SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CORRECTED TRANSCRIPT

x=======X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

vs

M 4113-03

ELENA R. SASSOWER, Defendant.

Washington, D.C.

June 1, 2004

The above-entitled action came on for a hearing before the Honorable BRIAN HOLEMAN, Associate Judge, in Courtroom Number 218.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Government:

JESSIE LIU, Esquire AARON MENDELSOHN, Esquire Assistant United States Attorneys

On behalf of the Defendant:

ELENA SASSOWER, Pro se White Plains, New York

MARK GOLDSTONE, Esquire Attorney Advisor Washington, D.C

Recorder:
Jacqueline Hogue
Official Court Transcriber

Telephone: 879-1757

decided it would be wiser to wait for the presentencing report.

In this case, Your Honor, we are asking for five days suspended and six months of probation conditioned on anger management training or an anger management course. The reasons are essentially set forth in the memorandum. It's the Government's view, Your Honor, that Ms. Sassower has never taken any responsibility for her actions on May 22, 2003 and, in fact, has responded to the charge and to the conviction with attack, not only on the United States

Attorney's Office, but on Senate Legal Counsel as well as on an AUSA who formerly worked for defendant's judiciary committee.

We wanted to point out that defendant is not a first-time offender. She was convicted of obstructing government in North Castle Town Court in 1994, and received a conditional release, which we believe is something similar to probation in that case.

Finally, Your Honor, we think that it is clear from her letters not only to this Court and to the U.S. Attorney's Office but from her testimony on the witness stand that she is an extremely angry individual who we think could benefit from anger management.

THE COURT: Very well. Thank you, Ms. Liu. Ms. Sassower?

.

MS. SASSOWER: At the outset, I'd like to hand up to the Court letters that were faxed on Friday, May 28, three letters to the Court, the hard copy, and would like additionally to provide the hard copies to the U.S. Attorney to whom they were also faxed on Friday and to which the U.S. attorney has now made reference as to part of the reason why sentence should be imposed.

At the outset, I refer the Court to the first two letters, which requested adequate time for me to review the presentence report with my legal advisor and to submit written comment and/or other substantiating matter with respect to that report. I requested an adjournment and I requested to be advised as to the pertinent statutory or rule provision governing sentencing proceedings. I received no response from the Court except for transmittal by fax shortly thereafter of the pre-sentencing report which I had not prior thereto received.

of your being directed to or apprised of pertinent sentencing rules, I have informed you from the outset of this case and, I reiterate here, that you are serving as your own counsel; therefore, you are held to the same responsibilities as counsel who would be representing you and it is not the purview of this Court to educate you as to the relevant sentencing rules and statutes and cases. That being the

case, do you have anything further for this Court? 1 2 MS. SASSOWER: I have a great deal further for this 3 Court, but firstly to --4 THE COURT: Then I would recommend that you get to 5 the issues. 6 MS. SASSOWER: So you will not hear further my objection to this proceeding taking place today in view of 7 8 the fact that I have not had --9 THE COURT: Give me the grounds for your objection. 10 MS. SASSOWER: Well, as set forth in the letter, I believe under Rule 32B3a I am entitled to reasonable time 11 within which to review the presentence report and indeed with 12 the assistance of my counsel to submit such written comment 13 and other substantiating matter as may be necessary. As 14 already was pointed out in my third letter to the Court, 15 there are some rather startling factual errors, some are of 16 not a substantial nature but others are. And obviously the 17 18 venue to --19 THE COURT: And what are the errors in the 20 presentence report that would warrant the Court granting you additional time to present additional material that would 21 assist the Court in its sentencing determination. That's 22 23 question one. 24 MS. SASSOWER: Okay. I certainly would maintain --25 look.

1	THE COURT: No. I don't have to look. You answer
2	my question.
3	MS. SASSOWER: I'm not saying look to the Court.
4	I'm saying look as a manner of expression. I am entitled to
5	a record that has an accurate presentencing report. There
6	are a multitude of errors throughout the
7	THE COURT: What are the errors in the report that
8	would warrant grant of additional time for your response?
9	It's a simple question.
10	MS. SASSOWER: Well, the report takes the position
11	that it's not within its purview to examine my evidentiary
12	presentation to it or to include my evidentiary presentation
13	to Court Services that I was denied a fair trial. I was
14	wrongfully convicted. Their view is they can only recite my
15	allegations as relates to the bogus and malicious disruption
16	of Congress charge.
17	THE COURT:
18	MS. SASSOWER: but cannot look at the further
19	aspects having to do with the manner in which I was brought
20	to trial and convicted.
21	THE COURT: Very well. Is there something else?
22	MS. SASSOWER: I did want to make a record as to my
23	right, what I believe to be my right, citing to the rule and
24	also to reflect on the fact
25	THE COURT: No, no. Just a minute. We are dealing

here solely with the inadequacies of the report that would warrant my grant of a continuance. The first matter that you have brought to my attention is the fact that apparently the probation services would not take into account the manner by which you were brought to the Court and the conduct of the proceedings once you got here, as I understand it. Those were matters that you wanted laid out in specific detail in the presentence report and they were not laid out to your satisfaction. What is the next issue?

MS. SASSOWER: Well, just to clarify what Your Honor has recited, not only were they not included, and by not included, I mean, specifically the written letter submission of six pages dated May 25, which I provided to Ms. Westry for inclusion in her presentence report. Not only was that not included, but it was represented to me by Ms. Westry when she apprised me of the fact that it would not be included, that I could speak to her supervisor Ms. McDaniel and that the report would not be submitted until I had reviewed the basis upon which I was contending that it was properly a part of the presentence report.

Now as Your Honor is aware from the correspondence of May 28, despite numerous phone messages left for Ms.

McDaniel, despite the representations made by Ms. Westry that I would first have an opportunity to speak with Ms. McDaniel before the report went in, the report was submitted without

Ms. McDaniel discussing with me this serious and substantial aspect which I contend was rightfully a part of their evaluation because as has been recognized by the U.S. Attorney, I am, as they say, I show no remorse whatsoever.

And indeed because it is my contention, fully

And indeed because it is my contention, fully documented, that I was -- not only subject of a bogus malicious charge, but railroaded to trial and denied any kind of fair trial, my position to Ms. Westry was that for the pre-sentence personnel to understand why I show no remorse, they have to understand both components here. And Ms. Westry recited my recitation as relates to the charge, that she did.

She reproduced in the presentence report verbatim virtually the entirety of the memorandum that I prepared for the American Civil Liberties Union from July 7, 2003. What she did not include was what took place at trial, why my version of events did not prevail at trial.

THE COURT: Very well. Is there some other inadequacy with the report that you would seek to use as the basis for this Court's grant of continuance of this sentencing?

MS. SASSOWER: Yes, Your Honor, and that is the recognition of the U.S. Attorney that they also wanted to have the pre-sentence report in hand before they submitted a memorandum in support -- in aid of sentencing. And that is reflected by their footnote one, which says that they

withheld this memorandum. And indeed they have only 1 submitted it to the Court today and they have only submitted 2 it to me today. Whereas the presentence report is, in fact, a 3 very favorable document to me, to say the least, 4 notwithstanding, there was no exploration of the specifics of 5 my contention as to why I was --6 7 THE COURT: Then if the report was favorable to you, if that's the argument that you are making for this Court, 8 not taking into account the Government's memorandum, then why 9 would we be continuing this hearing for what you perceive to 10 be the inadequacies of the exact same report? 11 MS. SASSOWER: Well, as I said, I have a -- there 12 are a multitude -- and I think it is, with all respect, 13 because the presentence -- I'm sorry -- because Court 14 15 Services tried to rush the report for delivery for today's sentencing, and because of that there are a multitude of 16 factual errors which should properly be corrected because 17 years from now the errors in this report might be somehow --18 they seem innocuous now -- might somehow come back to haunt 19 me or someone else. And I would prefer that not be the case. 20 I would prefer to have the opportunity to have 21 those factual errors corrected, whether or not they are 22 material but just so that the record is properly kept. 23 Additionally, I, as I said, I have a legal advisor and he was 24 away on vacation from Friday until last night. 25

1631

speak with him until shortly before nine this morning in the hall. He spent -- at that time he spent a very brief five/ten minutes cursorily reviewing the report. We had no opportunity to examine it, to discuss it as to what is appropriate.

The U.S. Attorney has submitted a written memorandum. The written memorandum, in contrast to the presentence report, which is very favorable to me, the Government's memorandum in aid of sentencing is a document for which the U.S. Attorney's Office should be sanctioned and a disciplinary referral should be made of them because it is a false document.

THE COURT: Ms. Sassower? Ms. Sassower, you are to state for me the bases upon which this Court would grant a continuance, and I will not hear during this hearing any commentary by you as to your view of the Government's preparation here.

MS. SASSOWER: I wish to have the opportunity, Your Honor, to document my view in a written submission in aid of its evaluation of the Government quote memorandum in aid of sentencing. I would like to have that opportunity both with respect to recommendation of a five-day incarceration albeit suspended, and six months of probation conditioned on completion of anger management course. As to both aspects I wish to make a written submission.

1 And I believe, Your Honor, with all respect that should the Court not defer the sentencing so that a proper 2 submission might be made both with respect to the presentence 3 report and with respect to this memorandum, that at the very 4 least the memorandum has to be rejected. If the U.S. 5 Attorney sought to submit a written memorandum when I 6 requested in written correspondence on Friday a deferment of 7 the sentencing, they needed to join. They did not oppose my application, but they did not join it. And if they were planning -- if they felt that they

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

too were relying on the presentence report to prepare a memorandum, they needed to say, and Your Honor we also were waiting to put in a written submission. Ms. Sassower should also have that opportunity, assisted by her legal advisor.

THE COURT: Well, again, it seems you've overstepped the bounds that I set for you in terms of the address that you are to make to me at this point in the proceedings.

> MS. SASSOWER: I'm sorry. I didn't understand.

THE COURT: The Government -- the Government can certainly make whatever argument it chooses when it comes to continuing or not the sentencing. The Government could choose not to have submitted the report this morning. chose to do so after having received the presentence report, as that presentence report was faxed from my chambers.

Government chose nevertheless to proceed in the manner in 1 2 which it has. 3 MS. SASSOWER: And I also --4 THE COURT: It has submitted the report and it has 5 allocuted. 6 MS. SASSOWER: Okay. 7 THE COURT: Now with regard to your -- do you have any other bases for grant of a continuance here? 8 9 MS. SASSOWER: Yes -- oh, on the continuance? Excuse me one moment, Your Honor. I could go on at further 10 length but -- well, I will identify for the record, yes. 11 think it appropriate that not only does the presentence 12 report not reflect, in deed conceal, that it was not supposed 13 to issue, I was told it would not issue until I had first 14 spoken to the supervisor Ms. McDaniel which you will see if 15 you look at the list of contacts, there is no contact 16 information for me for May 27 where I left repeated messages 17 and did speak with Ms. Westry. 18 19 But, further, the other issues that were to be discussed included my request that there be a stay of the 20 sentence pending appeal. That albeit sentencing because of 21 my contention, documented for them that I had been wrongfully 22 convicted, I was asking for a separate recommendation that 23 whatever sentence the Court saw fit to impose be stayed 24

25

pending my appeal.

1	
1	The last issue was for discussion with Ms. Westry,
2	also not reflected in the report and should rightfully have
3	
4	the presentence report insofar as time within which to
5	respond. Ms. Westry asserted she did not know what rule or
6	statutory provision governed as far as my rights to make a
7	responsive to submission and she said that Ms. McDaniel her
8	supervisor, would have that information. That was yet the
9	third area for discussion with Ms. McDaniel. I think that
10	covers it.
11	
	THE COURT: Very well. All right. Does the
12	Government wish to respond?
13	MS. LIU: Your Honor, on the issue of continuance we
14	defer to your judgment.
15	THE COURT: Very well. Under Rule 32 of the
16	Superior Court Rules of Criminal Procedure, at subsection B
17	which deals with the presentence investigation, clearly in a
18	misdemeanor case the Social Services Division will make a
19	report available upon the request of the Court. And in this
20	case I did request the report.
21	
22	That rule also governs disclosure. At subpart 3 it
23	states that the Court shall make available to the defendant
[through defendant's counsel and to counsel for the Government
24	a copy of the report of presentence investigation a

reasonable time before imposing sentence.

Ĭ

In this case the current question for the Court is whether the submission of the report on last Friday at 11:35 a.m., when it was faxed from my chambers to -- faxed from my chambers immediately following receipt to the Government and to defense counsel, whether the period between defendant's receipt and this morning's hearing which commenced some ten or fifteen minutes ago was adequate time for review of the report.

It is my view that a sufficient basis has been stated for the grant of a continuance. The matter will be continued until Monday, June 28.

MS. SASSOWER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now having said that, I will address certain particulars so that there is no time wasted during the period between now and sentencing. I have reviewed the presentence, such as it is, and to my -- in my view it is adequate for its intended purpose. The presentence report contains several pages of material from a July 7, 2003 memorandum from Ms. Sassower to the American Civil Liberties Union. That's found at pages 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the presentence report.

To state for the record that there is somehow an inadequate presentation of the defendant's position is simply at odds with the content of this report. The purpose for this sentencing hearing is not to re-review evidentiary

matters, as those matters were already decided by a jury, and upon their review a finding of guilty was made. That being the case the continued hearing will not be a forum for any further discussion of your dissatisfaction with the manner in which the events developed that brought you to court or the proceedings that took place once you got here.

The sole matter for this Court's consideration is having been convicted of a misdemeanor which in this jurisdiction carries a maximum sentence of six months, \$500 fine, or both, the question for this Court is what factors should be considered in its sentencing determination. And I will tell you now so that you are well prepared on June 28, there will be no further discussion of the evidence previously presented, previously reviewed and considered and upon which a jury rendered its verdict.

MS. SASSOWER: The jury did not have the evidence.

THE COURT: Second -- be quiet. Second, with regard to the presentence report, it is foreign to me and I invite you and your legal adviser to obtain authority for the proposition that the Social Services Division requires your permission before submission of a report to the Court that the Court ordered. I don't expect to hear from you during this ruling.

Next, with regard to any further inclusion of materials into the report that you have determined were

1	either by oversight or intent not included in the report, to
2	the extent that these matters involve your interpretation of
3	the evidence or the Court proceedings, there is no need for
4	Social Services to include such matters in this report.
5	MS. SASSOWER: Your Honor?
6	THE COURT: Just a minute.
7	(Pause)
8	THE COURT: Finally, in my view there is sufficient
9	information of record in this case and in the presentence
10	report to enable me in the exercise of meaningful sentencing
11	discretion to render sentence in this case. And the only
12	reason that this matter is being continued is because of your
13	stated basis for having an inadequate time to prepare, given
14	the submission of the report on May 28, 2004.
15	MS. SASSOWER: Indeed, I would not say something
16	that was not true.
17	THE COURT: Well, Ms. Sassower, I'm not asking you
18	to say anything right now. That being the case, this matter
19	is continued for sentencing to June 28, 2004, at 11 p.m.
20	(sic).
21	MS. SASSOWER: Thank you.
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ms. Sassower, if you fail to
24	appear on
25	THE COURT: June 28.

1	THE DEPUTY CLERK: June 28 at 11 o'clock, a
2	warrant will issue for your arrest. If you are convicted of
3	failing to appear you face five
4	failing to appear, you face five years in jail or \$5000 fine
5	or both for failing to appear for sentencing, which is a
	felony. Do you understand?
6	MS. SASSOWER: Yes
7	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please sign your notice
8	signature
9	[Thereupon, the proceedings were concluded.]
10	* * *
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
- 1	

	i e
1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
2	I, Jacqueline Hogue, an Official Court Transcriber
3	
4	certify that in my official capacity I prepared from
5	electronic recordings the excerpt proceedings had and
6	testimony adduced in the matter of UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
7	versus ELENA R. SASSOWER, Docket Number: M 4113-03, in said
8	Court, on the 1st day of June 2004.
9	I further certify that the foregoing 17 pages were
10	transcribed to the best of my ability from said recordings.
11	In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name this
12	the 7th day of June 2005.
13	
14	
15	Jacqueline Hoque (free)
16	Official Court Transcriber
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	