```
O1BZZBICP-NK
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
      -----x
 2
3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                             23 Cr. 91 (PKC)
                V.
5
     TREVOR THOMAS BICKFORD,
6
                    Defendant.
                                             Plea
 7
                                             New York, N.Y.
 8
                                             January 11, 2024
                                              12:00 p.m.
9
10
     Before:
11
                          HON. P. KEVIN CASTEL,
12
                                             District Judge
13
                               APPEARANCES
14
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
15
          United States Attorney for the
          Southern District of New York
     BY: SARAH L. KUSHNER
16
          KAYLAN E. LASKY
17
          MATTHEW J.C. HELLMAN
          Assistant United States Attorney
18
     FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK INC.
          Attorneys for Defendant
19
     BY: MARISA K. CABRERA
20
          JENNIFER BROWN
21
     ALSO PRESENT: FBI Special Agent Jack Amaro
22
23
24
25
```

1	(Case called)
2	MS. KUSHNER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
3	Sarah Kushner, Kaylan Lasky, and Matthew Hellman, for
4	the government, and also at counsel table is FBI Special Agent
5	Jack Amaro.
6	THE COURT: Good afternoon to you all.
7	And for the defendant?
8	MS. CABRERA: Good afternoon, your Honor.
9	Marisa Cabrera and Jennifer Brown of Federal Defenders
10	on behalf of Mr. Trevor Bickford.
11	And I'd also like to note in the audience we have
12	Mr. Bickford's mother, stepfather, as well as his two aunts.
13	THE COURT: All right. And also appearing, Ms. Brown,
14	yes. Okay.
15	Good afternoon to both of you.
16	Now, Mr. Hellman, I'm going to ask you to move your
17	seat, if you don't mind, that way, yes, just so I can see
18	Mr. Bickford. I'd appreciate that.
19	Sorry, Ms. Brown.
20	MS. BROWN: I see you.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Bickford, I've been advised that you
22	wish to enter a plea of the guilty to certain counts of the
23	indictment.
24	Is that correct, sir?
	1

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Before I can accept a guilty plea from you, I must be satisfied that you understand the rights you would have if this case proceeded to trial, and the rights you're giving up by pleading guilty. Also, I must be satisfied that you understand the consequences of pleading quilty and there's a factual basis for your plea of quilty. So in a moment I'm going to have you placed under oath. I'm going to ask you certain questions and inform of you of certain rights. If I ask you something or I tell you something and you don't quite understand, please let me know and I'll put it into different words. Do you understand all of that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I understand. THE COURT: Okay. Please stand and the clerk will administer the oath. (Defendant sworn) THE COURT: Mr. Bickford, you're now under oath, and your answers to my questions are subject to the penalties of perjury or of making a false statement. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: And that's true for anything you say today.

Do you understand that?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: All right. How old are you?
3	THE DEFENDANT: I'm 20 years old.
4	THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
5	THE DEFENDANT: I dropped out of my senior year.
6	THE COURT: Senior year of what?
7	THE DEFENDANT: High school.
8	THE COURT: Of high school? All right.
9	And are you now or have you recently been under the
10	care of a medical doctor?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: For what condition?
13	THE DEFENDANT: May I consult my lawyers, your Honor?
14	THE COURT: I'm sorry.
15	THE DEFENDANT: May I consult, your Honor, with
16	THE COURT: Yes. Sure.
17	(Defendant conferring with counsel)
18	THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'm unsure of the
19	diagnosis, but I know it's for psychiatric treatment.
20	THE COURT: All right. You have not been given a
21	diagnosis, is that what your testimony is?
22	THE DEFENDANT: I'm unsure of the diagnosis, your
23	Honor.
24	THE COURT: Has anyone told you what the diagnosis is?
25	THE DEFENDANT: May I consult?

1	THE COURT: Yes.
2	(Defendant conferring with counsel)
3	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I've been diagnosed
4	with schizo-affective disorder.
5	THE COURT: All right. And are you prescribed any
6	medication for that disorder?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: And what medications have you been
9	prescribed?
10	THE DEFENDANT: I've been prescribed lithium,
11	risperidone, and Lexapro.
12	THE COURT: And do you take them on a regular basis?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: And when was the last time you took any of
15	these medications?
16	THE DEFENDANT: It was this morning, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: And how does that affect the clarity of
18	your thinking?
19	THE DEFENDANT: It does not, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Well, is your mind clear now?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Do you understand what's happening?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. And question, Ms. Cabrera, any
25	doubts as to the defendant's competence to proceed?

1	MS. CABRERA: No, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Ms. Brown, as any doubts as to the
3	defendant's competence to proceed?
4	MS. BROWN: Not at all.
5	THE COURT: Same question for the government.
6	MS. KUSHNER: No, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: All right. Based upon Mr. Bickford's
8	responses to my questions and my observations of his demeanor,
9	I find that he is fully competent to enter an informed plea in
10	this case.
11	Mr. Bickford, have you discussed the indictment and
12	the evidence underlying the indictment which contains the
13	charges with your lawyers, Ms. Cabrera and Ms. Brown?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Have you had enough time to consider all
16	of your options in this case?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Are you satisfied with your lawyers'
19	representation of you?
20	THE DEFENDANT: I'm satisfied, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: I'm now going to explain to you the rights
22	that you would have if this case proceeded to trial, and these
23	are the rights that you are giving up by entering a plea of
24	guilty:
25	Under the Constitution and laws of the United States,

you are entitled to a speedy and public trial before an impartial jury on the charges contained in the indictment. At such a trial, you would not have to prove you were innocent. The government would be required to prove each element of each crime by proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Before you could be found guilty, a jury of twelve people would have to agree unanimously that you are guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And at such a trial, you would be entitled to be represented by a lawyer, and if you could not afford a lawyer, one would be provided at public expense.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, the witnesses for the government would have to come to court to testify. You would be able to see and hear them. Your lawyer could question them through cross-examination. Your lawyer could object to evidence offered by the government. Your lawyer could present evidence and could ask the Court to compel witnesses to appear at trial on your behalf.

Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to testify, if you chose to do so. You could come up

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here and take the witness stand.

Also, you would have the right not to testify and no one would be permitted to draw any inference or suggestion of guilt from the fact that you decided not to testify.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial and the jury found you guilty, you would have the right to appeal that finding.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, those are the rights that you would have if you proceed to trial.

If you plead guilty and I accept the guilty plea, there will be no trial. You will proceed to the sentencing phase in which the Court will determine the punishment to be imposed upon you. Of course, throughout every critical stage of the proceeding, including sentencing, you will be entitled to be represented by counsel and counsel at public expense, if need be.

Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Even now, you can change your mind, instead of pleading guilty you can persist in your original plea of not guilty and proceed to trial.

Do you wish to plead not guilty and proceed to trial?

1	THE DEFENDANT: I wish to plead not guilty, your
2	Honor.
3	THE COURT: All right.
4	THE DEFENDANT: May I consult my lawyers?
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	(Defendant conferring with counsel)
7	THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, your Honor. I mean to
8	plead guilty here and not proceed to trial.
9	THE COURT: So you understand you don't have to plead
10	guilty, you may plead not guilty and go to trial.
11	Do you understand that?
12	THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: What do you want to do?
14	THE DEFENDANT: I would like to plead guilty, your
15	Honor.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
17	Now, Counts Two through Four of the indictment, each
18	of these counts charge you with attempted murder of officers
19	and employees of the U.S. government and persons assisting
20	them.
21	Do you understand that?
22	THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Counts Two though Four each carry a
24	maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years, a maximum term of
25	supervised release of life, a maximum fine of the greatest of

\$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary or monetary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

Do you understand that all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Counts Five through Seven each charge you with assault of officers and employees of the U.S. government and persons assisting them. Count Five through Seven each carry a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself resulting from the offense and a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: The total maximum term of imprisonment on Counts Two through Seven is 120 years.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in addition to the foregoing, you would be required to make restitution in an amount ordered by the Court to any person I find was injured by reason of your conduct.

1 Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor. THE COURT: And, Ms. Cabrera, is your client prepared 3 4 to admit the forfeiture allegations in Paragraphs Eight and 5 Nine of the indictment today? 6 MS. CABRERA: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: With regard to supervised release, there 8 are terms and conditions attached to supervised release, and if you do not live up to those terms and conditions, you can be 9 10 returned to prison for a substantial prison sentence. 11 Do you understand that? 12 THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Are you a U.S. citizen? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Among the consequences of pleading guilty are that you give up valuable civil rights such as the right to 16 17 vote, to sit on a jury, to hold public office, possess a 18 firearm, to possess other licenses, and to receive certain 19 government benefits. 20 Do you understand all of that? 21 THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Are you serving any other sentence imposed 23 by any other Court or being prosecuted by any other Court for 24 any other crime?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm being served by the state, New

THE COURT: Please tell me about that.

3 York State.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Cabrera, do you want to expound on that, please?

MS. CABRERA: Sure, your Honor. There's a current case for the same underlying conduct for the federal matter that is still open in New York County.

THE COURT: All right. The important thing for you to understand, Mr. Bickford, is that the sentence I impose on you has nothing to do with any sentence you may receive with regard to the state case. I do not control the state case. I do not take the state case into account in imposing my punishment. And the state is free to do as it chooses after hearing, I assume, arguments of the attorneys who are representing you in the state case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you discussed that with your lawyers?

THE DEFENDANT: I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. In sentencing you, I will receive a presentence report that contains background information and a recommended sentence under the sentencing guidelines. After hearing from your lawyers and from the government, I will make my own determination of the correct guideline range that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

applies in your case. Even after determining the correct guideline range, I need not follow it and can sentence you all the way up to the statutory maximum. The guidelines are advisory and they are one of the factors that the Court takes account of in passing sentence.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: You will only be permitted to successfully appeal a sentence on the grounds that it is unreasonable or contrary to law.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Am I correct that there is no plea agreement of any kind between you and the government? Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Cabrera, can you confirm that?

MS. CABRERA: Yes, that's correct.

THE COURT: And can the government confirm that?

MS. KUSHNER: Yes. That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. Now, I have been told that your lawyers have been provided with a letter dated

November 30, 2023, on the letterhead of the Department of

Justice which is four pages in length and it sets forth the government's view today, or at least as of November 30th, on

any possible punishment to be imposed on you including the government's view of the guideline calculation.

And the question No. 1, have you received that letter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you reviewed it with your attorneys?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that letter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the government has taken the position that ordinarily the guideline range in this case would be life imprisonment, but because the maximum sentence for Count Two through Seven is 120 years' imprisonment, the government is of the view that the guidelines range is 120 years' imprisonment and a fine in the range of 50,000 to 500,000.

Now, as I told you before, the guidelines are calculated ultimately by the Court. I determine the correct guideline range. And I am not permitted by law to sentence you above the 120 years, but I can sentence you all the way up to the 120 years, even though the guidelines are advisory. I don't know whether the government is correct in its view on the guidelines or they're not correct. Today is not the day for that. It is the day for the government to state what its position is.

I'll just ask the government if they can confirm that,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as of today, they stand by the statements in the November 30, 2023 letter.

MS. KUSHNER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone threatened or forced you in any way to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone given you anything of value in order to induce you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I want you to know that any prediction, calculation, or estimate that anyone has made to you, including your own lawyers, is not binding on the Court, not binding on me, and if it turns out to be wrong, you will not be permitted to withdraw your guilty plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me call on the government to lay out the elements of the crimes charged and what, in summary, the government's evidence would be if this case proceeded to trial.

Let me say, Mr. Bickford, the reason I'm doing this is when they lay out the elements, this is what the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt if the case proceeded to trial. So this is really for your benefit, so you

hear it from the government.

Go ahead.

MS. KUSHNER: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, if the government proceeded to trial, it would have to prove the defendant guilty on Counts Two, Three, and Four of the indictment beyond a reasonable doubt, based on the following elements:

First, the defendant had the intent to commit murder as defined in Title 18, United States Code Section 1111.

Second, the victim or the victims here were U.S. officers or employees while such officers or employees were engaged in the performance of their official duties or on account of the performance of such duties or any person assisting such an officer or employee in the performance of such duties or on account of that assistance.

And, third, the defendant engaged in conduct that constituted a substantial step towards the commission of the crime.

With respect to Counts Five, Six, and Seven of the indictment, the government would be required to prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, the defendant forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with any person designated under Title 18, United States Code Section 1114 while that person was engaged in or on account of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

performance of official duties.

Second, the assault was voluntary and intentional.

And, third, the defendant used a dangerous weapon or a deadly weapon or inflicted bodily injury.

And, of course, in addition to those elements, the government would have to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that venue was proper here in the Southern District of New York.

With respect to the government's evidence, if it proceeded to trial, the evidence would include physical evidence including, for example, the machete that the defendant used to attack three NYPD Officers on New Year's Eve. It would include a journal that was recovered at the scene of the crime that included the defendant's essentially last will and testament. It would include body-worn camera footage of the defendant attacking the officers near Times Square with the machete and then being neutralized. It would include witness testimony including civilians who witnessed the defendant attack the officers. It would include testimony from the officer victims themselves as to what happened to them that night as well as the injuries that each of them suffered. would include law enforcement witness testimony about the nature of the FBI and NYPD's joint operation on New Year's Eve, which I can explain in more detail if the Court would like. would also include the defendant's own post-arrest Mirandized

statements, including, for example, that he was considering waging jihad abroad, but ultimately decided not to travel overseas to wage jihad and instead to commit jihad here in New York City; that on the night of December 31, 2022, prior to the attack, the defendant walked around Times Square, "trying to figure out the right time to kill;" that the defendant started reciting verses from the Koran to hype himself up shortly before the attack; and that after attacking the first officer, the defendant charged another officer and tried to forcibly remove the officer's firearm in order to continue his attack.

The defendant also made statements that he attacked the New York -- the NYPD officers because they were men in uniform who had weapons, that all men of military age were his targets, that no one can work for the U.S. government and be a true Muslim because the U.S. government supports Israel, and that he wanted to kill as many these military-age targets as he could.

The defendant stated that he intended to die in the attack and that he believed the attack was unsuccessful because he unfortunately did not kill the officers and also died himself to achieve martyrdom.

And, finally, the government's evidence would include electronic evidence including evidence of text messages from the defendant's phone between him and his brother, a U.S. soldier, discussing the defendant's desire to travel abroad and

criticizing the brother for joining ranks of the enemy. It would also include electronic evidence from the defendant's phone that in the week leading up to the attack the defendant downloaded and used an encrypted application in order to conduct searches such as, how does Al-Qaeda recruit and searching where Al-Qaeda has the most presence as well as specific research about the New Year's Eve 2022-2023 event in New York City, reflecting his intention to commit the attack that ultimately happened on that New Year's Eve night. Finally, the defendant also conducted research further indicating his intent to achieve martyrdom, including searches about what the prophet Muhammad did before battles and how much does a Muslim funeral cost.

That, in essence, would constitute the government's evidence, and show that on New Year's Eve the defendant traveled to Times Square with the purpose of killing military-age U.S. government men, and, in fact, began to carry out that mission by attacking and seriously injuring three NYPD officers who were part of the special federal-state operation assigned that night to protect the city during the Times Square event.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Bickford, please tell me in your own words what you did that leads you to believe that you are guilty of Counts Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, and Seven of the

indictment.

THE DEFENDANT: On December 31, 2022, I attempted to kill three uniformed NYPD Officers in an attack with a knife while they were working in Manhattan.

I know what I did was wrong and I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Did you know the police officers were working at the time you attacked them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does defense counsel have a basis to challenge the allegations in Counts Two, Three, and Four that the officers covered by those counts were engaged in and on account of the performance of official duties and a person assisting such officer and employee in the performance of such duties and on account of that assistance?

MS. CABRERA: No. The defense does not have a basis to challenge that.

THE COURT: And with regard to Counts Five, Six, and Seven, the same question: Any basis to challenge that the officers were engaged in or on account of the performance of official duties, specifically an officer or an employee of the United States, while such officer and employee was engaged in and on account of the performance of his official duties, and a person assisting such officer and employee in the performance of such duties and on account of that assistance and in the commission of said offense?

MS. CABRERA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the defense have any basis to challenge the allegation that what Mr. Bickford referred to as a knife was a deadly or dangerous weapon including a weapon intended to cause death or danger?

MS. CABRERA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And where did this take place, the attack, Mr. Bickford?

THE DEFENDANT: In Manhattan, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government agree that there's a sufficient factual predicate for a plea of guilty to Counts Two through Seven?

MS. KUSHNER: Yes, your Honor. And the government would just like to note that the defendant did not need to know that the officer-victims were persons assisting U.S. government officers or employees at the time of the attack. That's not an element that the government would be required to prove.

Of course, as I previously laid out, the defendant's post-arrest statements leave no doubt that the defendant specifically targeted the officer-victims here because they were military-aged men in uniform.

Second, I would just like to note that in reviewing the evidence that the victims here were, in fact, persons assisting U.S. government employees and officers at the time the defendant attacked them. These were not officers assigned

to or conducting their regular NYPD duties. In fact, they're not even assigned to Manhattan but they were specifically assigned to the joint federal-state operation that both the NYPD and FBI employ specifically for New York City's Annual New Year's Eve Celebration, and these three officers were part of -- they were assigned to 52nd Street and Eighth Avenue, which was one of the main designated checkpoints allowing civilians to come into Times Square, and they were part of the designated area that night of FBI and NYPD personnel who were deployed to that area for the specific purposes of working jointly together to ensure the safety of the event.

Finally, I just would like to note that there could be no question that the foot-long machete-type knife that the defendant used in his attack would, of course, constitute a deadly or dangerous weapon, and in addition that the defendant did, in fact, inflict serious bodily injury or bodily injury, rather, on the victim-officers.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Cabrera, I may not have fully articulated my question correctly with regard to Counts Two and Four. So let me ask it again of you: Is there any basis to challenge that each of the three officers who were of the subjects of Counts Two, Three, and Four were an officer, an employee of the United States while such officer or employee was engaged in and on account of the performance of his official duties, any

```
person assisting such officer and employee in the performance
1
 2
      of such duties, and on account of that assistance?
 3
               MS. CABRERA: No, your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 5
               Does defense counsel agree that there is a sufficient
6
      factual basis for a plea of quilty to Counts Two through Seven?
 7
               MS. CABRERA: Yes.
8
               THE COURT: Are you aware of any valid defense that
9
      would likely prevail at trial or any reason why your client
10
      should not be permitted to plead guilty?
11
               MS. CABRERA: No, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT:
                          Same question, Ms. Brown.
13
               MS. BROWN:
                          No, your Honor.
14
                          Mr. Bickford, do you have any questions
               THE COURT:
      for me?
15
16
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: With regard to Count Two, how do you
18
     plead, guilty or not guilty?
19
               THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Count Three, guilty or not guilty?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Count Four, quilty or not quilty?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Count Five, guilty or not guilty?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.
```

25

11 a.m.

THE COURT: Count Six, guilty or not guilty? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Count Seven, quilty or not quilty? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Do you admit or deny the forfeiture 6 allegations in Paragraphs Eight and Nine? 7 THE DEFENDANT: I admit, your Honor. THE COURT: Based upon your responses to my questions 8 9 and my observations of your demeanor, I find that you know your 10 rights, you know the consequences of pleading quilty, and 11 there's a factual basis for your plea of quilty. Your plea of quilty to Counts Two through Seven and your admission to the 12 13 forfeiture allegations are accepted. 14 I will order a presentence investigation and report and direct that no interview of you take place unless your 15 lawyer is present. It's important that you be truthful, 16 17 candid, and honest with the people who prepare the report, tell them the good things and the not so good things because the 18 report will be important in my decision on sentencing. Before 19 20 the day of sentencing, you will have the opportunity to review 21 that report. If there are any mistakes in it, point them out 22 to your lawyers so that they can point them out to me. 23 Sentencing in this case is set for April 11, 2024 at

And the defendant is remanded until then.

1	Anything further from the government?
2	MS. KUSHNER: No, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: From the defendant?
4	MS. CABRERA: No, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Thank you all very much.
6	We are adjourned.
7	And the trial date is vacated, of course.
8	Thank you.
9	000
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	