1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN JOSE DIVISION
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR-01-20127-JF
5	Plaintiff,)) San Jose, California
6	vs.) May 2, 2002
7	ROGER VER,
8	Defendants.)
9	/
10	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEREMY FOGEL
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12	APPEARANCES:
13	
14	For the United States United States of America: Attorney's Office
15	By: SCOTT H. FREWING, AUSA 150 Almaden Avenue
16	Suite 900 San Jose, California 95113
17	For the Defendant Arguedas, Cassman & Headley,
18	Ver: LLP By: CRISTINA C. ARGUEDAS
19	803 Hearst Avenue Berkeley, California 94710
20	
21	
22	Court Reporter: PETER TORREANO, CSR License Number C-7623
23	
24	
25	

1 San Jose, California May 2, 2002 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 THE COURT: At this time the Court will take up the matter of United States versus Roger Ver. 4 5 And could I have counsels' appearances for the record, please. 6 7 MR. FREWING: Scott Frewing for the United 8 States. Good morning, Your Honor. 9 MS. ARGUEDAS: And Chris Arguedas for Roger Ver this morning and Roger is present. 10 11 THE COURT: Good morning. The Court has read 12 and considered the following documents -- I'm sorry. 13 Ms. Santos, did you want to state your 14 appearance. MS. SANTOS: Laurie Santos, US Probation. Good 15 16 morning, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Good morning. 18 The Court has read and considered the probation 19 report prepared by Ms. Santos and dated April 23rd, 20 2002. The Court has read and considered the 21 Government's sentencing memorandum filed May 1, 2002 and the Court has read and considered the evaluation of 22 23 Dr. James Missett dated April 16th, 2002. And the Court 24 has also received a letter dated October 30th, 2001 by

Kym, K-Y-M, Barnings, B-A-R-N-I-N-G-S, a close friend of

25

the Defendant.

I did want to clarify one thing before hearing from counsel and from Mr. Ver and that is that Ms. Santos pointed out to me this morning that there is an error in the sentencing recommendation, that if the Court were to adopt a total offense level 11, which is the agreed-upon offense level in the 11(e)(1)(C) plea agreement, and criminal history category 3, which is the criminal history category calculated by Probation, then the appropriate guideline is twelve to eighteen months rather than ten to sixteen.

The Court could arrive at a ten- to sixteen-month range by determining that the criminal history is overrepresented and I'm open to that. I'd like to hear comment on that.

The Government is recommending a ten-month sentence. So I've taken that into account, but I'd like to hear from counsel and from Mr. Ver.

So Counsel?

MS. ARGUEDAS: I believe, Your Honor, that we are all in agreement that that's the way it should be arrived at and we also are asking for a ten-month sentence. I don't know whether we need to explicitly request this or if it automatically happens, but in the ten-month sentence we're asking that it be served five

months in custody and five months in the halfway house, which is permissible under zone C.

THE COURT: Permissible but not required.

MS. ARGUEDAS: Right.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. ARGUEDAS: If I need to say more about that?

THE COURT: I would like your thinking about that particularly since Dr. Missett and Ms. Santos seem to have a different view.

MS. ARGUEDAS: Primarily, Your Honor, my reasoning is that the events that underlie this offense happened now a couple of years ago and he's been on pretrial -- you know, bail and been extremely well behaved and he has been doing something very productive which is starting a business that has to do with buying and selling computer memory I think, something to do with computers. And he's it. He is the business.

He may be able to find somebody who can let it not die if he was gone for five months, but it's because of his knowledge people call up on the phone and say they want a certain something and he knows the part number in his head and he has a website about it and that's why he's able to make it successful.

So whoever he gets to try and take it over is only going to be able to keep it on life support for

five months and then I don't think he would be able to do it for ten months. So he's going to be on supervised release, which I think is a good thing, and the question is do we want to extinguish his business, and I would say the answer should be no.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Frewing?

MR. FREWING: Yes, Your Honor.

I must say I had noted the change in the -pardon me, the -- I guess the error in the calculation
of the actual sentencing range previously and I had
brought it to everyone's attention and then failed to
sort of recall that when I wrote my very brief
sentencing memo yesterday.

I think a ten-month sentence in this case is just. I think the departure for the criminal history overrepresentation isn't objectionable given that all the other offenses are essentially traffic offenses.

I do have some concern about the Court then in addition deciding to depart -- or to split the sentence following a departure. It seems to me that is a pretty big departure in total from the actual sentence that the Guidelines calculate.

Mr. Ver's conduct was serious. I think one factor that the Court can take into consideration or at least should consider is there were some pipe bombs

involved in this case as well that were not charged and are not incorporated in the conduct that's before the Court except arguably as relevant conduct.

The split sentence is -- would result only in five months incarceration for what I think is a fairly serious offense. It's my recommendation to do the ten-month sentence in prison in total.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Santos?

MS. SANTOS: Probation does stand by the recommendation presented here to the Court today, Your Honor.

After talking with Dr. Missett he did basically indicate that the behavior that occurred a couple of years ago wasn't just juvenile behavior. It was not just immature actions; that apparently Mr. Ver still has some of these negativistic attitudes and Dr. Missett did say that incarceration would be most appropriate as far as a sentence was concerned.

So Probation does stand by that recommendation.

THE COURT: Mr. Ver, you have an opportunity to address the Court. Is there anything you would like to say this morning?

THE DEFENDANT: I think my attorney summed it up very well.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Well, I've given this case a lot of thought.

I'm very troubled by it. And when I say that I'm troubled by it I'm troubled by it in several ways. Not only am I troubled by the underlying conduct, which is quite serious, but I don't want to overreact either and I think that's what makes it hard.

I think if you have a case which strikes you as being particularly severe, in a way that's kind of an easy thing to just say all right, we'll throw the book at the defendant and that will satisfy that impulse.

But I don't think judges ought to sentence anybody impulsively. You have to look at the offense and you have to look at the person who committed it.

There are elements in the probation report and in Dr. Missett's report which concern me a great deal.

One has to be very careful. Mr. Ver, you're a young man and you've led a law-abiding life for the last two years and you've by all accounts performed well on pretrial release. I did note in your letter that you accepted that your conduct was illegal, and I appreciate that.

I also don't in any way want to confuse your political beliefs, which you are absolutely entitled to have, with your criminal conduct. There's a long and honorable tradition of libertarian politics in our

country and I don't mean to in any way hold that against you. It's something that you're entitled to have.

The problem, though, is that the law is a representation of authority in a certain way. People can disagree and they can disagree very vigorously and very reasonably about what ought to be legal and what ought not to be legal and how much the Government ought to do or ought not to do.

But there is a point at which we start talking about public safety and I think even the most die hard libertarian would agree that one function of government, if there is to be a government, is to protect public safety. So then it's just a question of how you do it, how you do it in a way that's least invasive of individual liberties.

Selling explosives over the Internet doesn't cut it in any society that I can imagine and I think it's -- the conduct here is simply not tolerable conduct and it's not -- I don't think one has to be a big government person or believe in government regulation of every aspect of human life to suggest that people should not be selling explosives over the Internet.

The other thing that concerns me is that in looking at your social history it seems to me you've got some reasons for not trusting authority, and that's

okay. I mean, those are feelings that are a product of your life experience. Nonetheless, those feelings don't give you the right to be above the same social constraints that bind all of us.

And I'm not saying this as well as I'd like to, but I think there's a difference between saying I believe that the government which governs best governs least and saying that I'm above the law totally, that I'm so smart, I'm so able, I'm so perceptive that I don't have to follow the rules that apply to other human beings.

There's a difference between those two positions. And while one of them is a very respectable position that I think any judge ought to uphold and support rather than punish, the other I think is why we have courts. It's when a person believes that he or she is so important and so intelligent and so much better than everybody else that they don't have to follow even the most basic rules that keep us together in this society.

I hope and I actually suspect that you've grown up a bit since you did these things. I don't know if you have any desire to pursue therapy, to deal with your issues about your father and about your family of origin. That's your choice, but I think a lot of the --

a lot of the edge in the things you did when these offenses were committed I think may be traced to that, and that is not in any way meant to devalue the political beliefs that you have.

Again, I think one can have sincere political beliefs and also have some personal issues that cause a person to do irrational things. Those things are not inconsistent and, frankly, I think that's what happened here.

I think that these offenses are very serious. They could have been a lot more serious. The bombs could have gone off or people could have used them in destructive ways. Selling bombs to juveniles is never okay.

I'd like to say that the five and five sentence that your attorney proposed is something that I'm comfortable with, but I just can't. And it's not a desire to be overly punitive or to send you a message. It's simply saying that this conduct -- when the law punishes behavior, criminal law is directed at conduct.

This conduct to me would have warranted a much stiffer sentence than ten months. There's a plea agreement. I'm bound by it. I'm not going to upset it. It was arrived at in good faith by the Government and by the defense and I will respect it, but I'm not going to

dilute it.

And I think part of growing up and part of accepting responsibility for what you did is recognizing that when you do something that's this dangerous and this anti-social that there is a significant consequence for it.

And I certainly don't mean to devalue the efforts you've made since then or the growth that you've experienced since then. I want to encourage it, but I think part of it is recognizing that this is a big deal. This case is not insubstantial and ten months actually I think in the scheme of things is something of a break and I think it's something of a recognition that you have grown up, that you have accepted some responsibility, that you don't have a prior criminal history.

But particularly post-9/11 you get cases like this coming in here the Government is seeking to put people away for a lot longer than ten months.

So, you know, I don't minimize the effects on your business and on your personal life or anything else, but I just can't in good conscious do less than that.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of this Court that the Defendant Roger Keith Ver is hereby committed to the custody of

the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of ten months.

Upon release from custody the Defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. Within 72 hours of release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons the Defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which the Defendant is released.

While on supervised release the Defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court and shall comply with the following special conditions: The Defendant shall participate in a mental health treatment program as directed by the probation officer.

The Defendant is to pay part or all of the cost of this treatment in an amount not to exceed \$60 per session as deemed appropriate by the probation officer. Payment shall never exceed the total cost of mental health counseling. The actual co-payment schedule shall be determined by the probation officer.

The Defendant shall submit his person, residence, office, vehicle or any property under his control to a search. Such a search shall be conducted by a United States Probation officer at a reasonable

time and in a reasonable manner based upon reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of release. Failure to submit to such a search may be grounds for revocation. The Defendant shall warn any residents that the premises may be subject to searches.

The Defendant shall refrain from accessing via a computer any material that relates to selling explosives over the Internet. The Defendant shall not own or possess any firearms, ammunition, destructive devices or other dangerous weapons. The Defendant shall pay a fine that is imposed by this judgment that remains unpaid as directed by the probation officer.

I do agree with Mr. Frewing that some fine is appropriate in this matter because there was profit from selling the explosives and Mr. Ver does appear to have the ability to pay a fine. I think in light of the overall disposition of the case that I'm inclined to impose the statutory minimum fine, which is \$2,000, and that will be the order of the Court.

It is further ordered that the Defendant shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$150 which shall be due immediately.

Mr. Ver, the plea agreement contained a waiver of your right to appeal. However, if you believe that

```
1
   you have a basis for an appeal, an appeal must be filed
2
   within ten days of today.
3
            And I have no problem with a self-surrender.
   Was there some discussion as to when that would be?
4
5
            MS. ARGUEDAS: Ninety days?
            MR. FREWING: No objection.
6
7
            THE COURT: Without objection. And again I
8
    think that's a credit to your good performance on
9
   pretrial release.
10
            MS. ARGUEDAS: Thank you.
11
            THE COURT: The Defendant is to report to the
12
   facility designated by the Bureau of Prisons on August
13
    2nd, 2002 at 9:00 a.m.
14
            MS. ARGUEDAS: And could you recommend Lompoc?
15
            THE COURT: I can recommend a minimum security
16
   facility in California. Beyond that -- every time I've
17
   tried to recommend a specific facility to the BOP I get
18
   a note from them saying I can't do that.
19
            MS. ARGUEDAS: Okay.
20
            THE COURT: But I can recommend a minimum
21
    security facility in California.
22
            MS. ARGUEDAS: All right.
23
            THE COURT: And there's only one of those that I
   know about. Okay?
24
25
            MS. ARGUEDAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

```
MR. FREWING: Thank you, Your Honor.
1
2
             MS. SANTOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
             (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)
3
4
5
                              ---000---
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	
4	
5	I, Peter Torreano, Official Court Reporter of
6	the United States District Court for the Northern
7	District of California, 280 South First Street, San
8	Jose, California, do hereby certify:
9	That the foregoing transcript is a full, true
10	and correct transcript of the proceedings had in United
11	States v. Ver, Case No. CR-01-20127-JF, dated May 2,
12	2002; that I reported the same in stenotype to the best
13	of my ability, and thereafter had the same transcribed
14	by computer-aided transcription as herein appears.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	/S/
20	PETER TORREANO, CSR
21	License Number C-7623
22	
23	
24	
25	