```
02KQmasC
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
      -----x
2
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 3
                                             23 CR 347 (JGK)
                V.
 4
     ALEXANDER MASHINSKY
5
                    Defendant
6
 7
                                              New York, N.Y.
                                              February 20, 2024
 8
                                              12:00 p.m.
9
     Before:
10
                           HON. JOHN G. KOELTL
11
                                              District Judge
12
                               APPEARANCES
13
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
14
          United States Attorney for the
          Southern District of New York
15
     ALLISON NICHOLS
          Assistant United States Attorney
16
     MUKASEY YOUNG LLP
17
          Attorneys for Defendant
     MARC L. MUKASEY
     TORREY K. YOUNG
18
     MICHAEL F. WESTFAL
19
     ALSO PRESENT: BRANDON RACZ, FBI
20
                    RICHARD PALMA, CJA Attorney
21
22
23
24
25
```

for the record.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DEPUTY CLERK: All parties please state who they are

MS. NICHOLS: Allison Nichols for the government. With me is Special Agent Brandon Racz of the FBI.

Good afternoon, your Honor.

(In open court; case called)

MR. MUKASEY: Good afternoon, Judge.

Marc Mukasey for the defendant, Alex Mashinsky, who is seated to my left.

And to his left is my partner, Torrey Young, and our colleague, Michael Westfal.

THE COURT: Good afternoon all.

The reason that we are here is to hold a Curcio hearing with respect to Mr. Mashinsky's representation by Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young.

So, Mr. Fletcher, please administer the oath to the defendant.

ALEXANDER MASHINSKY, sworn.

DEPUTY CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE DEFENDANT: Alex Mashinsky.

THE COURT: Mr. Mashinsky, do you understand that you are now under oath, and that if you answer any of my questions falsely, your false or untrue answers may later be used against you in another prosecution for perjury or making a false statement?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

at the outset that this is a Curcio hearing. A defendant in a criminal case has the right to be represented by a lawyer who has absolutely no conflicts of interest. And if a defendant cannot pay the cost of such a lawyer, the defendant is entitled to have counsel appointed for the defendant free of cost. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: In this particular case, the government has alleged that there are possible conflicts of interest between Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young in representing you, while at the same time they're representing Sam Bankman-Fried in another criminal case.

The gist of what the government says are possible conflicts of interest is that you are a founder of a company called Celsius. Mr. Bankman-Fried is the founder and owner of a company called Alameda Research. The interest of your company, Celsius, may conflict with those of Alameda Research. It may be that your company claims that it is a victim of Alameda Research, and that as a result of that, your company and you would be entitled to restitution from Mr. Bankman-Fried.

In that connection, there have been lots of documents produced in connection with the criminal case against

Mr. Bankman-Fried that are subject to some protective orders.

Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young may be subject to those protective orders so that the discovery produced in that case to them as lawyers for Bankman-Fried may not be available to you in this case. The documents that have been produced may be subject to different protective orders.

So it may be in general that the arguments that they make on behalf of Mr. Bankman-Fried may be in conflict with arguments that they would like to make on your behalf in this case and they may feel constraints against making those arguments on your behalf because of their continuing loyalty to Mr. Bankman-Fried. Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about any of that? Do you have any questions?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't have questions. Again, this is a first time in the court, it's not -- I'm not an expert in this space, so ...

THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure that if I say anything that raises a question in your mind and that you would like to ask me, you just tell me, and you're certainly welcome to consult with Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young about anything that I say. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Okay. So I say all of this as background

25

to explain to you that you have a right to a lawyer with 1 2 absolutely no conflicts of interest and to give you some 3 background about why the government contends that there may be 4 a conflict of interest in Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young 5 representing you in this case. Do you follow that? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 7 THE COURT: I am now going to ask you some more 8 specific questions. I am going to begin by making sure that 9 you are competent to understand the possible conflicts and to 10 waive, if you wish, any potential conflicts. 11 So tell me your name. 12 THE DEFENDANT: Alex Mashinsky. 13 THE COURT: And how old are you? 14 59 years old. THE DEFENDANT: 15 THE COURT: How far did you go in school? 16 THE DEFENDANT: I attended college. 17 THE COURT: Are you able to speak and understand 18 English? 19 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 20 THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been 21 under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist? 22 THE DEFENDANT: I have a doctor, yes. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Are you seeing the doctor for any 24 conditions that may affect your ability to understand these

proceedings and to consult with your lawyer?

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't. 2 THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized for any mental illness or any type of addiction? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, I have not. 5 THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have you taken any 6 drugs, medicine or pills? 7 THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't. 8 THE COURT: Is your mind clear today? 9 THE DEFENDANT: I hope so, yes. 10 THE COURT: Are you feeling all right today? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Now, I have explained to you the general 13 outlines of what the government says may create a conflict of 14 interest between Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young representing you in 15 this case while they are continuing to represent and have represented Mr. Bankman-Fried in another case. 16 17 Do you understand that? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 19 THE COURT: Have you consulted with Mr. Mukasey and 20 Ms. Young about this possible conflict of interest? 21 THE DEFENDANT: I did. 22 THE COURT: I have explained to you the ways in which 23 they are representing Mr. Bankman-Fried may present a conflict 24 of interest. One of the problems in trying ton understand

conflicts of interest is that it's impossible to foresee all of

the possible ways in which a conflict of interest may affect you. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Could you tell me in your own words what you understand to be the possible conflict of interest between Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young representing you in this case while at the same time they're representing Mr. Bankman-Fried?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. My concerns are that I'm making a big investment of time and of money to obviously prove my innocence in my case, and that in some way the conflict of interest may cause the Mukasey team not to be able to represent me going forward. That's my main concern.

I understand the potential for conflict of interest.

I don't think there is one, but I do have a concern about them right before trial, for example, saying, sorry, we are conflicted, and you have to go and seek new counsel. So that's my main concern.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you just explain a little more why you think a conflict could arise?

THE DEFENDANT: Because we can't foresee the future. That's ...

THE COURT: Okay. They may think that they couldn't make an argument on your behalf because it would conflict with their representation of Mr. Bankman-Fried.

THE DEFENDANT: I assume that his sentencing will be

completed before my trial, but it may not be. So it's things like that that are unforeseen, but ...

THE COURT: Okay. Are you prepared to waive any or give up your right to object to Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young representing you in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: So I considered the fact and I agreed to waive my right. I signed a waiver agreement.

THE COURT: Okay. Did anyone make any threats or promises to you or give you any inducements to get you to waive any possible conflicts that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young may have in representing you in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't have any threats or inducement.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you give up or waive any possible conflict that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young have in this case, you are giving up or waiving that conflict for purposes of this case now and forever? You are giving up that right to object on the basis of any possible conflict today and at all future times, including any appeals in this case. So you're making the decision now, and it applies throughout the future. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I do. I understand.

THE COURT: Is there anything else that you want me to explain to you?

THE DEFENDANT: I can't think of anything.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, you have the right to be represented by another lawyer, an independent lawyer, who has no conflict, no interest other than yours, and to consult with that lawyer before you finally make the decision to waive any conflicts that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young have. Have you consulted with an independent lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: I did.

THE COURT: Who is that lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: Sheryl Giugliano with Muscou and -- I don't remember the full name of the firm, but it has the name Muscou in it.

THE COURT: Is Ms. Giugliano here?

THE DEFENDANT: No, she's not.

THE COURT: No.

THE DEFENDANT: It's really her partner David who is the criminal lawyer.

THE COURT: Okay. I want to give you the opportunity to continue to consult with Ms. Giugliano or her partner, or if you weren't consulting with another lawyer, I'd appoint another lawyer to consult with you.

I am going to adjourn the proceeding to a convenient time, because I want to make sure that you have had the opportunity to consult with separate counsel. And I want to hear from separate counsel that they agree that this is a possible conflict that can be waived and that you have

knowingly and voluntarily waived that. I want to hear from Mr. Mukasey and his colleague that they agree that they can represent without you being influenced by any possible conflict. And I want to hear from the government that this is, in fact, a waivable conflict.

So I'm going to adjourn the hearing to a convenient time for everyone soon. But before I do that, Mr. Mukasey, do you think I should ask any other questions of the defendant at this point?

MR. MUKASEY: I don't think so, Judge. We recommended that Mr. Mashinsky speak to independent counsel. I also want to just put on the record that Ms. Young and I conferred with our own firm's professional responsibility counsel concerning the applicable Rules of Professional Responsibility and did secure a written waiver from Mr. Mashinsky. But proceeding in an abundance of caution, your Honor's plan seems perfectly good to us.

THE COURT: Okay. The government, first of all, do you want me to ask any other questions of the defendant at this point?

MS. NICHOLS: No. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government know of any reason that this is not a waivable conflict or any basis to believe that so far the defendant has not knowingly and voluntarily waived any potential conflict?

MS. NICHOLS: We do believe that the conflict is both potential and waivable, your Honor. And from what we are hearing today, as well as my conversations with Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young ahead of today, we do believe that Mr. Mashinsky understands, and that his waiver is knowing and voluntary.

THE COURT: I certainly would like to complete the proceeding soon, so sometime either later this week or the beginning of next week. And I will take a very brief break so that Mr. Fletcher can consult with you on a mutually convenient date.

(Recess)

MR. MUKASEY: Judge, would it be okay if I gave a bit of a status update?

THE COURT: Yes, certainly.

MR. MUKASEY: So just to backtrack a little bit,

Mr. Mashinsky had discussed with our firm going back to January
the potential conflict here in our representation of

Mr. Bankman-Fried, and the way that could potentially
hypothetically be adverse to him, and his right to
conflict-free counsel. We obtained a written waiver from him
that he signed, I believe, January 4.

Since then, we've also advised him that -- again, that he can and should speak to independent counsel. I'm informed that he spoke to independent counsel -- yesterday?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

MR. MUKASEY: -- within the last couple of days, I think at a law firm called Ruskin, Moscou, Faltischek. We tried to reach the lawyer at that firm during the break and we were unable to. So he is not here. However, Mr. Palma is here, the CJA lawyer on duty, and we encourage Mr. Mashinsky, if he wishes to continue that discussion, either with the lawyer at the Moscou firm or with Mr. Palma, who I understand is willing to do this today to move things along, but I -- we want the Court and the client to be as comfortable and take as much time as necessary.

THE COURT: That's fine. Thank you for the update.

Commonly, Mr. Mashinsky, in the course of a Curcio hearing, a judge appoints the Criminal Justice Act attorney for the day as independent Curcio counsel to consult with the defendant.

It's not at all common to have the situation where a defendant has already consulted with independent counsel. So you've consulted with independent counsel, and I am certainly prepared to have you consult with the Criminal Justice Act counsel for today just so that you've had the opportunity to consult with independent counsel. And you have told me already that you had consulted with the Ruskin firm and were prepared to waive any conflict going forward with Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young.

As I told you at the sort of what's known as the

second phase of the Curcio hearing, I listen to all of the lawyers, including your independent counsel, to make sure that you have been adequately advised, and that you wish to waive any conflicts you have with Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young.

So if you wish, I am perfectly prepared to have you consult with the Criminal Justice Act counsel for today,
Mr. Palma, and then to come back later today after you've had the opportunity to consult with Mr. Palma, and to listen if you are still of the mind to waive any conflicts that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young have. Or we could put it off until you could get your other independent counsel here and proceed then. So if you are prepared to consult with independent counsel,
Mr. Palma, that would be fine. It's up to you.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. I spent an hour yesterday with David and Sheryl from Ruskin Moscou Faltischek, and I did spend a few minutes with Mr. Palma before the hearing today, and I'm comfortable that, you know, I was advised of all the potential conflicts. And so if your Honor wishes me to spend more time with Mr. Palma, I'm happy to do so.

THE COURT: Yes.

So, Mr. Palma.

MR. PALMA: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. I will appoint you under the Criminal Justice Act to represent Mr. Mashinsky to consult

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

02KQmasC with him about whether he wishes to waive any conflicts that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young have and then to resume this hearing at 1:45 if that's okay. MR. PALMA: Certainly, your Honor. With the Court's permission, could we use the jury room? THE COURT: Absolutely. Okay. So we will adjourn until 1:45. Thank you all. (Recess) DEPUTY CLERK: Continuation of United States v. Alexander Mashinsky. THE COURT: The attorneys for the government, Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Long are here with the defendant, and

Mr. Palma, whom I appointed as Curcio counsel, is also here.

Mr. Mashinsky, have you had an opportunity to consider everything that we discussed this morning in connection with the possible conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Long have in representing you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions for me?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you had an opportunity to consult with Mr. Palma about waiving any conflicts that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Long have?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Are there any questions that you have for me or anything that you'd like me to explain further? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: After considering everything that we 6 discussed this morning, do you wish to proceed with Mr. Mukasey 7 and Ms. Long as your counsel? 8 MR. MUKASEY: Just for the record, Judge, it's 9 Ms. Young. Y-O-U-N-G. 10 THE COURT: Ms. Young. 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Do you wish to waive any potential 13 conflicts that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young have in representing 14 you? 15 THE DEFENDANT: I think I signed the waiver already, so I'm standing by my waiver. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. Do you understand that by waiving 18 any potential conflict you're waiving it for now and in the future, including any appeals in this case? 19 20 THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Palma, have you had the 22 opportunity to consult with Mr. Mashinsky? 23 MR. PALMA: Yes, I have, and I believe he fully 24 understands actual conflicts of interest and potential 25 conflicts of interest, and we discussed the potential conflicts

of interest in this case, and he fully understands that that is a waivable conflict. He's prepared to explain it to you.

THE COURT: Based on your discussion, is it your conclusion that he can knowingly and voluntarily waive any of the potential conflicts?

MR. PALMA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Mukasey, are you confident that you can proceed with the representation of Mr. Mashinsky without any interference from any potential conflicts with your representation of Mr. Bankman-Fried?

MR. MUKASEY: I believe we can fulfill our constitutional obligation to Mr. Mashinsky while respecting our obligations to both clients under the Professional Rules of Responsibility.

THE COURT: Okay.

Ms. Young, are you confident that you can represent Mr. Mashinsky without any interference from any potential conflicts with your representation with Mr. Bankman-Fried?

MS. YOUNG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government think that the defendant can waive any potential conflicts that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young have in representing Mr. Mashinsky from their representation of Mr. Bankman-Fried?

MS. NICHOLS: We do.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I find that any conflict that Mr. Mukasey and Ms. Young have from representing Mr. Bankman-Fried is only a potential conflict; that it is waivable, and that Mr. Mashinsky has knowingly and voluntarily waived any such conflict.

Anything further?

MS. NICHOLS: Yes, your Honor. The government has an application with respect to the trial schedule in this case, which we have talked with defense counsel about ahead of today.

THE COURT: I should say, Mr. Palma, you're excused.

Thank you for your representation.

MR. PALMA: Thank you very much, your Honor.

MS. NICHOLS: Thank you, your Honor.

So the government and defense counsel have talked in advance of the conference today, and the government wishes to put a proposal before the Court for your consideration. The issue, your Honor, is that I expect to be out on maternity leave during the trial in this case. So we discussed with defense counsel the possibility of a brief adjournment and looking to a trial date in early 2025. I, of course, don't know the Court's schedule, but the parties had contemplated perhaps something in late January or early February. As I said, the defense consents under the Speedy Trial Act. And I think that under that Act, this adjournment is in the interest of justice and outweighs the defendant's right in a speedy

trial for a few reasons that I'd be happy to proffer.

The first is, of course, as I mentioned, the continuity of government counsel, which is one factor that the Court can consider. I think the other factors that are very relevant here largely pertain to the complexity of this case. I think the additional time would be in the interest of -- I won't speak for defense counsel, but -- certainly both parties in continuing to prepare for trial, to ensure an efficient presentation of the evidence and an efficient proceeding of the trial.

I think the discovery in this case, as we have discussed with the Court already, is extremely voluminous in this case and somewhat complicated. Defense counsel and the government have, in the months since we were last before your Honor, had a number of discussions and back and forth about the discovery that the government has produced. You know, I would like to add that these conversations have been, from my perspective, certainly extremely collaborative and collegial, and we are working together to try to resolve some of the -- I don't know if they're issues, but I think there are things that have come up with respect to the metadata in the discovery that, you know, defense counsel is seeing one thing and want to understand how the government is processing the discovery material and what metadata the government has available to it, and these kinds of back-and-forth require consultation with

each of our respective IT personnel and vendors.

So I think that is essentially what I have for the Court, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mukasey?

MR. MUKASEY: Judge, we don't oppose the government's application, and we echo the amicable collaborative nature, and, frankly, the complexity of the discovery in this case. We have discussed with our client the government's request for an adjournment of a couple of months. We've hashed it out with him, discussed with him pros and cons, and, as I say, we do not oppose the government's application.

THE COURT: The trial is scheduled for September, right?

MS. NICHOLS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, it's a four-month adjournment. It's not a couple of months.

Mr. Mukasey, when you say that the defendant does not oppose, does that mean that the defense supports an adjournment; that the defense thinks that the adjournment is —that the continuance is necessary in the interest of justice or simply that the defense is prepared to live with it?

MR. MUKASEY: I do so believe that it is in the interest of justice, and I can be perhaps more precise and say we join in the application. We consent to their application and think that the interests of justice outweigh for 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

reasons Ms. Nichols stated the interest of the Court and the public in a speedy trial.

THE COURT: Mr. Fletcher?

What's the estimate with respect to the length of trial?

MS. NICHOLS: The government anticipates three weeks for its case in chief, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'll adjourn the case until January 28, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. I am doing it on the representations of counsel. First of all, continuity of counsel is important, both for the government, as well as for the defense. I would grant it equally, but there is no application that it's necessary for defense counsel, but there is an application that it is necessary for government counsel. The case is plainly complicated. There is extensive discovery. I accept the representations of counsel that the discovery is voluminous, complicated, and that both sides agree that a continuance is warranted based upon the complexity of the evidence and the need to understand it. So I will adjourn the trial date until January 28, 2025. The Court finds that the continuance is necessary to assure effective assistance of counsel, and because of the complexity of the case, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by ordering the continuance outweigh the best interest of the defendant and the public in a speedy trial. This order of exclusion is made

pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3161(h)(7)(A).

I also know that there is a motion to dismiss that is pending, and at that some point I will hear argument on that motion to dismiss.

Okay. Anything further?

MS. NICHOLS: Nothing for the government, your Honor.

MR. MUKASEY: Nothing for the defense. Thank you,

Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon all.

(Adjourned)