UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION

) DOCKET NO. 3:11-cr-337
)
)
)
)

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. CONRAD, JR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
JUNE 18, 2014

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Government:

STEVEN R. KAUFMAN, ESQ., Assistant United States Attorney 227 West Trade Street, Suite 1700 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

On Behalf of the Defendant:

PATRICK MICHAEL MEGARO, ESQ., Brownstone, P.a. 33 E. Robinson Street, Suite 210 Orlando, Florida 32801

> LAURA ANDERSEN, RMR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Charlotte, North Carolina

1 2 JUNE 18, 2014, COURT CALLED TO ORDER 2:08 p.m.: 3 THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. 4 MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 5 MR. MEGARO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: We're here in the matter of United 7 States V Corvain Cooper for sentencing. Are the parties ready 8 to proceed? 9 MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor. MR. MEGARO: Yes, Your Honor. 10 11 THE COURT: Mr. Cooper was found guilty by a jury on 12 October 21st, and after that his case was referred to the 13 Federal Probation Department for the purpose of preparing a 14 presentence report. 15 Mr. Cooper, I have a few questions to ask you about 16 that presentence report, if you would please stand. 17 Have you had a chance to read the presentence 18 report? 19 DEFENDANT COOPER: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: Do you believe you understand it? 21 DEFENDANT COOPER: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Have you had enough time to go over the 23 presentence report with your attorney? 2.4 DEFENDANT COOPER: Yes, sir. 25 THE COURT: All right. You may sit down.

Is it Mr. Megaro, is that the correct pronunciation? 1 2 MR. MEGARO: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 3 THE COURT: Were there any objections to the 4 presentence report? 5 MR. MEGARO: Yes, Your Honor. I had filed an 6 objection letter on January 23rd, 2014, as well as an update 7 on May 20th, 2014, and the Defendant's Sentencing Memorandum, which I believe was electronically filed on June 12th, which 8 incorporates by reference and expands on some of those 9 objections. 10 11 THE COURT: I've received all of those. It appears 12 to me that there are two things going on here. 13 One is the statutory mandatory minimum issue, and 14 the other is a series of guideline objections. 15 I guess, taking them in order. With respect to the 16 851, does the defendant deny the validity of any of the predicate convictions that were noticed by the Government in 17 their 851? 18 19 MR. MEGARO: No, Your Honor. We don't -- we don't 20 object to the validity of the underlying convictions. 21 more or less an Eighth Amendment argument with respect to the 22 cruel and unusual punishment with respect to the mandatory 23 minimum. 24 So we've got that going on. And if the THE COURT:

Eighth Amendment doesn't bar the imposition of the mandatory

25

life sentence, the Court has no discretion under the statute.

MR. MEGARO: I would agree with that statement. If the Court does not find that this violates the Eighth

Amendment of the United States Constitution, the statute would strip the Court of any discretion.

THE COURT: And what is the argument that there is an Eighth Amendment issue here?

MR. MEGARO: I have laid it out in my sentencing memorandum at -- I think it was point 6, Your Honor, which begins on page -- I'm sorry -- page 10 of my memorandum.

And without rehashing everything that I've written,
I know the Court has read it. The main thrust of the argument
is that the punishment does not fit the crime for the factors
that were laid out in the Supreme Court case.

And I would point out that if Mr. Cooper was prosecuted by the State of North Carolina rather than the United States government, he would be facing a sentence which would be in line with the highest sentence that a co-defendant or co-conspirator received in this case, and what I believe would be -- if the mandatory minimum did not apply, and the Court were to credit all of my objections -- would be a level 32, a criminal history category VI, which is 210 to 262 months. Which is roughly the same maximum sentence that the State of North Carolina would impose. He would not be able to receive a life sentence.

I'm unaware of any state in the United States that would impose a life sentence for trafficking marijuana without any other aggravating factor that would include violence.

THE COURT: Very well. What says the Government with respect to the Eighth Amendment claim?

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, the convictions are valid. In terms of the Eighth Amendment, Mr. Cooper is an adult male of the age of majority. There's not an issue as to his age. I don't believe there's any issue as to his competence or I.Q. So I don't believe that there's a constitutional challenge.

In terms of the 851 notice that we filed, we did so knowing that Mr. Cooper had several factors that weighed in favor of us filing it, to include his very extensive criminal history. He's a VI, based on actual convictions not on status as a career offender. He had a leadership role. He had firearms in the course of the conspiracy. There was obstructive conduct.

I mean, there are numerous factors that our office internally would consider, and he hits many of those pistons not just one of them, in terms of using the 851 enhancement.

THE COURT: Mr. Megaro, I'm sympathic to your argument. I would want to have discretion before imposing a life sentence. The absence of discretion is a troubling thing for the Court. But it appears to the Court that from a statutory standpoint, the i's have been dotted, the t's have

been crossed. The imposition of a mandatory life sentence is what Congress has provided for someone who has been found guilty of this offense with the priors that Mr. Cooper has.

From a constitutional sense, it does appear to me
that the Fourth Circuit has spoken in this area and has upheld
the constitutionality of a mandatory life sentence for a crime
such as this in the Kratsas case, and in the unpublished

Sylvester case cited by the Government. I'm going to overrule
the Eighth Amendment challenge in light of that case law.

Having done that, you having preserved your constitutional challenge, do you still wish to be heard on the guideline issues?

MR. MEGARO: Your Honor, I know that it would seem almost academic in light of the mandatory nature of the sentence, but I don't want to -- I'm ever conscious of possibly waiving any appellate rights.

THE COURT: Right. Well, why don't we do this: I have reviewed the objections with respect to the two level increase for a weapon; the drug amount, the -- seems like the leadership enhancement and the double counting.

I've reviewed your objections, as well as the government's response, and as to each I think the government has the better argument for the reasons specified, either in the probation office response to your objection or the government's response and supplemental response.

And so for the record, you have made each of those 1 2 objections and I have overruled them. 3 MR. MEGARO: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: All right. 5 MR. KAUFMAN: And Your Honor, I apologize. I 6 believe there was also an enhancement for the obstruction 7 based upon the letter to Mr. Moseley. 8 THE COURT: There was. Do you have Government's Exhibit 45 with you? 9 I should, Your Honor. 10 MR. KAUFMAN: 11 MR. MEGARO: I have -- Your Honor, I have seen 12 Government's Exhibit 45. 13 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear the argument of 14 the Government as to why this exhibit justified a two level 15 obstruction enhancement. MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, the context of his letter 16 17 was after co-defendant Leamon Keishan Moseley, who was one of 18 the testifying witnesses against Mr. Cooper eventually, but it 19 was right after he had been arrested. In actuality, Your 20 Honor had released him on bond. But it was not a fact yet 21 known to Mr. Cooper. 22 He sent this letter to Mr. Cooper's mother with 23 whom -- I'm sorry -- to Mr. Moseley's mother. Mr. Cooper and

Mr. Moseley were very close friends. I believe that

Mr. Moseley even talked about it almost like a brothership.

24

25

And that he was very close to Mr. Moseley's mother. So he addressed it to Mr. Moseley's mother, who is Ms. Scott. And in the letter he is giving an update to Mr. Moseley about the status of the case to include who's saying what.

He even at the very back attaches a list of -- the actual indictment and has handwritten who's cooperating, who's on the run, adding defendants who weren't even shown on this superseding indictment as to who is cooperating, good their friend Mr. Alegrete, Mr. Johnson, who Your Honor heard from during testimony. So he's clearly trying to keep Mr. Moseley abreast of what's going on during it. There were a couple of specific comments. For example, just below the signature block is one of the key comments.

"Call my mom or Susan." Susan is Mr. Cooper's girlfriend. "And any questions or concerning Keishan should be cool." Now, again, he's talking about Keishan in third party person because he thinks this is going to Keishan Moseley's mother.

And then very importantly, "If he did" -- "If he did the takes on the bank accounts, he can say that money came from anywhere."

This is a very important statement there, Your

Honor. Because Mr. Cooper was aware that he was charged with

money laundering. There were money laundering charges. And

obviously one of the key things in a money laundering case

like this is, what is the source of the funds. The deposit slip doesn't say "drug proceeds" on it.

And so Mr. Cooper is trying to influence what Mr. Moseley will tell law enforcement, if and when he eventually is asked about these bank accounts. Which, very importantly, Mr. Moseley testified he opened on behalf of Mr. Cooper. So he was receiving funds for Mr. Cooper.

And so to say that the money came from anywhere, he's basically saying, it didn't come from me. The money in your account did not come from me. He's trying to influence the testimony of Mr. Moseley.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to -- I'm going to grant the objection to the obstruction enhancement. I do believe that there's -- it's a very close call. The letter does not have overt threats. It comes very close to crossing the line. The government says it does cross the line with respect to either unlawfully influencing a witness or suborning perjury. I'm going to find that it comes just short of the line and overrule the objection.

Having done that, it appears that -- or not overruling the objection -- granting the objection to the obstruction enhancement.

Which I think would make the -- based upon the other rulings of the Court would make the offense level a 44, and still reduced to 43 because that's as high as the guidelines

1 go.

Are there any other objections?

MR. MEGARO: Other than what I've laid out in the letters, Your Honor, I believe the other big one would probably be -- or the other two big ones would be the firearm.

THE COURT: And the drug amounts?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ MEGARO: And not only the drug -- well, that would be --

THE COURT: -- and leadership.

MR. MEGARO: The drug amounts and the leadership role, which I believe has been carefully laid out and briefed by both parties.

THE COURT: It has, and I've read both sides, and I recall the testimony at trial, and I find as to each that the objection should be denied.

MR. MEGARO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Those are the findings of the Court. I think based upon those findings, the statute requires a mandatory life sentence. The guidelines -- advisory guideline range is life. And having made those findings I'll be glad to hear from you Mr. Megaro on behalf of Mr. Cooper at this time.

MR. MEGARO: Certainly, Your Honor.

Again, I've laid out a lot of the factual reasons for a possible departure or mitigating factors for this Court to take into consideration.

I did submit a number of letters of recommendation from friends and family, and it's clear to me that Mr. Cooper does have a very loving and caring family. They've been in touch with me throughout my representation on the case.

Because of the distance -- they all reside in

California where Mr. Cooper is a resident of -- they were

unable to make the trip out across the country. But they -
they have shown their support, and I think it speaks volumes

that despite the amount of trouble that Mr. Cooper is in, that

these people have stood by him, continued to support him,

financially and emotionally.

I have laid out a number of mitigating factors for the Court to consider and I cannot stress enough that this is a case that did not involve any violence on Mr. Cooper's part. There was no acts of robbery or any physical violence.

I understand there's an enhancement for a weapon, but there was no use of that weapon or threatened use of that weapon, which to me is one of the most important factors.

It's how a person comports themselves. If they're in the drug business strictly for business purposes, that's one thing. But if they employ violence as a means themselves or directly or indirectly, or commit any violent acts, I think that places them in a whole different category. And certainly I don't think there's any indicia that Mr. Cooper used any violence or threatened any violence.

Other than that, I will rely upon my written submission and leave it to the Court's discretion.

I have spoken to my client about speaking today. He understands there will be an appeal. I have gone over every document that I filed on his behalf with respect to the sentencing, as well as the government's responses to my objections. And Mr. Cooper agrees with me that anything that he could have said, I've laid out in my sentencing memorandum. So based upon that he will not address the Court.

THE COURT: How old is Mr. Cooper?

DEFENDANT COOPER: I'm 34 years old.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Cooper, I understand that you believe that
Mr. Megaro has laid out the case for you in terms of
mitigation, in terms of anything that can be said on your
behalf, but I want to make sure that that's your -- if you
wish to say anything, you're entitled to do that, and you have
that opportunity. And if you don't wish to say anything, I
have read everything that Mr. Megaro has filed on your behalf.

And so do you understand that you have a right to say anything you wish to say to me at this time?

DEFENDANT COOPER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And do you care to say anything further?

DEFENDANT COOPER: I just want to see my family

again.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, there's, I guess, not much to say. There's a statutorily required sentence here. I want to say that it's unfortunate that we're here in the circumstance. Although Mr. Cooper was a major marijuana trafficker, the firearms enhancement -- actually, interestingly, while the act of violence that we know of involving Mr. Cooper involved him initially as the victim of a drug related robbery, and that's why he then armed himself. But the danger inherent in arming himself, even to protect himself from other drug dealers is serious and has to be deterred.

His leadership role, the magnitude of the overall investigation -- very importantly I have to say that we have, throughout the process pretrial, sought his cooperation against others, and quite honestly, Your Honor, even post-trial. He did not testify, and we felt that we could still have him as a credible witness if he was so inclined. He declined to be a cooperator, even with our offer post-sentencing -- I'm sorry, post-trial.

So we've done what we could. We're continuing the investigation. Fortunately we've recently had some breakthroughs going up the chain, even from Mr. Cooper. And Your Honor will probably become aware of those pretty soon.

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Cooper, if you would please stand.

I've considered the information in the presentence report, the arguments of the attorneys, the pleadings filed by both sides, I also remember this trial quite well, presided over it, heard the testimony of the witnesses, and will take that into account in terms of announcing a sentence.

I do echo what I said earlier, and that is, the

Court is not comfortable with imposing a mandatory life

sentence on a 34 year old individual without some discretion

to consider the 3553(a) factors that a court normally is

entitled to consider.

Congress has essentially made the sufficient but not greater than necessary sentence in this case through that mandatory minimum sentence. The Court has no discretion. I'm not sure what I would do if I had discretion, but the absence of discretion is a difficult thing for the Court.

Nonetheless, the Court recalls the testimony, believes that Mr. Cooper was involved in a very serious way in a multi-million dollar drug trafficking organization, and that he has a lengthy criminal history. That I believe his total number of criminal history points were 17, even though several of the convictions didn't register any points.

A criminal history category of 17 at such a young

age shows a degree of recidivism that makes a substantial sentence necessary in order to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant and to serve some of the other purposes of sentencing.

Mr. Cooper's convictions go back to 1999 and were largely theft and fraud related until the 2000 -- post 2000 period of time where he got a conviction for battery, a marijuana conviction, and a second controlled substance conviction.

And so his serious -- the serious nature of his criminal history, the serious involvement of the defendant in this multi-state drug trafficking organization all combine to warrant a very substantial sentence.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Corvain Cooper, is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be in prison for a term of life on Count One, a term of 240 months on Count Two, and a term of 120 months on Count Four to be served concurrently.

A life sentence is the mandatory minimum sentence

Congress has indicated is required in a case like this. The

Court overruled the Eighth Amendment challenge and the Court

is left with no discretion other than to impose a term of life

on Count One.

A substantial sentence is required to reflect the

seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, just punishment, adequate deterrence, and as I said, importantly in this case, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant. It takes into consideration the serious conspiracy Mr. Cooper was involved in, as well as his lengthy criminal history.

Further ordered that the defendant be required to support all dependents as outlined in the presentence report from prison earnings while incarcerated.

The Court calls to the attention of the custodial authorities that the defendant has a history of substance abuse and recommends that he be allowed to participate in any available substance abuse treatment program while incarcerated, and if eligible, receive the benefits of 18, United States Code, Section 3672(e)(2).

In the event the defendant is released from imprisonment, a 10 year term of supervised release is ordered.

Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which he is released.

While on supervised release he shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. He shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court in the Western District of North Carolina.

Further ordered that the defendant pay to the United

States a special assessment of \$300 due and payable immediately.

The Court declines to impose a fine or interest in this case but will order forfeiture of any interest the defendant has in any property seized by the United States in the course of this investigation.

With respect to the special assessment, if the defendant is unable to pay that assessment immediately -- the special assessment and the order that the defendant support all dependents -- the Court will require the defendant to participate in the Inmate Financial Responsibility Program.

Other than what we've discussed, is there any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed as stated?

MR. MEGARO: Your Honor, the Fourth Circuit has taught me that if I don't register an objection after sentence has been imposed, then it is waived for purposes of appeal. So I would incorporate my prior objections and the Court's ruling, as if I set forth just now.

I neglected to ask if the Court would consider endorsing a recommendation that the Bureau of Prisons designate him -- designate him for a facility in California so that his family could visit him without undue hardship.

And finally, I had advised Mr. Cooper of his right to appeal, and it looks like I will be the appellate attorney. He has executed a in forma pauperis affidavit and a financial

affidavit which I will be filing. And I'm going to ask the Court to consider waiving the cost of filing the fee -- the filing fee for the notice of appeal and for the preparation of the transcripts.

THE COURT: Very well. I'll take that up after imposing the sentence.

Let me modify the sentence to this extent. The 10 year term is to Count One. There's a three year term on Count Two and Count Four. Those terms are to run concurrent with each other and the 10 year term.

I will make a recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Cooper be designated to a facility as close to -- is it central California -- is that --

MR. MEGARO: Yeah, central California.

THE COURT: As close to central California as possible, consistent with the needs of the Bureau of Prisons.

MR. MEGARO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me inform Mr. Cooper of your right to appeal your conviction and sentence.

Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days from the entry of judgment. If you are unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal with no cost to you. And if you request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Your attorney has indicated already that you are

1	prepared to make the necessary filings with respect to
2	indigency status, and we'll take that up when those motions
3	are filed.
4	But do you understand your rights to appeal as I've
5	just explained them to you?
6	DEFENDANT COOPER: Yes, sir.
7	THE COURT: All right. Anything further from either
8	side?
9	MR. MEGARO: No, Your Honor.
10	MR. KAUFMAN: No, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Then this matter is concluded.
12	Mr. Cooper, you're remanded to the custody of the
13	Marshals at this time.
14	(The matter is concluded at 2:37 p.m.)
15	(End of Proceedings.)
16	* * * * *
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Τ	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER
3	
4	I, Laura Andersen, Federal Official Court Reporter, in
5	and for the United States District Court for the Western
6	District of North Carolina, do hereby certify that pursuant to
7	Section 753, Title 28, United States Code that the foregoing
8	is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically
9	reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and
10	that the transcript page format is in conformance with the
11	regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.
12	Dated this the 18th day of September, 2014.
13	Dated this the roth day of september, 2014.
14	
15	S/Laura Andersen
16	Laura Andersen, RMR Federal Official Court Reporter
17	rederal Official Court Reporter
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	