1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
2			US ON GENER
3		x	AUG OFFICE
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,		CR OO-15 TAM. O 2000 NV
5		;	*
6	-against-	2	United States Courthouse
7			Brooklyn, New York
8	JENNIFER GRAZIANO,	•	April 20, 2001
9	Defendant.	:	12:15 o'clock p.m.
10		x	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING		
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHARLES P. SIFTON SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
13	ADDENDANGED		
14	APPEARANCES:		
15	For the Government:		STTA B. LYNCH
16	and one of the same of the same	BY:	RUTH NORDENBROOK
17	Assistant United States Attorney One Pierrepont Plaza Brooklyn, New York		
18.	By September 1 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 1	BLO	oklyn, new lock
19	or the Defendant:	PAU	L LEMOLE, ESQ.
20	0.		1
21	Contraction	Con	n Rudolinh Lord
22	Court Reporter:	225	Rudolph Cadman Plaza East oklyn, New York
23			8) 260-2538
24			
25	produced by computer-aided transcription.		
	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.		

1 THE CLERK: The United States versus Jennifer Graziano, criminal cause for sentencing. 3 THE COURT: All right. Who is representing the prosecution in this matter? 5 MS. NORDENBROOK: Ruth Nordenbrook for the United States, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: And for --8 MR. LEMOLE: Paul Lemole for the defendant. 9 Good afternoon, Judge. THE COURT: Good afternoon. 10 11 Here again, I have a transcript of a plea before 12 Magistrate Judge Gold back in March of last year. Is there 13 any reason I shouldn't accept that plea, Mr. Lemole? MR. LEMOLE: No, Judge. 14 THE COURT: Ms. Nordenbrook? 15 16 MS. NORDENBROOK: No. Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. I have reviewed the 17 transcript. There is a factual basis for the plea. The 18 19 defendant was acting voluntarily, with knowledge of the consequences of pleading quilty, so I will accept the plea. 20 21 Now, have you and your client, Mr. Lemole, seen both the original presentence report and the addendum that was 22 prepared by the Probation Department? 23 24 MR. LEMOLE: I have, Judge. 25 THE DEFENDANT: I have too.

1 THE COURT: Do you have any -- aside from the dispute concerning the defendant's role adjustment and your application for departure, do you have any other issues with 3 regard to the report? 5 MR. LEMOLE: Judge, just what I brought up in my sentencing memorandum. That would be --7 THE COURT: Did that summarize it? There is a dispute as to the role and also an application for departure? 8 9 MR. LEMOLE: Yes, it does. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Any issues you have with regard to 11 the report, Ms. Nordenbrook? 12 MS. NORDENBROOK: No, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: I also have from both sides -- well, I have Mr. Lemole's submissions, a sentencing memorandum and a 14 15 report, a thorough report, by the -- is it a psychiatrist? 16 Psychologist? MR. LEMOLE: Two of them, Judge. Doctor Hughes, I 17 18 believe, and Doctor Heffernan. 19 THE COURT: I have examined the psychologist report 20 of Doctor Hughes and the report of Doctor Berrill. So tell 21 me -- I have to say this, whatever I do in terms of the -- what position do you take on the role adjustment? 22 23 MS. NORDENBROOK: That the -- the role recommended in the PSR is an appropriate one. It is supported by the 24 25 evidence in the case.

1 THE COURT: All right. I don't want your argument. I just want your position. 3 You are taking -- since I didn't see that in writing 4 anywhere in your submissions. 5 MR. LEMOLE: Judge, in the written plea agreement, if I might? 7 THE COURT: I realize that. But I am asking what position the prosecutor is taking now. She says she is 8 supporting the Probation Department. 10 MS. NORDENBROOK: I'm sorry. No, I stand by the --11 I'm sorry. The one in the plea agreement. I'm sorry, Your 12 Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MS. NORDENBROOK: I'm sorry. I thought --15 THE COURT: All right. All right. That's where you 16 both are. I have to make an independent determination on the 17 subject. At least I know what the parties' positions are. What I started to say was, whatever impact 18 this -- the psychological evaluations are going to have on the 19 20 sentence, and given the offense level, it is hard to see 21 that's going to have any enormously large effect on the sentence. 22 23 This is just a terrible -- terribly upsetting picture of the life you have been living. It is just -- I mean, to 24

a -- to an outsider, who doesn't know you, to see what you

25

have had to put up in your -- in your relationships is just astounding.

1

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 It put me in mind, Ms. Nordenbrook, of years ago, you had a -- I don't think any direct involvement, but you had some involvement with a notorious case, of a woman who was abused by her -- by her husband or whatever it was, and that there have -- partly as a result of that case, there have 7 8 grown up support groups and people with expertise in this area who I think could do a great deal to help out whatever the 10 sentence is. You have been in this area for a long while, 11 Ms. Nordenbrook. Maybe you are in a position to pass on to 12 Ms. Graziano, whatever the disposition here is, some of these support groups who can intervene in situations like this. 13 14 Not -- not only with regard to the people who commit the abuse 15 but also with regard to the victims who have such a difficult time for reasons that are so difficult for an outsider to 16 17 understand.

Am I right in thinking you've got information of that sort or not?

MS. NORDENBROOK: My involvement years ago was more with abused children, Your Honor. I am not -- I'm sure that I could --

THE COURT: The Probation Department probably has something. If you have any information.

All right. Let's get back to the matter at hand,

which is the sentence here.

Mr. Lemole, tell me anything further you want to add to your submissions.

MR. LEMOLE: Well, Judge, I really don't have too much to add to my submissions. I asked Your Honor for a downward departure basically for various identified bases.

Namely, her extraordinary family circumstance, and not that I want to rehash what I wrote because I thought what I submitted to Your Honor was as complete as I could make it.

But here is a girl, Judge, notwithstanding her psychological problems, diagnosed disorders, which is even supported by the government psychologist, Judge, she stands before the Court with a one-and-three-quarter-two-year-old child, Judge, who -- who is basically, if I might, Judge, a -- a product of an interracial relationship. Her family, Judge, doesn't look kindly upon it. Her family can't take care of this child. They won't take care of it. They won't treat this child like a, quotes, white human being.

I put in the papers, Judge, as much as the limit would push it, to show the Court that a sentence of jail will take this child away from this mother and deprive the child of a healthy and emotionally healthy youth and he won't bond with her mother, nor will the child be able to, if you will, acknowledge its black heritage and the child will be left in the hands of her family during a period of incarceration and

certainly their influence will not be good.

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor has seen in the Probation report some references to the household which she now lives and she only lives there because she is forced to live there, in a sense, that she doesn't know her future. To go out and get her own apartment would be a mistake without knowing what her sentence would be.

But, Judge, that is, I submit to Your Honor, an extraordinary family circumstance, particularly in light of the racial aspect of this child. Without going --

THE COURT: What's the prospect of release of this -- of the husband?

MR. LEMOLE: Nil, Judge.

THE COURT: No. How long -- he's going to be --

MR. LEMOLE: I think he's going to be prosecuted for a homicide.

MS. NORDENBROOK: It's -- I don't think it is clear.

THE COURT: For some substantial period of time?

All right. Go ahead.

MR. LEMOLE: Judge, in addition, again, not to rehash
my memorandum, but we spoke about -- we addressed the Court
about her diminished capacity. Although it is not a defense
to the case, we wanted to make the Court aware of that. I
could not bring her psychological problems basically to say it
was causative of her criminal conduct but neither could the

government bring it to say it was not causative.

This woman, regardless of what those psychologists do say. Is obviously a victim and -- of a battered woman syndrome, Judge, of a man that has a relationship with her, ordered her to do something. She did it. And that's the seat of her problem, although neither psychologists of the three mention that because that apparently is a -- is a symptom as opposed to a diagnostic condition.

But that's -- that is her -- right from being brought up, that's what this girl is, an automaton, Judge. I ask the Court to depart for that reason.

During this period, Judge, this girl has gone to drug rehabilitation. She still does. She is -- she is still in drug rehabilitation program now for sixteen months or so. She continues to see a psychologist for help, with her mental problem.

And I ask the Court in view of all these factors, namely, the child and the particular facts, that racial situation, and the age of this baby, and the particular and peculiar needs of this child, and together with the other reasons, cumulative factors, Judge, basically I'm asking for a downward departure on all those grounds.

Judge, other than that, I have nothing further to say, other than I just want to make it clear, the government agreed with the defendant to the three point role, not to the

four point role. I put in my papers that since the government knows its case better than anybody in the world, and their agreement to the three points, I'd ask Your Honor to abide the government's three points.

I have nothing further to say, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Nordenbrook?

MS. NORDENBROOK: Your Honor, with regard to the defendant's claim that she acted as an automaton as a result of posttraumatic stress disease, we note the following. First we note that in large measure any diagnosis is based on self report and -- to the psychologists who are doing the analysis.

Ms. Graziano has a masters degree in psychology. So we assert that the bases -- she has some knowledge about what one has to claim in order to meet the diagnoses under these various diseases.

Having said that, I would point out, Doctor Berrill concluded that although there was evidence of posttraumatic stress disease, quote, based on Ms. Graziano's self report and an examination of information available to this examiner, there does not seem to be a substantive connection between Ms. Graziano's symptomatology and her willingness to engage in a criminal exercise, unquote.

Now, in Ms. Graziano's submissions neither doctor makes a causative link between the two illnesses. In fact,

the abuser, the former boyfriend, and Ms. Graziano ceased their association totally over a year before she engaged in 3 this criminal conduct. THE COURT: Don't get beyond your field, 5 Ms. Nordenbrook. MS. NORDENBROOK: I am just -- all right. 6 7 THE COURT: I happen to be quite familiar with 8 posttraumatic stress syndrome and it's all about things that 9 happen in the past, not about things that are happening. 10 MS. NORDENBROOK: I have a final observation. THE COURT: Go ahead. 11 MS. NORDENBROOK: That is based on the recorded 12 13 conversations by Ms. Graziano. That recorded conversations of 14 Ms. Graziano, which contrary to her claims do not show a 15 depressed automaton. 16 For instance, in --17 THE COURT: That wasn't the defendant's words 18 herself. That's the lawyer's words. That's not a symptom of 19 the ailment either. 20 In any event, go ahead. 21 MS. NORDENBROOK: Well, these conversations show her very much an active, conscious free participant, and director 22

On October 6, 1999, she was intercepted directing her

of the activities of other people in these -- in this

23

24

25

conspiracy.

brother-in-law Hector Pagan on who to deal with on that particular day.

On October 7, 1999, she directed Hector Pagan to mix poor quality marijuana with better quality marijuana and just sell it together.

She also instructed Hector Pagan on that day on how many containers he was to give each runner.

Finally, Hector Pagan, who wanted to change his pay day, asked Ms. Graziano if he could have his pay day on another day beside Friday, and she agreed.

In a conversation on October 18, it is a conversation not between Ms. Graziano and someone but, rather, an -- I have excerpted these for the purposes of -- for the purposes of this hearing. These are in the complaint and were a part of the complaint.

In the conversation on October 18, one of the runners is objecting to being directed by Mr. Pagan and Ms. Sanchez, and he says -- he says -- I'm sorry. He goes, isn't that up to Jenn, indicating his belief that what he is supposed to do and how he is supposed to conduct himself is subject to the direction of Ms. Graziano rather than of Mr. Pagan.

In that -- and in that same conversation -- oh, in a subsequent conversation on October 21, she semi upbraids

Mr. Pagan for distributing what they call popcorn, which means small pieces that aren't welcomed by their customers in the

same way that better quality marijuana is, and she says that she doesn't want Mr. Pagan to distribute any more popcorn.

She also approves Mr. Pagan's use of Daniel Costanzo

THE COURT: All right.

MS. NORDENBROOK: -- as a source of supply.

THE COURT: I get the point.

MR. LEMOLE: May I be heard on those two issues? The medical report? The psychologist report?

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEMOLE: If not --

THE COURT: Go ahead. Go ahead.

MR. LEMOLE: Judge, the medical -- the psychological report that Ms. Nordenbrook referred to by Doctor Berrill interestingly states, I asked Jennifer if she could connect the psychological problems to her -- to her involvement in the instant offense. Ms. Graziano had a difficult time doing so.

Indeed, it's unusual to me that the -- the interviewing psychologist would ask the patient, so to speak, or the person who labors from the disorder, can you give the connection and that's one of the basis --

THE COURT: Did either of you even look at the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual and consider what we are talking about here? I don't think either of you have the slightest idea --

MS. NORDENBROOK: I did look --

THE COURT: -- what this ailment is. I mean, you are just talking. You are lawyers. You are not doctors.

MR. LEMOLE: I am trying to respond.

THE COURT: I've got the doctor's report. I can evaluate the doctor's report myself, with the assistance of professional sources.

MR. LEMOLE: Judge, just one further comment.

THE COURT: What?

MR. LEMOLE: On the tape that Ms. Nordenbrook referred to, at page six, she referred to a statement, you know, isn't that up to Jenn. Ms. Nordenbrook failed to state the next sentence says, the person says no, it is not up to her. And later on says, all she is good for is trying to get a lawyer for Ramon.

THE COURT: All right. There we go.

All right. Ms. Graziano, is there anything that you would like to say yourself in your own words before I impose sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: I would like -- I would like to -- to say that I am sorry to the Court and to the judge -- to you and to the government, but mostly to my son who is the most important thing that I'm here for today and I don't -- I don't want -- I'm sorry. I shamed him and put him in a situation where I might be taken away from him.

...

I just -- I could stand here and I could honestly say that this is something that I would never have normally done in my right life. I don't know how I got into this life. It was just crazy things and I would never do it again. That's for sure. I can say that with all of my certainty and I'm sorry. I just apologize.

THE COURT: All right. Well, you are right, that the child is -- in a sense has been, but in the future will be, the biggest victim here unless you figure out how to protect him and you've got to get out of this situation, these relationships, which -- of which you have been the primary victim up to now but he's going to be the victim in the future if you don't get both him and yourself into a new way of living.

There are -- the reason I mentioned this, these resources, these women's groups, let's say what we are talking about. There are women's groups out there who can help you put yourself in a frame of mind so that neither you or, I think most important, your son is abused in the future as a result of the unfortunate circumstances, I don't know what they are, that led you to be what you're like in the past and what you're like right now.

This posttraumatic stress syndrome, I don't question the reality of it, but as you probably know better than the lawyers, having had the education you have had, it is something the prisoners had coming out of Korea, just a reliving of the experience for a period of time that doesn't make you depressed. It just puts you out of commission. It is a short -- terrifying short term reaction to things. It doesn't explain why people do or don't function or how they function.

I have to agree with the prosecutor, that during -- that you functioned reasonably well on an every day basis, both in running this drug operation and in the absence of this fellow who fortunately has been locked up.

I think the role adjustment that the lawyers have agreed to is probably a more accurate picture of your role than the one that the Probation Department assigned to you because I believe that what happened here was you took over a drug operation of a probably fairly scary person. You seem -- I mean, I guess you grew up in a fairly scary family and you certainly surrounded yourself with frightening people and you've just got to figure out a way to stand independently of them, to protect -- because these people turn on you and they'll turn on your son.

So one thing I know, as I have said already, is I am going to certainly recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that you receive the best psychotherapy they can give you to deal with this, but I hope while you are in prison you are able through correspondence or otherwise to get in touch with the people

you are going to need once you get out of prison to prepare
you for the day when this -- these rather terrifying
individuals seek you out again, and seek out your son.

In any event, I am going to -- aside from adjusting the offense level to indicate a lower role, I am not going to depart, both because I don't think this very real psychological problem that you have had in fact was the cause of, at least not the psychological cause of doing what you did, and I don't think I can say that reducing your sentence would assist in the treatment of your -- I don't think you've handled your family responsibilities very well up to now. I think there is a possibility for the future, but I don't think it would help your son much.

I think your son will be, as best I can judge it,
taken -- safe and taken care of for the time you are going to
be in prison, and in a way perhaps more safe than he'll be if
you don't -- if you are taking care of him and don't get ahold
of the problems that you have and will bring on him if you
don't figure out how to get out of these abusive
relationships.

So I am going to sentence you to the custody of the Attorney General for a period of twenty-one months, to be followed by a three-year period of supervision.

During the period of supervision, I am going to direct that you follow the directions of the Probation

Department with regard to psychotherapy.

I am going to impose the one-hundred-dollar special assessment that is required by law; and I am not going to impose a fine because financially you are not in a position to pay one.

On application of the government, I will dismiss -this is a single count.

MS. NORDENBROOK: Yes, it is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So you may have a right to appeal this sentence. If you wish to pursue an appeal, you must file a notice of appeal within ten days. If you lack the funds to pay the costs of the appeal, the costs can be waived, and an attorney can be appointed to represent you at no cost to you.

I am going to fix a date in June for your surrender at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons.

I would recommend, actually -- well, I am not going to make a recommendation as to the facility without giving your attorneys an opportunity to look -- consider the options. There are, for example, in the women's detention facility in Lexington, Kentucky, there is, I believe, better medical resources for women than are available here in the New York metropolitan area. But probably if you are able through friends to maintain contact with your child here but not through visits in Lexington, probably would be better to have you here with such medical assistance as you can get.

1 I think the best medical assistance you can -- you 2 will eventually get will be more specialized than anything, 3 unfortunately, the Bureau of Prisons can give you. 4 MR. LEMOLE: Would Your Honor recommend a local -- a 5 prison within the proximity of New York City or Jersey because 6 of the fact that she does want to see her child? THE COURT: All right. If that's what you would like 7 8 to do, I can't say that Lexington is that much better. But 9 you've got a lot of work ahead of you. MR. LEMOLE: Would Your Honor consider recommending 10 11 the shock program? 12 THE COURT: No. Okay. The shock program? Come on. 13 14 MS. NORDENBROOK: Thank you, Your Honor. (Matter concludes.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25