UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re:

Docket #13cr315

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff, :

- against -

FREDERIC CILINS, : New York, New York

May 15, 2013

Defendants.

-----:

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE FRANK MAAS,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK BY: DANIEL TEHRANI, ESQ. One Saint Andrew's Plaza New York, New York 10007

(212) 637-2455

For the Defendant: LAW OFFICE OF MICHELLE P. SMITH, P.A.

BY: MICHELLE SMITH, ESQ.

827 Menendez Court Orlando, Florida 32801

(407) - 616 - 7641

INTERPRETER PRESENT

Transcription Service: Carole Ludwig, Transcription Services

141 East Third Street #3E New York, New York 10009 Phone: (212) 420-0771 Fax: (212) 420-6007

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;

Transcript produced by transcription service

INDEX

Re- Re- Witness Direct Cross Direct Cross

None

EXHIBITS

Exhibit Voir Number Description ID In Dire

None

- THE CLERK: United States v. Frederic Cilins. 1 2 Counsel, state your name for the record. MR. DANIEL TEHRANI: Good evening, Your Honor, 3 Daniel Tehrani for the Government. With me at counsel 4 5 table is Special Agent Christopher Martinez. MS. MICHELLE SMITH: 6 Good afternoon, again, Your 7 Honor, Michelle Smith on behalf of Frederic Cilins seated to my right. 8 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon or evening. understand Judge Wood has referred the bail issue to me, as 10 11 I thought she might. 12 MR. TEHRANI: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: I guess I have two questions beyond 14 what we discussed earlier, the first of which relates to 15 the underlying conduct. I read in some magistrate judge's decision in Florida - I don't see a name on it - that the 16 17 conduct involved payment of as much as a million dollars in 18 bribes, but I don't think I understand much about the 19 underlying conduct. Let me start with that. 20 MR. TEHRANI: Sure, Your Honor. So by way of 21 background, the case ultimately arises out of an extremely 2.2 valuable mining contract. 23 That's the \$12 billion mining company THE COURT:
- MR. TEHRANI: Yes, most likely more than that.

24

that's referred to?

- 1 Attained from the former government of Guinea by an entity
- 2 of which the defendant was a representative. There is an
- 3 ongoing criminal investigation into the circumstances
- 4 surrounding the procurement of that mining contract. And
- 5 in connection with that criminal investigation, the
- 6 defendant contacted a government cooperating witness, who
- 7 I'll refer to as a CW, that CW is a wife of a former high-
- 8 ranking Guinean government official in the prior
- 9 government. There's been sort of regime change.
- And so the defendant contacted the CW to have the
 CW destroy documents that purported to, that were
- 12 purportedly evidence of the CW's involvement with this
- 13 mining company, with payments to the CW, again, purportedly
- 14 to help that mining company obtain the contract.
- 15 THE COURT: So it's a Foreign Corrupt Practice
- 16 Act?
- 17 | MR. TEHRANI: The underlying investigation, yes,
- 18 Your Honor, is an FCPA investigation. And in addition to
- 19 destruction of evidence, the defendant wanted the CW to lie
- 20 to the FBI.
- 21 And so that led to a series of recorded telephone
- 22 | calls and recorded meetings. There was three recorded
- 23 telephone calls, four recorded meetings between the
- 24 defendant and the CW. And in those calls and in those
- 25 | meetings, the defendant repeatedly asked the CW to destroy

the documents urgently. And not just documents, he wanted to destroy the originals of these documents. He wanted to witness the destruction of the documents so that he could be certain that he observed the destruction of the original documents.

At some point during the meetings and calls - it wasn't the first call, it was meeting along the line, the CW informed the defendant that she had been contacted by the FBI, that the grand jury was involved, and, in fact, provided a French description of what a grand jury is, and the defendant was dismayed that they had not acted quickly enough, that now the FBI was involved, and they really needed now to urgently destroy these documents.

At another meeting, the CW brought copies of the documents that the defendant wanted destroyed. The defendant was, again, upset because these were not the originals, and so would not serve his purpose or the purposes of these meetings to destroy copies. He needed the originals destroyed.

The defendant then had the CW sign a statement, a declaration that included a number of false statements, including the fact that the CW had never had any contact with the mining company, that the CW had never been paid in any way, that the CW had never intervened in any way on the company's behalf. That document was recovered from the

defendant when he was arrested. This document that he provided to the CW that the CW signed was recovered from the defendant when he was arrested, after he was arrested, in addition to \$20,000 in cash. And that \$20,000 in cash was a downpayment on the million dollars that the defendant offered the CW for the CW's assistance in both destroying these documents as well as providing false information to the FBI.

That was not the extent of the money that was going to be paid. The defendant also offered the CW an additional \$5 million contingent upon the mining company ultimately maintaining these mining (inaudible).

THE COURT: Well, let's assume that the case is strong and then there is a considerable inconsistency between the representation to Pre-Trial Services that the defendant makes - I don't have the report, but it was something like 25,000 or 30,000 Euros, something on that order, and the notion that he could come up with these sums, perhaps with others, to pay to silence somebody and for other corrupt purposes. What struck me in the detention findings from Florida was that the defendant has proposed, in addition to posting substantial property with the other co-owners, 24-hour security. And assuming the Government played a role in the selection of the security company, I'm not sure why a private militia isn't enough to

1 ensure the defendant's appearance.

2.2

MR. TEHRANI: A couple of things on that point, Your Honor. The first is that if the defendant has the resources in order to pay for his own private security, he certainly has the resources to evade security and to flee.

The other is that having --

mean if he hires, to use mayoral candidate Lhota's unfortunate phrasing, a mall cop, that would follow, but if, after consulting with the U.S. Attorney's Office, he hires a major security firm, then it seems highly unlikely that they would allow any steps to take place where he could flee.

MR. TEHRANI: The question is not whether the security firm would be somehow in on it. It's more that he has significant resources in order to concoct other ways with other individuals who are certainly involved in this scheme, the scheme to destroy documents, the scheme to force witnesses to lie --

THE COURT: I'm just focusing, and you may be right, but I was trying to focus on risk of flight first.

If he's guarded 24/7 by a security firm of some national prominence, then I'm not sure that risk of flight is still part of the equation. Risk of further obstruction perhaps, but do you concede that risk of flight then would largely

1 be out of the case?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 MR. TEHRANI: I don't, Your Honor, and I understand the point you're making, but 24-hour 3 surveillance by security quards at your own home is not the 4 same level of security that you would have, or the 5 6 Government would be assured of, if he were detained. And 7 so there is going to be inherently some risk that, despite the best efforts of this privately retained security 8 9 entity, that the defendant will be able to evade security. And the point that I'm trying to make is to the extent he 10 11 has the resources for that, he has the resources to find 12 whatever loophole, whatever way he can find to evade that 13 security.

The other point that I'd like to make, Your Honor, is having that kind of money is inconsistent with the income that he's reported to Pre-Trial Services, which I understand he's reported properties.

THE COURT: For some reason the Pre-Trial

Services report I guess maybe it got turned back. Is there
a copy floating around? Thank you. Go on, I'm sorry.

MR. TEHRANI: So the defendant has reported a number of properties. As an initial item, not all of all of those were initially disclosed to Pre-Trial Services.

So there was this initial issue of disclosing five properties and then subsequently disclosing two additional

properties. Those turned out to be the most valuable of the properties.

2.2

Owning those properties seems to me to be somewhat inconsistent with what he's reporting as his monthly and annual income. It also seems inconsistent to me to be the income that someone who can afford to pay a million dollars in cash and five million dollars later has access to. So either the defendant is not being forthcoming with Pre-Trial Services or it's not an accurate depiction of the money and assets the defendant does, in fact, have access to.

The second point about those properties, Your

Honor, is that, again, there was an issue with disclosing

the ownership of those properties and disclosing the

ownership of the entity that owned those properties. There

are these two LLC's.

And I understand, I know defense counsel will say that was an oversight, but whether it is or it is not, the two other individuals who are co-owners of these LLC's and own these properties are very much coconspirators with the defendant. They're individuals who have been intercepted over wires talking to the defendant about the defendant's meetings with the CW. They are individuals who signed some of the contracts with the CW, the contracts that the defendant was asking the CW to destroy. So their

incentives are very much aligned with the defendant as far as the defendant not returning to court on these charges.

Now, if Your Honor is inclined to think that the security guard is going to address risk of flight, I don't necessarily need to talk more about that. I just would note for the record the defendant is not a citizen of the United States. He has no ties to this community, has very few ties to the United States. There is no extradition treaty with France, so if he were to flee to France, he could not be extradited back to the United States.

He is facing significant penalties, and, you know, we credit the findings of the magistrate judge and defense counsel that the exposure here is 97 to 121 months which is still a significant amount of time. So that definitely does give the defendant incentive to flee.

Focusing on dangerousness, and I mean dangerousness by way of destroying evidence and destruction. That is what the defendant did, that is what he is charged with, and it was in a very overt way. These were not coded conversations. There's nothing ambiguous about what happened here. The defendant knew someone was a key witness in a criminal investigation, sought to have that person destroy documents, sought to have that person obstruct a grand jury investigation, sought to have that person lie to the FBI.

THE COURT: But the jig is pretty much up as to that, wouldn't you agree?

MR. TEHRANI: I'm sorry?

3

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

4 THE COURT: The jig is pretty much up as to that.

5 MR. TEHRANI: As to that witness, yes, Your

6 Honor. You know, the defendant still has access to others.

7 The defendant still has access to his coconspirators. And

8 | I think it speaks of the defendant's willingness to evade

9 prosecution and speaks of his willingness to do things to

10 ensure that criminal prosecutions, whether it's the

11 underlying FCPA one or it's this one, go away.

And for those reasons, Your Honor, the Government agrees with the findings of the magistrate judge in the Middle District of Florida, as well as Pre-Trial Services' recommendation here that detention is warranted.

THE COURT: Miss Smith.

MS. SMITH: Your Honor, I'll begin with the question that you posed to Mr. Tehrani about the underlying offense. With all due respect to Mr. Tehrani, I think some of the facts he's laid out are not necessarily what we would propose to the Court and what we would be willing to put in front of a jury with regard to the underlying facts.

We had roughly ten hours of hearings, and a lot of that was me outlining the problems and issues with the Government's case, beginning with what Mr. Tehrani told

Your Honor a while ago. Mr. Cilins prior was an agent of BSGR. BSGR is the entity in question here. That was in 2006. He has not been an agent of the entity, from the best of my knowledge and understanding, from all of the investigation I've done, since 2006. And that's public knowledge, it's all over the internet, it's been reported by half the reporters that are sitting in the room, that he has not been an agent. Some have reported other things.

The contracts in question were signed initially in 2006 and were renewed in 2008. Mr. Cilins was not present, a part of, had anything to do with the 2008 signing of the final contracts in Guinea. And, Your Honor, what happened was Lansana Conté, the deceased president of Guinea, was the one who initially, he and the minister of mines signed the initial contracts. Then after he died and the interim government took over, those contracts were reviewed as were the contracts of Rio Tinto and Chinalco, and the contracts of all the other mining companies that are in Guinea right now. They were reviewed. They were approved, and BSGR was let to go forward.

Rio Tinto had sat on these contracts since 1990's, on these iron ore deposits. They had been sitting on them and had done nothing. BSGR came in, and between 2006 and 2009, '11, '12 actually started into actually drilling, production, and research. Rio Tinto sat on them probably

to keep the iron ore and the bauxite monies up and the commodity prices up.

Once Rio Tinto had to give back concessions, some of those concessions were what the mining contracts that BSGR received. They bid on them like every other mining contractor, there were three or four of them that bid. They were the recipients in 2008.

THE COURT: Yeah, but the charges here at the moment are not FCPA charges. They relate essentially to the obstruction of the grand jury.

MS. SMITH: They do, Your Honor, but the problem is is the Government wants to make it a very - this one limited issue. You have to have the backdrop to understand why Mr. Cilins was doing what he did, which we deny that he was obstructing the grand jury. And if I could have just a few minutes.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. SMITH: In 2009 the CW, Mamadie Toure, which it's all over the papers, is that she was the CW, who was a consort of the deceased, not the wife, she was not the legal wife, has never been the legal wife, according to her own family, of the president. Was ran out by the next government after he died, she was ran out of the country.

The following year a new interim government came into play in Guinea. They, again, reviewed the mining

1 contracts of Rio Tinto, Chinalco, BSGR, and all of the
2 other entities in Guinea. The contracts were approved.
3 Nothing was found to be out of line.

In 2010, Alpha Condé, the current president, he won the election. There was speculation in the election, and Alpha Condé right now, it is under investigation, my understanding is from the World Bank, that he and his son Mohamed Condé who are the driving force, along with George Soros and Walter Hennig, and that is the George Soros we all know, are behind this investigation because they want Chinalco, who has paid something to the tune of \$25 million currently to Alpha Condé's son Mohamed.

So there are many investigations going on in Guinea now into both the current president, past contracts, and everything. These contracts are worth a lot of money. But Mr. Cilins is not a beneficiary thereto. His deal and work, to the best of my understanding, was done in 2006.

Now backdrop this over Mamadie Toure. Throughout the years, and especially in 2010 when there was an effort, either on her behalf, with her name, or the use of her name, to exact payments from various sources, i.e. Rio Tinto, BSGR, and other mining companies.

THE COURT: BSGR is a U.S. company or --

MS. SMITH: It is not a U.S. company. It is the

25 Benny Steinmetz Diamond Group. Benny Steinmetz Resources

1 Group is what it would be.

2 THE COURT: And where's it located?

MS. SMITH: England, the U.K.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

2.2

MS. SMITH: Rio Tinto is Australia, Chinalco is obviously China, Brazil Vale is Vale from Brazil, and then there's other companies, but those are the major four, five players in Guinea right now.

Rio Tinto is now in - well, let me back up.

Mamadie Toure, others are on her behalf are and have been attempting to exact payments, blackmail, and extort money. They were presented - and I'll use this - this is a contract that was signed, you owe me money, I introduced you to this person, I introduced you to that person. The contracts, Your Honor, that are floating around that he Government I believe has and are relying on are frauds. There are no originals, there have never been originals, and that was exactly what we put forward at the detention hearing.

The reason, as I said at the detention hearing, that Mr. Cilins wanted to retrieve this is to stop the blackmail once and for all. She signed a prior attestation - excuse me - her attorney signed a prior letter to BSGR in 2010 saying that these contracts that the Government is relying on are fraudulent, they're forgeries. We don't

- 1 want to get into this, we want to back off. She signed
- 2 two, Mamadie Toure, two attestations in 2012 saying
- 3 | virtually identically what she signed with Mr. Cilins
- 4 during the pendency of this case, long before the grand
- 5 | jury started.
- 6 Your Honor, it is our position, Mr. Cilins'
- 7 position, that these purported original contracts, these
- 8 purported business dealings are non-existent with Mamadie
- 9 Toure. BSGR never had any business dealings with Mamadie
- 10 Toure. Furthermore, she was ran out of Guinea January of
- 11 2009 within weeks of Lansana Conté dying.
- 12 THE COURT: So your position is your client is a
- 13 victim rather than a --
- MS. SMITH: Yes, Judge, we are, and that's
- 15 exactly our position. And because Mamadie Toure had
- 16 | absolutely no ability to influence any contracts. They're
- 17 | saying 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012. She is not welcome in the
- 18 | country of Guinea. How is she going to get the Guinean
- 19 | government to do anything on anyone's behalf BSGR, Rio
- 20 | Tinto, Chinalco if she's not welcome in the country and
- 21 | she's no longer a part.
- 22 | THE COURT: How do I square what your client
- 23 reports as income to Pretrial with his assets by way of
- 24 real estate?
- 25 MS. SMITH: Very simply, Your Honor. As I've

explained and I tried to explain in the court there and I
explained to Mr. Jeff Stimel, I believe his name, with PreTrial Services today --

THE COURT: Stimel, yeah.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

His income for the last two years has MS. SMITH: decreased. The income he reported is his income from the company CWF, I think it's CWF or CFW, that he actually runs. Previous to that he has larger amounts of income. He is a legitimate, respected businessman. He travels to hasn't traveled to Guinea in several years, but he travels to Guinea, to Sierra Leone, Mali, Morocco. He's traveled all over Africa, all over Europe. I don't know that he's been to Brazil, but they're had dealings with Brazil to import chicken from Brazil, Halal chicken from Brazil into South Africa. They've imported foods, medicines into Africa. He has acted as a broker and middleman in business in Africa since the late 1990's if not the early 2000's, 2000, 2001, and, forgive me, I'm not real sure on the dates.

He has had resources, he's worked hard the last two years, income has not been good, but he invested and invested wisely. He invested in real estate here. The properties are paid for, and they're now, one property is rented this coming month, well, it'll be rented. His income will increase and be another \$1,200 in addition to

what we reported.

2.2

He is not receiving payments, to the best of my knowledge, from BSGR. Mamadie Toure has never received. So it is our position that it can't have happened.

With regards to the income, again, Your Honor, he has made significant income over the years. The last two years are not good. And, Your Honor, with all due respect to Pre-Trial Services in Jacksonville, the Pre-Trial Services officer testified that she did not have an interpreter. She was not sure if Mr. Cilins did or did not understand, she thought he did, some of the questions. But she was not sure if he did or did not understand, and he certainly did not have me present.

Upon my first meeting, and it's 188 miles for me to have gone from my office to South Georgia where he's housed, we talked about what he had. With regard to the incident where the one-third was not disclosed, Your Honor, as I told the court there, as an officer of the court, I take responsibility for that. Mr. Cilins had nothing to do with that. He told me about the properties, I asked the attorney Allen Marcus in Miami to prepare the deeds, to talk to the other - and he sent me the deed and mortgage packages that I presented to the court in Jacksonville.

I did not, my bad, I did not fly speck those. I saw what the values were of the properties. They looked

okay. When I was submitted - and later during the hearing I caught some typos and asked the judge to have time to review them, and that's in the transcript, Judge. about 400 pages of transcripts. I asked him, when I looked at them and actually sat down to fly speck them, I realized we had a problem. I called Allen Marcus. I represented to the court at the last hearing. I called Mr. Marcus and I said is he the 100 percent owner or the one-third owner? He goes one-third. He says I did the affidavits one-third, and I said, no, Allen, go look at them. You didn't. You sent me that he's the sole owner.

So we corrected tem, I brought that to the court, and I accept responsibility because I should have double-checked them. But that certainly was not Mr. Cilins' fault.

With regard to bond and the issues raised by the United States here today, the problem that I have with the court's ruling, in addition to what we've discussed, is he never found he was a serious risk of flight, and that's the standard in this circuit and virtually every circuit in the country. He said he's a risk of flight. He didn't find he's a serious risk of flight.

Assuming, for argument's sake, that the Government met its burden to show that Mr. Cilins is --

25 THE COURT: Wait, let me go back. Why didn't he

```
have to find --
 1
 2
                           It's on page, Your Honor --
              MS. SMITH:
                           No, I accept what you say --
 3
              THE COURT:
              MS. SMITH:
                            It's the case law in this circuit,
 4
    and I don't have it with me. I think it's in Khashoggi or
 5
 6
    Dreyer that I cited to the court. I think it's in the
 7
    Dreyer case. And forgive me, I didn't bring the case with me,
    Your Honor, but it's either in Khashoggi or Dreyer where it
 8
 9
    lays out that the U.S. Attorney has to prove that he's a
    serious risk of flight not just a risk of flight. And I
10
11
    believe the statute also tracks that language.
12
                           I guess I've always focused on
              THE COURT:
13
    preponderance rather than clear and convincing for the two --
14
              MS. SMITH:
                           Yes. And we do that, Judge, you know
15
    that we tend to just - yeah, it's preponderance on the risk of
16
    flight, but it has to be a serious risk of flight, and I
17
    believe it's clear and convincing for danger, but danger's not
18
    the issue here. And the Government, neither in this hearing
19
    or in the other hearings, has really moved under the
20
    dangerousness prong.
21
              Mr. Cilins is 50 years old. He's married.
2.2
    been with his - he recently married in the United States to
23
    the woman he's been with -
24
              (conversation in French between attorney and
25
    defendant)
```

1 MS. SMITH: Twenty-one.

2 MR. CILINS: (in French)

3 MS. SMITH: He's been with her twenty-three years.

4 They have three children. They recently married; they married

5 here in the United States. He travels frequently to the

6 United States. He's done so, as represented in both the

7 passport that the Government has, the passport that I have

8 here. He has two legitimate French passports. The documents

are with the court, and they were rendered as exhibits in

10 Florida.

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

He is willing to - he's willing to surrender both passports. He's willing to sign over all of the properties that he has, the five properties that he solely owns. He and the other business partners are willing to sign over the other two partners, totalling \$3.6 million worth of assets.

Again, he is only - assuming he is convicted, he is only facing ten years, 97 to 121 months, and that's assuming he doesn't plead or assuming he's not - but if he's convicted, he's not looking at a thirty or forty or even a twenty or twenty-five-year sentence.

THE COURT: Well, between ten years or being in the country with no extradition for this type of offense, ten years might seem like a very long time.

MS. SMITH: I understand that, but, Your Honor, someone with legitimate business ties like Mr. Cilins who's

made his business and his reputation on brokering businesses,
brokering deals, supplying food stuffs, medicines, etc. in all
these foreign countries on three or four continents is not
going to be able to look over his shoulder and run from the
United States government forever. He would be virtually
penniless to have to sit at home in France and hide in his

home and not go anywhere. He couldn't conduct business.

And that likens to the Adnan Khashoggi case where bond in that case was granted, and he was a Saudi businessman with no way of extradition who was facing significantly more time. Like Mr. Cilins, he did not have significant ties to the United States, but because of the conditions fashioned, this court granted him bail.

THE COURT: Although there the Royal Consulate said that they would ensure that he was sent back if he fled to the Kingdom.

MS. SMITH: And, Your Honor, I'm not gonna argue with the Royal Consulate, but we all know how foreign countries, if they really wanted to keep him, he would stay, and if he really wanted, they wanted to send him back, they could send him back. It's extremely funny to me that the 911 bombers came out of that very same country, and we didn't get any Intel from Saudi Arabia about those people. So I don't take that with a whole grain of salt what the Saudi Arabian Consulate or the Embassy says.

THE COURT: I think I've heard enough unless the 1 2 Government wants to add something. I do, but before I do, Your Honor, 3 MR. TEHRANI: may I just confer with defense counsel for a minute? 4 5 THE COURT: Sure. 6 THE COURT: I've got the Southern District 7 supplement, but do you have the underlying Georgia report? 8 Thanks. 9 (pause in proceeding) 10 MS. SMITH: Your Honor, Mr. Tehrani brought 11 something that I probably need to bring to the Court's 12 attention. The properties owned - number one, I noticed in 13 the revised Pre-Trial Services report there's actually a 14 property missing, I believe. If I can just - Judge, I think 15 there should be - I don't want to speak out of turn, but I 16 believe we're missing the Turnberry - I believe we're missing the Turnberry property which is the actual vacation home that 17 18 he owns with his wife. It's owned by Fie Investments (ph),

20 THE COURT: How much roughly is it worth?

he's the sole owner of that, and that's the affidavit --

19

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SMITH: It doesn't change the analysis. It was 245,000 if I remember correctly or 240, but it doesn't change the 3.6 million, the 3.6 was the total. And that is where he would propose to stay. Your Honor, I don't know if you have attached to the back of the report - this it is - it's

Turnberry Isle South. It's \$252,410.

THE COURT: Is that one of the affidavits here?

MS. SMITH: Yes, Judge. And, of course, he would

4 execute those as well as the mortgages. I have the mortgages

5 signed by the manager of the LLC's. Mr. Cilins would also

6 execute those. We did not execute at the time. I have those

7 | in my possession if the Court granted bond.

Your Honor, the only other thing that if I could just briefly, it's illogical that someone would put their bribe, if they were bribing someone, this Mamadie Toure, in writing. As a prudent businessman you're not gonna lay out your dirty deeds for the world to see in all these contracts, and that's always struck me as odd that BSGR hires, is a huge company, Rio Tinto is a huge company. She's attempted to blackmail both of those companies.

Neither one of them I can believe, being multinational, using the best law firms, are going to let their client put that kind of - even if it's true - put it in writing. So that's the thing that is sort of - you said things struck you odd. That's something that struck me as odd, and I'll sit down.

22 MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, if I may.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TEHRANI: So defense counsel's characterization of what was going on here between defendant and the CW is just

simply inconsistent with the recordings were. So as an initial matter, it really doesn't even matter what these documents --

THE COURT: Are they in French or --

2.2

MR. TEHRANI: The documents are in French.

THE COURT: The recordings.

MR. TEHRANI: The recordings are in French as well.

THE COURT: That's what I meant.

MR. TEHRANI: And we proposed - we have proposed, some reason, snippets in the complaint, which we could give Your Honor to review. I'm sure defense counsel will take exception to certain of those translations. But as in the sworn complaint - the initial point though is, it almost doesn't even matter what these documents are, and defense counsel could be entirely right, that these documents are entirely fraudulent. The fact of the matter is that the defendant was trying to destroy documents that were the subject of a grand jury subpoena, that the defendant knew were the subject of a grand jury investigation.

The defendant encouraged the CW to lie, the defendant wanted to see the destruction of documents. That he - bear with me. In paragraph 22(a) of the complaints, Cilins or Cilans (ph) stated in substance that the CW needed to lie to the FBI. That's after the CW had informed the defendant that she had been contacted by the FBI, and he was, again,

very aggravated that they hadn't moved quickly enough.

And then the whole structure of payments here is entirely inconsistent with the defendant having nothing to do with the mining company with the extraordinarily valuable contract. He offered a million dollars up front for the CW to destroy these documents and to lie to the FBI and to obstruct the grand jury investigation. As soon as she did that, she got a million dollars.

THE COURT: Assuming that she?

MR. TEHRANI: If she did those things, she cooperated with the defendant, she got a million dollars. If she did all of those things and the mining company retained, after the entire criminal investigation, the broader criminal investigation, the mining company retained its contract, mining contract in Guinea, the CW would get five more million dollars, five additional million dollars. That is entirely inconsistent with the defendant being concerned about the blackmail. That's entirely inconsistent with the defendant having nothing to do with this mining company from 2006. And it is very much consistent with the defendant having access to all of the resources at this company's disposal, all of the resources that may be used or may be needed to protect this extraordinarily valuable mining contract.

24 THE COURT: Thank you.

25 (pause in proceeding)

income, it seems that the defendant is a person of means, and certainly some of his associates are persons of means. I understand what the Government has said in relation to danger to the community, but it seems to me the danger of obstruction, no matter how much money the defendant and his colleagues may have, is largely past in relation to this crime, and there's certainly nothing in the traditional sense of dangerousness in terms of weapons and the like.

So the issue is risk of flight to my mind, whether it's risk of flight or serious risk of flight, it's will the defendant be available for trial. And the fact that France does not have an extradition treaty with the United States certainly is a significant factor favoring the Government's position.

But the question before me is are there any conditions that would reasonably assure the defendant's presence in court for trial, and I conclude that there are, but I think persons beyond his colleagues who are the owners of the other two-thirds of some of the properties need to have some skin in the game.

I'm going to fix bail in the amount of a \$15 million personal recognizance bond to be cosigned by five financially responsible people, and further secured by \$5 million cash or property. So it calls for property beyond that which has been

1 proffered thus far.

2.2

The defendant's travel would be restricted to the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the Middle District of Florida.

5 MS. SMITH: Your Honor, Southern District. He 6 actually lives (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Oh, okay, he was -I saw he was arrested in the Middle District.

MS. SMITH: Sorry, Judge, for interrupting you.

THE COURT: No, thank you. Appreciate that correction. He's to surrender all travel documents and not seek new ones. He'll be subject to strict Pre-Trial Services supervision with home incarceration at the Turnberry Isle property to be enforced through electronic monitoring, and, far more importantly, I'm providing that he's to be guarded 24/7 by a reputable, capable security company approved both by the United States Attorney's Office and by the Court. So some local security company is not what I have in mind. What I have in mind is people who are armed and who are from a company of some renown. And I'm providing that the defendant is to be detained until all those conditions are met. Any questions about my bail conditions?

MS. SMITH: Actually, Your Honor, since I don't practice in this jurisdiction and I'm pro hac, everybody's definition of responsible financial third party is different.

1	THE COURT: And it varies from case to case I find
2	in this district. Sometimes individuals who one would think
3	could not honor a bond are accepted by the United States
4	Attorney's Office after an interview. Sometimes, and Mr.
5	Tehrani can correct me if I'm wrong, my impression is that the
6	Government takes the position that each person would have to
7	be solvent enough to honor the unsecured portion of the bond.
8	More frequently, I think the analysis is could all of the
9	people collectively honor that unsecured portion of a bond.
10	So it's a bit of a moving target, but if the issue
11	arises, then the Court will get involved in that. If folks
12	who are acceptable to the Government after an interview are
13	proffered, then it's not an issue that the Court has to deal
14	with. So I guess that's something that would be decided down
15	the road. Any other questions on your part, Miss Smith?
16	MS. SMITH: Your Honor, the other question that I
17	have are just two little brief matters. I do have his
18	passport. The Government has his 2008 French passport that
19	was issued 2008. I have the 2007. Would you like me to
20	surrender it to
21	THE COURT: Please.
22	MS. SMITH: Your Honor or to
23	THE COURT: Not to me.
24	MS. SMITH: To the Government?
25	THE COURT: Yes.

Okay, I'll take care of that. And the 1 MS. SMITH: 2 other issue, while he's being detained, I know that there is an issue, he has high blood pressure, and he is only getting 3 one portion of his medication. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MS. SMITH: He --7 THE COURT: Yeah, go on. I have the prescription. He takes 8 MS. SMITH: 9 Temerit which - and I'll spell it for the Court - T-E-M-E-R-I-T, 5 mg one time each day, and I can provide the Court with 10 11 the actual U.S. name, but the other drug he takes he Coaprovel 12 which is C-O-A-P-R-O-V-E-L, and it's 150 mg by 12.5 mg and he 13 14 THE COURT: Wait, 150 mg by what? 15 MS. SMITH: 12.5, it's 150 mg/12.5 mg, and he takes 16 THE COURT: 17 That's with a B or a V? 18 V, V like Victor. MS. SMITH: 19 THE COURT: Right. 20 And he takes one time per day. MS. SMITH: 21 currently receiving the two pills that are the equivalent of 22 Coaprovel, but he's not receiving the equivalent of the 23 Temerit. 24 THE COURT: Ironically, there was a meeting of the

criminal justice advisory counsel today with both wardens of

25

- 1 the two facilities in New York, and there was some discussion
- 2 about this. Frequently, they do not have precise analogs or
- 3 drugs. They always use generic versions. I'll fill out a
- 4 medical attention slip, but there's no guarantee that they
- 5 | will conclude that the second drug is required. You can
- 6 always take it up with the warden's office if you think the
- 7 | treatment's inadequate, but I will fill out a medical
- 8 attention slip.
- 9 MS. SMITH: Thank you, Judge.
- 10 THE COURT: Any other questions?
- 11 MR. TEHRANI: Yes, Your Honor, just one question
- 12 about court approval of the security firm. Should we come to
- 13 Your Honor with that, Judge Wood?
- 14 | THE COURT: I quess it's her call in the first
- 15 place.
- MR. TEHRANI: Okay.
- 17 | THE COURT: If you chose to appeal it, I guess if
- 18 | she reverses me, it becomes academic. If you don't appeal or
- 19 | if she sides with me on that issue and she wants to refer that
- 20 | to me, that's fine too. I wouldn't suggest you go to whoever
- 21 | the duty magistrate judge is whenever it's ripe for
- 22 | consideration. You can certainly bring that issue to me if
- 23 Judge Wood approves.
- 24 THE COURT: Understood, Your Honor, thank you.
- MS. SMITH: And, Your Honor, would it be

- appropriate in that case if Mr. Tehrani or Mr. Kobre and I sat down and maybe picked five or six companies, and then we can figure out --
- THE COURT: Well, ideally you'll agree on one.

 Failing that, however you want to present the issue to me is

 fine, but what I don't have in mind, if it comes before me, is

 hearing about some company I've never heard of even if you can

 tell me it's the best darn company in the Southern District of

 Florida. And when I say 24/7, I mean 24/7, such that to the

 extent that the defendant has to travel to court, that these

I don't know whether you can meet the conditions I fixed, Mr. Cilins, but if you are able to and you thereafter violate any condition of the bond, you and whoever cosigns the bond with you will each become liable for the full \$15 million amount of the bond. Further, if you fail to appear as required, you can be charged with the crime of bail-jumping. So even if for some reason this obstruction of justice case were to be dismissed, you could be prosecuted on that charge. Do you understand all that, sir?

MR. CILINS: Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

THE COURT: Thank you all.

folks will be traveling with him.

MR. TEHRANI: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Judge.

25 (Whereupon the above matter was adjourned.)