally on record and documented since June 26, 1992. It's on record, and we have a number. And it behooves me why we're being ignored as if we don't exist.

It appears to me that y'all want to proceed on in your system with our lives. We are Native Americans. We have our own lives; we have our own rights; we have our own inalienable rights; we are indigenous people; and we're sovereign. be tried, sir, by a jury of my peers, among my people. there are people in court right now who are Yamassees who are qualified to stand up and speak for me. Can one of them come and talk? With all due respect, Your Honor, just give me the benefit -- this is, as you know, my life. My life is hanging, you know, on a string of y'all's decisions on me. And so it's only fair that I get a fair shot at, you know, expressing my own feelings before I'm determined crazy, the mad-man, and it goes on down the line. There's gentlemen in the court who are qualified to speak on behalf of me right now, if you could just indulge them for a little while, so we can proceed on. be granted that, sir?

1

2

3

4

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you understand what we're doing here today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. I vaguely understand what the process that's going on. I am -- I am -- I'm totally upset by the fact that I wasn't informed. I never got any documents, no lawyers visits.

THE COURT: What were you not informed about?

THE DEFENDANT: I wasn't even -- I wasn't informed about this case or when I was coming to court. I didn't know

```
about the May 29th case. I was not informed. Nobody came to
1
            I didn't get no documents. I happened to see it
2
   because another inmate who has access to the television, which I
                           I don't have access to television.
                                                                Τ
   don't have access to.
   don't get access to the telephone. I don't get access to walk
5
   outside and breathe fresh air. I'm locked in a room 24/7. You
6
   know what I'm saying? But on two occasions, I might add -- on
   two occasions while I was considered a special prisoner, an
8
   inmate was put in there. Both of them was convicted of murder,
   and they was allowed to live with me a short period of time.
10
   One of them -- one of them's name is Brian Moore (phonetic), and
11
   the other gentleman was in Putnam County. I'm quite sure Mr.
12
    Sills knows who I'm talking about, the tall gentleman who
13
   eventually was tried and found guilty in Covington for killing
14
                I was allowed to be in the cell with these people
15
   his family.
    when I'm not classified, according to even your peers, as a
16
    violent offender. But murderers were --
17
             THE COURT: Mr. York --
18
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I'm running on. I'm running
19
         Okay, sir. What I'm asking --
20
                        Let me ask you --
21
             THE COURT:
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
22
                        -- on June the 19th of this year --
23
             THE COURT:
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
24
             THE COURT: -- 10 or 12 days ago --
25
```

THE DEFENDANT: Uh-huh (affirmatively). 1 THE COURT: -- did Mr. Arora come to the jail to speak 2 with you? Do you remember? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 4 5 THE COURT: He did? Yes, he did. THE DEFENDANT: 6 THE COURT: Did he have with him Mr. --7 THE DEFENDANT: Joel Pagani (phonetic). 8 THE COURT: Pagani? 9 Yes, sir. THE DEFENDANT: 10 THE COURT: Did you speak with them on that day? 11 THE DEFENDANT: That day? Yes, I did. And I asked 12 them how come I was not informed or in the court physically when 13 they was going to have a discussion pertaining to the plea. 14 supposed to be there physically so I can defend myself. 15 I wasn't there physically. They had a meeting. I was told a 16 lawyer was hired on my behalf, I was told, to come out of 17 Florida, and he was rejected right into the courtroom. 18 can be verified. He was -- he was coming in to make a certain 19 statement, and they would not let him in so they can have a 20 covered meeting, of which I was supposed to be there, according 21 to the law, in person so I can defend myself. I know it says 22 you have the right in a plea hearing for me to stand up and 23

voice my opinion. Is that not right, sir?

THE COURT: Did you hire Mr. Garland and --

24

THE DEFENDANT: No, I didn't hired Mr. Garland.

THE COURT: -- Mr. Arora?

б

THE DEFENDANT: No, I didn't.

THE COURT: You did not?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I didn't. I would ask that Mr.

Garland show us a document, because if I hired him, he should have a -- a --

THE COURT: A contract.

THE DEFENDANT: -- a contract, sir. He should have a contract with me, whether verbal or signatured.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, he has --

THE DEFENDANT: He's representing me because he -- he

-- he met with my sister, sir. My sister and them, you know,

feared that I was not going to get just treatment as a Native

American so they -- so my nephew hired him. Right? And they

never drew a contract. They got paid an exuberant amount of

money. You follow? And as far as I was concerned, I repeatedly

stated over, "I'm sovereign; I'm a Native American; I'm not

under the jurisdiction of your court; I'm Yamassee and I'm not

supposed to be here; I'm supposed to be in my court being tried

by my people." Whatever their findings is, that's them; but

that's -- that's the law. That is the law of this country, of

this land under which we both live. We've accepted y'all into

our country as native indigenous people, and now we made

treaties, and we have -- we -- we respect these treaties. We're

supposed to keep these treaties. And I --THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this, if I may. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: You appear to have accepted Mr. Garland and Mr. Arora as your lawyers. They appeared with you back in January. And I remember I talked to you about your lawyers, did I not? And I asked you if they were your counsel --THE DEFENDANT: Uh-huh (affirmative). THE COURT: -- and my recollection is that you I asked you if you had had time to responded, yes, they were. 10 talk and confer with them, and I believe you told me that you 11 had. I asked you if they had done everything that you wanted 12 them to do as your counsel, and you responded in the 13 affirmative. I asked if you were satisfied with their services, 14 and I believed you said that you were. Are all those things 15 true? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: I was under duress, sir. I had been locked down in the federal penitentiary with a -- in a two-man 18 cell with four men. I'm almost 60. I'm sleeping on the floor; 19 rats, bugs --20 THE COURT: Are you telling me then that the plea that 21 you entered in January was an involuntary plea, that you did not 22 want to enter it? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Sir, I repeated to counsel, with all 24 due respect, that I was indigenous. They kept telling me, "Our 25

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

```
courts ain't going to recognize that, and your butt is in a
 l
 2
    sling, and you're looking at a thousand years, and if you don't
    think sor --
 3
             THE COURT: Listen, I've got the part about your being
 4
    indigenous. I understand your --
 5
             THE DEFENDANT: I'm glad. So you got --
 6
 7
             THE COURT: -- position on that.
             THE DEFENDANT: So you got this blue-back?
 8
             THE COURT: No, let me ask you this. I'm trying to
 9
    understand about your plea in January.
10
                             Right. I was under duress.
11
             THE DEFENDANT:
12
             THE COURT: Was that an involuntary -- did you want to
    with enter that plea?
13
             THE DEFENDANT: I was under duress.
14
15
             THE COURT: Well, does that mean that it was an invalid
    plea?
16
17
             THE DEFENDANT: No, it means that I was under duress.
18
    That means that after -- after going --
             THE COURT: Well, you made --
19
             THE DEFENDANT: -- after being tortured and given
20
    inhumane treatment and mental persuasion by officers of the
21
22
    court telling me that "If you don't do this, you're going get a
    thousand years," I don't think we could win this case, and then
23
    once I went before the court of Putnam County and I saw the
24
    circle of three and how they worked together -- the Judge, the
25
```

Sheriff, the D-A, and they was denying every one of our motions, 1 regardless of what it was; like today, another motion, just bang 2 -- they made it look like, sir, it was no way possible a human 3 being was going to get a fair trial in this court. They made it look like a racial issue to me. "Listen, you're basically a 5 black man and you're not going to get a fair trial in here." So we asked for a venue move, sir. And instead of them moving it 7 to a suitable environment, they moved it to, let's say, 20 miles 8 away. Anybody who goes to K-Mart and can't find a product in K-Mart, the next stop is to go to Covington, so everybody in 10 Covington already knew the case before I got there. So I was on ] ] the cross already, sir. The crucifixion was there. The nails 12 were going in. And all I was asking for is a fair trial; that's 13 I think I'm entitled to a fair trial but in my court. 14 THE COURT: I understand your position about that. 15 Now, you said that the plea that you entered in January 16 was under duress? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I felt I was under duress. 18 It was forced? THE COURT: 19 No, I was under duress. I don't want 20 THE DEFENDANT: to go any further because I don't want to add words. 21 THE COURT: I'll just have to figure out what that 22 23 means, but --Well, I'm quite sure you're --THE DEFENDANT: 24 My sense is that you didn't want to do it. THE COURT: 25

THE DEFENDANT: I'm quite sure you're much more educated than I am and know --THE COURT: I'm not sure about that at all. THE DEFENDANT: -- what "duress" means. I don't want The legal to go any further than what's the legal jargon. jargon is "under duress" --THE COURT: Okay. THE DEFENDANT: -- because as a sovereign, it does --9 it does state --THE COURT: How would you like to be relieved of the 10 burden of that plea? 11 THE DEFENDANT: I would like to be transferred into the 12 custody of Native Americans of my tribe where I can be tried by 13 a jury of my peers, as indigenous people who have our 14 inalienable rights and have been accepted by Geneva. 15 seat in Geneva and a seat in the United Nations, number that 16 number 215-1993, which was recognized and drafted on June 26th 17 -- I have to keep it on record -- June 26th of 1992. 18 there's officers in the court right now that's willing to stand 19 up and just give you a slight briefing. While I'm wasting the 20 time, they're much more eloquent than I --21 THE COURT: Have y'all paid your United Nations dues? 22 I beg your pardon? Yes, we do. THE DEFENDANT: 23 THE COURT: You do? 24 The United Nations We have a seat. THE DEFENDANT:

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

25

called us to come there -- when is the date? SPECTATOR: September. THE DEFENDANT: -- September, for us to appear -- I beg your pardon? SPECTATOR: September 19th. THE DEFENDANT: September 19th, we should be there in I am -- and I must add my name is Maku. the United Nations. THE COURT: Maku? THE DEFENDANT: That's my title. It's called Amico That's the Native American name for the Yamassee (phonetic). tribe of a chief, Chief Black Eagle. And I'd like to also add that Mrs. Baskins (phonetic), if I might add, while she was interrogating a witness, was a police officer, meaning a officer of the government, in the court in Putnam County. She asked him does he know me. He said, "Yes." She said, "How long?" said, "Since 1979." "Did you know him as Maku or Black Eagle?" He said, "Yes." Then he asked -- she asked him in reference to the land, of which he said he does not know. So he put on record, and Mrs. Baskins asked him, that I am a Native American. Plus, our officer/sheriff, Mr. Sills, with all due respect, he mentioned -- he calls himself a Yamassee Native American. Right?

THE COURT: All right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: It's on the record. It's in the case with Ronnie Jones versus -- all I need is the officers to stand

up for me, sir, someone who can come in and give me a couple of minutes. THE COURT: I can't accommodate you in that way. there anything you'd like to tell me that you've not already said? THE DEFENDANT: I understand what you're saying. THE COURT: All right. THE DEFENDANTS: I do hear you, sir. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may be seated. Thank you, sir. Thank you for letting THE DEFENDANT: me be heard. THE COURT: Are there any other issues that we need to resolve today? MR. GARLAND: Not at this time, Your Honor. THE COURT: If there is a trial, there will be a change of venue. I'll enter an order in due course on that. 16 My mind is unsettled on the motion for a competency examination, and when it is settled, I'll issue an order on We're going to proceed in any event as if we're going to 19 meet the August 4th trial date. So, Mr. Garland, you and Mr. 20 Arora need to keep your schedules somewhat flexible because you 21 may be required to -- we will probably hold pretrial hearings 22 here. And I think you mentioned a motion to suppress. If there 23 is a hearing needed in that, how long will it take to hear it? 24

MR. ARORA: Judge, I think it will just be one witness,

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

25

like we did on the State side. It would be a federal agent testifying with regards to --

THE COURT: So we can do that in a day or less?

MR. MOULTRIE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, we'll do that fairly quickly. I probably want to do it before then. We'll talk about that.

Mr. Moultrie, there's some question under the -- in my mind, under the present order, about what documents are actually supposed to remain under seal in this file. I want you and your office to examine the file and make an appropriate presentation to me, because it's obvious that some do not need to be sealed and should be made available for public consumption. So I wish you all would do that immediately.

Mr. York?

б

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: There are two more things that I'm required to tell you, and I want to do that before we leave here today. One of them I touched on briefly, but I don't think I was able to complete this advice to you before we became embroiled in the other issues. You are advised that the Court is not required to follow the plea agreement which you made with the government and which was the basis of your plea of guilty back in January. The Court is not required to follow that. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand what you're saying, sir.

THE COURT: And you have the right to withdraw your

plea of guilty. Now, Mr. Garland, on your behalf, has said that he does not want you to do that today; and that's all right; but at some point in the near future you're going to have to decide whether or not you're going to withdraw this plea of guilty.

б

If you withdraw the plea of guilty and if further negotiations with the government do not produce a satisfactory resolution to the case, then we're going to proceed to a jury trial, and it looks like now that's going to begin on August the 4th, somewhere in the Middle District of Georgia. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that.

THE COURT: If you do not -- if you do not withdraw your plea of guilty, then the Court will proceed to sentence; and I'm telling you that in that event, if you don't withdraw your plea of guilty and if you proceed to sentence under the present plea which you entered in January, the case may result in a disposition which is less favorable to you than that which was contemplated by the plea agreement which you originally entered into; that is to say, if you are sentenced -- if you don't withdraw the plea agreement and you go to sentence, you will probably end up being sentenced to serve more time than the 15 years you originally agreed to. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. It is confusing to me, if I may add.

THE COURT: All right. Let me say it again.

You've heard me say that you have the right to withdraw
the plea of guilty that you entered in January. Do you
understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. If you do not withdraw it, then you will be sentenced under that guilty plea. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. The plea agreement which accompanied the guilty plea back in January stipulated that the sentence that you would receive would be 15 years, 180 months.

Do you recall that?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. That is the part that the Court rejects. And it's fair to assume, although a decision will not be made until that time -- you've heard all that Mr. Garland has said about objections to the presentence report, and all of those things have to be resolved -- but it's possible that if you are sentenced under this plea agreement that you entered, under the guilty plea that you entered in January, that you will receive a sentence more severe than 180 months or 15 years. It is possible. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not trying to be difficult.

THE COURT: Nor am I.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm saying -- I'm saying I'm not trying

```
What it sounds like you're saying, I took a plea for 15,
1
   that I'd better take off, and if I do take it off, then I'll go
   to trial where I can get more time, and if I don't take it off,
3
   then y'all will proceed with trial where I'll get more time.
   That's what it sounds like to me. I mean, that's why -- my mind
   must be joggled. But is that -- is that what it's saying?
6
            THE COURT: I'm saying that if you go to trial, you
7
   could get more time than 15 years.
8
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
9
                        If you go to trial, you could also be found
             THE COURT:
10
   not quilty and get nothing.
11
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
12
                         Those are the two possibilities.
             THE COURT:
13
             THE DEFENDANT: And withdrawing the plea --
14
                        And if you do not withdraw your plea --
             THE COURT:
15
    that is, if you proceed, leave your plea of guilty intact and
16
    then are sentenced -- there is the possibility that you could
17
    receive more time than 15 years.
18
             THE DEFENDANT: So in both cases I receive more time?
19
             THE COURT: No, you're making it a certainty.
20
    telling you it's a possibility.
21
             THE DEFENDANT: Oh, I see what you're saying.
22
    exactly what you're saying. Uh-huh (affirmative).
23
             THE COURT: Now, do you understand?
24
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, sir. Uh-huh (affirmative).
25
```

All right. Is there anything else? THE COURT: Your Honor, with regards to the venue MR. ARORA: motion, could we keep that portion under seal as we've discussed? Now, that's all we can do today. THE COURT: Yes. This matter is concluded. (THEREUPON, THIS CASE ADJOURNED AT 3:10 P.M.) \*\*\*\*\* CERTIFICATE I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken in the above-captioned matter. W. Craig DeLoach Official U. S. Court Reporter