

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
3 MIAMI DIVISION
4 CASE NO. 22-cr-20326-KMM

5 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
6
7 Plaintiff,

8 vs.

9 ANDRE LORQUET,

10 Defendant.

Miami, Florida
October 31, 2023
Pages 1-22

11 TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING (Cont'd)
12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE LAUREN FLEISCHER LOUIS
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14 APPEARANCES:

15 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: By: Jonathan Bailyn, A.U.S.A.
16 United States Attorney's Office
99 Northeast 4th Street
Miami, Florida 33130

17
18 FOR THE DEFENDANT: By: Henry Philip Bell, Esq.
19 Bell, Rosquete, Reyes, Esteban, PLLC
20 999 Ponce De Leon Boulevard
Suite 1120
Coral Gables, FL 33134

21
22 TRANSCRIBED BY: DAWN M. SAVINO, R.P.R., C.R.R.
23 Official Federal Court Stenographer
111 North Adams Street
24 Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: 850-521-3674
25 Dawn_Savino@flnd.uscourts.gov

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. The United States
3 District Court for the Southern District of Florida is now in
4 session, the Honorable Lauren Luis presiding.

5 Calling case number 22-20326-criminal-Judge Moore,
6 United States versus Andre Lorquet.

7 Counsel, would you please note your appearances for the
8 record, beginning with the government.

9 MR. BAILYN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jonathan Bailyn
10 on behalf of the United States. I'm joined here at counsel's
11 table with Special Agent Jose Hernandez of Homeland Security.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 MR. BELL: Good morning, Judge. Henry Bell on behalf
14 of Mr. Lorquet, the defendant, who is, of course, in court
15 standing to my left.

16 THE COURT: Thank you so much. And to the deputy
17 marshals, I thank you for letting Mr. Lorquet out of cuffs for
18 the hearing.

19 Go ahead and have a seat, everybody.

20 We had taken a recess at our last hearing to give you
21 all a chance to decide how you wanted to proceed from last week.
22 Who wants to bring me up to date?

23 MR. BELL: I'm sorry, Judge. My client was telling me
24 something. I apologize.

25 So Judge, we did sort of explore some stuff, but in any

1 event, we don't have an agreement. I think each party is
2 essentially arguing for their respective positions here.

3 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. We had stopped sort of
4 mid-summation. I don't know if "closing" is the right word, but
5 each side was kind of cut off from their opportunity to argue
6 their position. So you have the floor if there's anything else
7 that you want me to consider or to be heard on. It's your
8 motion, Mr. Bell. If you want the floor first?

9 MR. BELL: Sure. Thank you, Judge. I'll be brief.
10 This has been fully briefed. You heard Mr. Lorquet testify.
11 The crux of his testimony was that he had repeatedly told his
12 attorney that he did not want to plead guilty and that he felt
13 pressured and as if he had no choice but to go through the
14 hearing, in which he ultimately pled guilty. I understand the
15 government's position, and even the questioning elicited or
16 conducted by the court, sort of pointing out that the transcript
17 of the hearing and the reality of that hearing was that he
18 answered questions that communicated that he understood what he
19 was doing, and that he was doing so voluntarily, and that if he
20 really had an opportunity to back out of the plea at that point
21 and that he didn't do that.

22 Acknowledging or accepting that argument and evidence,
23 if you will, I would point out that from Mr. Lorquet's
24 perspective, however, as a layperson who was relying on his
25 lawyer, he felt like he was in a place where he really couldn't

1 do anything else but go forward with the plea.

2 And that's the bottom line of the argument. And I
3 don't know if the court has any questions, but I don't know that
4 I have any more to argue about it.

5 THE COURT: I do. I don't -- you don't -- I'll leave
6 it to you to decide how you want to answer it, if at all, but I
7 don't mind telling you my observations and my concerns about how
8 to weigh the credibility, as I told you last time, of
9 Mr. Lorquet's testimony from one day to the next.

10 And so the things that stuck out for me were, for
11 example, learning or hearing at the second hearing your
12 inability to read and write when I asked you that question at
13 the change of plea. And while you have told me that you felt
14 pressured to limit your answers to yes or no, you answered yes
15 to that question and you could have answered no, and it feels
16 confusing and unexplained why that would be the result of being
17 pressured by your attorney. And it makes me, again, question
18 which Mr. Lorquet I should believe from one day to the next.

19 And that is just but one example. There was
20 immediately after that another question that now I don't have in
21 front of me, but that your answer was different than how you
22 would have answered it at this hearing.

23 I know what it is. It was with respect to mental
24 disease or illness, and not perhaps revealing the impediment
25 that would have maybe prevented you from understanding the plea

1 agreement and the factual proffer.

2 So again, it's not so much a direct question as my
3 candid sharing with you my inability to, you know, sit here and
4 tell you that from one hearing to the next I know which of your
5 statements to credit. And so that makes it difficult for me.

6 MR. BELL: Understood, Your Honor. And sort of -- I
7 appreciate where the court is coming from, and let me try, in
8 some way, at least to address those concerns as expressed by
9 Your Honor.

10 So first with respect to not having revealed his issues
11 with reading and writing, I mean, let me sort of address that
12 point if I may. So this is not something that was known to me,
13 right. It's not like Mr. Lorquet came out and told me I have a
14 problem, I have a disability or impediment. A learning
15 disability as apparently it was explained to him as a child. I
16 didn't understand that to be the case at all when I started to
17 represent him. It was only over time as I went to FDC to
18 discuss copies of the motions that -- I gave him a copy and I
19 noticed that he was taking a long time getting through it, and
20 then he was asking me about certain words, what does this mean,
21 that I fleshed out that there's a problem.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. BELL: And to be fair and clear and fully
24 transparent about this issue, it's not a situation where
25 Mr. Lorquet can't read anything at all and can't write anything

1 at all. It's just not very good, if you will. There are
2 certain words that he needs his lawyer to explain to him, and if
3 I receive something in writing from him I can tell that -- I can
4 tell when it's been written by him and I can tell when it hasn't
5 been.

6 THE COURT: Understood.

7 MR. BELL: Okay?

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. BELL: And maybe that -- I do think it's -- how
10 should I say this. It's not something he enjoys talking about,
11 and perhaps it's somewhat humiliating to have to admit to this
12 openly.

13 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bell.

14 MR. BELL: And then in terms of assessing the
15 credibility, look, the way I see this, I don't think that it's
16 really that he's changed his story so much and evaluating the
17 standard and whether it's been met or not.

18 THE COURT: The standard of what?

19 MR. BELL: The standard that the court has to evaluate
20 and whether to withdraw the plea. Right? I mean, it's what
21 really rises to the level of involuntariness or not. The
22 government is going to argue that hey, even if you credit my
23 client's testimony, that you still shouldn't grant this motion,
24 and I disagree with Mr. Bailyn about that. But I think that's
25 where the issue is. It's not so much that he changed his story,

1 but whether or not what he went through rises to the level of
2 warranting Your Honor granting the motion. And I don't know if
3 I'm making myself clear.

4 THE COURT: I understand it now.

5 MR. BELL: And I say that because I sense -- well, not
6 sense. The court is overt in mentioning the issues of
7 credibility here and whether you believe my client's testimony
8 and whether he was misleading you in some way. And I don't
9 think he was misleading you. I just think that putting
10 ourselves in his shoes, if you will, even though he told the
11 court at the change of plea that he was acting voluntarily and
12 that he wanted to plead guilty, that down inside apparently,
13 according to him, that it was a emotional hearing, overtly
14 emotional, if the court would have seen him crying or something
15 to that effect, and that behind the scenes he felt pressured by
16 his lawyer. Whether or not that rises to the level of this
17 court having to grant the motion, I will let the court decide
18 and I will disagree with Mr. Bailyn's arguments that are
19 obviously diametrically opposed to mine. But from the
20 defendant's perspective, he felt as if he had no choice and
21 that's -- it's not that he didn't know what was happening or
22 that someone put a gun to his head, but it is that he -- things
23 had broken down with his lawyer, and he felt that he had no
24 choice and he felt that his lawyer would not continue to labor
25 in defending and representing him at trial, and that it was a

1 very emotional situation. And none of this is made any better
2 by the fact that he does have a reading comprehension problem.

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. BELL: And some kind of impairment, the bottom of
5 which I haven't really gotten to, to be candid. I don't know
6 the full extent of it, but I have some ideas.

7 THE COURT: Understood. Okay. And I guess at the end
8 of the day, I really just have to ask the direct question: Do
9 you want to go to trial?

10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

11 THE COURT: Mr. Bailyn?

12 MR. BAILYN: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Can I likewise forecast for you what I'm
14 thinking about?

15 MR. BAILYN: Absolutely, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: I can't remember, and candidly couldn't
17 find where I read that part of the government's opposition
18 because I think -- did you take the position that one of the
19 factors the court should consider is the impact on the victim
20 who does not want to go to trial?

21 MR. BAILYN: Yes, Your Honor. That's in the -- that
22 would be the fourth buck {als} factor, which was the --

23 THE COURT: But did you -- I mean, are you taking that
24 position, or did I just understand Mr. Bell to be responding to
25 what he anticipated your position to be? Do you take the

1 position that the court should not allow Mr. Lorquet to withdraw
2 his plea because of the impact on the purported victim?

3 MR. BAILYN: That is a consideration.

4 THE COURT: But is it still your position.

5 MR. BAILYN: Well, we've removed it from our -- our
6 second opposition -- Your Honor, if I can, I think you're
7 probably remembering there was a first motion to withdraw. In
8 the response that was added.

9 THE COURT: That's why I couldn't find it. I didn't go
10 back that far. So that had been the government's position.

11 MR. BAILYN: Yes.

12 THE COURT: But you're not traveling on the victim
13 shouldn't have to go through this again.

14 MR. BAILYN: No, Your Honor. That's a very close read,
15 but as things have changed the government's position on that
16 particular consideration sub-factor has changed as well.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So as you sit or stand here, you are
18 prepared to go to trial and present the victim who is the
19 subject of the aggravated identity count.

20 MR. BAILYN: We are, Your Honor. However, I'm still,
21 as we mentioned the last time, conducting my investigation up in
22 Palm Beach. It's possible that what that trial will look like
23 will be different than how it was indicted.

24 THE COURT: Understood. I just want to make sure that
25 I -- because if that was -- I wanted to make sure the government

1 wasn't traveling on any representation that the victim has
2 decided to forgo any right to restitution because it would be so
3 traumatic to go through a trial. But that's not the
4 government's position.

5 MR. BAILYN: No, Your Honor. And your close read
6 certainly noticed the difference between our position, so I
7 appreciate that. Thank you.

8 THE COURT: Done my best.

9 MR. BAILYN: No, it's great.

10 So let me just first address the credibility of the
11 defendant briefly, and the story that I believe has changed.

12 In his first motion to withdraw, the defendant argued
13 that he believed the plea hearing we were at was a bond
14 revocation hearing and that he was under duress by his attorney.

15 Now that's changed. That changed in the second motion
16 to withdraw. He believed that he was supposed to go to a bond
17 revocation hearing, but again, that he was still under duress by
18 his attorney.

19 Then when he testified before Your Honor, we heard a
20 new allegation, that the duress didn't just come from his
21 attorney but it came from some third parties who were
22 threatening him. We don't know who those were or how they were
23 threatening him, but he said that he was being threatened.

24 It's hard to get a grip as to what the defendant's
25 exact position and rationale is, but if it is what has been

1 stated, at least repeatedly, that this was duress by his
2 attorney, I just find that not to be credible.

3 THE COURT: Can I give you -- again, forecasting where
4 you need to go and not need to go?

5 MR. BAILYN: Sure.

6 THE COURT: The assertion that there are third parties
7 who were pressuring him is too vague for me to do anything with.
8 I am focused on the relationship between him and his attorney.
9 So you're welcome to make the record you want, but I will just
10 tell you you don't have to persuade me that that is not a basis
11 that has been substantiated.

12 MR. BAILYN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

13 Then allow me one moment to switch gears. I'm not
14 privy to the conversations the defendant had with his attorney,
15 but I will say what I'd said in my motion, that the defendant
16 had privately retained counsel, spent thousands of dollars for
17 privately retained counsel. Ms. Bozanic is a certified criminal
18 trial attorney. She's practiced before this court, she's
19 well-aware of the sentencing guidelines, how pleas work. And
20 when she represented to the court that she had reviewed
21 everything with the defendant, I don't believe that the
22 defendant's statement that he felt pressured should contradict
23 that.

24 But even if he did feel pressured, the defendant, when
25 he testified, never articulated any pressure that would rise to

1 a legal reason for the plea to have found to be sort of
2 involuntarily or unknowing.

3 So the standard or -- under the Buckles ruling, which
4 is 843 F.2d at 472, is quote, a defendant cannot complain of
5 coercion where his attorney, employing her best professional
6 judgment recommends that the defendant plead guilty. I have no
7 doubt that Ms. Bozanic recommended that the defendant plead
8 guilty, and he has a lot of benefits from this plea agreement
9 despite claiming that it's an open plea.

10 The statutory maximum term of imprisonment has been
11 reduced, because he pled guilty to money laundering, not wire
12 fraud.

13 The government has agreed to recommend a two-level
14 reduction for acceptance of responsibility, even though Judge
15 Moore disagrees with the government's assessment. We've
16 maintained that position because it's within the plea agreement.

17 So there were benefits that he received.

18 And he has not articulated, and did not testify, that
19 Ms. Bozanic did anything that would be a true pressure or
20 coercion. She never physically threatened him, she never, as I
21 understood it, threatened to withdraw as counsel or do anything
22 to undermine his case.

23 I'm not sure what the duress is. But I do know that
24 when the defendant testified, he repeatedly used the term
25 duress. Using that term, for someone who allegedly doesn't read

1 or write well, is peculiar, because duress is a legal term.
2 It's not the term that most people consider when they're forced
3 to do something.

4 And I think it's very telling. I think the defendant
5 has, through whatever jailhouse attorney he's consulted with,
6 learned about what the appropriate legal standard is and found a
7 way to sort of wedge whatever he believes happened to him into
8 that particular standard.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Bailyn, I'm not going to rely on
10 speculation from the government any more than vagueness from the
11 defendant. So I understand that that may be what you surmise
12 happened, but I have to make a record.

13 MR. BAILYN: Sure. So then, Your Honor, that was
14 argument.

15 But as a pure factual matter, we have nothing here that
16 would show that there was anything to color that claim of
17 duress. We have no factual allegations that would -- or
18 testimony from the defendant that would allow us to understand
19 what that, quote, duress is.

20 Your Honor, I can focus on this, the four Buckles
21 considerations briefly, unless Your Honor doesn't need argument
22 on those areas.

23 THE COURT: I would encourage you to make the record
24 that you want. There's going to be a report and recommendation
25 and thus objections, so you have the floor.

1 MR. BAILYN: Thank you, Your Honor. So first, there's
2 four factors. The first is whether the close assistance of
3 counsel was available. The defendant has privately retained
4 counsel. She was there during the plea hearing, I have no doubt
5 that she, although I'm not privy to her conversations, advised
6 the defendant. I certainly was in contact with her frequently.

7 Second, whether the plea was knowing and voluntary. As
8 the government explained in its motion, the plea agreement was
9 written, was reviewed with the defendant, he answered all of the
10 court's questions appropriately, and the court made a
11 recommendation that it was knowing and voluntary. The
12 allegation the defendant has made that he was under duress I
13 believe is not something that can be factually supported.

14 Third, whether judicial resources would be conserved.
15 I think that's obviously in this case. We've already expended a
16 significant amount of judicial resources just with two motions
17 to withdraw, the sentencing hearings that have had to be
18 continued, the appointment of court counsel.

19 THE COURT: But it's not about backward-looking
20 inquiry, it's forward-looking.

21 MR. BAILYN: Sure. So we would be avoiding, I think,
22 the need for the court to have a trial; the court to have a
23 sentencing hearing all over again to simply repeat what it had
24 already done.

25 THE COURT: Isn't that always the case on a motion to

1 withdraw a guilty plea? I find it a difficult factor to assess
2 myself, and that's why I'm asking you. How is this different
3 from a motion that gets granted?

4 MR. BAILYN: So Your Honor, I also understand that. So
5 I've had to look at the way that Judge Moore has considered this
6 factor, and in my briefing I've cited a couple of cases of his.
7 And if you don't mind may I just read --

8 THE COURT: Of course.

9 MR. BAILYN: Sure. So in two cases in which Judge
10 Moore denied the defendant's motion to withdraw the plea, he
11 explained that judicial resources should not be expended, quote,
12 in the conduct of a trial on issues to which the defendant has
13 already freely admitted.

14 So in this case the defendant has admitted particular
15 facts, and we would then be having a trial to re-establish facts
16 that the defendant has already admitted. That would be a use of
17 judicial resources to prove what has already been proven.

18 THE COURT: Were there factual objections filed to the
19 PSI? Are there facts in dispute at sentencing? Were there?

20 MR. BAILYN: The government didn't file factual
21 objections to the PSI, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Did you have to respond to factual
23 objections to the PSI filed by the defendant?

24 MR. BAILYN: So let me just briefly go back. They
25 weren't -- it's hard to parse factual -- the dispute was between

1 whether or not the defendant's application for a passport would
2 rise to the level of obstruction of justice. One of the facts
3 in that would have been the purpose of applying for that
4 passport, but those factual allegations were outside the
5 relevant offense conduct.

6 THE COURT: Hmm-hmm.

7 MR. BAILYN: That was post-indictment conduct.

8 THE COURT: Did you come to the sentencing hearing
9 prepared to put on evidence?

10 MR. BAILYN: I did, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: I'll be candid with you. The only time
12 that I had a defendant withdraw her plea in front of Judge
13 Moore, it was because of contested facts at sentencing and that
14 the sentencing was going to essentially be a trial, and he tried
15 the case instead of going forward with the sentencing.

16 MR. BAILYN: Oh, I see. So in this case the sentencing
17 hearing would not have been that. I was prepared to put on
18 evidence and testimony from the agent about the reason for
19 applying for a passport, as well as to show just pictures of
20 what the defendant had spent the stolen money on. But in terms
21 of the factual issues in the PSI and the offense conduct, that
22 wasn't at issue.

23 THE COURT: I don't know that it's determinative. I'm
24 just, again, sharing with you the questions that I have.

25 MR. BAILYN: I understand, Your Honor.

1 And then finally prejudice to the defendant. I guess I
2 have to speak personally then. As the trial attorney I'm no
3 longer in Miami. I would have to be traveling down to Miami,
4 and I know that's a minimal imposition, but my trial partner has
5 been called to military duty so we'll have to find another trial
6 partner to prepare this case.

7 The government was prepared to go to trial. The
8 defendant pled guilty shortly before the trial was supposed to
9 commence. Trying these cases so long after the offense conduct
10 can be quite difficult.

11 THE COURT: When did it occur?

12 MR. BAILYN: So the offense conduct occurred throughout
13 the COVID crisis. So in 2020 until the end of 2021. And the
14 reason for that --

15 THE COURT: I was thinking about the poor economic
16 crime section.

17 MR. BAILYN: And I'll explain that. What makes them
18 very difficult, Your Honor, is that -- well, we've all read the
19 news, a lot of the lenders that were providing these PPP loans
20 were recently instituted Fintech companies. Some of them have
21 absolutely no relationship to Florida other than the fact they
22 provided loans to people in Florida. That is one of the lenders
23 in this case, and I believe the name's in the factual proffer,
24 and it eludes me.

25 But corralling these witnesses to come to Florida is

1 difficult because many of these lenders have other trials to
2 attend to now that these cases have become more manifold. These
3 are difficult cases to try, and there's a huge benefit to the
4 government when the defendant decides to plead guilty.

5 THE COURT: I understand this is going to sound like a
6 familiar response, but can I credit that generic complaint that
7 it is difficult to marshal them without evidence that any of the
8 particular witnesses would be difficult to corral?

9 MR. BAILYN: So I -- I could proffer, Your Honor, that
10 one of the witnesses, and I believe it's ALC Lending has -- I
11 did serve them with a trial subpoena for the previous trial.
12 Their counsel called me and said that they would not attend the
13 trial, and that we would have to litigate a motion to quash.
14 That eventuality didn't occur because the defendant chose to
15 plead guilty, but I don't know that would be like now. But
16 these things have happened.

17 THE COURT: Okay. I have to ask this candid question
18 in the same way that I asked Mr. Lorquet if he wanted a trial.

19 If you had to, is the government still prepared to
20 prove its case?

21 MR. BAILYN: Yes, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Is it still capable of proving its case?

23 MR. BAILYN: The government is capable of proving its
24 case. The trial would likely look slightly differently. We may
25 call more agent testimony to help explain some of the documents

1 as opposed to some of the true custodians of the records, for
2 example, the lenders. But I still think that we can -- I don't
3 want to say "I still think", we certainly could prove our case
4 beyond a reasonable doubt. I could definitely marshal that
5 evidence.

6 THE COURT: Okay.

7 MR. BAILYN: So Your Honor, I think the standard to
8 withdraw your plea is a tough one, and it's the defendant's
9 burden. And I've not heard sufficient facts from the
10 defendant's testimony, other than this generic claim of duress,
11 that would rise to the level of an involuntary or an unknowing
12 plea. The defendant committed a significant amount of fraud.
13 All of this was paper fraud. So that would he certainly belie
14 any allegation that the defendant had trouble with comprehension
15 or anything like that. He certainly seemed to be comprehending
16 the PPP loan applications, and I believe that he had the ability
17 to comprehend the short plea colloquy as well.

18 THE COURT: Understood. All right. Thank you,
19 Mr. Bailyn.

20 Mr. Bell, if there's anything else?

21 MR. BELL: No, Judge. I don't know. Unless you have
22 any questions. I did notice you asked about the sentencing
23 hearing. I mean, we disputed an obstruction of justice
24 enhancement. Judge Moore unfortunately disagreed, which meant
25 that the defendant also lost his acceptance of responsibility

1 according to Judge Moore. The issue was whether a bond
2 violation rose to the level of obstruction of justice or not.
3 The government conceded it did not, and was in agreement with
4 us, but Judge Moore had a different view.

5 THE COURT: Got it.

6 MR. BELL: To sort of put a fine point on your
7 question.

8 THE COURT: Understood. Okay. I'm going to write up
9 an R and R. If we can get it on file today, we will, but I'll
10 be candid with you, I do want to take it under advisement. I
11 want to read the change of plea colloquy one more time with the
12 benefit of your explanation, which was meaningful.

13 But, you know, Mr. Lorquet, you know, I've been direct
14 with you about what my concerns are, but Mr. Bell makes good
15 points. I will review it again before I render a final
16 decision. Any way around it you'll have the period of time to
17 object, to file objections to my findings or analysis therefrom
18 to Judge Moore, and he'll ultimately decide whether you'll be
19 permitted to withdraw the plea or to go to trial -- withdraw the
20 plea or not. Okay?

21 All right. If there's anything else, somebody let me
22 know. Otherwise I'm going to let you all go. From the
23 government?

24 MR. BAILYN: No, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor.

25 MR. BELL: May I have a moment?

1 THE COURT: Of course.

2 MR. BELL: Okay. So there is one thing, although I
3 don't know if the court can address it or not, but since you
4 brought it up, and my client has brought it up, and my client's
5 mother has brought it up --

6 THE COURT: Okay.

7 MR. BELL: -- you asked me whether Mr. Lorquet had been
8 evaluated. The answer to the question is no, but we're probably
9 at a point where I'm being asked to seek that evaluation.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Like a 4142 evaluation? Okay.

11 So let me try to say it this way without saying too
12 much, a couple of things. First and foremost, whether you want
13 to advance anything under seal in writing, or if you want to do
14 -- if you want this discussed in open court at the hearing.

15 MR. BELL: That's a good point. I hadn't thought about
16 that. So why don't I file something, and I'll do it the
17 old-fashioned way.

18 THE COURT: I mean --

19 MR. BELL: You're right. You're absolutely right.
20 I'll do it the old-fashioned way. I'll put something in writing
21 under seal for the court.

22 THE COURT: I appreciate it.

23 MR. BELL: I'd forgotten about that, and I apologize to
24 you and to my client.

25 THE COURT: Listen, I'm the one who interjected it.

1 MR. BELL: It's okay. But it's true.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. BELL: Forgot there. But you're right.

4 Absolutely.

5 THE COURT: Got it.

6 MR. BELL: Thank you so much.

7 And then therefore we don't have anything further at
8 this time.

9 THE COURT: I appreciate it. Okay. Thank you
10 Ms. Lorquet for always being here in support of your son.

11 Okay. We're adjourned.

12 COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.

13 (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)

14 * * * * *

15 C E R T I F I C A T E

16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
17 from the digital recording of the proceedings in the
18 above-entitled matter. Any redaction of personal data
19 identifiers pursuant to the Judicial Conference Policy on
20 Privacy is noted within the transcript.

21 5-28-2024
22 Date

23 /s/ Dawn M. Savino, R.P.R., C.R.R.
24 DAWN M. SAVINO, R.P.R., C.R.R.
25