UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

Defendant.

In re:

BERNARD L. MADOFF,

Debtor.

IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

LEGACY CAPITAL LTD.,

Defendant.

No. 08-01789 (SMB)

SIPA Liquidation

(Substantively Consolidated)

Adv. Pro. No. 10-05286 (SMB)

DECLARATION OF OREN J. WARSHAVSKY IN SUPPORT OF TRUSTEE'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

45 Rockefeller Plaza New York, New York 10111 Telephone: (212) 589-4200 Facsimile: (212) 589-4201

Attorneys for Irving H. Picard, Trustee for the Substantively Consolidated SIPA Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC and the Estate of Bernard L. Madoff 10-05286-smb Doc 143 Filed 09/07/16 Entered 09/07/16 15:48:18 Main Document

Pg 2 of 2

I, Oren J. Warshavsky, declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, that the following is true:

1. I am an attorney at the firm of Baker & Hostetler LLP and counsel to Irving H.

Picard ("Trustee"), trustee for the liquidation of the business of Bernard L. Madoff Investment

Securities LLC under the Securities Investor Protection Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78aaa-lll, and the

substantively consolidated estate of Bernard L. Madoff.

2. I submit this Declaration in support of the Trustee's motion for judgment on the

pleadings.

3. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of the Plea Hearing

Transcript of Bernard L. Madoff, dated March 12, 2009.

4. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of the Plea Hearing

Transcript of Frank DiPascali, Jr., dated August 11, 2009.

5. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of the Plea Hearing

Transcript of David Kugel, dated November 21, 2011.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: September 7, 2016

New York, New York

s/ Oren J. Warshavsky Oren J. Warshavsky

2

Exhibit 1

	93CMMADP1
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKx
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	v. 09 CR 213 (DC)
5	BERNARD L. MADOFF,
6	Defendant.
7	x
8	New York, N.Y. March 12, 2009
9	10:00 a.m.
10	Before:
11	HON. DENNY CHIN,
12	District Judge
13	
14	APPEARANCES
15	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney for the
16	Southern District of New York MARC O. LITT
17	LISA BARONI Assistant United States Attorneys
18 19	DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP Attorneys for Defendant
20	BY: IRA LEE SORKIN DANIEL J. HORWITZ
21	NICOLE P. DE BELLO MAURO M. WOLFE
22	ALSO PRESENT: STEVEN GARFINKEL, FBI
23	KEITH KELLY, FBI JULIA SCHULTE HANISH, USDOJ, FBI
24	THEODORE V. CACIOPPI, FBI
25	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Case called)

MR. LITT: Marc Litt for the United States. With me at counsel table are Lisa Baroni, an Assistant U.S. Attorney, and four FBI agents: Steven Garfinkel, Keith Kelly, Julia Hanish, and Ted Cacioppi. Good morning, your Honor.

MR. SORKIN: Good morning, your Honor. On behalf of the defendant Bernard L. Madoff, the law firm of Dickstein Shapiro LLP. Mr. Madoff is sitting to my left. To my right is Daniel Horwitz of my firm. To Mr. Madoff's left is Mauro Wolfe from my firm, and to Mr. Wolfe's left is Nicole De Bello from my firm. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

Mr. Sorkin, your client is still prepared to plead guilty today as we discussed on Tuesday?

MR. SORKIN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, if you would stand, please, and the deputy clerk will administer the oath.

(Defendant sworn)

MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, before you begin the allocution, we have provided the government and the court reporter with a copy of the allocution that Mr. Madoff will read, and we have a copy if the Court wishes to see it as well.

> THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

MR. SORKIN: May I hand it up?

THE COURT: Yes.

25

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

This statement is intended to cover all 11 counts? MR. SORKIN: Yes, your Honor. After your Honor goes through, he will give a statement which we believe will cover all the elements. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, do you understand that you are now under oath and that if you answer my questions falsely, your untrue answers may later be used against you in another prosecution for perjury or making false statements? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Try to keep your voice up so that I can hear you, please. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. MR. SORKIN: Can we get some water, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes. MR. LITT: I would note that the defendant has not yet been arraigned on the information. THE COURT: All right. That's true. Technically, we did the first part of it. We never did the final part. Let me just ask the final question. Mr. Madoff, the other day you waived indictment and you consented to being charged by an information of the government, correct? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: And how do you now plead to the

information, guilty or not guilty?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.			
2	THE COURT: Before I accept the plea I will conduct			
3	the allocution.			
4	Would you state your full name for the record, please.			
5	THE DEFENDANT: Bernard L. Madoff.			
6	THE COURT: On Tuesday you told me your age and			
7	educational background. We talked a little bit about your			
8	medical condition. Has your medical condition changed since			
9	Tuesday?			
10	THE DEFENDANT: No, it has not.			
11	THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have you taken any			
12	drugs, medicine, or pills, or have you drunk any alcohol?			
13	THE DEFENDANT: No.			
14	THE COURT: Is your mind clear today?			
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.			
16	THE COURT: And are you feeling all right today under			
17	the circumstances?			
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.			
19	THE COURT: Do either counsel have any doubt as to Mr.			
20	Madoff's competence to plead at this time?			
21	MR. LITT: The government does not.			
22	MR. SORKIN: No, your Honor.			
23	THE COURT: Now, Mr. Madoff, as I understand it, you			
24	wish to plead guilty today to all 11 counts of the information,			
25	is that correct?			

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is correct.

THE COURT: Have you had a full opportunity to discuss your case with Mr. Sorkin and to discuss the consequences of pleading guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: You told me on Tuesday that you were satisfied with Mr. Sorkin and his representation of you. Are you still satisfied?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Madoff's responses to my questions and my observations of his demeanor, I find that he is fully competent to enter an informed plea at this time.

Now, Mr. Madoff, before I accept any plea from you I am going to ask you some additional questions that are intended to satisfy me that you wish to plead guilty because you are guilty and that you fully understand the consequences of your plea. If you do not understand any of my questions, please ask me or Mr. Sorkin to explain.

I am going to describe to you certain rights that you have under the Constitution and laws of the United States. You will be giving up these rights if you plead guilty, so please listen carefully.

Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you which are contained in the information. If

there were a trial, you would be presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove your guilt by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove that you were innocent if you were to go to trial.

If there were a trial, you would have the right to be represented by an attorney. And if you could not afford one, an attorney would be provided for you free of cost.

and hear all the witnesses against you and your attorney could cross-examine them. You would have a right to have your attorney object to the government's evidence and to offer evidence on your own behalf if you so desired, and you would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense.

If there were a trial, you would have the right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you to testify if you did not want to. Furthermore, no inference or suggestion of guilt could be drawn if you chose not to testify at trial.

Mr. Madoff, do you understand each and every one of these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by pleading guilty today you are giving up each and every one of these rights, you are waiving these rights, and you will have no trial?

1	THE DEFENDANT: I do.			
2	THE COURT: Do you understand that you have the right			
3	even now to refuse to plead guilty?			
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.			
5	THE COURT: You do not have to enter a plea of guilty			
6	if you do not want to, for any reason.			
7	Do you understand that?			
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.			
9	THE COURT: Now, did you receive a copy of the			
10	information?			
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.			
12	THE COURT: And as we discussed on Tuesday and as we			
13	discussed a moment ago, do you understand that you have waived			
14	your right to be charged by an indictment, which is issued by a			
15	grand jury, and you have consented to being charged by the			
16	information which is issued by the prosecutor?			
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.			
18	THE COURT: And did you waive that right voluntarily			
19	and knowingly?			
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.			
21	THE COURT: Now, I am going to review the counts with			
22	you. As we said, the information contains 11 counts.			
23	Count One charges securities fraud.			
24	Count Two charges investment adviser fraud.			
25	Count Three charges mail fraud.			

	!
1	Count Four charges wire fraud.
2	Count Five charges international money laundering to
3	promote fraud in the sale of securities.
4	Count Six charges international money laundering to
. 5	conceal the proceeds of fraud in the sale of securities.
6	Count Seven charges money laundering.
7	Count Eight charges making false statements.
8	Count Nine charges perjury.
9	Count Ten charges making a false filing with the
10	Securities and Exchange Commission.
11	And Count Eleven charges theft from an employee
12	benefit plan.
13	Do you understand that those are the charges against
14	you?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
16	THE COURT: I'll ask the government to advise the
17	defendant of the elements of the crimes.
18	MR. LITT: Yes, your Honor. With respect to Count
19	One, securities fraud
20	THE COURT: Hold on one second.
21	Mr. Madoff, you can be seated. Pour yourself some
22	water.
23	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
24	MR. LITT: With respect to Count One, securities
25	fraud, in order to prove the crime of securities fraud, the

government must establish each of the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, the defendant did any one or more of the following:

(1) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud or (2) made an untrue statement of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact which made what was said under the circumstances misleading; or (3) engaged in an act, practice, or course of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon a purchaser or seller.

Second, that the defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and with the intent to defraud;

And, third, that the defendant knowingly used or caused to be used any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or the use of the mails in furtherance of the fraudulent conduct.

With respect to investment adviser fraud, the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt all four of the following elements: First, that the defendant was an investment adviser; second, that the defendant either (A) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud clients and prospective clients; (B) engaged in a transaction, practice, or course of business which operated as a fraud or deceit upon those clients and prospective clients; or (C) engaged in an act, practice, and course of business that was fraudulent,

2.2

deceptive, and manipulative.

Third, that the defendant devised or participated in such alleged device, scheme, or artifice to defraud or engaged in such alleged transaction, practice, or course of business, knowingly, willfully, and with intent to defraud.

And, fourth, that the defendant employed such alleged device, scheme, or artifice to defraud or engaged in such alleged transaction, practice, or course of business by use of the mails or other instrumentality of interstate commerce.

In order to prove the crime of mail fraud, the government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt the following four elements:

First, that at or about the time alleged in the indictment there was a scheme or artifice to defraud in order to obtain property or money by false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises;

Second, that the false or fraudulent statements and representations concerned material facts;

Third, that the defendant knowingly and willfully devised or participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud;

And, fourth, that the United States Mails were used in furtherance of the scheme as specified in the information.

In order to prove the crime of wire fraud the

government must establish the following four essential elements:

First, that at or about the time alleged in the information there was a scheme or artifice to defraud in order to obtain property or money by false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises;

Second, that the false or fraudulent statements and representations concerned material facts;

Third, that the defendant knowingly and willfully devised or participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud

And, fourth, that interstate or foreign wire facilities were used in furtherance of the scheme to defraud as specified in the information.

In order to prove the crime of unlawful transportation of funds or monetary instruments with the intent to promote the carrying on of specified unlawful activity, in violation of Section 1956(a)(2)(A), the government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following elements:

First, that the defendant transported a monetary instrument or funds from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States, or to a place in the United States from or through a place outside the United States;

And, second, that the defendant did so with the intent to promote the carrying on of specified unlawful activity.

In order to prove the crime of unlawful transportation of funds or monetary instruments to conceal and disguise the proceeds of specified unlawful activity, the government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following:

First, that the defendant transported a monetary instrument or funds from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States, or to a place in the United States from or through a place outside the United States;

And, second, that the defendant did so with the knowledge that the monetary instrument or funds involved represent the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity;

And, third, that the defendant did so with knowledge that the transportation was designed in whole or in part to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, or control of the proceeds of securities fraud, mail fraud, wire fraud, and theft from an employee benefit plan.

In order to prove the crime of engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity in violation of Section 1957, the government must establish the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant engaged or attempted to engage in a monetary transaction in or affecting interstate

1 | commerce;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Second, that the monetary transaction involved criminally derived property of a value greater than \$10,000;

Third, that the property was derived from specified unlawful activity; in this case, from securities fraud, mail fraud, wire fraud, or theft from a pension benefit plan;

Fourth, that the defendant acted knowingly; that is, with knowledge that the transaction involved proceeds of a criminal offense;

And, fifth, that the transaction took place in the United States or that the defendant is a United States person.

In order to prove the crime of making false statements to the SEC, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1001, the government must establish the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant made a statement or representation;

Second, that the statement or representation was material;

Third, that the statement or representation was false, fictitious or fraudulent;

Fourth, that the false, fictitious or fraudulent statement was made knowingly or willfully;

And, fifth, that the statement or representation was made in a matter within the jurisdiction of the government of the United States.

To prove the crime of perjury the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following:

First, that the defendant took an oath to testify truly before the Securities and Exchange Commission, a body authorized by law to administer oaths;

Second, that the defendant made false statements as to matters about which the defendant testified under oath as set forth in the information:

Third, that the matters as to which it is charged that the defendant made false statements were material to the issues under inquiry by the Securities and Exchange Commission;

And, fourth, that such false statements were willfully made.

To prove the offense of making a false filing with the SEC the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following:

First, that the defendant was required to file an application, report, or document with the SEC under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the rules and regulations thereunder;

Second, that the application, report, or document filed with the SEC contained false or misleading statements;

Third, that the false or misleading statements were material;

And, fourth, that the defendant acted knowingly and

willfully.

To prove the offense of theft from an employee pension benefit plan the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following elements:

First, that the defendant abstracted or converted to his own use or the use of others the monies, funds, securities, premiums, credits, property, or other assets of an employee welfare benefit plan;

Second, that the funds abstracted or converted from -excuse me, that the fund abstracted or converted from was an
employee welfare benefit plan within the meaning of the
statute;

And, third, that the defendant acted knowingly and willfully.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Madoff, would you rise again, please.

Mr. Madoff, do you understand that if you were to go to trial the government would have to prove all of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now I am going to review with you the maximum possible penalties for the crimes in question.

Count One charging securities fraud carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$5 million, or twice the gross gain or twice the

gross loss, a mandatory special assessment of \$100, and a maximum term of supervised release of three years.

In fact, each count carries a mandatory special assessment of \$100, so I am not going to repeat that for each of the 11 counts.

Count Two charges investment adviser fraud. It carries a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$10,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, and a maximum term of supervised release of three years.

Count Three, the mail fraud count, charges a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, and a maximum term of supervised release of three years.

In fact, all 11 counts carry the same maximum term of supervised release of three years, so I won't repeat that either.

I'm up to Count Four, the wire fraud count. That carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss.

Count Five, the international money laundering count, the first of those counts, carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of

\$500,000, twice the value of the funds involved, or twice the gross gain to any person or twice the pecuniary loss to any person other than yourself.

Count Six, the second international money laundering count, carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$500,000, or twice the value of the funds involved or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Seven, a money laundering count, charges a maximum sentence of ten years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Eight, which charges making false statements, carries a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Nine charges perjury. It carries a maximum sentence of five years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Count Ten charges making a false filing with the SEC. It carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$5 million, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss.

Finally, Count Eleven, which charges theft from an

23

24

25

employee benefit plan, carries a maximum sentence of five 1 2 years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of the greatest of 3 \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the pecuniary loss. 4 Do you understand that those are the possible maximum 5 sentences? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 7 THE COURT: Now, taking all the counts together, do 8 you understand that the total maximum sentence of incarceration 9 that you face is 150 years' imprisonment? 10 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 11 THE COURT: In addition, do you understand that as 12 part of your sentence I can order restitution to any person or 13 entity injured as a result of your criminal conduct? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 MR. LITT: Your Honor, I would just note that 16 restitution is mandatory, not discretionary. 17 THE COURT: I will order restitution if it's 18 mandatory. 19 You understand that? 20 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 21 THE COURT: I mentioned supervised release. By that I 22 mean that you would be subject to monitoring when you were

THE COURT: I mentioned supervised release. By that I mean that you would be subject to monitoring when you were released from prison under terms and conditions that could lead to reimprisonment without a jury trial if you were to violate them. And if you were to violate the terms of your supervised

H 93CMMADP1

	J SCMMADEL			
1	release you could be sent back to prison for the entire term of			
2	your supervised release.			
3	Do you understand that?			
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.			
5	THE COURT: Are you a citizen of the United States?			
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.			
7	THE COURT: Do you understand that as a result of your			
8	guilty plea you may lose certain valuable civil rights, such as			
9	the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right			
10	to serve on a jury, and the right to possess any kind of			
11	firearm?			
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.			
13	THE COURT: Now, have you talked to Mr. Sorkin about			
14	the federal sentencing guidelines?			
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.			
16	THE COURT: Do you understand that the guidelines are			
17	now advisory only and that they are no longer mandatory?			
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.			
19	THE COURT: Nonetheless, before I can sentence you I			
20	still have to determine what your sentencing range is under the			
21	guidelines. I can't do that until after the probation			
22	department prepares a presentence report and you, your lawyer,			
23	and the government have had a chance to review the report and			

Do you understand that?

to make any objections.

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: And even after I decide what your 3 guideline range is, I still have the authority in appropriate 4 circumstances to impose a sentence that is above or below the quideline range. 5 6 Do you understand that? 7 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 8 THE COURT: Do you understand that parole has been 9 abolished in the federal system and, thus, you would not be 10 released from prison any earlier on parole? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Do you understand that if your attorneys 13 or anyone else has attempted to predict what your sentence will 14 be that the prediction could be wrong? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 16 THE COURT: And that is because no one, not your 17 attorney, not the government, can or should make any promises 18 to you as to what your sentence will be as your sentence cannot 19 be decided until after the presentence report is completed, I 20 have ruled on any objections, and I have decided whether there is any basis to go above or below the guideline range. 21 2.2 Do you understand that? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Finally, do you understand that even if

your sentence turns out to be different from what your attorney

|| 93CMMADP1

(- 	1	or anyone else has told you it might be, or even if your
	2	sentence turns out to be different from what you expect, you
	3	will still be bound to your guilty plea and you will not be
	4	allowed to withdraw your plea of guilty?
	5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
	6	THE COURT: Do you understand that by pleading guilty
	7	you may be giving up or waiving certain aspects of your right
	8	to appeal?
	9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
	10	THE COURT: The government provided your lawyers with
	11	a letter, dated March 10, 2009, which we call a Pimentel
	12	letter?
	13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
	14	THE COURT: Did you review that with your lawyers?
	15	THE DEFENDANT: I did.
	16	THE COURT: And that Pimentel letter explains that
	17	your guideline sentence is 150 years.
	18	Do you understand that?
	19	THE DEFENDANT: I do.
	20	THE COURT: That's the government's calculation.
	21	That's the government's position and you and your lawyers will
	22	have the opportunity to comment on that.
	23	Do you understand that?
<i>(</i> "	24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
	25	THE COURT: And do you understand also that this
	1	

22

23

24

25

1 calculation that's set forth in the government's letter is not 2 binding on the Court? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Has anyone offered you any inducements or 5 threatened you or forced you to plead guilty? 6 THE DEFENDANT: No. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Sorkin, do you know of any valid 8 defense that would prevail at trial, or do you know any reason 9 why your client should not be permitted to plead guilty? 10 THE DEFENDANT: I do not, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, tell me what you did. 12 MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, may I make one, 13 respectfully -- according to the Pimentel letter, we agree that 14 while the maximum statutory penalty in terms of imprisonment is 15 150 years, the guideline range -- and this can be found on page 16 6 of the Pimentel letter -- is life imprisonment. The criminal 17 history category I yields a sentencing range of life 18 imprisonment. 19 THE COURT: I understand. But the government goes on 20 further to take the position that when a count does not permit 21 life, then you look at the statutory maximum. That's the

life, then you look at the statutory maximum. That's the government's position.

MR. SORKIN: I just want to make sure Mr. Madoff understood that. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Technically, the guideline range is life, but none of the counts in question carries a sentence that can go up to life. The top is 20 years. According to the government, in that circumstance then the guideline range is the maximum and the government's position is that the guideline range is 150 years. Again, I don't know whether Mr. Sorkin agrees or disagrees, but we will deal with that before sentencing.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, would you tell me what you did, please.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, for many years up until my arrest on December 11, 2008, I operated a Ponzi scheme through the investment advisory side of my business, Bernard L. Madoff Securities LLC, which was located here in Manhattan, New York, at 885 Third Avenue. I am actually grateful for this opportunity to publicly speak about my crimes, for which I am so deeply sorry and ashamed. As I engaged in my fraud, I knew what I was doing wrong, indeed criminal. When I began the Ponzi scheme I believed it would end shortly and I would be able to extricate myself and my clients from the scheme. However, this proved difficult, and ultimately impossible, and as the years went by I realized that my arrest and this day

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

would inevitably come. I am painfully aware that I have deeply hurt many, many people, including the members of my family, my closest friends, business associates, and the thousands of clients who gave me their money. I cannot adequately express how sorry I am for what I have done. I am here today to accept responsibility for my crimes by pleading guilty and, with this plea allocution, explain the means by which I carried out and concealed my fraud.

The essence of my scheme was that I represented to clients and prospective clients who wished to open investment advisory and individual trading accounts with me that I would invest their money in shares of common stock, options, and other securities of large well-known corporations, and upon request, would return to them their profits and principal. Those representations were false for many years. Up until I was arrested on December 11, 2008, I never invested these funds in the securities, as I had promised. Instead, those funds were deposited in a bank account at Chase Manhattan Bank. When clients wished to receive the profits they believed they had earned with me or to redeem their principal, I used the money in the Chase Manhattan bank account that belonged to them or other clients to pay the requested funds. The victims of my scheme included individuals, charitable organizations, trusts, pension funds, and hedge funds. Among other means, I obtained their funds through interstate wire transfers they sent from

financial institutions located outside New York State to the bank account of my investment advisory business, located in Manhattan, New York, and through mailings delivered by the United States Postal Service and private interstate carriers to my firm here in Manhattan.

I want to emphasize today that while my investment advisory business, the vehicle of my wrongdoing, was part of my firm, Bernard L. Madoff Securities, the other businesses my firm engaged in, proprietary trading and market making, were legitimate, profitable, and successful in all respects. Those businesses were managed by my brother and two sons.

To the best of my recollection, my fraud began in the early 1990s. At that time, the country was in a recession and this posed a problem for investments in the securities markets. Nevertheless, I had received investment commitments from certain institutional clients and understood that those clients, like all professional investors, expected to see their investments out-perform the market. While I never promised a specific rate of return to my client, I felt compelled to satisfy my clients' expectations, at any cost. I therefore claimed that I employed an investment strategy I had developed, called the split strike conversion strategy, to falsely give the appearance to clients that I had achieved the results I believed they expected.

Through the split strike conversion strategy I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

promised to clients and prospective clients that client funds would be invested in a basket of common stocks within the Standard & Poors 100 index, a collection of the 100 largest publicly-traded companies in terms of their market capitalization. I promised that I would select a basket of stocks that would closely mimic the price movements of the Standard & Poors 100 index. I promised that I would opportunistically time those purchases and would be out of the market intermittently, investing client funds during these periods in United States Government-issued securities, such as United States Treasury bills. In addition, I promised that as part of the split strike conversion strategy, I would hedge the investments I made in the basket of common stocks by using client funds to buy and sell option contracts related to those stocks, thereby limiting potential client losses caused by unpredictable changes in stock prices. In fact, I never made those investments I promised clients, who believed they were invested with me in the split strike conversion strategy.

To conceal my fraud, I misrepresented to clients, employees, and others that I purchased securities for clients in overseas markets. Indeed, when the United States Securities and Exchange Commission asked me to testify as part of an investigation they were conducting about my investment advisory business, I knowingly gave false testimony under oath to the staff of the SEC on May 19, 2006 that I executed trades of

common stock on behalf of my investment advisory clients and that I purchased and sold the equities that were part of my investment strategy in European markets. In that session with the SEC, which took place here in Manhattan, New York, I also knowingly gave false testimony under oath that I had executed options contracts on behalf of my investment advisory clients and that my firm had custody of the assets managed on behalf of my investment advisory clients.

To further cover up the fact that I had not executed trades on behalf of my investment advisory clients, I knowingly caused false trading confirmations and client account statements that reflected the bogus transactions and positions to be created and sent to clients purportedly involved in the split strike conversion strategy, as well as other individual clients I defrauded who believed they had invested in securities through me. The clients receiving trade confirmations and account statements had no way of knowing by reviewing these documents that I had never engaged in transactions represented on the statements and confirmations. I knew those false statements and account statements would be and were sent to clients through the U.S. Mails from my office here in Manhattan.

Another way that I concealed my fraud was through the filing of false and misleading certified annual reports and financial statements -- excuse me. Another way that I

concealed my fraud was through the filing of false and misleading certified audit reports and financial statements with the SEC. I knew that these audit reports and financial statements were false and that they would also be sent to clients. These reports, which were prepared here in the Southern District of New York, among other things, falsely reflected my firm's liabilities as a result of my intentional failure to purchase securities on behalf of my advisory clients.

Similarly, when I recently caused my firm in 2006 to register as an investment adviser with the SEC, I subsequently filed with the SEC a document called the form ADV uniform application for investment adviser registration. On this form I intentionally and falsely certified under penalty of perjury that Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities had custody of my advisory clients' securities. That was not true, and I knew it when I completed and filed the form with the SEC, which I did from my office on the 17th floor of 885 Third Avenue, here in Manhattan.

In more recent years, I used yet another method to conceal my fraud. I wired money between the United States and the United Kingdom to make it appear as though there were actual securities transactions executed on behalf of my investment advisory clients. Specifically, I had money transferred from the U.S. bank account of my investment

advisory business to the London bank account of Madoff
Securities International Limited, a United Kingdom corporation
that was an affiliate of my business in New York. Madoff
Securities International Limited was principally engaged in
proprietary trading and was a legitimate, honestly run and
operated business. Nevertheless, to support my false statement
that I purchased and sold securities for my investment advisory
clients in European markets, I caused money from the bank
account of my fraudulent advisory business, located here in
Manhattan, to be wire transferred to the London bank account of
Madoff Securities International Limited.

There were also times in recent years when I had money, which had originated in the New York Chase Manhattan bank account of my investment advisory business, transferred from the London bank account of Madoff Securities International Limited to the Bank of New York operating bank account of my firm's legitimate proprietary and market making business. That Bank of New York account was located in New York. I did this as a way of ensuring that the expenses associated with the operation of the fraudulent investment advisory business would not be paid from the operations of the legitimate proprietary trading and market making businesses.

In connection with the purported trades, I caused the fraudulent investment advisory side of my business to charge the investment advisory clients four cents per share as a

commission. At times in the last few years, these commissions were transferred from Chase Manhattan bank account of the fraudulent investment advisory side of my firm to the account at Bank of New York, which was the operating account for the legitimate side of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, the proprietary trading and market making side of my firm. I did this to ensure that the expenses associated with the operation of my fraudulent investment advisory business would not be paid from the operations of the legitimate proprietary trading and market making business. It is my belief that the salaries and bonuses of the personnel involved in the operation of the legitimate side of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities were funded by the operations of the firm's successful proprietary trading and market making businesses.

Your Honor, I hope I have conveyed with some particularity in my own words the crimes I committed and the means by which I committed them. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Madoff.

Mr. Sorkin, I don't think there was mention of an employee benefit plan.

MR. SORKIN: The pension fund was mentioned, your Honor.

THE COURT: What page that?

MR. SORKIN: I think it's page 2. If you look at the top, the victim -- I'm quoting -- the victims of my scheme

24

25

following:

1 included individuals, charitable organizations, trusts, pension 2 funds, and hedge funds. 3 THE COURT: I see. And those pension funds include employee welfare 4 5 benefit plans? 6 MR. SORKIN: Yes, your Honor. 7 Is that correct? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Madoff, you can be seated for a 10 moment. 11 Does the government believe that Mr. Madoff's 12 admissions cover the elements of the crimes of each count? 13 MR. LITT: Yes, your Honor. The government does not 14 entirely agree with all of the defendant's description of his 15 conduct. However, the government does believe that his 16 allocution does cover each of the elements of the charged 17 offenses. 18 THE COURT: Would you summarize what the government's 19 evidence would be if the defendant were to go to trial? 20 MR. LITT: Yes. 21 Had this case proceeded to trial, the government would 22 have proven through testimony and evidence beyond a reasonable 23 doubt all of the facts set forth in the criminal information.

In summary, the government would have proven the

The defendant operated a massive Ponzi scheme

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

through his company, Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, beginning at least as early as the 1980s. Over the decades working from his New York City office and elsewhere, Madoff solicited and caused others to solicit prospective clients to open accounts with his company. His clients included individuals, charitable organizations, trusts, pension funds, and hedge funds, among others, and those clients were also his victims.

Madoff told those clients that he would invest their funds in publicly-traded securities, options, and treasury bills. In fact, over the life of his scheme Madoff did not buy stocks or options as he had promised. Instead, Madoff used client funds to pay other clients who sought to redeem their investments, and used so-called commission revenue generated by charging clients four cents per share for shares that he never, in fact, purchased to generate revenue for his firm. At times. his firm would have been unable to operate but for the cash generated from this Ponzi scheme. Madoff repeatedly lied to clients in person, on telephone calls, and through mailings, including account statements and confirmations of purchases and sales of securities that he mailed through the U.S. Postal Service.

Some investors sent checks to Madoff through the mails, others wired money to Madoff, and many of those wires came from outside New York State into the Southern District of

New York. Madoff also caused hundreds of millions of dollars of client funds to be wired overseas to accounts in London. Some of that money was sent back to his firm and used to pay its expenses. Other money was sent back and forth between New York and London to give the false impression that he was actually buying and selling securities in European markets when, in fact, he was not.

Madoff also used some of the money funneled through
London to support his lavish lifestyle. Madoff also used other
means of deception to hide his scheme. He lied when he told
clients that he was purchasing securities on their behalf.

He also lied to regulators, including the SEC. He filed false and fraudulent certified financial statements with the SEC that failed to disclose his fraud scheme, failed to disclose his liabilities to the victims of his Ponzi scheme, and contained false certifications that the audited statements had been prepared in accordance with generally-accepted auditing standards and principles.

Mr. Madoff lied in a form that he was required to file with the SEC as an investment adviser, claiming that his company had custody of client securities when, in fact, he had not purchased any securities for those clients.

He also lied at least seven separate times in an SEC deposition in 2006.

At the end, Madoff told his clients that he was

93CMMADP1 holding nearly \$65 billion in securities on behalf of those clients. In fact, he had only a small fraction of that amount. (Continued on next page)

1	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Madoff, please stand.	
2	When you did the things you told me you did in your	
3	statement, did you know that what you were doing was wrong and	
4	illegal?	
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.	
6	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count One of the	
7	information, guilty or not guilty?	
8	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.	
9	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Two of the	
10	information, guilty or not guilty?	
11	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.	
12	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Three,	
13	guilty or not guilty?	
14	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.	
15	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Four, guilty	
16	or not guilty?	
17	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.	
18	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Five, guilty	
19	or not guilty?	
20	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.	
21	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Six, guilty	
22	or not guilty?	
23	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.	
24	THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Seven,	
25	guilty or not guilty?	

1 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty. 2 THE COURT: How do you plead to Count Eight, guilty or 3 not quilty? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty. THE COURT: How do you plead to Count Nine, guilty or 5 6 not guilty? 7 Guilty. THE DEFENDANT: 8 THE COURT: How do you now plead to Count Ten, guilty 9 or not guilty? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty. 11 THE COURT: And finally, how do you now plead to Count 12 Eleven, guilty or not guilty? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Did you do the things that you are charged 15 with doing in all 11 counts of the information? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: And are you pleading quilty because you 18 are guilty? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 20 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of 21 your own free will? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 23 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Madoff, you may be seated. 24 Based on what I have heard, I am inclined to accept 25 Mr. Madoff's guilty plea.

As I stated the other day, the government received a number of e-mails from victims objecting to any plea bargain or any plea deal. As it is clear that there is no plea bargain or plea deal, there is no basis for these objections. At this time, nonetheless, if there is any victim who signed our sign-in sheet who wishes to be heard on the question of whether I should accept Mr. Madoff's guilty plea, you can have a chance to speak now. We have a list.

Mr. Nierenberg, do you want to speak?

MR. NIERENBERG: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Come to the microphone.

And remember that today is not the sentencing. Victims will have a chance to speak at sentencing. Go ahead.

MR. NIERENBERG: I am one of the many victims of Madoff's egregious crimes. I don't know whether you had a chance to turn around and look at the victims --

THE COURT: Mr. Nierenberg, Mr. Nierenberg --

MR. NIERENBERG: I just wanted to --

THE COURT: Remain at the podium, please.

MR. NIERENBERG: All right. I know that the operation -- Madoff's operation was massive, that he didn't commit these crimes alone, and I don't understand why conspiracy is not a part of one of his pleas. Just to produce the reams of documents that were received and the elaborate data that went into them must have required an army of people

" 93CGMADP2

25

	93CGMADP2	
1	to produce. And we all know that Madoff wasn't around a lot at	
2	his operation. There were other people that were there who	
3	handled it when he was gone. I	
4	THE COURT: I gather your point is that I should	
5	reject the plea because the government has not charged	
6	conspiracy?	
7	MR. NIERENBERG: No. The question is I'm not	
8	suggesting that you reject the plea. What I'm suggesting is	
9	that there's an additional crime that was committed that wasn't	
10	included in the plea that needs to be considered.	
11	THE COURT: All right. What I want to hear from now	
12	are victims who object to my accepting the plea.	
13	MR. NIERENBERG: Okay.	
14	THE COURT: Do you object to my accepting the plea?	
15	MR. NIERENBERG: No, I don't.	
16	THE COURT: Well, thank you, then. You can have your	
17	seat.	
18	MR. NIERENBERG: Okay.	
19	THE COURT: Mark Labianca? No.	
20	Brian Felsen? Mr. Felsen, do you want to be heard?	
21	MR. FELSEN: I would like to be heard, but I do not	
22	object to the plea.	
23	THE COURT: All right. If you want to be heard with	
24	respect to sentencing, we will make sure we have procedures to	

give victims an opportunity to be heard at sentencing.

II 93CGMADP2

	93CGMADP2	
1	MR. FELSEN: Okay.	
2	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.	
3	Bennett Goldwait? I can't quite read the handwriting.	
4	MR. GOLDWORTH: Goldworth. No thank you.	
5	THE COURT: Ronnie Sue and Dominic Ambrosino, do you	
6	wish to be heard?	
7	MS. AMBROSINO: Yes, I do.	
8	THE COURT: All right. Come forward, please. And say	
9	your name again when you get to the microphone.	
10	MS. AMBROSINO: My name is Ronnie Sue Ambrosino, and I	
11	would object to the plea I just need to find a spot. I have	
12	taken a lot of notes. Judge, I believe that you have the	
13	opportunity today to find out information as to where the money	
14	is and to find out who else may be involved in this crime. And	
15	if that plea is accepted without those two pieces of	
16	information, then I do object. If you can ascertain that you	
17	can get those two pieces of information, I would love to see	
18	this man, who admits that he lied under oath in May of 2006 and	
19	sat here and took an oath today I would like to see him	
20	guilty.	
21	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.	
22	MS. AMBROSINO: Thank you, sir.	
23	THE COURT: Maureen Aebel? Go ahead.	
24	MS. AEBEL: Judge Chin, I would like to present you	
25	with a different scenario that our country could witness if you	

reject Mr. Madoff's plea. If we go to trial, we will show our people in this struggling country and the world, who looks to us as the global moral leader, that we hold all people accountable. If we go to trial, we can show all our world that all crimes, all crimes, including crimes of greed, can be dissected, ruled upon, and punished. And we can demonstrate that we are a country that can learn from our mistakes, and we will be then able to reexamine and improve the mechanisms that exist for our protection that have failed so completely. If we go to trial, we have more of a chance to comprehend the global scope of this horrendous crime. At trial we can hear and bear witness to the pain that Mr. Madoff has inflicted on the young, the old, and the infirmed. No man, no matter who he knows or who he is able to influence, is above the law. Thank you, Judge Chin.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. That is it with respect to the victims who signed up on the acceptance of the plea. Does the government or the defense want to respond to anything? Does the government want to respond to anything?

MR. LITT: May I just have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LITT: I think the only thing the government would say is that the government's investigation continues. It is continuing. A lot of resources and effort are being expended, both to find assets and to find anyone else who may be

responsible for this fraud.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Sorkin?

MR. SORKIN: Nothing at this time, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: First of all, I appreciate the comments from the victims. With respect to Ms. Ambrosino's comments about where the money is, as the government has just said, it is continuing its investigation, and this guilty plea certainly does not preclude the government from proceeding.

With respect to Ms. Aebel's comment about how a trial would show the world that we hold all people accountable, I believe that these proceedings will do the same thing.

Mr. Madoff, please stand. I am accepting the plea.

Mr. Madoff, because you acknowledge that you are guilty as charged in Counts One through Eleven of the information, because you know your rights and are waiving them, because your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact for each of the elements of the 11 offenses, I accept your guilty plea and adjudge you guilty on Counts One through Eleven of the information. You can be seated.

Mr. Madoff, the probation department will prepare a presentence report to assist me in sentencing you. You will be interviewed by the probation department, and it is important that you give the probation officer truthful and accurate

information, for the report is important in my decision as to what your sentence will be. You and your attorney have a right and will have an opportunity to review the report, to challenge or comment upon it and to speak on your behalf before sentencing.

Sentencing is set for June 16th at 1:30 p.m.

Turning to bail, is the government requesting that I remand Mr. Madoff pending sentencing?

MR. LITT: Yes. The government moves for remand at this time pursuant to 18 USC 3143, which puts the burden on the defendant to show by clear and convincing evidence that he can be trusted to appear for future court appearances.

The defendant has now pled guilty and been found guilty of 11 -- or does the Court wish to hear argument now or -- $\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \, dx \, dx = 0$

THE COURT: Well, let me ask Mr. Sorkin whether he opposes remand.

MR. SORKIN: We do, your Honor, and I'd like to be heard on that point.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Sorkin.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you, your Honor. May I go to the podium, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, wherever you would like.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you. Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, let me take just a little bit of while, because I want

to review the history of the bail as it related to this case.

THE COURT: Yes. The government provided me with the transcripts and the letter briefs, and I've reviewed them too.

MR. SORKIN: I'm not going to go through every one of them, but I think it's important that I list the chronology and how we got to this point today.

THE COURT: That's fine. That's fine.

MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, this case started when Mr. Madoff on December 10th confessed his wrongdoing to his two sons, knowing full well that his two sons were going to turn him in. He didn't run. He didn't attempt to flee at that time. When he was arrested by the FBI the next morning, he confessed to the FBI.

He appeared on December 11th before Magistrate Judge Eaton, and a personal recognizance bond of ten million dollars was signed by Mr. Madoff and his wife. There were three additional cosigners that were required, and it was secured by Mr. Madoff's residence in Manhattan. Surrender of Mr. Madoff's travel documents took place, and his travel was restricted to the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the District of Connecticut.

The Pretrial Services at the time, your Honor, did not recommend in its initial recommendation that Mr. Madoff be remanded, and I add additionally that the government had no difference and no objection with any of the conditions that

were imposed on December 11th. That was before Magistrate Judge Eaton.

On December 17th, your Honor, before another magistrate judge, Magistrate Judge Gorenstein, Mr. Madoff -- and it was ratcheted up -- was placed on home detention in his apartment with electronic ankle bracelet monitoring. He was permitted to travel only to his attorney's offices and to the court. A curfew of 7:00 p.m. through 9:00 a.m. was imposed, and this was done in addition to the entry of confession of judgments with respect to his wife's properties on Montauk, New York, and Palm Beach, Florida, a surrender of Mrs. Madoff's passport and a reduction of the number of cosigners on the bond from four to two. This, too, your Honor, was consented to by the government. Indeed, I believe it was done by stipulation without argument before Magistrate Judge Gorenstein.

On December 19th, again, on consent of the government, a ten million dollar personal recognizance bond was signed by Mr. Madoff, his wife, and his brother, secured by confessions of judgment on his wife's properties in Montauk, in New York, and Palm Beach. The passports of both Mrs. Madoff had already been surrendered, and other than scheduled court appearances, Mr. Madoff was confined to his home 24 hours a day. He was no longer permitted to visit his counsel. And they had, in addition to the 24-hour-a-day confinement, an electronic monitoring device, which is still attached to his ankle.

At his wife's own expense --

THE COURT: Would the audience please remain quiet. Go ahead.

MR. SORKIN: Because Mr. Madoff's assets were all frozen, but his wife's were not, although she later voluntarily committed to a freeze of her assets under certain restrictions. So with the government's consent, Mrs. Madoff's own assets, which were not frozen by Judge Stanton or any judge in this court -- she agreed to pay a security firm acceptable to the government to provide the following services to prevent harm or flight.

And with these unfrozen assets, not objected to by the government, Mr. Madoff has round-the-clock monitoring at his building 24 hours a day, including video monitoring of all of his apartment, doors, communications devices, and services permitting security to send a direct signal from an observation post to the FBI in the event of even the suspicion of harm or flight. This is known as a panic button. There are additional guards available on request, if necessary, to prevent flight or harm, both inflicted by Mr. Madoff -- I'm dealing with the danger to the community issue -- and also harm to Mr. Madoff.

On January 12th, your Honor -- and again, this was by consent of the government. On January 12th, Magistrate Judge Ronald Ellis imposed additional restrictions. This was briefed, as your Honor well knows. It was argued by Magistrate

Judge Ellis. And on that date, Magistrate Judge Ellis incorporated the restrictions set forth in the order of Judge Stanton, who has jurisdiction over the SEC matter, including restrictions on the transfer of all property whatsoever wherever located in the possession or under the control of Mr. Madoff. And that was part of the SEC consent under the TRO and also the consent under the preliminary injunction, which Mr. Madoff consented to. Magistrate Judge Ellis incorporated these restrictions to a voluntary restraint agreement, which the government agreed to, involving Mrs. Madoff's assets and restricted the transfer of all assets owned by her voluntarily, your Honor.

Additionally, Magistrate Judge Ellis directed the compilation of an inventory of all valuable portable items in the Manhattan home, which is to be checked once every two weeks by government-approved security, who are also required to inspect all outgoing mail.

The government appealed Magistrate Judge Ellis' ruling, and before District Judge Lawrence McKenna on January 16th, 2009, argument was held. The matter was briefed, and Judge McKenna added additional conditions: One, a compilation of any inventory of all valuable portable items in the homes in Montauk, Palm Beach, as well as any property owned by Mrs. Madoff in a small residence in France.

I quote, which your Honor, I'm sure, has read, from

Judge McKenna's statement in court after hearing argument and seeing papers, that, quote -- and this is from Judge McKenna -- I think the chances of Mr. Madoff fleeing at this point are as close to nil as you can get in any bail package, period, unquote.

Now, nothing has changed, your Honor, and I agree it has changed substantially in terms of the plea. And I agree with Mr. Litt that the burden is upon us to show by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Madoff is neither a flight risk nor a risk to the community.

As far as we are aware, your Honor, Pretrial Services has not found that Mr. Madoff has been negligent or careless in complying with all of the bail conditions. There has been no incident at all, as far as we are aware, that has been conveyed to us by Pretrial or the government that Mr. Madoff has attempted at any time to flee or certainly, which the government conceded before Magistrate Judge Ellis and Judge McKenna, posed any risk of harm. The argument before Judge Ellis and Judge McKenna was the risk of harm was in the financial world, that he would dissipate assets. That was taken care of, your Honor, respectfully, by Magistrate Judge Ellis and by Judge McKenna. All mail going out, all packages going out are inspected by the security firm approved by the government.

I respectfully submit, your Honor, that the change has

been the media attention and the increased and, in many cases, justifiable anger by people who claim they lost money, but the Bail Reform Act doesn't deal with those two issues. I do not believe, your Honor, that the precedent set in this court where such individuals as Rigas in the Adelphia case, Ebbers in the WorldCom case, Messrs. Skilling and Lay -- Mr. Lay passed away before sentencing -- all of whom were facing substantial years in prison, Rigas and Ebbers in this court, Mr. Skilling in Texas. All were released on bail pending sentence. All went to trial but did not plead guilty, and all, your Honor, as far as I am aware, never once confessed at the get-go to the wrongdoing that you heard Mr. Madoff confess to today.

So I would respectfully submit, your Honor, that there is no chance that Mr. Madoff will certainly be a risk to the community, a danger to the community. And his risk of flight -- and I agree with Judge McKenna -- is virtually nil with all of the restrictions that have been imposed on him. So I respectfully request that his bail be continued.

I would also add, your Honor -- again, I refer to the Bail Reform Act as not being relevant on those two other issues. What is also relevant, your Honor, is that Mr. Madoff is going to have the opportunity, I am sure, if the government and the defense can come to some agreement, to review literally thousands of thousands of documents which the trustee and the government have been reviewing to discover where this

forfeiture number comes from. And we've been able to communicate with him in his apartment, and I think that is a factor that your Honor should consider, even though that is not my argument with respect to the Bail Reform Act. I think we have met all the conditions under the act.

So by clear and convincing evidence, I don't think he is a risk of either danger to the community, flight, and I

is a risk of either danger to the community, flight, and I would respectfully request that his bail be continued. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't need to hear from the government. It is my intention to remand Mr. Madoff.

Please, ladies and gentlemen, please.

Now, I have a number of people who signed in who wanted to be heard on the issue of bail, and I think you should only be heard if you object to remand.

Adriane Biondo? Mr. Ross? Helen Chaitman?

MS. CHAITMAN: No objection.

THE COURT: Donald Schupak?

MR. SCHUPAK: I do not object.

THE COURT: Mark Labianca?

MR. LABIANCA: I do not object.

THE COURT: Sharon Lissauer?

As Mr. Madoff has pled guilty, he is no longer entitled to the presumption of innocence. The exposure is great, 150 years in prison. In light of Mr. Madoff's age, he

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

has an incentive to flee, he has the means to flee, and thus, he presents a risk of flight. Bail is revoked, and the defendant is remanded.

MR. SORKIN: Your Honor, would your Honor consider, respectfully, a stay so that we might appeal your Honor's bail decision? We intend to do it expeditiously.

THE COURT: The request for a stay is denied.

MR. SORKIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Sentencing, as I said, is set for June 16th, 1:30 p.m. Some of the victims may wonder why do we need so much time. Well, the probation department has to prepare a presentence report. By law, the defendant is entitled to 35 days to review the presentence report before sentencing. We also have to give the parties an opportunity to submit written materials.

Mr. Madoff, I will see you at sentencing. We are adjourned.

2.2

Exhibit 2

	98B6DIP Ple	ea
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURS	
2		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	v.	. 09 CR 764 (RJS)
5	FRANK DIPASCALI,	
6	Defendant.	x
7		New York, N.Y. August 11, 2009
8		3:15 p.m.
9	Before:	
10		AND TO GUIL THAN
11	HON. RICI	HARD J. SULLIVAN,
12		District Judge
	i	
13	A	PPEARANCES
	LEV L. DASSIN	
13	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No	for the
13 14	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No MARC LITT LISA BARONI	for the ew York
13 14 15	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No MARC LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States	for the ew York
13 14 15 16	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No. MARC LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States BRACEWELL & GIULIANI Attorneys for Defendant	for the ew York s Attorney
13 14 15 16 17	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No. MARC LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States BRACEWELL & GIULIANI Attorneys for Defendant MARC L. MUKASEY CRAIG S. WARKOL	for the ew York s Attorney
13 14 15 16 17 18	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No. MARC LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States BRACEWELL & GIULIANI Attorneys for Defendant MARC L. MUKASEY	for the ew York s Attorney
13 14 15 16 17 18	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of Note Marc LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States BRACEWELL & GIULIANI Attorneys for Defendant MARC L. MUKASEY CRAIG S. WARKOL JAMIE RENNER	for the ew York s Attorney
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No. MARC LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States BRACEWELL & GIULIANI Attorneys for Defendant MARC L. MUKASEY CRAIG S. WARKOL JAMIE RENNER DANIEL S. CONNOLLY Also Present: Special Agent Keith D. Kelly	for the ew York s Attorney
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No. MARC LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States BRACEWELL & GIULIANI Attorneys for Defendant MARC L. MUKASEY CRAIG S. WARKOL JAMIE RENNER DANIEL S. CONNOLLY Also Present: Special Agent Keith D. Kelly Special Agent Julia Hanish Special Agent Steven Garfin	for the ew York s Attorney t
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	LEV L. DASSIN United States Attorney Southern District of No. MARC LITT LISA BARONI Assistant United States BRACEWELL & GIULIANI Attorneys for Defendant MARC L. MUKASEY CRAIG S. WARKOL JAMIE RENNER DANIEL S. CONNOLLY Also Present: Special Agent Keith D. Kelly Special Agent Julia Hanish	for the ew York s Attorney t

98B6DIP

25

Plea

(In open court; case called) 1 THE DEPUTY CLERK: All parties can state their 2 appearances for the record, please. 3 MR. LITT: Good afternoon, your Honor. Marc Litt for 4 the United States. With me at counsel table is Lisa Baroni, 5 Keith Kelley of the FBI, Julia Hanish, and Steven Garfinkel of 6 the FBI, and Natasha Ramesar of the U.S. Pretrial Services 7 Office. 8 THE COURT: Good afternoon to each of you. 9 For the defense. 10 MR. MUKASEY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Marc Mukasey 11 from the law firm Bracewell & Giuliani for the defendant Frank 12 DiPascali, who is seated to my left. With me are Dan Connolly, 13 Craiq Warkol, and Jamie Renner. 14 THE COURT: Good afternoon to each you and to Mr. 15 DiPascali. 16 Let me just get a little bit of background so it is 17 clear since this is the first appearance of anyone on this 18 On Friday I received a letter from the government, Mr. 19 case. Litt and Ms. Baroni, advising me that the defendant, Mr. 20 DiPascali, was prepared to waive the indictment and plead 21 quilty pursuant to an information in this case. 22 The government also included a notice of intent to 23 file an information as opposed to an indictment, as well as a 24

motion pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3771

regarding the right of victims. The government also provided a disclosure statement setting forth a list of potential victims of the criminal activity alleged in the case. This statement contained a 61-page, single-spaced list of victims which the government conceded was not an exhausted or complete list but was a list that they had been able to put together over the course of the investigation.

Mr. Litt, so far so good?

MR. LITT: Yes. I believe it is only institutional victims, corporate parties.

THE COURT: That's right. 61 pages of institutional victims.

In light of this fact that this case has not been assigned a docket number, it will not receive a docket number today after the defendant formerly waives indictment and pleads here in open court.

The government requested that I issue an order directing that its letter of August 7th be posted and the other materials I mentioned be posted on the web page created by the U.S. Attorney's Office for Madoff related cases. In the government's view this was the most practical and efficient way to notify potential victims of today's proceeding. So I issued such an order on Friday, August 7th.

Late yesterday afternoon I received a copies of a proposed information, a plea agreement, as well as a letter

98B6DIP

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plea

from the government setting forth the bail conditions proposed by the parties in this case. I ordered that the last of these be posted similarly on the and U.S. Attorney's Office web page page. The information and plea agreement will presumably be posted today presuming the defendant waives indictment and executes the agreement that I received a draft of yesterday.

4

To ensure at least some notice to the victims, including those who may be present here today, I directed the government to summarize and post on the web page the charges contained in the information and the nature of the proposed plea agreement between the parties.

So are there any other additional facts that I left out, Mr. Litt?

MR. LITT: I don't believe so. No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, anything you think is relevant to the record?

MR. MUKASEY: No, Judge. I think that is it.

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, I understand that your client wishes to plead guilty pursuant to the information that has been drafted and provided to me, is that correct?

MR. MUKASEY: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. DiPascali, before I accept your guilty plea -- you can sit for the moment. Before I accept your guilty plea, I am going to ask you certain questions to ensure first of all that you are pleading guilty because you are

98B6DIP

Plea

guilty and not for some other. And also to make sure that you fully understand your rights, your Constitution and statutory rights, including your right to a trial.

So if at any point during the course of my questioning you don't understand my question or require some further elaboration on my part, let me know and I will do everything to clarify. If at any point you wish to confer with Mr. Mukasey or your other attorneys, that is perfectly fine. I will give you as much time as I need. I don't want you to feel rushed into a plea in this matter.

At this point I am going to ask Ms. Levine to administer the oath. This is an oath that I ask you to rise for. This is an oath that you will answer truthfully my questions.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
(Defendant sworn)

THE COURT: Mr. DiPascali, having taken that oath, do you understand that any false answers to my questions could subject you to the penalties for perjury or for making a false statement, which would carry separate penalties and be accept and distinct from any of the crimes charged in the information in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, if at any point you wish to confer with your attorneys before answering, that is fine. If at any

	DiPascali Plea Allocution Pg 7 of 95
	98B6DIP Plea
1	point you would like me to clarify a question before answering,
2	that is also fine. In fact, you should do that. But don't
3	make any false statements because that will compound any
4	problems that you may already have.
5	THE DEFENDANT: Understood.
6	THE COURT: Mr. DiPascali, could you state your full
7	name for the record?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Frank DiPascali, Jr.
9	THE COURT: How old are you, Mr. DiPascali?
10	THE DEFENDANT: 52.
11	THE COURT: How far you go in school?
12	THE DEFENDANT: High school.
13	THE COURT: Where was that?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Archbishop Malloy High School in
15	Briarwood, Queens.
16	THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been
17	under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist?
18	THE DEFENDANT: No.
19	THE COURT: Have you ever been treated for any type of
20	mental illness or any type of addiction, including drug or
21	alcohol addiction?
22	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

or any pills or have you drunk any alcohol in the past 48 hours?

23

24

25

THE COURT: Have you taken any drugs or any medicine

	98B6DIP Plea
1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
2	THE COURT: Tell me about that.
3	THE DEFENDANT: I had a glass of wine at dinner the
4	night before last.
5	THE COURT: The night before last?
6	THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.
7	THE COURT: No medication, no pills, no drugs of any
8	kind?
9	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
10	THE COURT: No other alcohol?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Correct.
12	THE COURT: Is your mind clear today?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Crystal clear, sir.
14	THE COURT: Do you under the nature of this proceeding
15	and what is going to take place here today?
16	THE DEFENDANT: I do.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, do you have any doubt as to
18	your client's mental competence to enter an informed plea at
19	this time?
20	MR. MUKASEY: None whatsoever.
21	THE COURT: Let me ask Mr. Litt and Ms. Baroni if they
22	share your confidence in that regard.
23	Mr. Litt?
24	MR. LITT: We do. We have no reason to think
25	otherwise.

98B6DIP

Plea

THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. DiPascali's responses
to my questions, my observations of his demeanor, and on the
representations of his counsel and the prosecutors, I find that
Mr. DiPascali is competent to enter an information plea at this
time.
Now, Mr. DiPascali, as I understand it you wish to
plead guilty to an information, is that correct?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Have you had enough of an opportunity to
discuss this information and the charges contained in it with
your attorney, Mr. Mukasey?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Are you satisfied with Mr. Mukasey's
representation of you?
THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.
THE COURT: Do you feel you need or require any
additional time to review the information or review any of the
other documents associated with this matter?
THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
THE COURT: Now, have you received a copy of the
information that I've been referring to?
THE DEFENDANT: I have.
THE COURT: Have you read it yourself?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your attorney

Plea

98B6DIP Mr. Mukasey? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: Do you waive the public reading of that 3 information, or would you like me to read it to you here in 4 5 open court? THE DEFENDANT: I would prefer it to be waived. 6 THE COURT: You will waive the public reading. 7 That's fine. 8 Now, do you have in front of you -- I don't know 9 whether you have the original in front of you -- a waiver of 10 indictment form? 11 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 12 Is that your signature on that document? THE COURT: 13 THE DEFENDANT: It is. 14 15 THE COURT: When did you sign that? 16 THE DEFENDANT: About 15 minutes ago. THE COURT: Prior to signing that document had you 17 reviewed the information in this case and discussed it with 18 Mr. Mukasey? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 20 21

Mr. Mukasey, is your signature on that THE COURT: form as well?

MR. MUKASEY: It is, Judge.

22

23

24

25

And prior to signing it, did you review THE COURT: the information and discuss it with your client?

24

25

Plea

Extensively. 1 MR. MUKASEY: THE COURT: Now, I want to make sure you understand, 2 Mr. DiPascali, that you have a right, a constitutional right, 3 to proceed by way of an indictment, which is a charging 4 instrument returned by a grand jury rather than an information, 5 which is simply a charging instrument brought by prosecutors. 6 Do you understand that? 7 I do. Under the Constitution you have a THE COURT: 8 right to have evidence underlying the crimes charged in the 9 information brought before the grand jury, which is a group of 10 23 citizens who would decide by majority vote whether probable 11 cause had been established to demonstrate that you had 12 committed the crimes charged in the charging instrument. 13 Do you understand that? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 15 THE COURT: Only if the grand jury reached that 16 determination of probable cause by a majority vote with a 17 proper quorum of grand jurors present could those charges be 18 19 returned against you. Do you understand that? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: By waiving indictment, you will be giving 22 up that right and you will be agreeing to go forward on the 23

charges contained in the information without ever having the

evidence brought before a grand jury.

ļ	98B6DIP Plea
1	Do you understand that?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: Are you voluntarily and freely giving up
4	that right to proceed by a grand jury?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.
6	THE COURT: Now, I want to explain to you your other
7	constitutional rights. Have you had a chance to review with
8	your attorney, Mr. Mukasey, a three-page document probably
9	entitled Advice of Rights Form that should have been provided
10	to you by my chambers?
11	THE DEFENDANT: I have.
12	THE COURT: Is your signature on the second page of
13	that document?
14	THE DEFENDANT: It is.
15	THE COURT: Before you signed that document, did you
16	review it carefully with your attorney, Mr. Mukasey?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we did.
18	THE COURT: Did you have an opportunity discuss with
19	him any questions you may have had or any further explanation
20	of the rights described in that document?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Thoroughly.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, did you sign the third page?
23	MR. MUKASEY: I did, Judge.
24	THE COURT: Before signing it, did you have a full and
1	

extensive opportunity to discuss the rights described in that

document with your client?

MR. MUKASEY: Yes.

THE COURT: I am going to mark that as a court exhibit. I will mark it as Court Exhibit 1. I will date it and I will initial it.

I am also going to ask you in open court, Mr.

DiPascali, some questions about the rights that are contained in this document. The reason I do that is because these rights are so vitally important and it is so essential that you understand these rights because they are there rights that you will would be waiving. In addition to this document, I want to make sure you have had an ample opportunity to consider them so I will ask you questions that may seem redundant but I think is it a price worth paying for rights that are this serious.

Mr. DiPascali, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you would be entitled to a speedy and public jury trial on the charges contained in the information.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: At trial you would be presumed to be innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be found guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

98B6DIP	Plea

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, at trial a jury of 12 people would THE COURT: have to agree unanimously that you were quilty before you could be found guilty.

Do you understand that?

Yes, sir. THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: You would not have to prove that you were innocent if you went to trial.

Do you understand that?

I understand. THE DEFENDANT:

The jury would have to be persuaded beyond THE COURT: a reasonable doubt and they would have to be persuaded unanimously of that fact before you could be found guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

Now, at trial and at every stage of your THE COURT: case, you would be entitled to be represented by an attorney and if you couldn't afford an attorney, one would be appointed for you at no cost to you.

Do you understand that?

Yes, sir. THE DEFENDANT:

During a trial, the witnesses for the THE COURT: government would have to come into court and testify in your presence.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

25

98B6DIP

Plea

THE COURT: It is called your right to confront your
accusers. It is the confrontation clause of the Constitution.
What that means is the witnesses would have to come and sit
right here or in a box like it if it were in a different
courtroom and you would be able to see them and hear them and
they would be able to see you.
Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
THE COURT: At trial your attorney Mr. Mukasey would
have an opportunity to cross-examine those witnesses.
Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I have seen him do it. He is really good
at it. You would have that opportunity.
THE DEFENDANT: That is why I sit next to him.
THE COURT: He would also have an opportunity to
object to the government's evidence if he wished and if he felt
appropriate.
Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: At trial you would have the right to have
subpoenas issued, or other compulsory process used to compel
witnesses to testify if you wished.
Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If there are witnesses who you felt had valuable testimony, valuable to your defense and they didn't wish to testify, you could compel them to testify through subpoenas.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: At trial you yourself would have the right to testify if you chose.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Would you also have the right not to testify if you chose not to testify. If you chose not to testify then no one, particularly the jury, could draw any negative inference or any suggestion of your guilt by virtue of the fact that you chose not to testify.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I would tell the jury that more than once. I tell them at the beginning and I would tell them in the middle and at the end that this was a fundamental right and principle of bedrock proportions in our constitutional system, that the criminal defendant never has any obligation to do anything at a trial. The burden also rests with the government. So if a defendant were not to testify, they could not and must not draw any negative inference against that

witness by virtue of that nontestimony. 1 Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 3 THE COURT: Now, do you understand that if you went to 4 trial and you were convicted at trial, you would then have a 5 right to appeal the jury's verdict if you wished. 6 Do you understand that? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 8 THE COURT: Now, if you plead guilty and if I accept 9 your guilty plea, you will give up your right to a trial and 10 all the other rights I have just described. 11 Do you understand that? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 The only exception to that would be your THE COURT: 14 right to counsel. That right would continue through your plea, 15 through sentencing, and through appeal if you wished to appeal. 16 Do you understand that? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 18 THE COURT: But the other rights that I just described 19 and are described in the document that we talked about before, 20 Court Exhibit 1, those would be gone. You would be waiving 21 those. 22 Do you understand that? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 24 THE COURT: Do you understand you have a right to 25

change your mind even now?

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: Yes.

THE COURT: There are a lot of people here, and your lawyers are here, the government is here. That is well and good but if you want to go to trial, you have a right to go to trial and nobody will be upset with you and annoyed at you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, sir.

THE COURT: Do you nevertheless wish to go forward with your guilty plea at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Now, do you understand that if you plead guilty and if I accept your guilty plea then you will be sentenced on the basis of that guilty plea among other things; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you plead guilty, there will be no appeal on the question of whether or not you committed the offenses to which you pled guilty; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you also understand if you plead guilty, I am going to ask you questions about what you did. I am going to ask you basically to give up your right not to incriminate yourself because I am going to need you to tell me

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

what you did that makes you guilty of these crimes before I will accept the plea; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I said a minute ago if you went to trial you would have a right not to testify and that of course is true. No negative inference could be drawn against you or considered by the jury. If you are going to plead guilty then I will need to be persuaded that you are pleading guilty because you are guilty and not for some other reason. So that is why I am going to ask you questions about what you did and how that makes you guilty of the offense.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand each and everyone of these rights, Mr. DiPascali?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Are you waiving your rights to a trial and all the other rights I just mentioned?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Now, the information that you have indicated you've read charged you in 10 separate counts.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I am not going to go through it in detail.

I am not going to read it. The first count charges you with

Plea

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

98B6DIP conspiracy to commit securities fraud, investment advisory fraud, falsify books and records of a broker/dealer, falsify books and records of an investment fund, mail fraud, wire fraud, money laundering all in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371-72. Count Two charges you with a substantive count of securities fraud violation of 15, United States Code, Section 78j(b), 78ff. The third count charges you with investment adviser

fraud, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Section 80b-6 and 80b-17.

The fourth count charges you with falsifying broker/dealer books and records in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 78q(a) and 78ff as well as the regulation that is promulgated thereafter 17, C.F.R., Section 240.17(a)(3).

The fifth count charges you with falsifying investment adviser books and records in violation of 15, United States Code, Section 80(b)(4) and 80b-17 as well as a code section of the C.F.R.

Count Six charges you with mail fraud in violation of 18, United States Code, Section 1341.

Count Seven charges you with wire fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, 1343.

Count Eight charges you with money laundering in

violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1956(a)(2). 1 Count Nine charges you with perjury in violation of 2 Title 18, United States Code, Section 1621. 3 Count Ten charges you with income tax evasion in 4 violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7201. 5 So those are the 10 counts. 6 Do you understand that? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 8 In addition the information contains two 9 THE COURT: forfeiture allegations. The first calls for you to forfeit all 10 property and proceeds deprived from the crimes charged in 11 Counts One, Two, Six and Seven for a total amount of \$170 12 billion. 13 Do you understand that? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes I do. 15 THE COURT: Billion with a "B." 16 And the second forfeiture allegation charges or 17 contains an allegation which would call for you to forfeit all 18 the property derived from the money laundering count, Count 19 That is for a total amount of at least \$250 million. 20 Eight.

Do you understand that?

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I am going to ask the government now to state the elements of the offense. These are the things that the government would have to prove and the jury would have to

2.

Plea

find beyond a reasonable doubt for you to be convicted on those counts of the information. These are the things that I will have to find have been demonstrated before I will accept the guilty plea on those counts. So I want you to listen very carefully as Mr. Litt or Ms. Baroni describes these elements. It may take a while frankly. But it is essential that you understand these elements.

I assume you have discussed the elements of these offenses with your attorney Mr. Mukasey.

MR. MUKASEY: In detail.

THE COURT: So, mr. Litt, do you want to go through the counts in the indictment and the elements? In the information. I think I said indictment. Information.

MR. LITT: With respect to Count One conspiracy, in order to prove the crime of conspiracy the government must establish each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the conspiracy charged in the information existed. In other words, that there was in fact an agreement or understanding to violate the law of the United States;

Second, that the defendant knowingly, willingly, and voluntarily became a member of the conspiracy charged;

Third, that any one of the co-conspirators knowingly committed at least one overt act in the Southern

District of New York in furtherance of the conspiracy during the life of the conspiracy.

Count Two, securities fraud. In order to prove the crime of securities fraud, the government must prove each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that in connection with the purchase or sale of a security the defendant did any one or more of the following:

- 1: Employed a device, scheme or artifice to defraud or,
- 2: Made an untrue statement of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact which made what was said under the circumstances misleading or,
- 3: Engaged in an act, practice, or course of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon a purchaser or seller.

Second, that the defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and with the intent to defraud; and,

Third, that the defendant knowingly used or caused to be used any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or the use of the mails in furtherance of the fraudulent conduct.

Count Three, investment adviser fraud. In order to prove the crime of investment adviser fraud, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the four following

Plea

1 | elements:

First, that the defendant was an investment adviser;

Second, that the defendant either (A) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud clients and prospective clients, (B) engaged in a transaction, practice, or course of business which operated as a fraud and deceit upon those clients and perspective clients, or (C) engaged in an act, practice, and course of business that was fraudulent, deceptive and manipulative;

Third, that the defendant devised or participated in such allege device, scheme, or artifice to defraud, or engaged in such alleged transaction, practice, or course of business knowingly, willfully, and with the intent to defraud;

Fourth, that the defendant employed such alleged device, scheme, or artifice to defraud or engaged in such alleged transaction, practice, or course of business by use of the mails or other instrumentality of interstate commerce.

Count Four, falsifying broker/dealer books and records. In order to prove the crime of falsifying broker/dealer books and records, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following elements:

First, that at the time of the alleged offense,
Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities was a registered
broker/dealer;

Plea

1	Second, that that company failed to make and keep
2	certain accurate records as required under the SEC's rules and
3	regulations;
4	Third, that the defendant aided and abetted the
5	failure of that company to make and keep accurate records; and
6	Fourth, that the defendant acted knowingly and
7	willfully.
8	Count Five, falsifying books and records of an
9	investment adviser. In order to prove this crime, the
10	government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the
11	following:
12	First, that at the time of the alleged offense,
13	the Madoff firm was an investment adviser;
14	Second, that the firm failed to make and keep
15	certain accurate records as required under the SEC's rules and
16	regulations;
17	Third, that the defendant aided and abetted the
18	failure of the firm to make and keep accurate records;
19	Fourth, that the defendant acted knowingly and
20	willfully;
21	Fifth, that the offense involved the use of the
22	mails and means of instrumentalities of interstate commerce.
23	In order to prove Count Six, mail fraud, the
24	government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt each of the
25	following:

Plea

First, that on or about the time alleged in the information, there was a scheme or artifice to defraud in order to obtain money or property by false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises;

Second, that the false or fraudulent statements and representations concerned material facts;

Third, that the defendant knowingly and willfully

devised or participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud;

Fourth, that the United States mails or a commercial carrier were used in furtherance of the scheme specified in the information.

In order to prove the crime of wire fraud, Count Seven, the government must establish beyond a reasonable doubt the following four elements:

First, that at or about the time alleged in the information, it was a scheme or artifice to defraud in order to obtain money or property by false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises;

Second, that the false or fraudulent statements and representations concerned material facts;

Third, that the defendant knowingly and willfully devised or participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific

Plea

98B6DIP

intent to defraud; and

Fourth, that interstate or foreign wire facilities were used in furtherance of the scheme to defraud and specified in the information.

In order to prove the crime of unlawful transportation of funds or monetary instruments with the intent to promote the carrying on of a specified unlawful activity --

THE COURT: This is what we are referring to as the money laundering count?

MR. LITT: Count Eight, money laundering count, the government must establish the following elements:

First, that the defendant transported a monetary instrument or funds from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States, or to a place in the United States from or through a place outside of the United States;

Second, that the defendant did so with the intent promote the carrying on specified unlawful activity.

In order to prove Count Nine, perjury, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following elements:

First, that the defendant took an oath to testify truly before the Securities and Exchange Commission, a body authored by law to administer oaths;

Second, that the defendant made false statements

as to matters about which the defendant testified under oath and set forth in the information;

Third, that the matters as to which it is charged that the defendant made false statements were material to the issues under inquiry by the Securities and Exchange Commission; and

Fourth, that such false statements were willfully made.

To prove the offense of the attempting to evade or defeat a tax or the payment thereof, which is Count Ten, the government must prove the following elements:

First, that the defendant attempted to evade or defeat a tax;

Second, that additional taxes were due and owing by the defendant;

Third, that the defendant acted knowingly and willfully.

I should point out that there are aiding and abetting charges as well with respect to the substantive counts set forth in Counts Two through Eight. So if the defendant caused or aided and abetted another in committing any of those crimes, he would be quilty as if a principal.

THE COURT: I think I may have neglected to mention the aiding and abetting counts.

You understand, Mr. DiPascali, in addition to the

Plea

substantive crimes charged after the conspiracy count, Counts

Two through 10, some of those, most of those also charge aiding and abetting so that even if you didn't commit the crime, it is alleged that you aided and abetted others to commit the crime and so each of the elements would have to be met for aiding and abetting; all right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand those are the elements of the offenses?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: It took a long time but is that consistent with what you discussed with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, do you agree those are the elements to the offenses in the information?

MR. MUKASEY: I do, Judge.

THE COURT: I want to go over with you, Mr. DiPascali, the maximum penalties you face for each of these offenses.

Count One, the conspiracy count, carries a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of either \$250,000, or twice the gross pecuniary or financial loss to persons, other than yourself, resulting from the offense, or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense, whichever is greatest of those three alternatives is the

maximum fine. In addition as part of your sentence, I can order restitution be paid to any victims and I can also order that you forfeit the proceeds or least -- Count One carries at least part of the forfeiture allegation, right?

MR. LITT: Yes.

THE COURT: In addition, Count One carries a mandatory special assessment of \$100. That is in addition to any fine or forfeiture or restitution.

Count Two, which is the securities fraud count, carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$5 million, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss as I previously described those things so whichever is greatest of those three, as well as restitution and forfeiture and \$100 special assessment. The 100-dollar special assessment would be mandatory.

Count Three, which is the investment adviser fraud count, carries a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of either \$250,000, or twice the gross pecuniary gain deprived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons, other than yourself, as well as restitution to any persons injured by this conduct, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Count Four, which is falsifying books and records of a

Plea

98B6DIP

broker/dealer carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine again of the greatest \$5 million, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss to persons, other than yourself, from the offense, as well as restitution, and again a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Counts Five, which is falsifying books and records of an investment adviser carries a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$10,000, or twice the gross gain derived from the offense, or twice gross pecuniary loss to persons, other than yourself, resulting from offense, as well as restitution and again a \$100 special assessment.

Count Six is the mail fraud count. It carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, as well as restitution, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

County Seven, wire fraud, carries similar penalties. Again, a 20-year maximum term of imprisonment, a three-year term of supervised release, a maximum fine of the greatest of 250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss to persons, other than yourself, as well as a potential for restitution to any victims, and a \$100 special assessment.

Count Eight, which is a money laundering count,

carries a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$500,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gloss loss resulting from the offense, as well as restitution to any victims, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Count Nine carries a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, the perjury count, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Count Ten, which is the tax evasion count, carries a maximum term of imprisonment five years, a maximum term of supervised of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss, whichever is the greatest, as well as restitution, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Do you understand those are the maximum penalties?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Litt, something you wanted to add?

Did I misstate something?

MR. LITT: Your Honor, with respect to Count Six, Seven, and Eight, mail fraud, wire fraud, and money laundering, forfeiture is also a possible penalty.

THE COURT: Yes. I was going to mention the forfeiture. I thought I did with respect to the individual

counts. Understand for those counts for which the forfeiture allegation as been set forth in the information, in addition to any fine, in addition to any restitution, in addition to any mandatory special assessment you could also be ordered to forfeit any of the proceeds from the offense.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: The maximum possible penalties combined would be a maximum term of imprisonment of 125 years.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The maximum special assessment, when you collectively add up would be \$1,000, as well as the fines and everything else I mentioned.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Are you a United States citizen, Mr. DiPascali?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand as a result of your conviction, you could lose certain valuable civil rights, including your right to hold public office, your right to serve on a jury, your right to vote, and your right to possess any kind of firearm; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

Plea.

98B6DIP

THE COURT: Now, are you serving any other sentences to day, state, federal or local at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now, with respect to supervised release, you should be aware that there are terms and conditions associated with supervised release. If you were to violate the terms of your supervised release, you then could be returned to prison for the full period of your supervised release and you would not get any credit for the good time on which you are on supervised release.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: I will give an illustration because it is not always clear. If I sentenced you to a term of imprisonment and then sentenced you to five years of supervised -- three years of supervised release, we will say, three years. What that means is after you have finished your prison sentence, you will be released and you would be supervised by the Probation Department. There will be conditions associated with your supervision including, among other things, that you not commit any further crimes, you not possess a firearm, you not use or possess any kinds of drugs, among other things.

Well, if for 35 months you were perfect, you did everything you were asked to do and then in the 36th month, the last month of supervised release you committed another crime,

or you possessed a firearm illegally, well, then I could violate your supervised release and I could return you to prison for three full years, the full term of supervised release even though for 35 out of 36 months you were perfect.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that parole has been abolished so you would not be released from prison any earlier as a result of parole?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Parole doesn't exist in the federal system. It exists in certain state systems, including New York State. It used to exist in the federal system and what that meant typically is a judge would impose a sentence usually of an indeterminate nature, five to 10 years, and someone else, a parole board typically, would determine when would be the appropriate time for the defendant to be released depending on whether or not they had been rehabilitated or are ready to resume life in the community. That is not a part of this federal system. So whatever sentence I impose is the sentence you will serve.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: The only exception to that is that you could receive up to 15 percent off for good behavior. That

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

would be a determination made by Bureau of Prisons and it would be no more than 15 percent of the sentence imposed.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: I want to go over a few other things with sentencing. First of all, in terming what your sentence will be, that is a decision for me to make.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: For the Court and no one else.

So whatever your attorneys may have told you, whatever the government may have told you, whatever any one else may have told you, that is not binding on me.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: I will determine what is the appropriate sentence after reviewing the presentence report, after reviewing submissions made by you if you wish, made by the government, made by the victims of the offenses.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Only then will I decide what is the appropriate sentence.

Now, I also want to go over with you the current state of the law. Under the law I am required to consider certain

Plea

98B6DIP

factors before imposing sentence. I will tell you quite candidly even if I weren't required to consider these things, I would consider them. These are the factors that I think any civilized society would take into account in imposing a sentence on another human being.

Those things include, among other things, your own personal history and background. It also includes obviously the nature and circumstances of the offenses to which you have offered to plea guilty. It includes the need for me to impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offenses and the need to promote respect for the law.

Another objective for sentencing is deterrence, that is both general and specific deterrence. I would be obliged to fashion a sentence that prevents you from committing crimes of this sort or any other sort in the future and that also would have the effect of deterring others who might consider engaging in this kind of criminal conduct to think twice, general deterrence.

I would consider your own needs, your own rehabilitative needs, your own medical needs, your own educational needs, those things. For you and for any defendant who comes before me I would consider those things before imposing a sentence.

I would also consider the needs of the victims of these crimes to receive restitution. That is obviously an

Plea

important factor that would have to be considered in imposing a sentence.

I would also consider the United States Sentencing
Guidelines. Are you familiar with the Sentencing Guidelines,
Mr. DiPascali?

THE DEFENDANT: I am.

THE COURT: You have discussed those with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: In detail.

THE COURT: I am not going to go over them in great detail. The United States Sentencing Guidelines are a big book. A new edition comes out each year. This year's version is about 600 pages long. I am not going to go into it in any kind of detail. What these guidelines attempt to do is provide objectives and transparent criteria by which an individual and the criminal conduct that an individual engaged in can be evaluated.

These guidelines are advisory. They are not binding on me. I am not required to follow them. I am required to consider them and I will consider them. What they essentially do is that for each crime or type of crime, they provide a framework to assess the seriousness of that crime. There are two calculations that are done. First, is a offense level calculation. For financial frauds, for example, the calculation would focus on the amount of loss involved, the

number of victims, the nature of the offense. And for each of those factors, it would be numerical value ascribed. And so in calculating these things, the Court would basically do math and come up with a number, which would be the offense level.

In addition there is a separate calculation for criminal history category and so not surprisingly a person engaged in other criminal conduct who has prior convictions and prior sentences would be treated more seriously and would get more criminal history points than someone who has no criminal history. On the basis of those two calculations, offense level on the one hand and criminal history category on the other, the guidelines comes up with a range in terms of months which in the view of the Commission that prepares these guidelines would be appropriate in the ordinary case.

So as I said I will consider those calculations, I will make calculations, and I will certainly consider the range that is provided for and proposed by these guidelines. At the end of the day, ultimately I don't have to follow them and I am free to go higher or lower as I see fit.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Finally, I want to make sure that you understand whatever sentence I impose no matter how unhappy you may be with it, you will not be entitled to withdraw your guilty plea at that point and go forward with the trial.

	DiPascali Plea Allocution Pg 40 of 95
	98B6DIP Plea
1	Do you understand that?
2	THE DEFENDANT: I do.
3	THE COURT: You will be entitled to your opinion that
4	I got it wrong or I was too harsh, but you would not be able to
5	say I would like to turn the clock back to August 11th and go
6	to trial now because that option will have gone.
7	Do you understand that?
8	THE DEFENDANT: I do.
9	THE COURT: I understand there is a plea agreement in
10	this case, is that correct?
11	MR. MUKASEY: That's correct.
12	MR. LITT: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Is the original with you, Mr. Mukasey?
14	MR. MUKASEY: It is, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: You can keep that there for the moment. I
16	received a draft. I have not received an executed or signed
17	copy. Let me make sure it is the same as what you have. Bear
18	with me for a second.
19	(Pause)
20	It is an August 11th letter. It is a seven-paged,
21	single-spaced letter. It is from the government, Ms. Baroni
22	and Mr. Litt, to Mr. Mukasey, your attorney.
23	Do you have a copy of this in front you, or the

THE DEFENDANT: I have the original.

original in front of you?

24

25

1	THE COURT: Is your signature on the last page?
2	THE DEFENDANT: It is.
3	THE COURT: When did you sign it?
4	THE DEFENDANT: 35 minutes ago.
5	THE COURT: Before you signed it, did you have an
6	opportunity to read this agreement?
7	THE DEFENDANT: In detail.
8	THE COURT: Did you have an opportunity discuss it
9	with Mr. Mukasey in detail?
10	THE DEFENDANT: We have.
11	THE COURT: Do you require any additional time to
12	review this agreement?
13	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, is that your signature on the
15	last page as well?
16	MR. MUKASEY: It is, Judge.
17	THE COURT: Before you signed it, did you review this
18	agreement in detail with your client?
19	MR. MUKASEY: Yes, we did.
20	THE COURT: Now, Mr. DiPascali, I am not going to go
21	over this in tremendous detail because as I said it is a
22	seven-paged, single-spaced letter. I want to make sure you
23	understand the nature of this agreement. This agreement is
24	what is known as cooperation agreement.
25	Is that your understanding?

11

Plea

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.
2	THE COURT: By this agreement you have agreed to
3	cooperate with the government and to take on certain
4	obligations that are set forth in this agreement.
5	Is that correct?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
7	THE COURT: The government has agreed if you provide
8	substantial assistance, well, they will make a motion to the
9	Court to apprise me of that assistance, which would then allow
10	me for sentence you below the Sentencing Guidelines. So that
11	is essence what the agreement is.
12	Is that your understanding?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Exactly, sir.
14	THE COURT: Is there any other agreement that you have
15	besides this one, besides this August 11th agreement?
16	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
17	THE COURT: Is there any other oral agreement or any
18	side agreement that exists beyond the confines of these seven
19	pages?
20	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
21	THE COURT: Has anybody attempted to threaten you or
22	induce you or otherwise persuade you to plead guilty to the
23	charges contained in the information or to accept and sign this
24	plea agreement?
25	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

Plea

THE COURT: You signed it of your own free will and voluntarily?

THE DEFENDANT: I have.

THE COURT: Now, I want to make sure you understand if

THE COURT: Now, I want to make sure you understand if the government decides that you provided substantial assistance -- as I say they can make this motion -- I am not required to follow it and I will still ultimately decide what is the proper sentence.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Now, if the government decides that you did not provide substantial assistance, then that may limit my ability to sentence you below the guidelines. As I said the guidelines are just advisory so it ultimately wouldn't bar me from doing so. There was a time when it would have, but it wouldn't today. Certainly the government has the exclusive right to decide whether or not you provided substantial assistance under this agreement.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, are you aware of any of valid defense that would apply as a matter of law or any other reason why your client should not be allowed to enter a plea at this time?

MR. MUKASEY: No, Judge.

Plea

THE COURT: Now, at this point I am going to ask you to stand, Mr. DiPascali. I want you to tell me in your own words what it is that you did that makes you guilty of the offense -- excuse me -- the offenses charged in the information. So since there are 10 counts, this may take a while. I am not sure if you discussed with your lawyer how is the best way to do this, either count by count or groups of counts.

Mr. Mukasey, do you have a view?

MR. MUKASEY: Judge, we have we have worked together to prepare a statement that I think covers all the counts. I think we can have Mr. DiPascali read it if that is okay with the Court. I think that he will hit all the elements of all the counts. If you would like he can advise the Court of the counts that he is about to discuss if that is helps focus the Court.

THE COURT: Whatever you think is most appropriate.

There is nothing wrong with reading a statement, Mr. DiPascali, as long as they are really your words. It is not usual a defendant in your position would work with their attorney to prepare a statement that would be their allocution to crimes charged in the information. But it is important that they be your words and that is something you are just reciting or reading.

I may ask you some questions or interrupt along the

Plea

If you have a statement, why don't we start with that and 1 we will see if it is necessary to follow up in certain areas. 2 MR. MUKASEY: May I have one moment? 3 THE COURT: Yes. 4 While you are conferring if you could hand to 5 Ms. Levine the plea agreement, I will mark that as a court 6 I will mark that as Court Exhibit 2. I will initial 7 exhibit. and date it as well. 8 9 (Pause) Mr. DiPascali, are you ready? 10 THE COURT: Yes, I am. THE DEFENDANT: 11 Let me ask you to read slowly so the court THE COURT: 12 reporter can get it down. We have very good court reporters, 13 probably the best in the world, but there are limits to what 10 14 fingers can do. I frequently speak too quickly and they are 15 too polite to remind me, but I will remind you. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. 17 I am standing here today to say that from the early 18 1990s until December of 2008 I helped Bernie Madoff, and other 19 people, carry out the fraud that hurt thousands of people. I 20 am guilty and I want to explain a little bit about what I did 21 and how I want everybody everyone to know that I take 22

Judge, I started working for Bernard Madoff Investment Securities in 1975 right after a graduated from high school. I

responsibility for my conduct.

23

24

25

Plea

was a kid from Queens. I didn't have a college degree. I didn't know anything about Wall Street. I ended up spending the next 30 years working for Bernie Madoff and his firm until December 11th, 2008.

Over the first 15 or so years at the Madoff firm, I had a bunch of different jobs. I worked a research analyst, and options trader, and a guy who basically did whatever I was told to do around the office.

In 1987 I helped move our firm from the office at 110 Wall Street to our new office at 885 Third Avenue. Eventually Bernie Madoff's investment advisory business, which managed client accounts, took space on the 17th floor of 885 Third Avenue and I became sort of a supervisor of that floor.

During that first 15 or so years, I watched Bernie
Madoff and other people at the firm. I learned how the
securities industry worked, or at least how it worked in the
Madoff universe. I thought I worked for a prestigious and
successful securities firm.

By 1990 or so Bernie Madoff was a mentor to me and a lot more. I was loyal to him. I ended up being loyal to a terrible, terrible fault. By the early 1990s Bernie Madoff had stable clients whose accounts he managed as an investment adviser. He attracted a lot of these clients by telling them that the firm would apply a hedged investment strategy to their money. The clients were told that the strategy involved

Plea

purchasing what we call basket of blue chip common stocks.

Hedging those investments by buying and selling option

contracts, getting in and out of the market at opportune times

and investing in government securities at other times.

By 2008 Bernie Madoff had thousands of clients who believed their funds were being invested this way. For years I was a main point of contact for many of those clients when they had questions about their account.

From at least the early 1990s through December of 2008, there was one simple fact that Bernie Madoff knew, that I knew, and that other people knew but that we never told the clients nor did we tell the regulators like the SEC. No purchases of sales of securities were actually taking place in their accounts. It was all fake. It was all fictitious. It was wrong and I knew it was wrong at the time, sir.

THE COURT: When did you realize that?

THE DEFENDANT: In the late '80s or early '90s.

I would like to address some of the counts in the information. Regarding Count One, conspiracy; Count Two, securities fraud; and Count Three, investment adviser fraud.

From our office in Manhattan at Bernie Madoff's direction, and together with others, I represented to hundreds, if not thousands, of clients that security trades were being placed in their accounts when in fact no trades were taking place at all.

THE COURT: How did you do that? Through documents or through oral communications?

THE DEFENDANT: Both.

THE COURT: Both.

THE DEFENDANT: Most of the time the clients' money just simply went into a bank account in New York that Bernie Madoff controlled. Between the early '90s and December '08 at Bernie Madoff's direction, and together with others, I did follow things: On a regular basis I told clients over the phones and using wires that transactions on national securities exchanges were taking place in their account when I knew that no such transactions were indeed taking place. I also took steps to conceal from clients, from the SEC, and from auditors the fact that no actual security trades were taking place and to perpetuate the illusion that they actually were.

On a regular basis I used hindsight to file historical prices on stocks then I used those prices to post purchase of sales to customer accounts as if they had been executed in realtime. On a regular basis I added fictitious trade data to account statements of certain clients to reflect the specific rate of earn return that Bernie Madoff had directed for that client.

Regarding Count Six, mail fraud, on a regular basis I caused the U.S. mail to be used to send fraudulent account statements to clients from our office in Manhattan. The

account statements listed security transactions that had supposedly taken place in the client accounts, although I knew that no such transactions had indeed taken place. For example, in December of 2008, I caused fake accounts statements to be mailed from the Madoff firm to a client in Manhattan.

Regarding the wire fraud, or Count Seven, on a regular basis I caused money to be wired from bank accounts in that New York to bank accounts in London, and other places abroad. For example, in March of '07 I caused about \$14 million to be sent by wire from a bank account in London to a bank account in New York in furtherance of this fraudulent scheme.

THE COURT: How did it further this scheme?

THE DEFENDANT: Bernie Madoff was trying to present the scenario, Judge, to regulators and others that he was earning commission income on these fictitious trades in order to substantiate the ruse. He had me wire funds -- excuse me. He had our London office wire funds to New York that represented the theoretical amount of those commissioned incomes, had the regulators come in and added up all the tickets, if you will, to see our customer commissions. And in the example I cited in that particular instance, we would have had we actually done those trades earned \$14 million in commission income. So he had the London office wire to the New York office a figure of about \$14 million.

THE COURT: What was your role in connection with

Plea

those wire transfers?

THE DEFENDANT: I calculated the theoretical commissions and advised the London office where to send the money.

On Count Eight, sir, international money laundering, between 2002 and 2008, I caused money to be wired from a Madoff firm bank account in New York to a Madoff account in London, which again was used to continue this fraud. I participated in falsifying documents that were required to be made and kept accurately under the SEC rules and regulations, including ledgers, trade blotters, customer statements, and trade confirmations.

On Count Four and five, falsifying broker/dealer books and records and falsifying investment adviser books and records, between 2004 and 2008 the firm was a registered broker/dealer. Between September '06 and December '08 when the firm was also a registered as an investment adviser, it was required to make accurate books and records under the SEC rules. In January of '06, together with others, I used data from the Internet to create fake trade blotters that were made and kept and produced for the SEC.

In April of '08, together with others, I caused fake trade blotters, ledgers, and other books and records to be made and kept by the firm.

In order to discuss Count Nine, which is perjury, on

January 26, 2006, at Bernie Madoff's direction I lied to the SEC during testimony I gave under oath in Manhattan about the activities of the Madoff firm. My false testimony is set out in Paragraph 61 of the information.

I did all of these fraudulent activities, your Honor, in Manhattan.

THE COURT: Let me ask you about the perjury count.

There is a number of specifications of false statements, eight, in particular with an underlying portions which I gather are the false or allegedly false statements. Is your statement here today that the underlying portions set forth in pages 41 through 43 were in fact false statements?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At the time you uttered these statements -- this is a transcript of your testimony, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: It is indeed a transcript describing the Madoff trading operation, which I knew at time when I was describing it was entirely fraudulent.

THE COURT: So you anticipated my next question. You knew at the time you made these statements that portions of the statements, in particular the underlying portions, were false?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You did this to mislead the SEC?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

	51
	98B6DIP Plea
1	THE COURT: For what purpose?
2	THE DEFENDANT: To throw them off their tracks, sir.
3	THE COURT: Did you have a sense they were on the
4	track?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
6	THE COURT: At that point?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
8	THE COURT: These statements were made all on one
9	occasion, January 26, 2006?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
11	THE COURT: And where was that?
12	THE DEFENDANT: Down at the SEC offices in the World
13	Trade Center.
14	THE COURT: World Financial Center?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Correct.
16	THE COURT: I interrupted you. I think you were
17	proceeding on to another count.
18	THE DEFENDANT: Judge, thousands of clients,
19	institutions, individuals, funds, charities were all misled
20	about the status of their accounts, what was being done with
21	their money, and what their accounts were worth.
22	In order to discuss Count Ten, which is tax evasion,
23	let me say that in the years 2002, 5, 6 and 7, I evaded federal
24	taxes that I owed by putting some of my income in the name of a

corporation I controlled and that I didn't fully and truthfully

report my income on my federal income tax returns.

Your Honor, while this was going on, I knew no trades were happening. I knew I was participating in a fraudulent scheme. I knew what was happening was criminal and I did it anyway.

I thought for a long time that Bernie Madoff had other assets that he could liquidate if the clients requested the return of their money. That is not an excuse. There is no excuse. I knew everything that I did was wrong and it was criminal and I did it knowingly and willfully. I regret everything that I did. I accept complete responsibility for my conduct. I don't know how I went from an 18-year-old kid happening to have a job to before someone standing before the Court today. I can only say I never wanted to hurt anyone. I apologize to every victim of this catastrophe and to my family and to the government. I am very, very sorry.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. DiPascali.

Let me ask you a couple questions about the tax fraud count.

This is the years between 2002 and 2007. It sound like it is 2002, 2005, 2006, and 2007; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And when you made the false statements to the IRS, where were you when you did that? This was in your tax returns you made these false statements?

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

venue as to Count Ten.

Plea

In those years, sir, I did not file THE DEFENDANT: tax returns. THE COURT: But at the time you either filed false tax returns or didn't file tax returns, you understood that you were liable for additional taxes, that you had hidden income so to speak through this company that you controlled? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Did any of the fraud associated with the tax evasion take place in New York? MR. MUKASEY: May I have one moment, your Honor? THE COURT: Certainly. (Pause) MR. MUKASEY: Your Honor, with respect to the venue on Count Ten, I think it is fair to say that the evidence would show that the income that was evaded was earned in New York and the money was transferred into this corporation from an account To the extent that that establishes venue, we in New York. offer that for venue. If not, Judge, we are willing to waive

He is a resident of New Jersey. A lot of his personal accounting actions take place in New Jersey. So it is a movement of the money into this account that he controlled in the Southern District of New York. If it is not enough to establish venue, we will waive venue on Count Ten.

THE COURT: Mr. DiPascali, do you understand what

Mr. Mukasey just said?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, sir.

THE COURT: We didn't talk really about venue when we were going through the elements of the offense. These are the 10 elements that Mr. Litt described and these were things that would have to be demonstrated and proven beyond a reasonable doubt if you went to trial.

Each of the counts of the information also have a requirement that venue be established. The standard of proof for venue is lesser. It is by a preponderance. It means a little more than halfway basically. So what Mr. Mukasey has said is he thinks there is such basis for venue to be established on the tax evasion case; but if there weren't that you would you be prepared to waive venue, which you can do.

Is that your understanding? Is that what you wish to do?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Give me a minute. There are 10 counts here so I want to take a quick look to make sure we covered the elements.

While I am doing that, Mr. Litt, to your mind is that a sufficient allocution with respect to each of the 10 Counts of the information?

MR. LITT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey, do you agree?

Plea

1	MR. MUKASEY: I do, your Honor.			
2	Mr. DiPascali, has one or two more sentences.			
3	THE COURT: I am sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off,			
4	Mr. DiPascali.			
5	THE DEFENDANT: I wanted to make it very, very clear I			
6	know my apology means almost nothing but I hope my actions			
7	going forward with the government will mean something and I			
8	promise to dedicate all my energy to try to explain to others			
9	how this happened. I hope my help will bring some small			
10	measure of comfort to those who have been harmed.			
11	THE COURT: Thank you.			
12	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.			
13	(Pause)			
14	THE COURT: Mr. Litt, let me ask you to summarize the			
15	government's evidence if it were to go to trial.			
16	Mr. DiPascali, let me ask you to listen carefully to			
17	Mr. Litt as he summarizes the evidence and also as he			
18	summarizes your role in these offenses. Because after he is			
19	done, I am going to ask you if you take issue with or dispute			
20	anything he just said. So I want you to pay close attention.			
21	MR. LITT: Yes, your Honor. If this case were to have			
22	proceeded to trial, the government would have proven through			
23	testimony and evidence beyond a reasonable doubt the facts set			
24	forth in the information. In summary, the government would			
25	have proven that beginning at least as early as the 1980s, a			

Plea

conspiracy existed between Mr. DiPascali, Mr. Madoff, and others, to commit securities fraud, investment adviser fraud, falsifying books and records of a broker/dealer and of an investment adviser, mail fraud, wire fraud, and money laundering.

Mr. Madoff's firm, Bernard L. Madoff Investment

Securities, LLC., was a registered broker/dealer throughout the

period and was a registered investment adviser between about

September 2006 and December 11th of 2008.

Mr. DiPascali worked at the firm in New York, New York, where the firm was located beginning in 1975. By the early 1990s, Mr. DiPascali was responsible under the direction of Mr. Madoff for a major part of the firm's investment advisory business. That part of the business purported to invest client funds in the basket of stocks from the S & P 100 hedged by options transactions. In fact, the evidence would demonstrate that Mr. DiPascali, Mr. Madoff, and others knew that no stocks or options were being purchased as had been promised to investors.

Mr. Madoff, Mr. DiPascali, and other co-conspirators made it appear as though clients' investments with the firm were profitable by sending those clients literally millions of pages of false account statements and trade confirmations through the U.S. mails. Those account statements and trade confirmations reported or purported to report transactions that

had been made up using historical price data and with the benefit of hindsight. None of the reported transactions were real.

In later years when revenues from other parties of Mr. Madoff's business declined, Mr. Madoff and Mr. DiPascali wired hundreds of millions of dollars of invested funds to a bank account in London and sent some of that money back to New York, New York to an operating account that funded other parties of Mr. Madoff's business. Among the uses of interstate wires -- I should say Mr. DiPascali used interstate wires in connection with the fraud both in speaking with investors located outside New York as well as to transfer money to and from bank accounts in New York, New York.

The government also would have proven that to conceal the fraud and to deceive the SEC under the direction of Mr. Madoff, Mr. DiPascali and other co-conspirators created false books and records, records that were required to be kept and maintained by the firm and were required by SEC regulation to contain true data.

THE COURT: Can I ask -- perhaps I should have asked Mr. DiPascali this -- is Mr. DiPascali an advisement adviser or broker/dealer licensed to do these things, or the firm does and he worked with the firm?

MR. LITT: He is not. He worked for the firm. And the aiding and abetting charges in the information cover that.

25

MR. LITT:

Plea

Thank you. 1 THE COURT: 2 MR. LITT: As I was saying for the books and records, 3 SEC rules and regulations require the firm to keep various books and records both in its capacity as a broker/dealer and 4 5 as an investment adviser and Mr. Madoff, Mr. DiPascali, and 6 others caused false and fraudulent records to be created, some 7 of which were presented to the SEC as well. They did that to 8 conceal the fraud and conceal some of the activities that the 9 firm was engaged in. At Mr. Madoff's direction Mr. DiPascali also committed 10 perjury in sworn testimony from the SEC in New York. 11 several instances of that set forth under the indictment. 12 Information. 13 THE COURT: 14 MR. LITT: Sorry. 15 THE COURT: I did it before, too. 16 MR. LITT: In sum that false testimony disquised the 17 nature and scale of the investment advisory business that the 18 firm was engaged in. 19 Finally, the defendant attempted to evade federal income taxes by taking income through a nominee LLC, limited 20 liability corporation, in which he controlled in failing to 21 22 declare and pay taxes on that income. 23 Do you have a view with respect to venue THE COURT: on that count, Count Ten? 24

I think the transfer of the money from New

York, New York probably is sufficient; but I think out of an abundance of caution I think a waiver of venue is appropriate and covers venue.

THE COURT: Is a waiver of venue contained in the agreement between the parties on Count Ten?

MR. LITT: It is not.

THE COURT: So that would be something that Mr.

DiPascali has agreed to waive venue on Count Ten but it is not contained in the agreement?

MR. LITT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. DiPascali, did you hear what Mr. Littjust said.

THE DEFENDANT: I have.

THE COURT: Do you disagree or take issue with any of his characterization of the facts or the evidence in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, I don't.

THE COURT: Have a seat.

At this time I had put out a couple sign-in sheets before to provide for victims if they wish to be heard on the issue of whether or not the plea should be accepted and the plea agreement should be accepted, and if they wish to speak later on the issue of bail and remand. I had one victim sign the sheet to be heard as to whether or not the plea and plea agreement should be accepted. That is Miriam seed man.

Is Ms. Seed man here?

	DiPascali Plea Allocution Pg 61 of 95			
}	98B6DIP Plea			
1	Ms. Seed man, would you still like to be heard on this			
2	issue.			
3	MS. SIEGMAN: I would.			
4	THE COURT: Come up and use the lecturn if you don't			
5	mind. While I am here, if there is any other victim who wishes			
6	to be heard on this issue, and this issue only, who did not get			
7	a chance to sign, perhaps you can raise your hand now and I can			
8	send the sheet your way.			
9	Is there anyone?			
10	Let the record reflect that there is no other person			
11	here in the courtroom has signified that they wish to speak as			
12	a victim with respect to the issue of whether or not the Court			
13	should accept the plea and the plea agreement.			
14	Ms. Siegman, identify yourself for the record, speak			
15	slowly, spell your name too, and then I am happy to hear you.			
16	MS. SIEGMAN: Thank you, Judge Sullivan.			
17	Can you hear me?			
18	THE COURT: I can.			
19	MS. SIEGMAN: My name is Miriam Siegman. M-i-r-i-a-m,			
20	last name, S-i-e-g-m-a-n.			
21	THE COURT: I probably mispronounced your name. I			
22	apologize.			

facing homelessness. I stand before you, Judge Sullivan, to

I am a 65-year-old Madoff victim now penniless and

MS. SIEGMAN: That's fine.

23

24

25

Plea

ask that you consider rejecting this deal.

Criminal defendants in the Madoff case central to this murderous fraud want to cut deals by swapping information, naming names in exchange for lighter sentences. That, of course, is their right. To some victims, not all, but to some this behind-closed-doors bargaining seems to depend heavily on the quality and connectedness of the defendants' lawyers and a quest for expediency.

I ask, and others as well: Should these factors trump the victims and the public's need for the truth, the full truth that could come of a trial or the chance for victims to hear in open court evidence, witnesses' questioned, and cross-examined, or the chance to have brought before the mighty power of the Bench even the most exalted, the most highly placed, including government officials, and elected officials?

Has it been decided somewhere that a trial is too great a luxury, too much of an expense for the public quest for truth, too time consuming and bothersome or politically unpleasant?

Why, Judge Sullivan, am I asking you to consider my request to reject a deal? The crimes allegedly committed by Mr. DiPascali and already admitted to by Mr. Madoff, Mr. DiPascali's boss of 30 years, are enormous in scope. These crimes have affected thousands of men, women, and children, whole generations of families have been decimated, children,

parents, dependents who are ill. None of these victims knows how or why this has happened to them. The defendants won't say a word until today, even then very little, and the prosecutors have said very little to victims.

The alleged crimes were vast and systematic, executed with great attention to detail. The result total: Total destruction of normal daily life now and likely forever for thousands of us, certainly for me. Dazed, we are told that we have no need to know how the crimes against us were carried out. Today, a few tasty tidbits were thrown out into the court and I could see every snap to attention with a genuine interest in hearing those details and the need to know them.

Then there is the astonishing duration of the crime.

Mr. DiPascali was an employee of Madoff for 30 -- well over 30 years or around 30 years. The criminal enterprise went and on.

He, of course, had ample opportunity to do the right thing.

Victims have no idea how this could have been possible, this long duration. Though, there are hints of horrendous dereliction of duty within and outside of government and in the street. One sentence about lying to the SEC doesn't tell the story.

There is also the corrupting ripple effect of Mr.

DiPascali's alleged activities, activities which in the view of many victims encouraged and enabled criminal activity on the part of others, but we have learned nothing about how or why

Plea

and likely we will learn nothing about how or why.

And Finally, and perhaps the most troubling of all for me, the possible purchase of influence with the goal of protecting Madoff from investigation and legislation. Victims, and as importantly the American public, the little guy with a 401K or pension desperately need light to shine on this process. Victims want more than confirmation. They need information and knowledge. We want the kind of justice that allows the truth to be spoken out loud in a courtroom and we want to know that prosecutors will not conveniently pass over the too highly placed.

The crimes committed against me and others are life-shattering and they are forever. I want no others to suffer in this way. Judge Sullivan, you have the power to show the American people that justice works for victims and society as a whole as well as for defendants. Take the process out from behind closed doors and reject this plea deal.

In closing, if in the end you cannot, will you or someone help me and others victims understand why and how a plea deal will help them and the American public and allow men and women who run our public institutions to learn from this tragedy.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Siegman. I appreciate the time and attention you obviously put into preparing those

Plea

1 remarks.

Is there any other victim that wishes to be heard?

Let me ask Mr. Litt or Mr. Mukasey if they wish to respond to anything that Ms. Siegman just said?

MR. LITT: Not at this time, your Honor, no.

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey.

MR. MUKASEY: Simply that I think the allocution was sufficient for acceptance by the Court, Judge.

THE COURT: Ms. Siegman, I am certainly sensitive to the points you've made, but I think there is a difference between a criminal trial and a truth commission, which each may have their benefits to be sure. But I think a criminal trail is less ambitious than a truth commission.

Mr. Mukasey I think is correct in saying that the allocution that Mr. DiPascali gave is sufficient under the law and so the issue for me is there something manifestly unjust about the plea agreement or the plea that has been offered here. I don't believe that the request for the truth ends today. Certainly sentencing will not take place for several months. But before imposing sentence, I would expect to have more information than what I've heard today and what you've heard today. So I expect there will be more information and the Court will sentence on the basis of additional information. I assume that to be the case.

So in light of those remarks I will, I believe, accept

the plea. I have a few other things I would like to take up with Mr. DiPascali. I am certainly sensitive to your concerns, which I think are probably the concerns of many other people as well. Thank you for your time.

Let's me ask you now to rise again, Mr. DiPascali.

How do you now plead to Counts One through Ten of the information, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you do the things you are charged with doing in the information?

THE DEFENDANT: Indeed I did.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty because you are guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of your own free will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. DiPascali, because you acknowledge that you are guilty as charged in Counts One through Ten of the information, because you know your rights and are waiving those rights, because your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact for each of the elements of the offenses charged in the information, I accept your guilty plea and I adjudge you guilty on Counts One through Ten of the information.

	98B6DIP	Plea		
1	Yo	ou may have a seat.		
2	Mr. Litt.			
3	MR	. LITT: I would ask if the Court could inquire		
4	about whether the defendant Mr. DiPascali admits to the			
5	forfeiture allegations.			
6	TH	E COURT: Fair enough.		
7	Mr	. DiPascali, let me also ask you about the		
8	forfeiture allegations. There are two forfeiture allegations			
9	in the information.			
10	Yo	u indicated you have read them both, is that		
11	correct?			
12	ТН	E DEFENDANT: That's correct.		
13	TH	E COURT: Do you admit the facts that are contained		
14	in each of the allegations?			
15	TH	E DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.		
16	ТН	E COURT: Is that sufficient, Mr. Litt?		
17	MR	. LITT: Yes, it is.		
18	THE COURT: Thank you.			
19	Le	t's talk about sentencing now. The parties		
20	requested the sentencing be put over for a number of months in			
21	light of Mr	. DiPascali's cooperation and had requested that I		
22	set a control date in May of 2010.			
23	Is	that still the position of the parties?		
24	MR	. LITT: It is of the government, your Honor.		

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey.

98B6DIP Plea 1 It is the position of the defense, MR. MUKASEY: 2 Judge. Tell me what exactly it is that you have 3 THE COURT: So by that date I would get another submission or 4 letter from the parties, or by that date we would have 5 presumably a sentencing unless I adjourned it? 6 MR. LITT: Well, I think you would get a letter from 7 the parties, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: On that date or a date before that date? 9 MR. LITT: On that date. 10 THE COURT: On that date. You expect that the 11 12 cooperation will be going for at least that long? 13 MR. LITT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Or approximately that long? 14 15 I would say at least. MR. LITT: Mr. Mukasey, that is your position as 16 THE COURT: 17 well? 18 MR. MUKASEY: Yes, Judge. 19 THE COURT: May 15th. I will expect a letter from the government apprising the Court as to whether or not it is 20 21 prepared to go forward with sentencing, and if not proposing 22 another control date. Obviously Mr. Mukasey should be CC'd on

Let's talk about bail pending sentencing. Title 18, Section 3143(a) provides that a defendant shall be detained

23

24

25

any correspondence.

Plea

following a plea or conviction, unless the judicial officer finds by clear and convincing evidence that the person is not likely to flee. This is for the period between a jury's verdict or in the case of today a guilty plea and the sentencing.

So I had also had sign-in sheet to hear from any victims who wish to be heard on this sheet. No one has signed that sheet.

Does anyone wish to be heard with respect to bail or remand?

The parties have submitted a letter, which I referenced earlier. Bear with me while I am looking for it. I remember it well. It provided for a bond of \$400,000 -- excuse me, \$2.5 million to be secured by three financially responsible persons, to be secured with property of \$400,000 which would in essence be the equity value in the home of Mr. DiPascali's sister, surrender of all travel documents with no new applications permitted, and travel restricted to the Southern District of New York, Eastern District of New York, and here it says the District of Pennsylvania but Pennsylvania has more than one district, as well as regular pretrial supervision.

Is that the position of the parties?

MR. LITT: We meant to say the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the District of New Jersey, which is where the defendant lives.

25

Plea

1 MR. MUKASEY: That's right. THE COURT: I see. Anything else that the parties 2 wish to say on this? 3 4 MR. LITT: No, your Honor. 5 MR. MUKASEY: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey. 7 By agreement with Mr. Litt, subject to MR. MUKASEY: approval of the Court, we would ask for one week from today 8 9 until August 18th to satisfy those bail conditions if they are acceptable to your Honor. 10 11 THE COURT: I am not sure they are. I should state that up front. Following a jury's verdict or following a 12 quilty plea there is a presumption that the defendant will be 13 detained, remanded pending sentencing. That is for a variety 14 That is the Bail Reform Act of 1984. 15 of reasons. everyone at the front two tables understands that. 16 17 So I want to explore that. It seems to me that this 18 defendant has ample incentive to flee. I understand he is cooperating with the government, but the defendant is 52 years 19 He is facing a maximum term of imprisonment of 125 years. 20 Although the plea agreement has no guidelines calculation, I 21 certainly have done an admittedly quick and dirty quidelines 22 23 calculation. But based on just the fraud counts, it seems to me that the guidelines calculation comes out at a fairly 24

astronomical place based on the amount of the loss involved,

based on the abuse of trust that was involved in the course of the schemes to which Mr. DiPascali admitted.

So it seems to me under the guidelines, even with the acceptance the guidelines would call for a range of mandatory life. Now, because the maximum sentence is not life but 125 years, under the guidelines before considering cooperation, before considering the Section 3553(a) factors, the guidelines would be recommending a life term. So that is certainly serious, serious consequences facing Mr. DiPascali.

Now, the bail package proposed here by normal standards would seem pretty considerable. There is 2.5 million dollar bond that would have three financially responsible persons and property that is valued -- at least the equity value is \$400,000. So by most standards that would be a pretty large package. But that amount is completely dwarfed by the amount of restitution and forfeiture in this case. \$170 billion is what the plea agreement provides for Mr. DiPascali to forfeit. So it would seem to me that a 2.5 million dollar bond thrown on top of that mountain doesn't count for much.

Now, the next argument would be that the financially responsible persons, the co-signers and Mr. DiPascali's sister would have some moral suasion over him, that he would be disinclined to flee or do anything that might put them at risk, and only that might be persuasive. But in this case there are thousands of victims who many of them lost more than \$2.5

million. So the fact that three more victims might be thrown on top of a long list of victims doesn't strike me as a terribly compelling basis to believe that Mr. DiPascali would be deterred from engaging in conduct that would constitute a violation of the terms of his bail or flight.

Now, the penalties for bail jumping are by most human standards considerable. It is five years' imprisonment, maximum, with a two-level enhancement for obstruction of justice on top of the guidelines calculation in this case. But here it would be again virtually meaningless. It would expand the maximum penalty from 125 years to 130 years. It would expand the guidelines calculation from what I think looks like a level 46 to a level 48. And for those of you unfamiliar with the guidelines level 43 is life. So you can't do much more than that.

So in light of this, the package strikes me as fairly symbolic and not terribly onerous in light of the other facts in this case. So it seems to me that it is really we are on an honor system. I am being asked to believe that Mr. DiPascali is not going to run away because he has turned his life around and that I should credit his statements here today that he is sorry for what he has done and he is committed to making amends to the best of his ability, which I can understand the sentiment. But the fact of the matter is the defendant's conduct which is admitted today doesn't give me great

Plea

confidence on that store.

Mr. DiPascali has admitted to a 20-year period of fraud in which he committed perjury to the SEC under oath. He maintained and manufactured false books and records that were designed to mislead regulators and auditors. He issued by his own account and the government's account literally thousands or even millions of statements to investors that were designed to mislead them and lull them into maintaining investments they had made or increasing the investments that they had made. The money laundering that is set forth in one of the accounts describes a fairly massive-scale scheme that continued as recently as December of 2008.

So I think all of that suggests to me that Mr.

DiPascali is not a good bet. I think the argument that I anticipate is that, Well, Mr. DiPascali understands that if he violates the terms of his bail then his cooperation agreement will be ripped up and any hope he would have for a sentence below the guidelines would be greatly diminished. I understand that as well. But I don't think it would be irrational for a defendant faced with the kind of sentence that Mr. DiPascali is facing to decide that maybe cooperation is not going to do it.

So all of this basically leads me to the statute, back to the statute which is that I need to be persuaded as the judicial officer that there is clearing and convincing evidence that he is not going to flee and at this point I am not really

1 | there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So let me hear from counsel if they want to be heard on this. Mr. Mukasey.

MR. MUKASEY: Thirty seconds, Judge, to confer?

THE COURT: Certainly.

(Pause)

MR. MUKASEY: Judge, if I could be heard on the issue.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. MUKASEY: Mr. DiPascali, your Honor, has known that he has been under investigation that could put him in jail for the rest of his life since December 11th, 2008. At that time he was served with a grand jury subpoena. He has known that this day was coming for probably eight months.

THE COURT: Can I interrupt you?

Because it seems to me that based on what has been described to me is that Mr. DiPascali must have known that this house of cards was going to come crashing down for years but it didn't prevent him from doing what he did up until December of 2008.

MR. MUKASEY: As Mr. DiPascali mentioned, Judge, I think that he always thought that there would be a safe landing for many investors and it wasn't until really the end that he learned the full truth of this.

I would like to address my comments really to his ties to the community and why I think notwithstanding your guideline

analysis, which is pretty darn accurate, and notwithstanding the really cataclysmic nature of the fraud here, I think Mr. DiPascali is a clear and convincing bet to return to court.

He has known he has been under investigation for the better part of nine months. He has been speaking with the U.S. Attorney's Office. He has been following the guidance by the FBI. I am not shy to say that I believe he has established a relationship with the agents of trust. He is where he is supposed to be when they ask him to be there. He has been at every proffer, at every meeting, and every location that he is supposed to be at. He understands that he has but one way to ever see the light of day and that is to satisfy the government that he is trustworthy person.

I think the government is signing him up to the cooperation agreement says something about their trust in him. He understands that he has got miles to go in terms of providing substantial assistance. He is here today and he has known he was going to be here today to try to reach that goal. He understands that he is working his way down from probably a life sentence. I anticipate Mr. DiPascali, and I think the government would back me up on this, to be a cooperator in a white-collared case in a historic nature, somebody who can pull the curtain back on a fraud and answer a lot of questions that Ms. Siegman wants to be answered and the whole world wants to be answered.

We would not have gone through what was really a grueling process to convince the government that he was a person worthy of its trust if we didn't want to see this through to the end. Mr. DiPascali does want to see it through to the end and that is why he came here and admitted in open court a fraud of 30 years or the better part of 20 or 30 years.

Let me talk a little bit, Judge, about Mr. DiPascali's background. He has in Bridgewater, New Jersey, four children. He comes from an extremely close family. In fact, this is the first time I have ever seen him discuss the fraud without breaking down and crying. He is an emotional person. He is not a person that would ever do anything to harm his family. I think that really in the back of his mind he wasn't convinced that investors would be hurt here. Of course they could have been. I am not sure he was convinced that they would have been had Mr. Madoff actually had assets to back this up.

Let me tell you a little bit about each of Mr.

DiPascali's kids and the relationship he has with them as well has his siblings. He has a daughter today who is starting

Brooklyn Law School. Yesterday he went with her to move her in. He is incredibly close with her.

He has three sons -- Frank, Jr., Greg, and Mike. The two young ones live at home. Mr. DiPascali is their world and he is their world. He supports his mother who is 77 years old and also lives in Bridgewater with one of his sisters. Then he

Plea

98B6DIP

has the other sister who is willing to post her house to show her confidence in Mr. DiPascali.

I think that if the amount of the bond were raised and perhaps if we could somehow find additional security that that could be thrown on to the pile as well. There is not a bail package in the universe that is not without some risk, but I think this is a bail package that can be fashioned into a bail package that gives the Court comfort, like the government has comfort in Mr. DiPascali.

It is worth pointing out that since January Mr. DiPascali has been operating under, to use your term, the honor system with the government. They have never frozen his assets. They never seized his bank accounts. He voluntarily turned over to the U.S. Marshal some of his property. He is prepared to turn over his property. He has been operating since January on really a letter agreement with the government regarding his spending knowing that he would be ultimately subject to a forfeiture order. He has not violated the government's trust once.

Every month we report to the government the amount of money he is spending. They are keeping him on a tight leash and he is abiding by that. He has almost no assets that are not forfeitable. So as soon as the government moves to freeze the bank accounts and seize the bank accounts, he is not going to have disposable income. He doesn't have an ability to flee.

Plea

He doesn't have anywhere to go frankly. We turned over his passport. My office has kept the passport for months.

To the extent it is worth knowing, he has put hundreds of hours into preparing to proffer with the government, learning about what it means to be a government witness, learning what it means to accept responsibility and hopefully get a 5K1 letter because he wants it not because he wants to take off. He takes care of his mother. The Pretrial Services officer asked this morning, Do you speak to your mother and your sisters on a weekly basis? And he said, No, much more than that. He speaks to them not on a daily basis but sometimes on a multiple-times-in-a-day basis.

It sounds maybe odd stacked up against this fraud, but he is a family person. He doesn't travel. He doesn't go on lavish vacations. He is a homebody. He wants to cause no more pain to his kids. He sat in our office a couple nights ago explaining to his family the possibilities and the consequences. He has been straight up with them, he has been straight up with the government.

You can take this bet, Judge, Mr. DiPascali is here to do the right thing. He wants the 5K letter. It would be inane for him to flee and leave his family with nothing as it is. They are going to have to endure very, very rough times. I don't think he thinks about it in terms of, Well, I am facing

Plea

98B6DIP

life in prison, what is another two years if I get a bail jumping charge. He thinks of it in the opposite way, which is I am facing life in prison and I better show up every darn day if I am to avoid anything but that.

That is why we entered into the cooperation agreement. That is why we hope Mr. DiPascali can satisfy the Miriam
Siegmans of the world and the government and this Court. I
don't want to put anybody on the spot. I think the FBI agents
would speak to diligence and his compliance and his ability to
be trusted to continue to work with them. I think they would
establish a very good relationship with him, professional and
arm's length but very trusting. You can imagine the hill that
the government faced in offering him a cooperation agreement.
They I think came at this perhaps at the beginning with the
same scepticism that your Honor does and he won them over. If
your Honor releases him on an appropriate bail package, he will
win your Honor over with trust and with compliance.

May I have one moment, Judge?

THE COURT: Certainly.

(Pause)

MR. MUKASEY: Thank you for hearing me, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Litt, anything you want to add?

MR. LITT: I would ask a couple of points that I think your Honor anticipated in the arguments. Mr. Mukasey hit on some of them.

Mr. DiPascali, we do believe has known since very early on -- December 11th, 12th -- that he was a key player in this and he was under investigation and has not fled. He has always cooperated with the government to date and appeared when called upon to do so. He showed up today knowing what the consequences of his actions today would be and certainly deserves credit for that.

He does appear to be close to his family and he does have significant ties to the community. The plea agreement that he has entered into gives him every incentive to appear and to try to fulfill the terms of that agreement because to do otherwise would likely confine him to the rest of his life in jail.

THE COURT: If he flees and you were able to get him back.

MR. LITT: Yes. That's right, your Honor.

With respect to the bail package and amount, the reason why there is less securities than there is in some other cases there might have been is related to the forfeiture issue and the fact that most of Mr. DiPascali's assets are subject to forfeiture. And over the coming weeks we expect to be presenting preliminary orders or forfeiture to your Honor which may be submitted any time prior to sentencing to start the process of accomplishing that. We have already to date confiscated some of Mr. DiPascali's assets.

Plea

Finally, the government believes that the assistance, if we did not believe that he could provide substantial assistance to the government, we wouldn't have entered into this agreement. We do believe that he can provide substantial assistance and we believe that his ability to do so would be hampered were he to be detained.

THE COURT: Why is that?

MR. LITT: This is a very documented intensive investigation, among other things. There are literally millions of pages of documents and data and computer equipment and the like that it will be very beneficial were he to be able to have access to provide the substantial assistance that we expect he will be able to do.

I think some of the concerns that your Honor has can be addressed in part through electronic monitoring and home detention if your Honor thinks that would add such an additional layer of surety about flight. There are flaws with that as your Honor well knows. There is no substitute in terms of assuring somebody's presence in court other than incarceration, but the government certainly believes that given his connections to the community, again his record with the government to date, the fact that he has not fled in the last eight months, the fact that he showed up today and admitted his guilt, exposed himself to 125 years of incarceration, that he has three family members who would be tremendously harmed were

he to flee if they were approved as cosigners on the package, that those things even without home detention and electronic monitoring in the government's view provide clear and convincing evidence in this case, and every case must be viewed on its own facts, to reasonably assure clear and convincing evidence that Mr. DiPascali would appear when required.

Certainly those factors when necessary combined with home detention and electronic monitoring would do that.

THE COURT: Mr. Litt, I am looking at a submission you made to me in another case, which you reminded me that the Bail Reform Act of 1984 creates no general expectation of post verdict liberty. To the contrary, it establishes as a presumption in favor of detention. You then went on to remind me that "the interest in detaining defendants who have been found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of such crimes also includes the need to encourage general respect for the law by signaling that a guilty person will not be able to avoid or delay imposition and service of the sentence prescribed by law."

So, look, let me say this: I have great respect for the lawyers in this room. I know them. I think they are good at what they do and I have great respect for them. Clearly they have taken the positions they take because they believe them and I don't disregard that lightly. On the other hand, I think everybody recognizes that each of us has an independent

98B6DIP

Plea

role to play in this process.

Mr. Litt and Mr. Mukasey have focused on what Mr. DiPascali has done since December of 2008. I keep focusing on what he did for 20 or 30 years before that. I keep thinking of how many people put their trust in Mr. DiPascali and have lived to regret it deeply and I am frankly reluctant to put my trust in Mr. DiPascali. I don't see why he would anymore respect the oath he would take on a bail package than he would respect the oath he took in front of the SEC, another arm of the government. So I think we may have disagreement on this one.

I am not persuaded. Maybe I haven't heard enough about how remand would affect his ability to cooperate with the government. I think there are lots of individuals who are in custody who can still cooperate very effectively and work with law enforcement agents very effectively. On this record, in the length of time that this conspiracy went on, again the amount and nature of the misrepresentations to clients, to government entities, to auditors, I just cannot find by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. DiPascali does not pose a risk of flight. I just can't do it.

MR. MUKASEY: Judge, if I could add some facts to the record that might help persuade you that he is a trustworthy defendant. In terms of your concern about how he would be hampered from cooperating were he detained, not only he is going to cooperate with the U.S. Attorney's Office and with the

Plea

FBI, I can tell you from having been in these proffers, it is an extremely onerous process involving computers and documents and account statements and it requires the sort of 8-hour, 10-hour, 12-hour sessions that you just cannot have when you are remanded.

He is also going to be cooperating with the SEC, with the IRS, with any agency that wishes to speak with him, and we hope and we believe there will be a number of agencies both inside New York and outside New York that wish to speak with him. We've discussed among ourselves the Massachusetts Attorney General has been very, very active in this case.

Obviously he is a U.S. Attorney's Office cooperator, but I would hope that when the Madoff cases are going to spring up all over the country, Mr. DiPascali will be at least a very valuable witness to debrief to understand the operations and he is not a testifying witness. There are civil lawsuits that he may be able to help people out. I think he is going to be working chiefly with the FBI and SEC here in New York, but he can and is ready, willing and able to work with these other agencies.

The SEC of course have their limitations on where they can do and when they can go and when Mr. DiPascali can go if he were detained. I think it would seriously hinder his ability to work with the SEC. Part of what the world wants to know here is how did the SEC fail to catch this for lack of a better

phrase and just to use the terms of discussion of the day. I don't know the case that your Honor read back Mr. Litt's language to him but I would ask the Court consider whether that was a case of cooperation.

THE COURT: It was not.

MR. MUKASEY: And you make a good point obviously about --

THE COURT: You have to say that, Mr. Mukasey.

MR. MUKASEY: I am not saying I agree with everything. You make a good point about how do trust a guy who basically has been a fraudster for 25 years. Here is the answer: He lived in a universe for 25 years that he doesn't live in anymore. On December 11th he exited that universe. Once he got out of that universe -- by the way that universe was twisted and it was perverted, and it was almost impossible for somebody who wasn't living in that universe to understand. It was an alternative reality. It was not the kind of conspiracy where a bunch of people are down in the dungeon plotting how to rip off innocent old ladies. It wasn't like that.

Mr. DiPascali started with Mr. Madoff when he was 18 or 19 years old. He didn't know the way things run at Goldman Sachs. He didn't know the way things run at Morgan Stanley. So sat and watched and he learned and listened and at some point after several years I think a light went off, I think he said to himself, This is kind of a bizarre universe but this is

98B6DIP Plea

my universe. This is what Bernie tells me to do and this is what I am doing. By the way no one is going to get hurt at the end because Bernie Madoff has been telling me he has assets abroad and in real estate and in commodities that are going to make sure that all the clients' money will be able to be returned.

So he wasn't out there sort of ripping and robbing and stealing as you might think of it. He is guilty? 1,000 percent. No question about it. There is no way we could have a trial in this matter. He is absolutely guilty. He was living in a universe creating fake trade tickets and creating fake trade blotters. It is the way you did things. It was okay because Bernie was going to take care of it. Don't worry, Bernie will take care of it. That is how he went to sleep at night. That was the universe he was living in for 25 years, 20 years.

On December 11th he came to my office shaking, crying out of that universe. He stepped out of that universe and stepped into the real kind of world, the world that Ms. Siegman lives in, I live in, you live in. The world where you cannot create a fake trade ticket and say, Don't worry it is okay because no one is going to get hurt here. He realizes now, he is out of that universe. He is in a universe with laws and rules and regulations and oaths and promises and trusts.

I am happy to tell you that we had to knock hard on

Plea

98B6DIP

the door of the U.S. Attorney's Office to get Mr. DiPascali in there because they originally have the same -- I don't want to speak for them. I would imagine prosecutors in the real world have the same degree of scepticism. The guy was a fraudster for 25 years. How could I trust him? How can I put him on the witness stand? Well, you know what? He earned their trust. He now I think has their trust. Because he stepped out of the universe, the one that you are focusing on, the one that said you have wanton disregard for these victims and you have a 20-year history of fraud.

He is in a new world where he talks to the FBI agents almost every day. They were at his house yesterday. He goes to the U.S. Attorney's Office at his job. It is going be his full-time job. Never has never missed an appearance. He comes early. He stays late. He goes outside to smoke and gets a class of water. Otherwise he is in there looking at records, explaining history.

So you are right there was a world that he is going get punished for. He doesn't live in that world anymore. Now he is in this world. Now he is in the world where he has got to live up to what he says and he has to tell the truth or he is going to go right back to that world where the only other inhabitant is Bernie Madoff spending 150 years in prison.

THE COURT: I understand the arguments and the sincerity of what you are saying and what Mr. Litt is saying

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

that you have each reached a conclusion that Mr. DiPascali would do that. Perhaps you know him better than I. I don't think I can overlook the conduct that he admitted to today, which I think coupled with the seriousness of the penalties that he is looking at I think provides ample incentive to flee if cooperation doesn't look like it is going to pan out the way he thought, or as he gets closer to the day of sentencing that the harsh realities of a sentence for this conduct starts staring him in the face. I think in light of all facts and all the conduct in this case and in light that Mr. DiPascali has made false statements to the SEC and to others and in light of the fact for decades he made false statements to people that entrusted him with their life savings -- I am not going to trust him with his life savings. I am just hoping he shows up to court. People entrusted him with the life savings. unpersuaded respectfully.

MR. MUKASEY: Perhaps if we can add some heft to the bail package, something such as home detention.

THE COURT: Well, look, I don't rule out the possibility of the parties to make another motion. Based on what is before me today and based on the proposal that has been made jointly by the parties for bail, I am going to deny that request. I am going to remand Mr. DiPascali. It not designed to be punitive. Time for sentencing is later. It is designed really I think to meet the objectives of the statute in light

1 of the facts as I understand them.

Mr. DiPascali, it may not be what you wanted or expected today but --

MR. MUKASEY: May I have one moment to discuss one matter with the government?

THE COURT: Certainly.

(Pause)

MR. LITT: Your Honor, if I could at the risk of trotting over ground that we've covered, first with respect to the brief that your Honor mentioned that, as your Honor knows, was in a case following three and a half years of intense litigation and a nine-week trial, not a cooperator.

THE COURT: A man whose fraud, total fraud was tiny in comparison to this defendant's, right.

MR. LITT: Yes. Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't want anyone to be in the dark here. I am referring to Mr. Litt's submission in the case of United States v. Alberto Villar, 05 CR 621.

MR. LITT: That's right. I guess what I am having difficulty articulating is it is essential I think is that we believe that Mr. DiPascali's cooperation, what he wants to do, what he says he wants to do will be hampered if we --

THE COURT: You have to take him out in order to bring him to the FBI. Look, we are all experienced with cooperators. We all know there are many cooperators who are in custody who

are able to cooperate and meet with law enforcement officials and engage in cooperation. He is not doing anything activity. He is not wearing a wire and going out. I am not sure I am persuaded that he needs to be out to be able to effectively cooperate.

MR. LITT: The documents involved in this case fill a half a floor of a New York office building and about 6,000 boxes in a warehouse and a computer server that was dedicated in large part to the investment advisory activities, a computer that Mr. DiPascali has a certain amount of specialized knowledge about, a server that has proprietary software, that is ancient by modern standards in terms of technology and the operating system and the like. The records and the unraveling of what happened in this case over decades requires looking through exactly what I just described, a half of a floor of an office building.

In going through this process, and I will just speak in hypotheticals, to present a document to a witness that triggers a recollection of something else. It is one thing to be able to walk across the room or pull a file and present that file in realtime and through that process get to the bottom of what happened and a very small piece of what happened in this case then it would be to do that process through the cumbersome circumstance of Mr. DiPascali's being incarcerated.

I think it will just be a lot more efficient, the

Plea

government will be able to get Mr. DiPascali's cooperation much more fully, completely, efficiently, and quicker if he is out.

I would just urge the Court --

THE COURT: Let's me interrupt you, though. That is not really the consideration of 3143. It doesn't say or if the government thinks it would be more convenient to have a person out. So clearly the government has reached a conclusion. And I don't mean this disrespectfully. Clearly you reached a determination that bail is appropriate. I understand that. I am not persuaded by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. DiPascali is going to be here at the time of sentencing given the monumental sentence he is facing and given the amount of cooperation that is going to be needed to put a dent into that sentence.

So, look, I don't think there is much more that you folks can say today that is going to persuade me. If you want to make another submission, I will consider it. But on the basis of the facts as I have laid them out, I am not prepared to agree to the bail package that you have all proposed.

MR. MUKASEY: Understood that the current bail package on the table needs to be withdrawn and obviously I am told needs some more energy and some more heft. Judge, we were obviously surprised by your Honor's take on this and what I would propose is to allow us to brief this issue and or -- I quess the law is pretty clear. I am not sure how much briefing

98B6DIP

Plea

there is going to be, but Mr. DiPascali's family is completely unprepared for this. He is completely unprepared for this. He is the financial provider to his family. I frankly didn't recognize --

THE COURT: Is he working, though?

MR. MUKASEY: No. But I think he is certainly taking care of his family, the four kids and the girl in law school and the boys that are home for the summer. I think that we can probably work out a package if your Honor were to give us 48 hours, 72 hours that was strict, that satisfied your Honor of his ties to the community.

I agree that cooperation is not one of the 3142, 43 prongs. However, I think it bears some thinking about really how he will be able to cooperator or not cooperate if he is remanded, and probably satisfy your Honor with a package that includes home detention, strict Pretrial Services reporting, perhaps less travel, and a lot more for those he loves to lose.

THE COURT: I am reacting to what I have in front of me now. The statute is pretty clear that unless I make the finding that I am not prepared to make, Mr. DiPascali is remanded. So I am going to order his remand without prejudice to renewing a motion whenever you see fit with whatever submissions you think appropriate.

Mr. DiPascali, we have not set a sentencing date for you. That is because it has been represented to me that your

98B6DIP

Plea

cooperation will continue for some time. We have a control date in May. Then perhaps we will have more information as to when we will go forward with sentencing. I want to make sure you understand about sentencing, however. As I said before, the Probation Department will prepare a report, a presentence report, that will be quite extensive. They will interview a number of people, including the government to get more information about the offenses that are in the information, and also interview you, among others. So I would ask that you be cooperative with the Probation Department as they prepare that report.

Mr. Mukasey, I assume you wish to be present for any interview?

MR. MUKASEY: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: I will direct that no interview is to take place unless Mr. Mukasey is present. So if they show up to interview you and Mr. Mukasey is not there, you remind them that I told you not to go forward. If Mr. Mukasey directs you not for answer certain questions, listen to him, but don't make any false statements to the Probation Department. If you were to do that, it could be a separate offense or an enhancement for obstruction of justice. So I think that would serve no one's interest. Be as cooperative as you can be.

Mr. Mukasey.

MR. MUKASEY: I am going to back to the bail issue. I

Plea

98B6DIP

2.0

think that it might persuade your Honor what Mr. DiPascali is looking forward to in terms of his cooperation and the ties that he has to his family and the community and the cooperation that he has already given to the government is perhaps if I were allowed to ask the FBI Agent Keith Kelley some questions that --

THE COURT: Asking here in open court, you mean?

MR. MUKASEY: Yeah. I don't want to do anything that will put anybody on the spot, but I think there is a relationship of trust here that can be considered a tie to the community, in addition with the FBI and the government, which I think Special Agent Kelley would shed some light on, in addition to the very, very close ties Mr. DiPascali has with his family.

THE COURT: I am not sure what you are asking me. Are you asking me to put Mr. Kelley on the stand and let you examine him?

(Pause)

THE COURT: Counsel.

Mr. Mukasey.

MR. MUKASEY: I am going to withdraw that application.

THE COURT: If you folks want to renew the application, you can do so. I think I've explained what my concerns are and what the burden is.

Is there anything else we need to cover today,

Plea 98B6DIP Mr. Litt? MR. LITT: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey? MR. MUKASEY: If I can have just one moment? (Pause) MR. MUKASEY: Nothing further, Judge. THE COURT: Thank you all. I will hear from you May 15th if not before then. I appreciate all your time. Thank you to the court reporter, the marshals, and all the victims who came as well.

Exhibit 3

1 1BLMKUGP1 Plea UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 10 Cr. 228 (LTS) v. 5 DAVID KUGEL, 6 Defendant. 8 New York, N.Y. November 21, 2011 9 12:45 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 JULIAN MOORE 17 LISA A. BARONI MATTHEW SCHWARTZ 18 Assistant United States Attorneys MARTIN ADELMAN DANIEL ZELENKO 20 MICHAEL BLUMENTHAL Attorneys for Defendant 21 22 ALSO PRESENT: GREG HAGARTY, FBI PAUL TAKLA, FBI 23 JEFFREY STEIMEL, Pretrial Services 24 25

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

2 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 (Case called) 2 MR. MOORE: Good afternoon, your Honor, Julian Moore 3 for the government. With me at counsel table are my colleagues 4 of the USA, Lisa Baroni and Matthew Schwartz. Also present are 5 Special Agents Greg Hagarty and Paul Takla of the FBI. Jeff 6 Steimel of U.S. Pretrial Services is also with us. 7 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Moore, Ms. Baroni, 8 Mr. Schwartz, Agent Hagarty, Agent Takla, Officer Steimiel. 9 MR. ADELMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Martin Adelman for Mr. Kugel. The other gentlemen will introduce 10 11 themselves. THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Adelman, and good 12 13 afternoon, Mr. Kugel. MR. ZELEKNO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Daniel 14 15 Zelenko and Michael Blumenthal, also appearing on behalf of Mr. Kugel. 16 17 THE COURT: Good afternoon Mr. Zelenko and good 18 afternoon, Mr. Blumenthal, and good afternoon, everyone in attendance. 19 I would just like to say, I understand there was a 20 21 little bit of a miscommunication with respect to the door signage. I was conducting a trial in here this morning. As 22 23 you can see, it is a fairly small courtroom. The sign should

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

hope ye who entered here. Forgive us. It was just a matter of

have said: Kugel on at 12:30, trial in progress, not abandon

24

25

3 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 not wanting to have a lot of unnecessarily disruptive activity 2 going on while the trial was going on. But I also assumed that 3 anyone who would have come in while the trial was going on 4 would not have been disruptive. Again, my apologies. There 5 was no meaning to offend. And I hope that none was taken. 6 It is my understanding that Mr. Kugel has an 7 application to waive indictment and enter a guilty plea to a 8 six-count superseding information which is labeled S4 10 Cr. 9 228. Now, Mr. Adelman, would you be the principal one I 10 11 should speak to, or should it be Mr. Zelenko? 12 MR. ADELMAN: That's fine, yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Adelman, is that correct? 13 14 MR. ADELMAN: Yes, ma'am, it is. 15 THE COURT: And the plea is pursuant to the agreement that has been marked as Government Exhibit 1 and has been 16 executed and is at defense table. Is that correct? 17 MR. ADELMAN: Yes, it is, ma'am. 18 THE COURT: And an advice of rights form has also been 19 20 reviewed and executed and marked as Court Exhibit 1. Is that 21 correct? 22 MR. ADELMAN: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Now, I have a question for the government. 24 Mr. Moore, are you the principal one today? 25 MR. MOORE: Yes, today, your Honor.

4

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 THE COURT: Would you make a statement regarding 2 victim notification in connection with this proceeding? 3 MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor. As the Court is aware, 4 last week we reached out via a letter to the Court requesting 5 that today's proceeding be publicized. Your Honor so kindly 6 issued that order. And as of that date, which I believe was 7 Wednesday, December 16, we published on the U.S. Attorney's 8 Madoff website that today's proceeding would be conducted and 9 that Mr. Kugel, the defendant present in court today, would be pleading pursuant to the S4 superseding indictment to the 10 11 counts that we will go through today. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Kugel, before I accept your waiver of 13 indictment and your guilty plea, there are a number of 14 questions that I must ask you while you are under oath to 15 assure that it is a valid waiver and plea. At times I may cover a point more than once and I may cover matters that were 16 17 also addressed in the advice of rights form that you have seen. But if I do so, that will be because it is very important that 18 you understand what is happening here today. 19 20 In that connection, if you don't understand something 21 that I ask you, please say so and I will reword the question or you may speak with your attorney. 22 23 Do you understand that? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Ms. Ng, would you please administer the

5 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 oath or affirmation. 2 (Defendant sworn) 3 THE COURT: Would you please state your full name for 4 the record. 5 THE DEFENDANT: David Louis Kugel. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Kugel, do you understand that you have 7 solemnly promised to tell the truth and that if you answer any 8 of my questions falsely, your false or untrue answers may later 9 be used against you in another prosecution for perjury or 10 making a false statement? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: You can be seated for the next portion of 13 the proceeding. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: How old are you, sir? THE DEFENDANT: 66. 16 17 THE COURT: And how far did you go in school? THE DEFENDANT: I have a graduate -- undergraduate 18 19 degree. THE COURT: In this particular field? 20 THE DEFENDANT: BBA in accounting, business 21 administration. 22 23 THE COURT: Since you finished your formal schooling, 24 what types of work have you done? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Brokerage firms, security work.

б

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 THE COURT: Are you able to read, speak, and 2 understand English well? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Are you a citizen of the United States? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been 7 under the care of a doctor or psychiatrist? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Are you under care for any condition that affects your ability to think clearly? 10 THE DEFENDANT: I don't know, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: You don't know? 12 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Are you taking any medication that affects 14 15 your ability to think clearly? THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Are you under treatment for any condition 17 or taking any medication that affects your judgment in terms of 18 making important decisions for yourself? 19 20 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: In the past 24 hours have you taken any drugs, medicine or pills or have you drunk any alcohol? 22 23 THE DEFENDANT: I have taken medicine, prescribed medicine. No alcohol. 24 25 THE COURT: And have you taken the prescription

7

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 medicine on the schedule prescribed and in the amount 2 prescribed? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Is your mind clear today? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Are you feeling well physically today? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Are you represented by counsel here today? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And who are your lawyers? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Martin Adelman, Dan Zelenko, and 12 Michael Blumenthal. THE COURT: Messrs. Adelman, Zelenko and Blumenthal 13 and Mr. Moore, does any of you have any doubt as to Mr. Kugel's 14 15 competence to waive indictment and plead guilty at this time? 16 MR. MOORE: No, your Honor. And the government is aware of Mr. Kugel's prescribed medication that he takes, as 17 indicated on page 3 of the pretrial services report. 18 19 THE COURT: Defense counsel. 20 MR. ADELMAN: The same answer, your Honor. 21 MR. ZELEKNO: Same, your Honor. MR. BLUMENTHAL: Same also, your Honor. 22 23 THE COURT: Mr. Kugel, your attorneys have informed me 24 that you wish to waive indictment and enter a guilty plea to an 25 information.

8 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 Do you wish to waive indictment and plead guilty? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Have you fully discussed your case with 4 your attorneys, including the charges to which you intend to 5 plead guilty and any possible defenses to those charges? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Have you and your attorneys also discussed 8 the consequences of entering a guilty plea? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Are you satisfied with your attorneys and 10 11 their representation of you? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Kugel's responses to my questions and my observations of his demeanor, I find that 14 15 he is fully competent to waive indictment and enter an informed plea at this time. 16 17 Before I accept your plea, sir, I am going to ask you some more questions. These questions are intended to satisfy 18 the Court that you wish to plead guilty because you are in fact 19 20 guilty and that you fully understand your rights and the 21 consequences of your plea. Now, I will describe to you certain rights that you 22 have under the Constitution and laws of the United States. You 23 24 will be giving up these rights if you enter a guilty plea. 25 Please listen carefully. If you do not understand something

9

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 that I'm saying or describing, stop me and I or your attorney 2 will explain it more fully. 3 Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, 4 you have the right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on 5 the charges against you that are in the information. 6 Do you understand that? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Do you understand that you have the right to plead not guilty and to continue to plead not guilty? 9 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would be 12 presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove 13 you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. 14 You would not have to prove that you were innocent at trial. 15 Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: If there were a trial, a jury composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree 18 unanimously in order to find you guilty. 19 20 Do you understand that? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: If there were a trial and at all stages 22 23 leading up to it, you would have the right to be represented by 24 an attorney. And if you could not afford one, an attorney 25 would be provided to you free of cost.

10

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the 4 right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you and your 5 attorney could cross-examine them. You would have the right to 6 have your attorney object to the government's evidence and 7 offer evidence on your behalf, if you so desired. You would 8 also have the right to have witnesses required to come to court 9 to testify in your defense, and you would have the right to testify yourself, but you would not be required to testify. 10 11 Do you understand all that? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Do you understand that if there were a trial and you decided not to testify, no adverse inference 14 15 could be drawn against you based on your decision not to 16 testify? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that if you were 18 convicted at a trial, you would have the right to appeal that 19 20 verdict? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand each and every one of 22 23 these rights that I have questioned you about? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Do you have any questions about any of

11 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 these rights? 2. THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you understand that by pleading guilty 4 today you will be giving up each and every one of these rights, 5 that you will be waiving these rights? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Do you also understand that you will be 8 waiving any possible claim that your constitutional rights may 9 have been violated and that you will have no trial? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: One moment. 11 Ms. Baroni, do you need water? 12 13 MS. BARONI: That would be great, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Ms. Ng. 15 MS. BARONI: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Kugel, do you understand that by 16 17 entering a plea of guilty you will also have to give up your right not to incriminate yourself because I will ask you 18 questions about what you did in order to satisfy myself that 19 20 you are quilty as charged and you will have to admit and 21 acknowledge your guilt? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 22 23 THE COURT: Do you understand that you can change your

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

mind right now and refuse to enter a guilty plea. You do not

have to enter this plea if you do not want to, for any reason.

24

25

12

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 Do you understand this fully? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: And do you still wish to plead guilty? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: The document that contains the charges to 6 which you've indicated you wish to plead guilty is called an 7 information. It has been issued by the United States Attorney. 8 You have a constitutional right to be charged by an indictment 9 rather than an information. An indictment would be a charge issued from a grand jury. 10 11 Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Mr. Adelman, would you please show Mr. Kugel the waiver of indictment form. 14 15 MR. ADELMAN: I have done so, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. 16 17 Mr. Kugel, have you signed this waiver of indictment form? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Did you read it before you signed it? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney 22 23 before you signed it? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Did you fully understand it before you

13 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 signed it? 2. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you understand that if you do not waive 4 indictment, if the government wanted to prosecute you on these 5 particular charges that are in the information, the government 6 would have to present the charges to a grand jury, which might 7 or might not indict you on them? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Do you understand that you are under no obligation to waive indictment? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that by waiving 12 13 indictment you are giving up your right to have the case 14 presented to a grand jury? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Do you understand what a grand jury is? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Did anyone promise you anything or 18 threaten you to get you to waive indictment? 19 20 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Have you seen a copy of the fourth superseding information? That's the charging instrument that 22 23 says S4 10 Cr. 228 at the top. 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Have you read it?

14 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your attorney? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Do you understand the charges against you 5 that are detailed in the information? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: If you want me to, I'll read the 8 information out loud now here in court. Do you want me to read 9 it to you out loud? 10 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. THE COURT: I find that Mr. Kugel's waiver of 11 indictment is knowing and voluntary. I accept it and I so 12 order it. 13 14 Mr. Kugel, do you understand that Count One of the 15 superseding information charges you with participating in a conspiracy in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, 16 Section 371 to commit securities fraud in violation of Title 17 15, Sections 78jb and 77ff, and 17, Code of Federal 18 Regulations, Section 250 10B-5. Also to falsify books and 19 20 records of a broker dealer in violation of Title 15, Sections 21 78qa and 78ff, and 17, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 240.17A-3, and also to falsify books and records of an 22 23 investment advisor, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 80b-4 and 80b-17, and 17, Code of Federal 24

Regulations, Section 275.204-2?

25

15 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Do you understand that Count Two of the 3 superseding information charges you with conspiracy in 4 violation of Title 18, Section 371 to commit bank fraud in 5 violation of Title 18, Section 1344? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Do you understand that Count Three of the

- 8 superseding information charges you with securities fraud in
- 9 violation of Title 15 Sections 78jb and 77ff, as well as 17,
- 10 CFR, Section 240.10B-5, and Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 2?
- 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
- 12 THE COURT: Do you understand that Count Four of the
- 13 superseding information charges you with falsifying books and
- 14 records of a broker dealer in violation of Title 15, Sections
- 15 78qa and 78ff, 17, Code of Federal Regulations, Section
- 16 240.17A-3, and Title 18, Section 2?
- 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
- 18 THE COURT: Do you understand that Count Five of the
- 19 superseding information charges you with falsifying books and
- 20 records of an investment advisor in violation of Title 15, U.S.
- 21 Code, Sections 80b-4 and 80b-17, 17, CFR, Section 275.204-2 and
- 22 Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 2?
- THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
- 24 THE COURT: Do you understand that Count Six of the
- 25 superseding information charges you with committing bank fraud

16 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1344 and 2 Title 18, United States Code, Section 2? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Do you understand that the government 5 would have to prove each and every part or element of each of 6 these charges beyond a reasonable doubt at trial if you did not 7 plead guilty? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Moore, would you please explain the matters that the government would have to prove if we were to 10 11 go to trial on the charges in the fourth superseding 12 information? 13 MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor. With regard to Counts One and Two, the conspiracy 14 15 counts, in order to prove the crime of conspiracy, the 16 government must establish each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the conspiracy charged in the 17 information existed, in other words, that there was in fact an 18 agreement or understanding to violate the laws of the United 19 20 States; second, that the defendant knowingly, willingly and 21 voluntarily became a member of the conspiracy charged; and, third, your Honor, that any one of the conspirators, not 22 necessarily the defendant, knowingly committed at least one 23 overt act in the Southern District of New York in furtherance 24

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

of the conspiracy during the life of the conspiracy.

25

17 1BLMKUGP1 Plea

With regard to Count Three, your Honor, the securities
fraud count, to establish a violation of Section 10B as charged
in Count Three of the information, the government must prove
each of the following elements:
First, that in connection with the purchase or sale of
securities, the defendant did any one or more of the following:
One, employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; or,
two, made an untrue statement of a material fact or omitted to
state a material fact which made what was said under the
circumstances misleading; or, three, engaged in an act,
practice, or course of business that operated or would operate
as a fraud or deceit upon a purchaser or seller.
Second, your Honor, that the defendant you are
considering acted knowingly, willfully, and with the intent to
defraud.
And, third, that the defendant used or caused to be
used any means or instruments of transportation or
communication in interstate commerce or the use of the mails in
furtherance of the fraudulent conduct.
With regard to Count Four, falsifying books and
records of a broker dealer: First, the government must prove
beyond a reasonable doubt that at the time of the alleged
offense, Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, which I'll
refer to during the rest of these proceedings as BLMIS, was a
registered broker dealer; second, that BLMIS failed to make and

18 1BLMKUGP1 Plea

keep certain accurate records as required under the SEC's rules and regulations; third, that the defendant aided and abetted

3 BLMIS' failure to make and keep accurate records; and, fourth,

4 that the defendant acted knowingly and willfully.

With regard to Count Five, falsifying books and records of an investment advisor, in order to prove this crime

beyond a reasonable doubt the government must: First, prove

8 that at the time of the alleged offense, BLMIS was in fact an

9 investment advisor; second, that BLMIS failed to make and keep

10 certain accurate records as required under the SEC's rules and

11 regulations; third, that the defendant aided and abetted BLMIS'

12 failure to make and keep accurate records; fourth, that the

defendant acted knowingly and willfully; and, fifth, the

offense involved the use of the mails and means of

instrumentalities of interstate commerce.

14

16 Finally, with regard, your Honor, with regard to Count

17 Six, the bank fraud count, the government must prove beyond a

18 reasonable doubt that: First, that at the time of the alleged

19 offense, the defendant executed or attempted to execute a

20 scheme or artifice to defraud a bank or that the defendant

21 executed or attempted to execute a scheme or artifice to obtain

22 money owned by or under the control or custody of that bank by

23 means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or

24 promises; second, that the defendant engaged in the scheme or

25 artifice knowingly and willfully and with the specific intent

19 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 to defraud the bank; and, third, and finally, your Honor, that 2 the bank involved was a federally-insured chartered 3 institution. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Moore. Mr. Kugel, do you understand the matters that the 5 6 government would have to prove if you did not plead guilty? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum 9 possible penalty for the crime charged in Count One of the superseding information is five years of imprisonment, plus a 10 11 fine of the greatest of \$250,000, twice the gain resulting from 12 the offense or twice the loss to other people resulting from 13 the offense, plus a \$100 special assessment, plus full 14 restitution to all persons injured as a result of your criminal 15 conduct, plus three years of supervised release after your term of imprisonment? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum 18 possible penalty for the crime charged in Count Two is five 19 20 years of imprisonment, plus a fine of the greatest of \$250,000, 21 twice the gain resulting from the offense, or twice the loss to other people resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 special 22 23 assessment, plus full restitution to all persons injured as a 24 result of your criminal conduct, plus three years of supervised

release after your term of imprisonment?

20 1BLMKUGP1 Plea

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum
3	possible penalty for the crime charged in Count Three is 20
4	years of imprisonment, plus a fine of the greatest of \$5
5	million, twice the gain resulting from the offense, or twice
6	the loss to other people resulting from the offense, plus a
7	\$100 special assessment, plus full restitution to all persons
8	injured as a result of your criminal conduct, plus three years
9	of supervised release after your term of imprisonment?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum
12	possible penalty for the crime charged in Count Four is 20
13	years of imprisonment, plus a fine of the greatest of \$5
14	million, twice the gain resulting from the offense, or twice
15	the loss to other people resulting from the offense, plus a
16	\$100 special assessment, plus full restitution to all persons
17	injured as a result of your criminal conduct, plus three years
18	of supervised release after your term of imprisonment?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum
21	possible penalty for the crime charged in Count Five is five
22	years of imprisonment, plus a fine of the greatest of \$250,000,
23	twice the gain resulting from the offense or twice the loss to
24	other people resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 special
25	assessment, plus full restitution to all persons injured as a

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 result of your criminal conduct, plus three years of supervised 2 release after your terms of imprisonment? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum 5 possible penalty for the crime charged in Count Six is 30 years 6 of imprisonment, plus a fine of the greatest of \$1 million, 7 twice the gain resulting from the offense, or twice the loss to 8 other people resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 special 9 assessment, plus full restitution to all persons injured as a result of your criminal conduct, plus five years of supervised 10 11 release after your term of imprisonment? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: And do you understand that the maximum 14 possible combined penalty for the six crimes to which you 15 propose to plead guilty is 85 years of imprisonment, plus a fine of \$11,750,000 or, if greater, the sums of the relevant 16 17 gains, losses, and statutory amounts relating to your offenses, plus full restitution to all persons injured by your criminal 18 conduct, plus a \$600 mandatory special assessment, plus 19 20 supervised release for five years after your term of 21 imprisonment? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: I will now give you some information and 24 verify your understanding of the supervised release aspect of 25 the potential penalty. Supervised release means that you will

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 be subject to monitoring when you are released from prison. 2 Terms and conditions will be imposed. If you violate any of 3 the set terms and conditions, you can be reimprisoned without a 4 jury trial. If you are on supervised release and you do not 5 comply with any of the set terms or conditions, you can be 6 returned to prison for the remainder of the term of supervised 7 release. You will be given no credit for the time that you 8 served in prison as a result of your sentence and no credit for 9 any time spent on postrelease supervision. For example, if you received a prison term and then a three-year term of supervised 10 11 release and after you left prison you lived up to the terms of supervised release for two years, but then you violated some 12 13 term of the supervised release, you could be returned to prison for three whole years. 14 15 Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Do you also understand that if I accept 18 your guilty plea and adjudge you guilty, that adjudication may deprive you of valuable civil rights, such as the right to 19 20 vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a 21 jury, and the right to possess any kind of firearm if you currently have or otherwise contain such rights? 22 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Do you understand that there are 25 sentencing quidelines that the Court must consider in

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

23 1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 determining your sentence? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Has your attorney discussed the sentencing 4 guidelines with you? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Do you understand that in determining your 7 sentence the Court has an obligation to calculate the 8 applicable sentencing guideline range and must consider that 9 range, possible departures under the sentencing guidelines, and other sentencing factors under the statute we referred to as 10 11 Section 3553(a)? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Do you understand that if your attorney or anyone else has attempted to estimate or predict what your 14 15 sentence will be, their estimate or prediction could be wrong? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Do you also fully understand that even if your sentence is different from what your attorney or anyone 18 else told you it might be, or if it is different from what you 19 20 expect, you will still be bound to your quilty plea and you 21 will not be allowed to withdraw your guilty plea?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

imposed will be determined solely by the Court and that I can

only determine the sentence to be imposed after the probation

THE COURT: Do you understand that the sentence to be

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

22

23

24

1BLMKUGP1 Plea 1 department prepares a presentence report? 2. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you understand that the Court has 4 discretion while taking into account the specific provisions 5 and policy statements in the guidelines to sentence you to any 6 number of years of imprisonment between zero and the combined 7 statutory maximums of 85 years? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Are you now serving any state or federal sentence or are you being prosecuted for any other crime? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that the superseding 12 information also includes a forfeiture allegation in which the 13 14 government asserts that you are required to forfeit to the 15 United States any and all property constituting or derived from 16 any proceeds that you obtained as a result of the crimes 17 charged in Counts One, Two, Three, Four, and Six, as well as any and all property traceable to such property, including but 18 not limited to a sum of money representing the amount of 19 20 proceeds obtained as a result of said offenses, totaling

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

21

22

24 THE COURT: Mr. Adelman, would you please show

\$170 billion as to Counts one, Three, and Four?

25 Mr. Kugel the agreement which has been marked as Government

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

approximately \$3,585,000 as to each of Counts Two and Six, and

1BLMKUGP1 Plea

1	Exhibit 1.
2	MR. ADELMAN: I have done so, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Thank you.
4	Mr. Kugel, have you signed this agreement?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Did you read it before you signed it?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney
9	before you signed it?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Did you fully understand the agreement
12	before you signed it?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Does the agreement reflect accurately your
15	complete and total understanding of the entire agreement
16	between the government, your attorney, and you?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Is everything that you understand about
19	your plea, cooperation, and sentence covered in this agreement?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Has anything been left out?
22	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises to you other

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

than what's written in that agreement or threatened you or

forced you to plead guilty or to enter into the cooperation

24

1BLMKUGP1 Plea agreement? THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that even if the government does not oppose or take a position on what your attorney will ask as a sentence, I am free to impose whatever sentence I believe is appropriate under the circumstances and the applicable law, and you will have no right to withdraw your plea? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. (Continued on next page)

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

1bldkug2 Plea 1 THE COURT: Do you understand that the agreement 2 provides that you must cooperate fully with the office of the 3 United States Attorney, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 4 and any other law enforcement agency designated by the United 5 States Attorney? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Do you understand that the agreement does 8 not bind any federal, state, or local prosecuting authority 9 other than the United States Attorney? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Do you understand that the agreement provides that if the United States Attorney determines that you 12 13 have provided substantial assistance in the investigation or 14 prosecution and if you have fully complied with the 15 understandings specified in the agreement, the United States Attorney will file a motion, pursuant to Section 5K1.1 of the 16 17 Sentencing Guidelines, requesting that the Court sentence in light of the factors set forth in Section 5K5.1(a)? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Do you understand that the factors that 21 the Court may consider in this connection include the significance and usefulness of your assistance, taking into 22 23 account the government's evaluation of your assistance, the 24 truthfulness, completeness and reliability of any information

or testimony you provided, the nature and extent of your

1bldkug2 Plea 1 assistance, any injuries suffered or any danger or risk of 2 injury to you or to your family as a result of your assistance, 3 and the timeliness of your assistance? Do you understand that? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Do you understand that even if the United 6 States Attorney files such a motion, the sentence to be imposed 7 on you remains within the sole discretion of the Court? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Do you understand that you will not be entitled to withdraw your quilty plea even if the Court denies 10 11 the government's motion? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Do you understand that if the United 14 States Attorney determines that you have not provided 15 substantial assistance in an investigation or prosecution, or that you have violated any provision of the agreement, the 16 17 United States Attorney is not obliged to file a motion under Section 5K1.1 of the Sentencing Guidelines? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Do you understand that you will not be 21 entitled to withdraw your guilty plea even if the United States Attorney does not file the motion? 22 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Do you understand that your agreement 25 provides that if you commit any further crimes, or if it is

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

29 1bldkug2 Plea 1 determined that you gave false, incomplete, or misleading 2 testimony or information, or otherwise violated any provision 3 of the agreement, you will be subject to prosecution for any 4 federal violations of which the United States Attorney has 5 knowledge, including perjury and obstruction of justice? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Do you understand that your agreement 8 provides that if you commit any further crimes, or if it is 9 determined that you gave false, incomplete or misleading testimony or information, or otherwise violated any provision 10 11 of the cooperation agreement, all statements made by you to the 12 United States Attorney or other designated law enforcement 13 agents and any testimony given by you before a grand jury or 14 other tribunal may be admissible in evidence in any criminal 15 proceedings against you? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Do you understand that your agreement also provides that you may not assert a claim that such statements 18 should be suppressed from evidence and that you have waived 19 20 your right to claim that such statements should be suppressed? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that page 3 of the plea 22 23 agreement includes your agreement to forfeit to the United 24 States any and all property constituting and derived from any

proceeds that you obtained as a result of the unlawful

1bldkug2 Plea 1 activities charged in Counts One, Three and Four of the 2 Superseding Information, including, but not limited to, a sum 3 equal to \$170 billion, and also to forfeit any and all property 4 constituting and derived from any proceeds that you obtained as 5 a result of the unlawful activities charged in Counts Two and 6 Six of the Information, including, but not limited to, a sum of 7 money equal to \$3,585,000 as to each count, as well as your 8 right, title and interest in the specific property identified 9 in the agreement? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Do you understand that you are specifically agreeing that the amount to be forfeited includes, 12 13 but is not limited to, a sum of money equal to \$170,007,175,000 14 in United States currency as well as the specific property and 15 that a judgment will be entered against you for at least that 16 amount? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Do you understand that you are not 18 obligated to admit the forfeiture allegation? 19 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Do you understand that you are not obliged to agree to the forfeiture amount with the government? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 23 24 THE COURT: And do you understand that it is up to the 25 Court to make a final determination as to forfeiture?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

31 1bldkug2 Plea 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Do you understand that any amount that you 3 do forfeit will not be credited toward any fines, restitution, 4 cost of imprisonment, or other additional penalty that the 5 court may impose on you? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Do you still wish to plead guilty pursuant 8 to this agreement? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Adelman, do you know of any valid 10 11 reason why Mr. Kugel would prevail at trial? 12 MR. ADELMAN: I do not, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Do you know of any reason why he should not be permitted to plead guilty? 14 15 MR. ADELMAN: I do not. THE COURT: Mr. Kugel, would you please stand now and 16 17 tell me what you did that makes you guilty of the six crimes charged in the Fourth Superseding Information? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 19 20 Your Honor, I stand before you ready to plead quilty 21 to the six counts in the Information filed against me, and to accept responsibility for what I have done. I am deeply sorry 22 23 for my actions and the harm suffered by the victims. I want 24 the Court and everyone to know that I will do all I can to

cooperate with the government.

Plea

1bldkug2

17

18

32

1 As to Counts One, Three, Four and Five, I provided 2 historical trade information to other BLMIS employees, which 3 was used to create false, profitable trades in the Investment 4 Advisory clients' accounts at BLMIS. Specifically, beginning 5 the early '70s, until the collapse of BLMIS in December 2008, I 6 helped create fake, backdated trades. I provided historical 7 trade information -- sorry --first to Annette Bongiorno, and 8 later to Joanne Crupi, and others which enabled them to create 9 fake trades that, when included on the account statements and trade confirmations of Investment Advisory clients, gave the 10 11 appearance of profitable trading when in fact no trading had actually occurred. I helped Bongiorno, Crupi and others create 12 13 these fake, backdated trades based on historical stock prices 14 and were executed only on paper. 15 Many of these false trades were based on trades that previously had been used in the Proprietary Trading operations 16

19 confirmations, and that the information was false.

20 I did this at the Madoff offices in Manhattan and
21 known that many of the account statements and trade
22 confirmations were mailed to clients from the offices in
23 Manhattan.

BLMIS customers on their monthly statements and trade

at BLMIS. I was aware that the trades would be reported to

I therefore plead guilty to the crimes alleged against
me in Count One, Three, Four and Five. I did conspire with

1bldkug2 Plea 1 other BLMIS employees to commit these crimes and, in fact, they 2 were committed, in violation of the law. 3 Finally, as to Count Two and Six, I acknowledge that 4 from at least from 2002 through 2007, on several occasions, I 5 caused false financial information to be submitted to various 6 financial institutions on my behalf and on behalf of other 7 potential borrowers. The false financial information was 8 submitted in connection for applications for mortgage loans. 9 I asked Joann Crupi to prepare documents that did not accurately reflect my assets and the assets of others at BLMIS 10 11 and she did so. Those documents overstated the total value of 12 my own and the other potential borrowers' holdings in accounts 13 at BLMIS. These fake documents were submitted to financial institutions on my behalf and on behalf of other potential 14 15 borrowers. The false documents were prepared at BLMIS offices in 16 17 Manhattan and submitted to federally-insured lenders by U.S. 18 mail or wire transmissions. THE COURT: Thank you. I have a couple of questions 19 20 for you. 21 You used the term "conspired" in relation to Counts One, Three, Four and Five. What do you mean by that? 22 23 THE DEFENDANT: When I conspired, I worked together 24 with them to create the false trades that appeared on the

Investment Advisory clients' statements and confirmations,

Plea

1bldkug2

34

1 pursuant to agreement and understanding. 2. THE COURT: You had an agreement and understanding 3 with the other individuals you mentioned in order to create the 4 false trades? 5 THE DEFENDANT: That applied to historical 6 information, yes. 7 THE COURT: And you said that the customer information 8 regarding the false trades was mailed in the regular Postal 9 system, is that correct? 10 THE DEFENDANT: To the best of my knowledge, yes. THE COURT: And the financial institutions to which 11 12 the false mortgage information, application information, was 13 given were banks; is that your understanding? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Is it your understanding that they were federally-insured banks? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And when you were dealing with the false 18 trading history information and the false financial 19 20 information, did you know that that information was false? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And did you know that what you were doing 22 23 was wrong and unlawful? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Does the government have any further SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

35 1bldkug2 Plea 1 requests for factual matters to be addressed in Mr. Kugel's 2 plea allocution? 3 MR. MOORE: No. Thank you, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Adelman -- actually, before we do 5 that, Mr. Moore, would you please summarize the government's 6 evidence against Mr. Kugel? 7 MR. MOORE: Certainly, your Honor. 8 Had this case proceeded to trial --THE COURT: You will have to get up again in a minute 9 but it is your choice. 10 11 MR. MOORE: My apologies, your Honor. 12 Had this case proceeded to trial, the government would 13 have proven through testimony and evidence beyond a reasonable 14 doubt the facts set forth in the Superseding Information. 15 Specifically, the government would have proven, with respect to Counts One, Three, Four and Five of the Information, 16 17 that Mr. Kugel was employed at the Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC, or "BLMIS," from in or about 1970 through at 18 least on or about December 11, 2008. BLMIS was both an 19 20 investment advisor and a market maker, your Honor. 21 Beginning in or about the 1970s, Kugel was a trader in BLMIS's Proprietary Trading and Market Making operations. In 22 or about the late 1990s, your Honor, Mr. Kugel assumed a 23 24 managerial position on the trading floor and later took on the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

role of Trading Floor Compliance Analyst. Beginning in or

25

36 1bldkug2 Plea 1 about the early 1970s until the collapse of BLMIS in 2008, 2 Mr. Kugel helped create fake, backdated trades for Mr. Madoff's 3 Investment Advisory, or the "IA," business with his 4 codefendants, Annette Bongiorno, Joann Crupi, as well as other 5 individuals, your Honor. These fake, backdated trades -- many 6 of which mimicked actual trades executed in connection with the 7 Proprietary Trading operation -- were used to deceive the 8 clients of the IA business and to give the appearance that actual trading occurred when, as Mr. Kugel and others well 9 knew, no trading occurred at all in the IA account. 10 11 Beginning in or about the early 1970s, Bongiorno 12 requested from Kugel backdated arbitrage trades to be used in 13 Investment Advisory clients' accounts. On a regular basis, 14 when the IA business had received money that was to be 15 invested, Bongiorno told Kugel the amount of funds that she had 16 available to purportedly invest on behalf of IA clients, which 17 was typically in the millions of dollars. In response, Mr. Kugel provided Bongiorno historical information from which 18 she created the fake trades. Specifically, Mr. Kugel, using 19 20 historical stock prices from the Wall Street Journal and other 21 sources, he provided Bongiorno with the name of the stocks, the buy and sell dates of potential trades, as well as the 22 23 historical price ranges of those stocks of the respective dates

mimicked trades previously executed in connection with limited

that she could use to make a profit. Often, this information

24

25

37 1bldkug2 Plea

Proprietary Trading operation.

25

1 2 Mr. Kugel also gave Ms. Bongiorno the total volume of 3 shares traded in particular stocks on certain dates so she 4 would not exceed a particular stock's daily trading volume when 5 creating the fake trades. Using the information provide to her 6 by Kugel, Bongiorno then selected the particular stocks and 7 historical purchase prices from the price ranges given to her 8 by Mr. Kugel. Bongiorno selected different stocks and purchase prices to be used for each IA client in order to meet the rate 9 of return predetermined by Madoff for that client. In doing 10 11 so, Ms. Bongiorno calculated the number of shares that would 12 have to be used in each IA client's account, based on both the 13 amount of money the client had available to invest and the 14 predetermined rate of return for each client as determined by 15 Madoff. 16 Beginning in or about the early 1990s, Mr. Kugel 17 similarly provided Ms. Crupi with historical price information to enable Crupi to create false, backdated arbitrage trades for 18 IA clients. Using the information provide by Kugel, Crupi then 19 20 selected the particular stock and historical purchase prices to 21 be used for each IA client in order to meet the rate of return predetermined by Madoff for that client. In doing so, Crupi 22 calculated the number of shares that would have to be used in 23 24 each IA client's account based on both the amount of money the

client had to invest and the rate of return predetermined by

38 1bldkug2 Plea 1 Madoff. In or about the mid-1990s, your Honor, Crupi took over 2 3 the role of Kugel in selecting the historical information 4 needed for the fake arbitrage deals. In doing so, Crupi 5 selected the name of the stocks, the buy and sell date of a 6 potential trade, as well as the historical price range for that 7 date that she could use to make a profit. Crupi then created 8 fake, backdated arbitrage trades that were executed on paper 9 only in the IA clients' accounts. 10 With respect to Counts Two and Six, your Honor, the 11 government would have proven that, separate and apart from the 12 fake trades that Kugel, Bongiorno, Crupi, and others created at 13 BLMIS, Kugel, with the assistance of Ms. Crupi and others, also 14 defrauded numerous financial institutions in order to obtain 15 loans using artificially-inflated financial information. On 16 multiple occasions, Mr. Kugel and Crupi submitted false and misleading information concerning Kugel's assets and the assets 17 of others to financial institutions in order to obtain loans 18 for the purchase and construction of homes for Kugel and 19 20 others. With the assistance of Crupi and others, Kugel and 21 others obtained multiple million-dollar loans based on the submission of this fraudulent information. 22 23 THE COURT: Thank you. 24 Mr. Kugel, how do you now plead to the charge against 25 you in Count One of the Fourth Superseding Information, not

39 1bldkug2 Plea 1 quilty or quilty? 2. THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: How do you now plead to the charge against 4 you in Count Two, not guilty or guilty? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: How do you now plead to the charge against 7 you in Count Three, not guilty or guilty? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: How do you now plead to the charge against you in Count Four, not guilty or guilty? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: How do you now plead to the charge against 13 you in Count Five, not guilty or guilty? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: And how do you now plead to the charge against you in Count Six, not guilty or guilty? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty to each of these 18 charges because you are in fact guilty of each of these 19 20 charges? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of 22 23 your own free will? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Adelman, would you please show

Plea

1bldkug2

40

1 Mr. Kugel Court Exhibit 1, the advice of rights form. 2 MR. ADELMAN: I have done so, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 Mr. Kugel, have you signed this form? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Did you read it before you signed it? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Did you understand it before you signed it? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney 11 12 before you signed it? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Adelman, did you also review and sign 14 15 Court Exhibit 1? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Adelman, are there any other questions 17 that you believe I should ask Mr. Kugel in connection with his 18 plea? 19 20 MR. ADELMAN: No, ma'am. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Moore, are there any other questions that you believe I should ask Mr. Kugel in connection with his 22 23 plea? 24 MR. MOORE: No. Thank you, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Kugel, you have acknowledged that you SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

41

	1bldkug2 Plea
1	are guilty as charged in the Information. I find that you know
2	your rights and that you are waiving them voluntarily.
3	Because your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily
4	and is supported by an independent basis in fact, containing
5	each of the essential elements of each of the offenses, I
6	accept your guilty plea and I adjudge you guilty of the
7	offenses charged in Counts One, Two, Three, Four, Five and Six
8	of the Fourth Superseding Information, to which you have pled
9	guilty.
10	You can be seated now. Thank you.
11	Mr. Adelman, do you wish to be present for any
12	interview of Mr. Kugel in connection with the preparation of
13	the presentence report?
14	MR. ADELMAN: Yes, ma'am.
15	THE COURT: I will make that direction.
16	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Do the parties have a particular request
18	with respect to the setting of a sentencing date?
19	MR. MOORE: Your Honor, the government requests a
20	sentencing control date for six months from now and that a
21	presentence report not be ordered at this time.
22	THE COURT: Ms. Ng, may I have a date, please?
23	THE CLERK: Friday, May 4th, 2012, at 11 a.m.
24	THE COURT: May 4th at 11 a.m.?
25	THE CLERK: Yes.

42

1bldkug2 Plea 1 THE COURT: The sentencing control date is set for 2 May 4th at 11 a.m. 3 Will the government inform the Court and the defense 4 at such time that it believes that it is appropriate to prepare 5 a presentence report? 6 MR. MOORE: We will, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 Counsel, when it does come time for sentencing, please 9 be certain to give any comments or objections promptly to the Probation Office, and to make your sentencing submissions in a 10 11 manner consistent with my sentencing submission procedures, which are posted on the court's website and they are also 12 13 available here in hard copy. 14 Mr. Kugel, at some point the Probation Office will be 15 preparing a presentence report to assist me in sentencing you. 16 You will be interviewed by the Probation Office. It is 17 important that the information that you give to the probation officer be truthful and accurate. The report is important in 18 what my decision is as to what your sentence will be. 19 20 You and your attorney have the right and will have an 21 opportunity to examine the report, to challenge or comment on it, and to speak on your behalf before sentencing. Failing to 22 23 be truthful with the Probation Office and the Court may have an 24 adverse effect on your sentence and may subject you to 25 prosecution.

43 1bldkug2 Plea 1 Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Now, I understand that there is a --4 actually, we need to deal with bail conditions, and we also 5 need to deal with the documents that I have been given relating 6 to forfeiture. 7 Is it the parties' request that I sign today the 8 Preliminary Order of Forfeiture and also the Stipulation and 9 Order relating to forfeiture issues? 10 MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Any objection from the defense? 12 MR. BLUMENTHAL: No, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: And am I to sign the full and redacted 14 copy? 15 MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, your Honor. Of course, we ask that only the redacted versions be docketed. 16 17 THE COURT: Yes. And that the full version be filed under seal? 18 MR. SCHWARTZ: Please, yes. The redactions are in 19 20 accordance with the court's local rules. 21 THE COURT: So relating to the privacy rules. MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct. It is financial accountant 22 information and the names of minors. 23 24 THE COURT: Thank you. 25 (Pause)

44

1bldkug2 Plea 1 Ms. Ng will take care of the entry of those orders. 2 I have reviewed the Pretrial Services' report. Do the 3 parties have a joint application and recommendation with 4 respect to bail pending sentencing? 5 MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor. 6 In light of Mr. Kugel's cooperation, his full 7 disclosure of his financial assets and his dealings that limits 8 to the government, we are satisfied that he will follow the rules set forth by Pretrial Services in accordance with the 9 proposed bail package we are prepared to present to the Court 10 11 at this time. 12 Namely, we respectfully submit to you, your Honor, 13 that the defendant's ball be set at a \$3 million personal recognizance bond to be secured by six financially-responsible 14 15 persons and \$900,000 in cash or property. This property will, of course, have to be clean assets, wholly unaffiliated with 16 17 BLMIS. We further request that the defendant be subject to 18 strict pretrial supervision, and that his travel be restricted 19 20 to the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of 21 New York and the District of New Jersey. We further request that he surrender all of his travel 22 23 documents and make no new travel applications. We ask that 24 this restriction also apply to his wife. In light of the 25 holiday this week, your Honor, we request that the defendant

45 1bldkug2 Plea 1 have until Thursday, December 1st, to meet these conditions. 2 To date, the government has already met with a number 3 of the defendant's proposed suriters and has been satisfied 4 with their financial and personal qualifications. These 5 persons include close family members and friends of the 6 defendant who have known him for decades and present strong 7 moral suasion over the defendant to follow the conditions of 8 his release. 9 The defendant has been working with our office and the FBI for quite some time now, your Honor. During this time he 10 11 has been both been reliable, timely in making his appointments, and flexible with his schedule when the government requested 12 13 meetings with him. The defendant is a long-time resident on Long Island, 14 15 and his family resides in that district, in the Southern District of New York and the District of New Jersey. Moreover, 16 your Honor, the defendant currently helps assist his elderly 17 mother with her care, and that includes bringing her to visit 18 his brother, who resides in the District of New Jersey. 19 20 Currently, this is his primary job responsibility. 21 As part of the cooperation process, your Honor, the defendant has filled out financial affidavits and worked with 22 our Asset Forfeiture Unit at the U.S. Attorney's Office, 23 24 detailing the amounts and whereabouts of all of his assets. He

has worked closely with Mr. Schwartz in that regard, and has

25

46

1bldkug2 Plea 1 fully accepted the fact that he must forfeit the vast majority 2. of his assets. 3 As your Honor is aware, and I believe as the Court has 4 issued today or will be issuing shortly, our Asset Forfeiture 5 unit has presented forfeiture papers for your review in which 6 the defendant has agreed to a forfeiture amount of over \$170 7 billion. And as part of that forfeiture, your Honor, the 8 defendant has agreed to give up his home, luxury vehicle, 9 monies maintained in several financial institutions, and other specific assets detailed in the papers before your Honor. 10 11 The government does not believe the defendant is a 12 danger to the community. 13 For all of these reasons, your Honor, the government believes that the proposed bail package is reasonable and 14 15 appropriate in this case for this individual defendant. 16 THE COURT: And the government believes, I take it, 17 based on its thorough review of the financial situation and its dealings with Mr. Kugel over a lengthy period of time, that the 18 evidence is clear and convincing that the package that has been 19 20 proposed, including the delayed satisfaction of all of the 21 particulars of the package, is sufficient to address the societal interests in proper appearance for proceedings in this 22 23 case and protection of the public? 24 MR. MOORE: We do, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Thank you.

47

1bldkug2 Plea 1 Did Pretrial Services wish to be heard further on 2 this? 3 MR. STEIMEL: No, your Honor. We stand by our report. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 And the defense has no objection to the set of 6 conditions? 7 MR. ADELMAN: No, ma'am. I was just going to endorse 8 them by pointing out that Mr. Kugel, aside from these financial considerations, is closely tied to his family, all of whom are 9 here in New York. His brother and sister are going to be 10 11 suriters. The brother is a dentist in New Jersey. He is in contact with his aged mother on a frequent 12 13 basis. His goal is to help her when she needs help. His 14 daughter and son are here. His grandchildren are here. He has 15 no connections anywhere else in the world. I have the passports of Mr. and Mrs. Kugel with me to surrender to the 16 17 court. And I endorse the proposal that has been made. Your Honor doesn't have to hear this now, and I 18 apologize. At some point in time I will be requesting travel 19 20 permission for Mr. Kugel to go to Florida. He has a piece of 21 real estate, a house there, that he is obliged to sell to raise funds for the forfeiture. He is going to be the one selling 22 it, not the government, and he has his personal property there. 23 24 So I will be in communication with your Honor to ask for such a 25 trip, and I expect you will remember what I just told you today

48 1bldkug2 Plea 1 in ruling on the application. 2. THE COURT: I have listened carefully to what you just 3 told me. I would simply ask that you speak -- before you make 4 the communication to my chambers, that you verify that there is 5 no objection to it from the government, from the Probation 6 Department, and that you write a letter reciting those 7 communications and the positions of those two aspects of the 8 institution. 9 MR. ADELMAN: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: All right, then. 10 I am going to prepare a bail disposition sheet. I'm 11 12 sorry. 13 MR. STEIMEL: Your Honor, I'm sorry --14 THE COURT: It is Pretrial Services, not Probation? 15 MR. STEIMEL: Yes, your Honor. Just one clarification. I know that defense counsel 16 indicated that the wife's passport was also going to be ordered 17 seized or surrendered to Pretrial Services. I was not clear 18 actually -- I'm not sure if I heard you say whether the wife's 19 passport was also supposed to be surrendered. Did you order 20 21 that? THE COURT: I am going to. It was in the list of 22 conditions that -- I'm sorry, am I interrupting you? 23 24 MR. MOORE: No. I'm just saying you hadn't issued

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

25

your decision yet.

49

1bldkug2 Plea 1 THE COURT: It was part of the package as described by 2 Mr. Moore. 3 And so what I was about to say was that I find, based 4 on the review of the Pretrial Services' report and all of the 5 representations that have been made to the Court, that the 6 package as proposed is appropriate and sufficient to address 7 the statutory concerns of appearance and protection of the 8 community. Accordingly, I will approve release pending 9 sentencing on the basis of these conditions. Now I am going to prepare a bail disposition sheet on 10 11 which I will summarize the conditions. I will read out to make 12 sure that everyone agrees that I have reflected the appropriate 13 conditions. So if you will bear with me, I will do that. 14 MR. ADELMAN: Your Honor, may I have a moment to 15 consult with my brother and sister here? THE COURT: Yes, you may. 16 MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. 17 18 (Pause) THE COURT: This is what I have written. 19 20 \$3 million PRB with six FRPs; 900,000 security in cash 21 and property (not derived from BLMIS or any activity that is the subject of the charges); strict supervision; travel 22 restricted to S.D.N.Y., EDNY, DNJ; surrender passports of 23 24 defendant and spouse, and no new applications. All conditions 25 must be met by December 1, 2011.

50 1bldkug2 Plea 1 Does that cover it? 2 MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor. 3 MR. ADELMAN: Yes, your Honor. The only -- I don't 4 anticipate him not being compliant by December 1, but if there 5 is one piece that is missing or it will come in the next day, I 6 will come back to your Honor and advise. 7 THE COURT: Yes. If you need to, you can make an 8 application for an extension of the deadline, but this is the 9 deadline that I am putting in today. 10 MR. ADELMAN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Let me print the copies. 11 (Pause) 12 THE COURT: Mr. Kugel. 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Did you hear the conditions that I had set for your bail? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that you must comply 18 strictly with all of those conditions, and that the violation 19 20 of any of those conditions may result in the issuance of a 21 warrant for your arrest, the revocation of your release, or 22 other sanctions? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: The Pretrial Services Department will be 25 going over the details of all of the conditions with you.

1bldkug2 Plea Counsel, is there anything further that we need to address together this afternoon? MR. MOORE: Nothing from the government, your Honor. MR. ADELMAN: Nor from the defense. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We are all adjourned. MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. MS. BARONI: Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: All rise.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

10-05286-smb Doc 143-3 Filed 09/07/16 Entered 09/07/16 15:48:18 Exhibit Kugel Plea Allocution Pg 103 of 103