UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )

Plaintiff, )

Criminal Action
No. 10327-GAO

CHARLES F and STEVEN )
GROUL, )

Defendants. )

BEFORE THE HONORABLE GEORGE A. O'TOOLE, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## DISPOSITION

John J. Moakley United States Courthouse
Courtroom No. 9
One Courthouse Way
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
Thursday, July 17, 20
2:36 p.m.

Marcia G. Patrisso, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse
One Courthouse Way, Room 3510
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
(617) 737-8728

Mechanical Steno - Computer-Aided Transcript

1	APPEARANCES:
2	OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
3	By: Timothy A. Landry, Assistant U.S. Attorney John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse Suite 9200
4	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 On Behalf of the Government
5	NATHAN LAW OFFICES
6	By: Geoffrey G. Nathan, Esq. 132 Boylston Street
7	5th Floor Boston, Massachusetts 02116
8	On Behalf of the Defendants
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

## PROCEEDINGS

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 enters the courtroom at 2:36 p.m.)

THE CLERK: The United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. Court is in session. Be seated.

For a sentencing, the case of United States versus Charles ( and Steven Grown, 13-10327. Would counsel identify yourselves for the record, please.

MR. LANDRY: Tim Landry for the United States. afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

THE CLERK: All rise.

MR. NATHAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Attorney Geoffrey Nathan for Charles Plans and Steven Ground

THE COURT: And I think everyone will probably agree we can handle these two matters simultaneously?

MR. LANDRY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Each defendant appears for sentencing on conviction of one count of theft of public money, the conviction coming upon the entry of a plea of guilty in each case.

I have a final presentence report as to each defendant from the probation office, and in each case it proposes an application of the United States Sentencing Guidelines to determine what advice the Guidelines have with respect to an appropriate range of sentence.

Are there any issues with respect to the Guidelines or the Guidelines' recommendation that need to be resolved before we proceed to other issues?

MR. LANDRY: None, your Honor.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  NATHAN: Just my pleadings that are before you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. Well, I've reviewed the probation office's calculation and I concur that it's an appropriate application of the Guidelines. It yields, with respect to recommendation as to custody, a suggested guideline range of 10 to 16 months.

The Guidelines range, of course, is one factor, an important factor, but not by itself determinative. There are other factors, so I'll entertain your recommendation for a sentence with respect to each defendant as to all of the sentencing factors.

MR. LANDRY: Yes, your Honor. The government's recommendation is the same for each defendant. It's five months of incarceration to be followed by 36 months of supervised release with the first five months of that to be served in home detention, a \$3,000 fine, restitution, and asset forfeiture as charged in the information and as detailed in the plea agreement.

The reason for that recommendation is as follows: Two basic points -- and I made these points to some extent in a

memo that I filed back in May so I won't rehash all of that but rather hit them rather briefly. Number one, it's a scheme that involved a fair amount of planning and execution. This was not simply a crime of opportunity; this is something that the defendants had to sit down, plan out, carry out over a period of years and cover up as time went on. And I think that's a compelling factor in this case.

And secondly, it's a scheme that appears to have been motivated by greed. And what I mean by that is I know sometimes, particularly in these government benefits fraud cases, we have defendants who are poverty-stricken, facing homelessness or the like. And not that that excuses what they do, but I know the courts are sometimes sympathetic to those situations. But that doesn't appear to be at all what we have here. We have two individuals living apparently a rather comfortable lifestyle, according to the information in the PSR. They didn't really need the money, again, not that that would be an excuse, but they took it anyway. And I think that would be a compelling factor in this case as well.

To sum up, your Honor, I think the way this case has been charged it is just one count of theft of public money. And the way it's been pleaded to, it results in basically the most lenient guideline sentence available. We're recommending the low end of the 10 to 16 months, and then we're taking that low end of ten months and taking full advantage of the fact

that it's in Zone C, so we're recommending the 50/50 split so they only end up with five months of incarceration.

This is a case that could have been charged as wire fraud, which has a higher base offense level, but wasn't; it could have been charged as aggravated identity theft, even.

And I cited some case law to that effect in the memo I filed.

That carries a two-year minimum mandatory sentence. It hasn't been charged that way. There are -- there's passport fraud, tax fraud, false statements to the government, bank fraud all wrapped up in this scheme that they carried out, but none of those crimes have been charged.

So, your Honor, I think we've boiled this down really to the most simple basic crime that could be charged and pleaded to, the lowest base offense level available and even the lowest possible sentence of incarceration in that guideline range, and I would simply suggest to the Court that there's no need for any further reductions after all of that.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. LANDRY: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Nathan?

MR. NATHAN: Thank you very much, your Honor. First of all, Assistant United States Attorney Landry does reference the negotiations that went into the charging decisions. And I

commend his office for allowing defense counsel to have that opportunity to negotiate the charging instrument.

Before coming in today, the clients demonstrated a willingness to admit to what they did, and they did not obstruct or do anything to impede the investigation. They fell on the sword, so to speak. So to me the quick acceptance of responsibility, they didn't obstruct justice in the investigation or lie or do anything other than the fact that they said that they did it.

In the course of time, we have today for your consideration the further fact of a very substantial payment of \$40,000 which Mr. Landry and I had discussed to make payable today to the clerk's office. I have those two cashier's checks on me. I was showing them to your clerk.

I think what this demonstrates to me is that these are really two unique individuals who are prepared to take the hit today, that were prepared to come into court today to make the payments to show your Honor that they're candidates for either home confinement or some form of straight probation.

What -- the nursing board is going to work with me once this case is concluded so that hopefully where I've been talking to the investigator about how this crime had nothing to do with anything of defrauding a hospital or anything where he was a nurse, they're going to work with me on that. And they're waiting until -- to see, you know, what happens today.

So from my perspective is that it's a serious amount of restitution, that the Court has to take into consideration the levels of remorse, and also for how concerned they are about their future and what incarceration would mean for both of them as well as society. And for that purpose I enlisted the assistance of Mr. Peter Russo, who's in the courtroom today, who's a retired probation officer, helped me draft the memorandum before the Court, where we talk about the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense.

And I would suggest that there are going to be some serious collateral consequences here to these two as a result of the conviction today. The fact of the matter is that I personally can't see how society would be protected any further by incarcerating these two. I would, however, ask if your Honor finds that it is in their best interest to be incarcerated, that because they are marked, that you allow them to stagger their offenses. That may provide them with some basis upon which they can save their marked home.

I've thought a lot about how they would be best protected from future conduct or how society would be best protected from any future conduct. I don't see these two ever doing this again, your Honor. I think that they've run their course and realized that -- whether it's greed, whether it's because of their backgrounds, all of which we wrote about

extensively in our memorandums, which are certainly eye-popping. And a lot of it was really hard for them to spell out. It's hard to talk about how your father and your brothers committed suicide and it messed you up as a kid. It's hard to talk about your own mental illness as an adult. Those are really, really tough things to talk about.

It's tough to imagine the two of them being incarcerated together, particularly where they have talked to me so much about how they want to make things right and about how difficult it would be if your Honor incarcerates them. Where are they going to go from there? They don't have much equity left in the house, and they're not going to have too many other people funneling large sums of money at them in order to help them straighten their lives out.

And as you could see from my memorandum, a grandfather chipped in 20,000, a best buddy who got a business loan chipped in 20 percent of his business loan and is going to employ him so that he can both pay back the government, pay back his buddy, work a steady job, pay the government back, do the right thing, straight and narrow, no bogus passports. None of that.

I would suggest, your Honor, in my discussions that they've asked for five years and they would owe a balance of 60-, and that these are one of the very few co-D's who are actually going to make full restitution to the United States of America which has given them so much, as it has all of us. And

I know that it's hard for me to say, but these two really feel badly for what they did.

And one of them -- if you look at all those character references from the hospitals about what a wonderful nurse he was, he's never going to get that back if he's incarcerated.

And I know as someone who's had a lot of orthopedic surgery as a young adolescent how much these male nurses meant to me when I was suffering at Children's Hospital at age 16 all alone, crying, juiced up on morphine, no one to talk to except my nurse who cared for me.

And that's what we have these types of characters who have done one wrong, bad fraud. But when push came to shove, they manned right up and said, "I did it." They didn't want a trial, they fessed up right away, they came up with a substantial amount of restitution all to show the Court, We take this seriously. We're going to pay this dough back. We don't want to go to the can. That's the way it is.

If they wanted to go to the can, they would have showed up with no money and just said, We'll take the five to six months, whatever it is, or our Guidelines sentence, and go away and be done with it. But that's not what these two are. These are people who want to make it right. And based upon the facts as I outlined in my memorandum to you, I don't believe that my recommendation is that far of a stretch. I think that a community-based sentence of probation with a period of home

confinement with electronic monitoring or community work service and full restitution, balance to be paid -- well, 40 grand to be paid forthwith, downstairs in the clerk's office, together with the \$100 special assessment, no fine because they're going to be making the restitution payments. The two of them do know how to live right and they will make this right. And they can make their first monthly payment in a month.

Yes? Would you be able to make your payment in a month? Are you working now?

A VOICE: Yes.

MR. NATHAN: Oh, yeah. He started his job already. You let me report to your Honor in 60 days as to where I'm getting with the nursing board, and I'll come back and tell you what efforts I've made and where I'm going to go in regards to the nursing license.

And I think that those are fair -- that's fair, to give them one chance to prove themselves to your Honor that they mean business. And the business is: We're guilty. We did it and we're going to pay it back. Not in ten years, not in 20 years and not maybe if I had a scratch ticket or something like that, but I'm going to work it off. I'm going to earn a salary and pay a percentage of my salary back and pay over a payment [sic] of time. And there's probably going to be other people in the background maybe who come up who are going

to help them along the way, as they have so far. But based upon their employment history I see no reasons why they wouldn't be able to pay this back over a five-year period.

So for these reasons, together with all the other reasons outlined in my memorandum, I would respectfully suggest that these are two individuals who are very uniquely situated and for who should get a one-time consideration and a chance, and then to report back to you in 60 days as to how they're doing and whether or not I'm going to be successful in salvaging the nursing license. And that gives them the hope that they need and the aspiration here to make the government whole.

It's a rare opportunity. As I said to Mr. Landry, in 20 years I've never had anyone show up at court -- they have to pay something back in restitution, but they don't because they don't care because they're criminals and they're no good. And these are good people.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Mr. Grom you each have an opportunity to make a statement before I impose sentence. You don't have to if you don't want to, but this is your chance to do so if you wish.

A VOICE: No thank you.

THE COURT: No? Okay.

Well, it seems to me that the sentencing factors from

the statute that are most salient in these two cases are the need for an appropriate punishment of a serious offense, and the need for general deterrence, promote the respect for the law so that others will be advised against similar offenses. The need to protect the public from future crimes of these defendants I think is a minimal factor in these circumstances.

In light of the sum of restitution and, in fact, the initiative shown in payment of restitution, and the fact that there will be a joint and several forfeiture of an identical amount, I think it would be a sufficient and not greater than necessary punishment to accept and essentially impose the suggestion by the defense as to a period of probation with some home detention.

I don't think a short period of incarceration, while intellectually justifiable, is a practically prudent approach, and I don't think it adds enough to recommend it. So essentially I will impose the sentence on each recommended in the submitted papers, which is three years of probation, six months in home confinement with electronic monitoring, restitution, joint and several, in the sum of 105-plus-thousand, and a similar order of forfeiture also jointly and severally ordered.

I will add to it a period of, in each case, a requirement of a certain number of hours of community service over the three-year term of the probation.

1 | 2 | p

So, Mr. Flynn and Mr. Grondell, if you would stand, please.

(The defendants comply.)

THE COURT: I'll impose the sentence jointly since it's identical on both defendants.

Charles , Steven Grow, on your conviction of this offense and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that you shall be and you hereby are placed on probation for a term of three years. In each case the first six months of your term of probation will be spent in home confinement on electronic monitoring. You may be responsible for the cost of the monitoring on a daily basis in accordance with the costs under the probation office's national contract.

You're each ordered to make restitution in the sum of \$105,158 to the Social Security Administration. That liability is joint and several. Payment of restitution shall begin immediately according to a repayment schedule that can be determined by the probation office and yourselves by agreement with the approval of the Court, or if there is an inability to agree, can be set by the Court after hearing.

All payments of restitution shall be made to the clerk of this Court for transfer to the Social Security Administration.

In addition, pursuant to the allegations of the

information and your agreement in the plea agreement, the sum \$105,158 is ordered forfeited to the United States. That is, again, a joint and several obligation. And I will grant the government's respective motions with respect to that.

While you're on probation you shall comply with all the standard conditions that pertain to that status. Those conditions are set forth in the United States Sentencing Guidelines at Section 5B1.3(c). They're now incorporated by reference, but they will be set forth at length in the judgment.

In addition to those standard conditions, you shall comply with the following conditions of probation: You shall not commit any other federal, state or local crime, you shall not illegally possess any controlled substance. In light of the information presented in the PSR as to each man, there is no indication of -- a substance abuse issue, so I will suspend drug testing conditions.

You shall submit to the collection of a DNA sample as directed by the probation office.

You're prohibited from possessing a firearm, destructive device or other dangerous weapon. It is a condition of your period of probation that you pay restitution in accordance with the established schedule. You're prohibited from incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation office while

any of your financial obligations remain outstanding.

You are to provide the probation office with access to any requested financial information, which information may be shared with the Financial Litigation Unit of the United States Attorney's Office.

If directed to do so, you're to participate in any program for mental health counseling or treatment as you may be directed to by the probation office. If you participate in any such program, you may be responsible for payment of some or all of the costs of the program based on your ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment.

Each of you shall use your true name and are prohibited from the use of any false identifying information which includes but is not limited to aliases, false dates of birth, false Social Security numbers, incorrect places of birth or the like.

In addition to those conditions, it will be a condition of your probation that over the term of your three years of probation you perform, each, 105 hours of community service at a rate of 35 hours per year. Essentially, one week per year. It doesn't have to be performed as a week but it amounts to a week.

Finally, I will not impose a monetary fine in light of the size of both the restitution and the forfeiture. There is a mandatory assessment on the conviction of \$100, which is due

forthwith in each case.

In your plea agreements respectively you have agreed to limit your right to challenge or appeal the sentence. I believe the sentence falls within the scope of your agreement to limit your right to appeal. To the extent you have any right to appeal, you must exercise the right by filing a notice of appeal within 14 days of the entry of judgment.

And you are now directed to report directly to the probation office for initial processing.

We'll be in recess.

THE CLERK: All rise for the Court. The Court will be in recess.

(The Court exits the courtroom and the proceedings adjourned at 3:00~p.m.)