Case	1:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Docum	ent 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 1 of 24 PageID #: 7846 5729
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT CONTROL OF NEW	
2		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
4		Brooklyn, New York
5	-against-	June 19, 2019 9:00 a.m.
6	KEITH RANIERE,	9:00 a.m.
7	Defendant.	
8		
9	BEFORE THE HON	F CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR TRIAL NORABLE NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
10		ES SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE BEFORE A JURY
11	APPEARANCES	
12	For the Government:	UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE Eastern District of New York
13		271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201
14		BY: MOIRA KIM PENZA, ESQ. TANYA HAJJAR, ESQ.
15		MARK LESKO, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorneys
16	For the Defendant:	BRAFMAN & ASSOCIATES
17		767 Third Avenue New York, New York 10017
18		BY: MARC AGNIFILO, ESQ. TENY ROSE GERAGOS, ESQ.
19		DEROHANNESIAN & DEROHANNESIAN
20		677 Broadway Albany, New York 12207
21		BY: PAUL DerOHANNESIAN, II, ESQ. DANIELLE R. SMITH, ESQ.
22		
23	Court Reporter:	Rivka Teich, CSR, RPR, RMR, FCRR Phone: 718-613-2268
24		Email: RivkaTeich@gmail.com
25	Proceedings recorded by produced by computer-aid	

Case	1:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 2 of 24 PageID #: 7847
	PROCEEDINGS 5730
1	(In open court.)
2	MS. PENZA: Moira Penza, Tanya Hajjar and Mark Lesko
3	for the United States. Also at counsel table are Special
4	Agents Michael Lever and Michael Wenniger and Paralegal Teri
5	Carby.
6	MR. AGNIFILO: Mark Agnifilo, Temy Geragos, Paul
7	DerOhannesian, Danielle Smith for Keith Raniere, who is here
8	with us this morning.
9	THE COURT: Everyone may be seated.
10	You're working on putting together the evidence to
11	send back into the jury room?
12	MS. PENZA: Yes, I think we're almost there. We're
13	looking for one e-mail that we know attaches nude photos. We
14	would also ask that Government's Exhibit, I believe 550, the
15	glossy photo of Camila of age with the scar be sent back with
16	the redaction tape.
17	THE COURT: Any objection?
18	MR. AGNIFILO: No objection.
19	MS. PENZA: But all the other we have done our
20	best to try and remove all the naked photos.
21	THE COURT: When everything is squared away and
22	ready to go I'll come back down and just have you all agree.
23	MS. PENZA: Yes. And so we can put the rest of the
24	things on the record when we do that, I think only a couple of
25	little things that we want to make sure on the record, or you

Case	L:18 cr 00204 NGC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 3 of 24 PageID #: 7848
	PROCEEDINGS
1	want me to do it now?
2	THE COURT: Might as well.
3	MS. PENZA: So your Honor, as you may recall there
4	had been an objection over the admission of the box,
5	Government's Exhibit 204. At sidebar we agreed to certain
6	redactions. At this point we have conferred with defense
7	counsel and the only item they are seeking to have redacted is
8	the Albany Times Union article, which is titled "An Espian's
9	brief life, once a dynamic overachiever, a woman saw her world
10	deteriorate after she took classes offered by a halfmoon-based
11	group".
12	What we have proposed, and what defense counsel has
13	agreed to, is that we will redact the full text of the article
14	but leave the headline, the date, and that it was written by
15	Dennis Yusko, who is one of the people who is in the box.
16	So I think other than that, I think apart from their
17	original objection to the admission of the box in terms of
18	redactions of the box, we have reached agreement.
19	MR. AGNIFILO: That is true.
20	THE COURT: Good.
21	MS. PENZA: I don't believe there is anything else.
22	We're just checking on a couple of the nude exhibits, but
23	other than that I think we're all in agreement.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
25	MS. PENZA: No, your Honor.

Case	1:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 4 of 24 PageID #: 7849 5732
	PROCEEDINGS
1	THE COURT: I have a letter from the defense, did
2	you see the letter?
3	MS. PENZA: We did, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Do you have any comments on the letter?
5	MS. PENZA: We believe it should be denied, your
6	Honor. We don't believe the cross-examination was cut short.
7	Mr. Agnifilio said that he was finished during Lauren
8	Salzman's cross, and we don't believe that Mr. Lesko's
9	comments during rebuttal created any problems. And the
10	cooperation agreement, I would also say, is in evidence.
11	And as your Honor has instructed the jurors many
12	times, the arguments of the attorneys are not evidence.
13	MR. AGNIFILO: Just in response to one thing I
14	stand on the letters that we submitted.
15	THE COURT: Go ahead.
16	MR. AGNIFILO: My cross-examination was not
17	finished. When we broke I asked why your Honor cut off any
18	cross-examination. I asked that because Ms. Penza said she
19	thought my cross-examination was finished; I was not finished,
20	I was ordered to finish and I followed the Court's order.
21	MS. PENZA: I disagree. I think he said, "I'm
22	done." Then your Honor said, "I said you're done," but he had
23	already said he was done.
24	THE COURT: The point is, if this were a letter
25	requesting to reopen cross-examination in a timely fashion, I

Case	1:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 5 of 24 PageID #: 7850 5733
	PROCEEDINGS
1	would have considered it. But we've already charged the jury
2	and five weeks have gone by since that day and I didn't
3	receive a request in writing or orally to reopen
4	cross-examination of Lauren Salzman. So it's too little too
5	late. I would have considered it. We could have discussed
6	it.
7	And whether or not you were done, or you wanted to
8	continue the next day, which you told me you were going to
9	finish by the end of the day, it was about ten to five at the
10	time I instructed you to sit down, because you were not
11	following my instructions about the questions you were asking,
12	and placing the witness in some peril of having a breakdown,
13	as I pointed out at the time.
14	You could have asked, but you didn't. So the motion
15	is denied. And you have your record.
16	MR. AGNIFILO: Thank you, Judge. Just so the record
17	is clear
18	THE COURT: There is more?
19	MR. AGNIFILO: We filed a mistrial motion at the
20	time.
21	THE COURT: No, no that's different. You filed a
22	mistrial motion. You didn't file a motion to reopen
23	cross-examination. Those are two different things.
24	Here you're talking about all the things you were
25	planning to discuss between ten to five and 5:00 o'clock, all

Case	1:18-cr-00204-NGC-VMS_Document 764_Filed 07/19/19_Page 6-of 24 PageID #: 7851
	5734 PROCEEDINGS
1	right, and that was about something else. That was about your
2	relationship with the jury being injured, allegedly.
3	All I can remember from the balance of this trial
4	for the last five weeks is that that jury listened attentively
5	to your questions and listened attentively to your closing
6	argument.
7	So let me make my record. My record is that that
8	had no affect that I can discern on the part of that jury.
9	That jury listened very carefully to you, as they should have,
10	because you're very capable lawyer and you're doing a very
11	good job. That's it. Come back when you're ready.
12	(Judge exits courtroom.)
13	(Brief recess.)
14	THE COURT: Please be seated. How are we doing?
15	MS. PENZA: We are good. We're going to I think
16	ready to send back the exhibits. We think the list is going
17	to take about an hour to finalized, but we agree that it
18	should go back now to the jury.
19	MR. AGNIFILO: We agree.
20	THE COURT: That's fine. The charge and the verdict
21	sheet are going to back in a few minutes as well.
22	Anything else for now?
23	MS. PENZA: I don't think so. When the exhibit list
24	is ready should we
25	THE COURT: Just give it to Mr. Reccoppa, he'll send

Case	1:18-cr-00204-NGC-VMS_Document 764_Filed-07/19/19_Page 7 of 24 PageID_#: 785/
	PROCEEDINGS
1	it back as long as you have agreed to it.
2	MR. AGNIFILO: Were we able to make the changes?
3	THE COURT: I believe so. We made all the changes,
4	all the corrections, including the word common. But I'll go
5	back and double check before we give it to the jury. My clerk
6	was making changes as we delivered the charge. The word
7	common that you wanted placed in there.
8	We have a note from the jury. Here is the first
9	message from the jury: "Needs paperwork."
10	So I suggest that we immediately respond by
11	delivering the paperwork.
12	I'll double check on that, but I'm pretty sure we're
13	all set. I'll make sure both sides get a copy of what will go
14	into the jury.
15	MR. AGNIFILO: That's great, thank you.
16	THE COURT: Now as I said to the jury, between one
17	and two we're not going to be responding to them. But if you
18	go somewhere, even if it's for a few minutes please leave your
19	cellphone number with Mr. Reccoppa, so we can reach out to you
20	in an emergency. Thank you.
21	(Judge exits courtroom.)
22	(Brief recess.)
23	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All Rise.
24	THE COURT: Please be seated in the back.
25	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Case on trial.

Case 1:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 8 of 24 PageID #: 7 5736 PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. Court's Exhibit 5 is a note from the jury: "Does the use of the World Wide Web for any purpose" -- underscoring purpose -- "fall under the umbrella of affecting interstate or foreign commerce. Do e-mail chat communications within" -- underscore -- "stay qualify, does research online e.g. Wikipedia qualify."

7 MR. AGNIFILO: Your Honor, I don't know that we were 8 able to answer these questions as raised, except for the 9 second one. I think we have a jury instruction as to the 10 question, Do e-mail chats and communications within a state 11 qualify.

12 I think the way that we answered that question, your 13 Honor, on page 124 of our instructions where we say, The 14 interstate or foreign -- the interstate or foreign requirement 15 means that the wire communications must pass between two or more statements, as for example, a telephone call, a wire 16 17 transfer, of funds between banks in different states or e-mail 18 or electronic message that was transmitted over interstate 19 wires.

I think that's the only place in the instructions where we addressed that issue. We addressed it in the wire fraud context, but I don't think we addressed the other two questions, as I understand them, in our jury instructions. I don't know that there is any evidence in the record that addresses those questions. I don't know that we can answer

Case	1:18 cr 00204 NGC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 9 of 24 PageID #: 7854 5737
	PROCEEDINGS
1	the other two questions.
2	MS. HAJJAR: Your Honor, the part that Mr. Agnifilio
3	read relates to wire fraud, is unique to wire fraud.
4	Our read of this note, it is not clear, but our read
5	of this is that it relates to Racketeering Act 5, at best we
6	can tell, which is the interstate nexus portion of that
7	charge, which requires the transfer possession of use of means
8	of identification occurred in or affected interstate commerce,
9	or the means of identification, here the username or password,
10	was transported in the mail. We could direct the jury to that
11	portion of the charge and add something additional if your
12	Honor thinks that is appropriate.
13	There is a little more in the Sand instruction, but
14	certainly if what they are referring to is Racketeering Act 5,
15	the identity theft portion of the charge, then any means of
16	identification that is transmitted via the web would qualify
17	and we can craft something to that effect, if that's what the
18	jury is requesting.
19	THE COURT: What do you propose the response to be?
20	MS. HAJJAR: We would want to think about it for a
21	moment, but we could propose language. I think the language
22	could be something like, The fifth element
23	THE COURT: I don't want to let me tell you what
24	I don't want to do. I don't want to direct their attention to
25	something. I would rather ask them, In connection with which

Case 1:18 cr 00204 NGC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 10 of 24 PageID #: 7855		
	PROCEEDINGS 5738	
1	charge or charges do you seek this information?	
2	MS. HAJJAR: That would be very helpful, your Honor.	
3	MR. AGNIFILO: That's right, your Honor, I don't	
4	think we want to guess. The prosecution might be right it's	
5	Racketeering Act 5, but we don't know.	
6	THE COURT: Do you want to work out language between	
7	you or I could do it.	
8	MR. AGNIFILO: I think what makes the most sense is	
9	the interstate element that they are asking about is slightly	
10	different for various of the charges. We don't want to guess	
11	and guess wrong. So I think what makes the most sense is to	
12	ask them something along the lines, if they are asking these	
13	questions in connection with a particular charge, and if so,	
14	which charge, something along those lines.	
15	THE COURT: Why don't I just ask them that question.	
16	MS. HAJJAR: Yes, that makes sense, your Honor.	
17	THE COURT: But you know, generally speaking, the	
18	law of the Second Circuit is clear that any wire communication	
19	is considered interstate commerce.	
20	MS. HAJJAR: Yes.	
21	THE COURT: I've got United States V. Le 902 F.3d	
22	104. I've got United States V. Konn 634 F. Appendix 818.	
23	We just spent two minutes upstairs looking into it.	
24	But it would be better if we could give them a more focused	
25	answer than something like that.	

Case 1	
	PROCEEDINGS 5739
1	MR. AGNIFILO: That's fine.
2	THE COURT: "We have your questions, please identify
3	which charge or charges in the Indictment."
4	MR. AGNIFILO: "If any you're asking about."
5	THE COURT: Obviously.
6	MR. AGNIFILO: Right, but they could be asking
7	THE COURT: A general question?
8	MR. AGNIFILO: No, they could be asking about the
9	enterprise within the RICO section. The way, your Honor
10	THE COURT: "If any, raise these issues."
11	MR. AGNIFILO: Fine.
12	MS. HAJJAR: "To which charges are you referring to?
13	Which charges do you want more instruction," and then we can
14	respond to there. They clearly are thinking of a charge.
15	THE COURT: "To the jury, we have your questions
16	please advise the Court as to which charge or charges these
17	questions relate."
18	MS. PENZA: That's fine, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: It may be that we've already answered
20	their questions or some of them as to specific charges.
21	What I have, "To the jury, we have your questions.
22	Please advise the Court as to which charge or charges these
23	questions specifically relate."
24	MR. AGNIFILO: Perfect.
25	THE COURT: Is that okay?

Case 1:18-cr-00204 NCC-VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 12 of 24 PageID #: 785		
	PROCEEDINGS 5740	
1	MR. AGNIFILO: Yes.	
2	THE COURT: We'll make copies for everybody. We'll	
3	wait to hear from them.	
4	(Brief break.)	
5	MS. PENZA: Your Honor, we have some proposed	
6	language.	
7	THE COURT: Yes.	
8	MS. HAJJAR: "I instruct you, that use of the	
9	Internet is an activity that affects interstate commerce. The	
10	answer to your second and third questions is yes."	
11	We have some case as well if your Honor wants.	
12	THE COURT: The use of the Internet is not	
13	MR. AGNIFILO: I don't think that's the question	
14	they are asking. If we're talking about the fifth element,	
15	which they say they are, then the fifth element we read to the	
16	jury is that the transfer or possession or use of the means of	
17	identification. So what we're talking about is identity	
18	theft, so we're talking about the means of identification	
19	specifically, the transfer or possession or use of that has to	
20	have occurred in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce,	
21	or is the means identification was transported in the mail.	
22	So we're not talking about I'm on page 73, Judge. So we're	
23	not talking in the fifth element of this Racketeering Act,	
24	generally about Internet commerce in a general way, the way	
25	that they put it in their first question in terms of any	

Case 1:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 13 of 24 PageID #: 7858		
	PROCEEDINGS 5741	
1	purpose, which they underlined. Because what the element is	
2	confined to is specifically the means of identification and	
3	whether the means of identification was transferred, possessed	
4	or used and that occurred in interstate or foreign commerce.	
5	I think there is a limiting clause that limits the	
6	applicability of interstate commerce generally to specifically	
7	the means of identification. And then, your Honor when	
8	you're done with that I'll go on.	
9	THE COURT: Go ahead.	
10	MR. AGNIFILO: On page 75, in that middle paragraph,	
11	your Honor specifically charged them that as to the fifth	
12	element, "I instruct that you interstate or foreign commerce	
13	simply means the movement of goods, services, money and	
14	individuals between any two or more states, and a state and a	
15	foreign country."	
16	So we charged them that it's more than two states.	
17	MS. HAJJAR: Your Honor, the sentence goes on to	
18	say, "To satisfy this element the Government must prove the	
19	defendant's conduct affected interstate or foreign commerce in	
20	any way, no matter how minimal."	
21	The case law is clear that using the Internet is one	
22	of those ways. And so the transfer or possession or use of	
23	the means of identification is simply the other elements of	
24	that crime. It simply refers to the other two, the	
25	defendant's conduct or a co-conspirator's conduct.	

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 14 of 24 PageID #: 7859 5742
	PROCEEDINGS
1	THE COURT: Tell me what you had proposed again.
2	MS. HAJJAR: "I instruct you that use of the
3	Internet is an activity that affects interstate commerce.
4	Then the answer to your second and third question is yes."
5	THE COURT: "I instruct you that the use of the
6	Internet"
7	MS. HAJJAR: "Is an activity that affects interstate
8	commerce."
9	MR. AGNIFILO: We object to that, Judge, because
10	THE COURT: Because it's legally incorrect?
11	MR. AGNIFILO: Because it's not what they are
12	asking. Because what they are asking is they underline any
13	purpose.
14	And it's not true, that use of the Internet affects
15	interstate it might be true that's interstate commerce, but
16	that's irrelevant in terms of the specific charge.
17	They were very particular that this is in regard to
18	a specific charge as a Racketeering Act. And so it's not for
19	any purpose.
20	What we have is we have a language that I cited on
21	page 73 as the fifth element. And the language that I cited
22	on page 75 where your Honor further explains the fifth
23	element. And your Honor explained the fifth element as clear
24	as a bell, that it has to be more than two states. That's
25	what we charged them. And if you read that sentence and the

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 15 of 24 PageID #: 7860
	PROCEEDINGS
1	sentence after it, what you're left with is that it has to be
2	involving two or more states but the affect can be minimal.
3	It doesn't undo the two or more state language. We
4	have the two or more state language in there as an affirmative
5	factual statement. It wouldn't make sense to say that and
6	then to undue it in the next sentence. The next sentence, I
7	submit, tells the jury that once we have interstate commerce
8	involving two or more states, the nature of that can be very
9	minimal, but it doesn't undue the two or more states part of
10	it. And then here we charge them as to the fifth element on
11	page 73 has to relate specifically to the means of
12	identification.
13	And so I think we have to capture that in whatever
14	your Honor intends to tell the jury, because the jury has been
15	now specific that it's in regard to this particular
16	Racketeering Act that we've already given them language on.
17	MS. HAJJAR: Your Honor, the jury is only asking
18	about the fifth element. The other four elements of this
19	crime relate to the defendant's conduct and the means of
20	identification. This is a legally correct instruction from
21	the Second Circuit case law. We think it's appropriate to
22	instruct the jury that way.
23	MR. AGNIFILO: And I think we're watering down what
24	we agreed upon as the appropriate charge on this element.
25	THE COURT: "To the jury, I instruct you that the

Case 1:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 16 of 24 PageID #: 786

5744

PROCEEDINGS

1 use of the Internet is an activity that affects interstate 2 commerce. The answer to your second and third questions is 3 yes. Please apply this instruction to the instructions you 4 received in the jury charge."

So I'm not saying this is in place of it, this augments it. And that way they still have to go back and look at the jury charge and follow the jury charge. But the basic law, and I don't want them coming back to me every time they take a look at one of the charges and there is the use of the wires or there is a use of the Internet, the fact is, the use of the Internet is by definition an activity that affects interstate commerce. That's the law of the Circuit; that's the law of the United States.

And the fact that we didn't include it shouldn't 14 15 create a problem for them, that's our problem. We should have 16 caught it. But now that they've asked the question, and the 17 question they asked, the initial question, does the use of the 18 World Wide Web for any purpose fall under the umbrella of 19 affecting interstate or foreign commerce. And the answer 20 basically is yes. And we have plenty of case law to that 21 affect.

You have your objection, obviously, but I'm here to help the jury understand what the law is. And to the fact that we confused them, shame on us. We have to fix it. MR. AGNIFILO: But I don't think -- I think that

> Rivka Teich CSR, RPR, RMR FCRR Official Court Reporter

12

13

11

5

6

7

8

9

10

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 17 of 24 PageID #: 7862
	VERDICT 5745
1	they are trying to figure out by putting any purpose, it's
2	very possible that they are doing is someone might have used
3	the World Wide Web but not for something in regards to the
4	crime. Why else would they put any purpose and underline it?
5	THE COURT: I don't know. I'm not in the jury room.
6	MR. AGNIFILO: Of course not. But without knowing
7	the answer to that question, I think we're ignoring their any
8	purpose underlining language and we're assuming something
9	about their note that I don't know that we know. They are
10	obviously concerned about the any purpose language, that's why
11	they underlined it. We're not addressing that.
12	MS. HAJJAR: Your Honor is not proposing to instruct
13	that their answer to all of their questions is yes. The
14	instruction as your Honor just read it, is that use of the
15	Internet is an activity that affects interstate commerce. And
16	they can apply that definition as they look at the fifth
17	element as instructed, which makes sense, they reflect each
18	other. But they still have to go through each element. We
19	think that's a perfectly appropriate instruction.
20	THE COURT: All right, you have your objection. I'm
21	sure we'll hear from the jury soon.
22	(Judge exits courtroom.)
23	(Brief recess.)
24	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All Rise. Case on trial
25	United States V. Keith Raniere.

Case 1	:18 cr 99204 NCC VMS_Document 764_Filed 07/19/19_Page 18 of 24 PageID #: 786 3 5746
	VERDICT
1	Counsel state your appearances.
2	MS. PENZA: Moira Penza, Tanya Hajjar and Mark Lesko
3	for the United States. Also at counsel table are Special
4	Agents Michael Lever and Michael Wenniger and Paralegal Teri
5	Carby.
6	MR. AGNIFILO: Mark Agnifilo, Temy Geragos, Paul
7	DerOhannesian, Danielle Smith for Keith Raniere, who is with
8	us this afternoon.
9	THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated. The
10	Court has received a note from the jury. It reads: "We have
11	concluded deliberations. We have reached a verdict."
12	At this time please bring in the jury and the
13	alternates.
14	(Jury enters the courtroom.)
15	THE COURT: The Foreperson should remain standing,
16	everyone else may be seated.
17	Has the jury reached a verdict, sir?
18	THE FOREPERSON: We have.
19	THE COURT: Hand the jury sheet to the clerk. The
20	clerk may publish the verdict.
21	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Two Racketeering, how
22	do you find the defendant, guilty or not guilty?
23	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
24	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 1, 1A conspiracy
25	to commit identity theft, Ashana Chenoa, proved or not proved?

Case 1	:18-cr-00204-NCC-VMS_Document 764_Filed 07/19/19_Page 19-of 24 PageID #: 7864 5747
	VERDICT
1	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: 1B, Conspiracy to unlawfully
3	possess identification document, proved or not proved?
4	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
5	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 2, sexual
6	exploitation of a child on November 2, 2005, Camila, proved or
7	not proved?
8	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
9	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 3, sexual
10	exploitation of a child on November 24, 2005, Camila, proved
11	or not proved?
12	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
13	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 4, possession of
14	child pornography, proved or not proved?
15	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
16	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 5, 5A,
17	conspiracy to commit identity theft, proved or not proved.
18	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
19	COURTROOM DEPUTY: 5B, identity theft, James
20	Loperfido, proved or not proved?
21	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
22	COURTROOM DEPUTY: 5C, identity theft, Edgar
23	Bronfman, proved or not proved?
24	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
25	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 6, conspiracy to

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 20 of 24 PageID #: 7865
	VERDICT
1	alter records for use in an official proceeding, proved or not
2	proved?
3	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
4	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 7, conspiracy to
5	commit identity theft, Marianna, proved or not proved?
6	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
7	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 8, 8A,
8	trafficking for labor and services, Daniela, proved or not
9	proved?
10	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
11	COURTROOM DEPUTY: 8B, document servitude, Daniela,
12	proved or not proved?
13	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
14	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 9, extortion,
15	proved or not proved?
16	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
17	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 10, 10A, sex
18	trafficking, Nicole, proved or not proved?
19	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
20	COURTROOM DEPUTY: 10B, forced labor, Nicole, proved
21	or not proved?
22	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
23	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Racketeering Act 11, conspiracy
24	to commit identity theft, Pamela Cafritz, proved or not
25	proved?

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NGC VMS_Document 764_Filed 07/19/19_Page 21 of 24 PageID #: 786 6 5749
	VERDICT
1	THE FOREPERSON: Proved.
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count One Racketeering Act
3	Conspiracy, how do you find the defendant, guilty or not
4	guilty?
5	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
6	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Three, Forced Labor
7	Conspiracy, how do you find the defendant, guilty or not
8	guilty?
9	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
10	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Four, Wire Fraud
11	Conspiracy, how do you find the defendant, guilty or not
12	guilty?
13	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
14	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Five, Sex Trafficking
15	Conspiracy, how do you find the defendant guilty or not
16	guilty?
17	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
18	COURTROOM DEPUTY: As to Count Six, Sex Trafficking
19	of Nicole, how do you find the defendant, Guilty or not
20	guilty.
21	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
22	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you find that the defendant
23	knew means of force, fraud or coercion would be used to cause
24	one or more persons to engage in one or more commercial sex
25	acts, yes or no?

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NGC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 22 of 24 PageID #: 7867 5750
	VERDICT
1	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Count Seven, Attempted Sex
3	Trafficking of Jay, how do you find the defendant, guilty or
4	not guilty?
5	THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
6	THE COURT: Please retrieve the verdict form. You
7	may be seated. The clerk will pole the jury.
8	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Ladies and gentlemen, having
9	heard the verdict given by the Foreperson, Juror No.1, is that
10	your verdict?
11	JUROR NO. 1: Yes.
12	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No.2?
13	JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
14	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 3?
15	JUROR NO. 3: Yes.
16	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 4?
17	JUROR NO. 4: Yes.
18	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 5?
19	JUROR NO. 5: Yes.
20	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 6?
21	JUROR NO. 6: Yes.
22	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 7?
23	JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
24	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 8?
25	JUROR NO. 8: Yes.

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS Document 764 Filed 07/19/19 Page 23 of 24 PageID #: 7868
	PROCEEDINGS
1	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 9?
2	JUROR NO. 9: Yes.
3	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 10?
4	JUROR NO. 10: Yes.
5	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 11?
6	JUROR NO. 11: Yes.
7	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror No. 12?
8	JUROR NO. 12: Yes.
9	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Jury polled, Judge.
10	THE COURT: Thank you very much. Members of the
11	jury, this concludes your jury service. On behalf of the
12	Court I would like to thank you for your professionalism and
13	your attention to this very, very difficult case. You should
14	be very proud of the role you played. You're excellent
15	citizens. You've given a great deal of your time and your
16	energy to this pursuit. And we are honored by your
17	participation in this trial.
18	At this time you are discharged.
19	All rise for the jury.
20	(Jury exits the courtroom.)
21	THE COURT: Please be seated.
22	Sentencing is scheduled for Wednesday September 25
23	at 11:00 a.m. Will there be post-trial motions?
24	MR. AGNIFILO: Yes, Judge.
25	THE COURT: July 10 for the motions and July 24 for

Case 1	:18 cr 00204 NCC VMS_Document 764_Filed 07/19/19_Page 24 of 24 PageID #: 786 5752
	PROCEEDINGS
1	the response.
2	Is there anything else from the Government for
3	today?
4	MS. PENZA: No. Thank you very much, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Anything else from the defense?
6	MR. AGNIFILO: No, thank you, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. We're
8	adjourned.
9	(Proceedings concluded at 2:50 p.m.)
10	* * * * *
11	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
12	record or proceedings in the above encicied matter.
13	Rivka Teich, CSR RPR RMR FCRR
14	Official Court Reporter Eastern District of New York
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	