Pages 1 - 44

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Nathanael Cousins, Magistrate Judge

United States of America, ) No. CR11-05730 RS

Plaintiff,

Walter Liew and Christina Liew.

vs.

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, August 24, 2011

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING

## **APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiff:

MELINDA HAAG

United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor San Francisco, California 94102

BY: JOHN HENRY HEMANN

PETER BENJAMIN AXELROD

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

Transcribed By: Stacy Wegner

Transcriber

smwtyping@gmail.com

(859) 539-2802

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

For Defendant Christina Liew:

Ramsey & Ehrlich LLP 803 Hearst Avenue Berkeley, CA 94710

BY: ISMAIL JOMO RAMSEY

ATTORNEY AT LAW

For Defendant Walter Liew:

Manchester, Williams & Seibert

125 S. Market Street

Suite 1100

San Jose, CA 95113

BY: JOHN LYLE WILLIAMS, JR.

ATTORNEY AT LAW

1 Wednesday, August 24, 2011 10:35 a.m. 2 3 TRANSCRIBERS NOTE: Audio transmission malfunctioned periodically throughout the proceeding as indicated in the 4 record. 5 6 THE CLERK: Calling criminal 11-0573, United States 7 versus Walter Liew, United States versus Christina Liew. 8 THE COURT: Appearances, please. 9 MR. AXELROD: Good morning, Your Honor. Pete Axelrod and John Hemann for the United States. 10 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Axelrod and Mr. 11 12 Hemann. 13 MR. HEMANN: Good morning, Your Honor. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Your Honor. John Williams with Mr. Walter Liew who is in custody of the Marshal 15 service and in the courtroom. 16 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Williams. 17 MR. RAMSEY: Good morning, Your Honor. Ismail 18 Ramsey on behalf of Christina Liew, who is present, out of 19 20 custody and being assisted by a Mandarin speaking interpreter. 21 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Ramsey. Ms. Liew. Good morning, Mr. Liew. 22 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning. 24 25 THE COURT: All right. So I'll defer to the parties

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

24

```
as to the order that you want to do things. As I understand,
    we need for Ms. Liew to arraign her on the indictment; is that
    correct?
             MR. RAMSEY: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: And --
             MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, I wondered -- excuse me.
              THE COURT: Yes.
             MR. WILLIAMS: -- if I can interrupt the Court for
    one -- one reason only? One, I have a sureties here, one of
    whom is a United Airlines pilot, George Wong, who is here with
    his wife, and unfortunately he has a flight to check in for at
11
    11:00 o'clock.
              We can't -- I just sent the one -- George, can you
    (inaudible) stand up, please? They're here in the courtroom.
    I just wanted to acknowledge that for the Court. I can
    discuss what it is they could or could not say. They've been
    interviewed by Pretrial Services already.
18
19
              THE COURT: All right. I appreciate you being here,
    as well as the other people who are in attendance, and I
    understand you have somewhere else you need to be. I'm not
    sure that we're going to be able to accommodate that on a
23
    scheduling end of things. We've got --
             MR. WILLIAMS: I appreciate that. I just wanted the
    Court to understand that they were here. That's all.
```

```
THE COURT: Yeah. I understand that you're here and
1
2
    thank you for being here. We've got important things we need
3
    to make sure we get done. If they need to leave, I
    understand, and we'll -- we'll address the surety issues at
4
    the right time.
5
6
              MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
              THE COURT: So I think -- does it make the most
7
8
    sense -- so for -- for Mr. Liew we're going to have -- we've
9
    got a detention hearing which is set today.
10
              MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
              THE COURT: Do the parties -- are you in agreement
11
    or disagreement as to what the proposed --
12
13
              MR. HEMANN: Well, we have to arraign both Mr. and
    Mrs. Liew, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: All right.
15
              MR. HEMANN: We should probably do that first and
16
    then move to the --
17
              THE COURT: Agreed, but just forecasting what we
18
    need to do. We've got detention issues that we -- that are in
19
    dispute for Mr. Liew; is that correct?
20
21
              MR. AXELROD: That's correct, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: And Mrs. Liew, we've already addressed
22
23
    those?
24
              MR. AXELROD: At this point, Your Honor, we've
25
    addressed those.
```

```
THE COURT: All right.
1
              MR. AXELROD: (Inaudible - - audio malfunction.)
2
              THE COURT: Okay. So let's proceed with the
3
    arraignment of Mrs. Liew first, and then we'll turn to Mr.
4
    Liew.
5
6
              Mr. Ramsey, you have a copy already of the
7
    indictment?
8
              MR. RAMSEY: Yes, Your Honor.
9
              THE COURT: And she -- she's previously been alerted
    to the -- to the charges, and do you waive a more detailed
10
    reading of them?
11
12
              MR. RAMSEY: Yes, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: And do -- are you ready to enter a not
14
    guilty plea?
15
              MR. RAMSEY: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. So a not guilty plea will be
16
    entered.
17
              MR. AXELROD: And I just want to just -- I may have
18
    missed this, but I know this is a new interpreter, and I want
19
20
    to make sure that he's been sworn.
21
              THE CLERK: Yes, he has.
22
              MR. AXELROD: Okay. Thank you.
              THE COURT: The record will reflect he has been
23
    sworn in. All right.
24
25
              Anything else we need -- need to do for Mrs. Liew?
```

```
1
              MR. HEMANN: I think, Your Honor, on the indictment
    we need to advise her of the charges and the maximum
2
3
    penalties.
              THE COURT: Okay. I thought we'd already advised
4
    her of the --
5
6
              MR. HEMANN: We did that on the complaint.
7
    probably need to do it on the indictment (Inaudible - - due to
8
    simultaneous colloquy.)
9
              THE COURT: My mistake. I -- I -- I confused the
    two in my brain.
10
              So I'll ask whichever of you would like to take the
11
    role to -- to summarize the charges in the indictment and to
12
13
    advise Mrs. Liew of the maximum penalties provided by law.
              MR. HEMANN: And -- and would you like me to do both
14
15
    Mr. and Mrs. Liew at the same, Your Honor?
              THE COURT: If -- if that's efficient justice,
16
17
    please do.
              MR. HEMANN: Your Honor, Mr. and Mrs. Liew are
18
    charged in a four-count indictment alleging witness tampering
19
    and making false statements.
20
              Mr. Liew is charged in counts one and three -- one,
21
22
    three and four.
23
              Mrs. Liew is charged in counts two and four -- two,
    three and four.
24
25
              Counts one and two of the indictment charge witness
```

```
tampering, a violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 1512(b)(1).
1
2
              The maximum penalty for those charges are 20 years
3
    imprisonment, three years in supervised release, a $250,000
    fine, and $100 special assessment.
4
              Both Walter and Christina Liew are charged in count
5
6
    three of the indictment for violation of 18 U.S.C. Section
7
    1512(k), which is conspiracy to tamper with witnesses and
8
    evidence.
9
              The maximum penalty for that charge is 20 years
    imprisonment, a three-year term of supervised release, a
10
    $250,000 fine and a $100 special assessment.
11
              And then in count four, both Walter and Christina
12
13
    Liew are charged with violating 18 U.S.C. Section 1001(a)(2),
    making false statements in a manner within the jurisdiction of
14
15
    the executive branch.
              The maximum penalty for that charge is five years
16
    imprisonment, three years of supervised release, a $250,000
17
    fine and $100 special assessment.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Williams, do you have a
19
    copy of the indictment?
20
21
              MR. WILLIAMS: I have received that, Your Honor.
22
    Thank you.
23
              THE COURT: And do you waive a more detailed
24
    reading?
25
              MR. WILLIAMS:
                             I do.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: And are you ready enter a plea on behalf
2
    of Mr. Liew?
              MR. WILLIAMS: (Inaudible) not guilty as well, Your
3
4
    Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And Mr. Ramsey,
5
6
    I think I got ahead of myself before, but have you received a
7
    copy of the indictment?
8
              MR. RAMSEY: Yes, Your Honor.
9
              THE COURT: And Mrs. Liew, do you understand the
    charges?
10
              THE DEFENDANT CHRISTINA LIEW (through interpreter):
11
    I understand.
12
              THE COURT: All right. And I've entered a not
13
14
    guilty plea to her on those charges. All right.
15
              As to Mrs. Liew, what's the Government's position of
    her continued release or detention?
16
              MR. HEMANN: At this point in time, Your Honor,
17
    we're comfortable with the terms that are -- that she was
18
    released on the complaint.
19
20
              THE COURT: All right. So we'll continue the
    release conditions for Mrs. Liew.
21
22
              Mrs. Liew, we previously had a hearing where we
23
    determined the conditions of your release. Those conditions
    will continue for you. All right.
24
25
              Anything else we need to do as to -- to Mrs. Liew's
```

```
1
    part of the case? We need to set a date.
2
              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
              MR. RAMSEY: Yeah. If we could set the date for --
3
    with her after we have the detention hearing, I think that
4
    would be appropriate.
5
              THE COURT: All right. Well --
6
7
              MR. RAMSEY: The are custom issues as to (Inaudible
8
    - - audio malfunction.)
9
              THE COURT: All right. Well, she -- she then can --
    can sit down or can wait while we do the detention issues if -
10
    - and you as well, Mr. Ramsey, unless there's anything you'd
11
    like to address now?
12
13
              MR. RAMSEY: No, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: All right. Then turning to the
15
    detention issues for Mr. Liew, have the parties received a
    copy of the prebail report, which has both an addendum and an
16
    initial report?
17
              MR. AXELROD: Yes, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: Mr. Williams.
19
20
              MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
21
              THE COURT: And turning to you, Mr. Axelrod, first,
22
    what is your position on a release or detention of the
    Defendant?
23
24
              MR. AXELROD: Well, the Government moves for
25
    detention, Your Honor, and -- and I would say this. Having
```

reviewed the two reports from Pretrial Services, I seemingly agree with their reasoning and their basis for their assessment with the issues of flight risk and he should be detained.

What I'd like to do is spend a little bit of time amplifying on some of the issues that were raised in the -- the bail studies.

First of all, this -- this case right now relates to witness tampering and false statement in conjunction with theft of trade secrets.

There's a civil case filed by the DuPont Company against Mr. Liew and his company, and it's important for the Court to understand -- and -- and that's where we are right now. We are, obviously, actively investigating the trade secret aspect of this, and that's important for a number of reasons.

First is the technology that we're talking about is titanium dioxide manufacturing. It's -- it's a very complex technology. It's a very expensive technology. To get a plant of the type that Mr. Liew and his company were working on built is on the order of three, 400 million dollars.

THE COURT: Now, I'll disclose I've been at a number of titanium dioxide manufacturing plants, so I'm familiar with the --

MR. AXELROD: Okay.

```
THE COURT: -- with the technology.
1
              MR. AXELROD: That -- that's a -- that's a
2
3
    surprising disclosure.
              THE COURT: It's not going to make me -- you know,
4
    it's not going to change how I feel on this issue but --
5
6
              MR. AXELROD: Right.
7
              THE COURT: -- I'm very familiar with the
8
    technology.
9
              MR. AXELROD: Well, very well then. Then let me
    move on. The point is this is -- this is a big dollar item
10
    and it's a complicated item and -- and in consequence, there
11
    would be a motive to flee because the charges -- I mean, these
12
13
    charges are serious. Additional charges, even where the
    guidelines were would be very serious, but let me really focus
14
15
    on the flight risk posed by his substantial ties abroad and
16
    really the ties here in the community.
              As you know, it's basically his business, whether
17
    it's in his current iteration as USAPTI or its former
18
    iterations, is working on projects to -- selling these DuPont
19
    technologies to build titanium dioxide facilities in China.
20
21
              And there's at least two large projects. One is in
22
           It's a 30,000-metric-ton facility. And now there's a
23
    100,000-ton facility for the Pangang Group. The contract
    alone for the Pangang Group is 17 million dollars,
24
25
              So what you've got, and -- and this is reflected in
```

the -- the bail study -- this is somebody who's constantly traveling overseas. Understandable, considering he's got at least two major projects in China, and as far as we're aware, we're not aware of any domestic activity that -- that that business engages in.

So what you've got is a situation where there's substantial business ties to China, substantial travel to China and -- and an asset picture that is extremely complicated. And -- and, you know, to be candid, it's an asset picture that we're still working through,

But those -- the asset picture indicates, for starters, that Mr. Liew, his wife, the codefendant, and their various businesses have over 50 bank accounts. And obviously, all that is not reflected in this bail study, but there are substantial foreign -- the nexus is to some of the activity.

I'll just give you one example. On two of the projects that the PTI is involved in, there are letters of credit, so there's letters of credit from banks in China that USAPTI and Mr. Liew have been able to draw on here. One letter, in fact, for over 50 million dollars. I believe there's over three million dollars remaining on that letter of credit. That's on one project.

On another project there's a over two-million-dollar letter of credit, meaning that he has the ability to draw on these funds that are in China and direct where they go to,

okay, and that is a real concern.

Beyond that, there's -- what I can say about the banking activity, the financial activity, we've seen so far is it involves, you know, millions of dollars that are -- are moving around or have been in various accounts at various points in time.

I haven't -- I'm not in a position to tell you where it's all ended up, but that fact alone raises substantial concerns, particularly when you think about the fact that they've got all this business overseas. They've -- they're, obviously, originally from overseas, and they don't own any property here.

Now, they acknowledge that they're buying property in Singapore. We believe they also have a property in Lou Ming, China. So it -- these kinds of things, given the sort of the position of this case, raise enormous concerns about flight risk.

And it's frankly surprising, giving -- given the -the amount of money that's involved in these contracts and
their business activities that -- that there is no property
here in the United States. There's all these ties -- and
other than, you know, the minor child, there's not family, so
these are some of the concerns that I wanted to share with the
Court.

THE COURT: All right. I -- I will give you, Mr.

Williams, a full chance to -- to respond and address these issues.

Mr. Axelrod, as you're listening to -- to him, two kind of follow-up questions I have for you are, are there conditions that could address those -- those risk of flight?

And the propose sureties from the defense, which we'll hear more about what they're proposing, if you can comment when -- on reply as to the appropriateness of those sureties to address the risk of flight.

So Mr. Williams, what's your position?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, thank you, Your Honor. Let me start with the fact that my client is well aware of the nature of the charges, not just these charges, but the ongoing investigations before he was arrested.

There was a lawsuit filed that -- I think Mr.

Axelrod has eluded to that -- back in April, which laid out the allegations relating to the theft of trade secret.

There was more than a month ago in July a search warrant executed at Mr. Liew's residence and his business, as well as search warrants executed that were directed at several of his customers from Mainland China that were here at the time.

Mr. Liew sought counsel. Counsel had what I would characterize as discussions with the Government. The day before he was arrested, Mr. Liew was physically in this

building with his wife, and at the time we offered selfsurrender him, and that was declined.

And at that moment, I think the Court can reasonably infer, that Mr. Liew knew well what was about to happen and what the general parameters of the allegations were going to be on this case. So to address the issue of flight, I think you should start with that. That's a fact. That's a fact.

His wife has been released. She's here. She's been here since she was released. They have a ten year-old minor son Michael, Michael who's here in the courtroom.

He does have significant ties to the community. The -- he's been a citizen for over 20 years. He's lived in the Bay Area almost all of that time.

True, he doesn't own a house now, but he and Christina did own a house here in this -- in this area within the last several years.

We have proposed a number of sureties to the Court, and I'll talk about those in just a moment, but let me back to some of the allegations that are suggested by Mr. Axelrod in this matter.

This is a trade secret case, and I don't know how much experience the Court has had with these. I've had a fair amount over the years, and it's been my conclusion in these cases that it is really a black and white situation.

And to the extent that it is being suggested that

the reason -- that the ability of the Chinese corporations to build these plants is because Mr. Liew has provided them with technology that they otherwise could not have reached or that would make it impossible for them to build these things is simply incorrect.

For example, the 30,000-ton project that's been referred to was up and running. This is really an expansion of an existing plant. These plants exist in China. They are competitive, whether we like that or not.

And the issue of whether or not a trade secret has been taken and utilized, those are always interesting issues, but to suggest that the reason that this is ongoing is because of that theft, I think, is incorrect.

It's true, he does a lot of business in China. I don't deny that.

It's true that he has property in Singapore and property and bank accounts that have been disclosed to Pretrial Services.

However, the issue of whether or not there's another six million dollars that could be drawn on by Mr. Liew as a result of these letters of credit, the Court should consider two factors.

Number one, his customers were here, and they were probably not terribly enthused to their searched -- their hotels searched by the FBI and their passports seized. The

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

viability of the business and the continuing business environment may not be all that -- that official to Mr. Liew. Secondarily, that's an easy issue to address. That's an easy issue to address in terms of the Court making orders, the Government making whatever reasonable orders they want to make that we're obviously going to comply with. He's not going to draw on that six million dollars if the Court tells him he can't do it. In terms of the allegations about money moving, his 50 bank accounts -- I mean, I've -- I've been provided be no information about that. I don't know what to say about that. I -- I don't know where the money moves or doesn't move. He has a business entity. He has had other business entities in the past. He's dealing with Chinese business entities. More than that, I cannot say. Well, let me address, if I may, go to the issue of the sureties. Your Honor, I think for too many years we have all, myself included, been so caught up in the real estate market that we think that's there's only one way to do this, and that's to put up property values up. And that's because until, what, 2008, everybody had \$200,000 equity in the house, right? That's not the case anymore. That's not the case anymore.

And what we propose to the Court to -- to evidence

the fact that he has deep ties to this community are nine

separate sureties.

And I'm sorry, Your Honor, I'm going to provide -this is the list we sent to these folks. This is a list, Your
Honor, that I provided to the Government and to Pretrial
Services, and let me apologize publicly for not getting it to
them until 3:00 o'clock yesterday. I -- I -- that was
unfortunate. I wish I'd been -- give it to them earlier.

But what it represents, Your Honor, is a list of sureties that we're proposing to the Court. Now, some of these folks have been spoken to by Pretrial Services. Others have not because of the lateness in the hour in which we delivered it.

The dollar numbers may not look impressive to the Court, in the sense that we're used to two or three hundred thousand dollars in property bonds in the past, but I think that it is something that the Court should take into consideration because these nine people represent really nine different kinds of people, if you will.

There's a family member, his stepdaughter Joanna, who's present in the courtroom, that is here. There are neighbors, one of whom we to say good-bye to. That's the airline pilot, Mr. Wong, but there also are other neighbors here. There are friends, and there's a classmate from -- from college, Mr. Hu Chang (phonetic). Each of these people represent a different phase, if you will, of Mr. Walter Liew's

life in connection with this country.

Now, when you look at the amounts of money that are being pledged by Joanna, his stepdaughter, and by Ema Lee (phonetic), two thousand dollars, I know that's not the sort of numbers we normally throw around here in the district Court, but let me tell you why it's significant.

Neither of those have very much money, and that commitment of two thousand dollars from each of them represents a significant commitment of -- of moneys that are available to them.

Ema Lee, for example, is -- is a teacher at Lincoln High School. She's a single mom. That's a lot of money to her. The two thousand dollars that Joanna is talking about pledging represents a significant portion of the money that she's accumulated over the years.

The -- the individuals -- some of the other individuals that we're talking about here, Mr. Albert Son (phonetic), who is not present, and Mr. Feng Shu (phonetic) and his wife Dana Woo, they're not here today. They could be here next week.

Mr. Feng Shu actually works on the east coast. He lost a job here and had to go to the east coast and find a job. He's prepared to fly back here next week, if the Court is willing to entertain his petition to -- to be a surety, fly back here and post it.

Mr. Albert Son, a classmate of Walter's from college, is presently in Taiwan. He's prepared to get on an airplane next week and fly over here, so that he can also post a bond on behalf of his long-time friend.

And so while the numbers may not be overwhelming,

Your Honor, the kinds of people that we're offering are. And

I think that the commitment that they're showing, that they

are showing by being here today, and that they are prepared to

show in the future by coming from distant places in order to

pledge property on his -- on his behalf is -- is a significant
factor.

He's prepared to sort of post a two million dollar unsecured bond secured by 200 thousand dollars in cash. And perhaps most importantly, we're obviously willing to have him supervised on electronic monitoring, as his wife is presently, or if the Court is not comfortable with that because of the arguments the Government has made here, we're happy to have him in a halfway house.

This is going to be a case that's going to linger, unfortunately, in the court. It's a case that's going to involve boxes and boxes and boxes of documents. It is extremely difficult for him to properly defend him in a custodial situation.

And I recognize that isn't a reason to let him out, but it's a factor that I think the Court can consider when you

```
1
    look at what we're presenting as -- as guarantees to the
    Government and to the Court. And I'm prepared to answer any
2
3
    other questions the Court might have about the sureties.
              THE COURT: Very well. So to make sure I understand
4
    what you're proposing, it's a release on a two million dollar
5
6
    unsecured bond with 200 thousand dollars secured with the
7
    sureties here estimated on this document --
8
              MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct.
9
              THE COURT: -- being the secured and unsecured and -
    - and it sounds like some of them are not here --
10
              MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. The ones that are here --
11
              THE COURT: -- today?
12
13
              MR. WILLIAMS: George and Janet Wong, number two,
    had to leave. Joanna Liew, Walter's stepdaughter, is here.
14
15
    Number three, Mr. Shu and Dana Woo are not here. As I
16
    indicated, he's prepared to fly back from the east coast next
    week.
17
              Ema Lee is a teacher, and she, unfortunately because
18
    she's teaching, ideally would like to come down sometime after
19
    4:00 o'clock because she teaches until after three, but if
20
21
    not, we can probably arrange something next week with her
22
    also.
23
              Mr. Feng, who's an attorney, could not be here
    today, but he is available later this week or next week.
24
25
              Jenny Dwong (phonetic) is present in the courtroom.
```

1 Jenny is right here? Yeah, Jenny is here. 2 Steve Reese (phonetic) and Regina May (phonetic) are 3 here also. They're here. Albert Son is the gentleman that I indicated is in 4 Taiwan but prepared to fly back next week. And lastly Mr. Hu 5 6 Chang is here. Thank you, Mr. Chang. 7 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Chang. All right. For 8 those of you who are here, I appreciate you being here. 9 important for you to understand this is not a proceeding to determine the guilt or innocence of Mr. Liew. 10 It's a hearing to determine whether there's --11 whether he should be detained or released while the case is 12 13 pending. And it's very important to have you here to -whatever the Court decides in evaluating whether there are 14 conditions that would be sufficient to guarantee that Mr. Liew 15 16 will make future court appearances in this case. Now, Mr. Williams, before I turn it back to Mr. 17 18 Axelrod to reply, you had mentioned that it was late yesterday before you got all the surety information to Pretrial 19 Services. 20 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, and I apologize to both 21 22 Pretrial Services and the Government. 23 THE COURT: So one thing, while Mr. Axelrod is speaking, I want you to think about is whether you would like 24

a chance for them to do further inquiry, even today with these

```
1
    sureties.
              MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I think Pretrial -- I'm sorry,
2
3
    Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Yeah.
4
              MR. WILLIAMS: Pretrial Services has spoken to, I
5
6
    think, three of the five that are present -- that were going
7
    to be present today.
8
              They spoke to Mr. Walter -- I'm sorry, to Mr. George
9
    Wong who has had to leave. They haven't spoken to the
    stepdaughter, and they haven't spoken to Jenny Dwong, but
10
    they're both here.
11
              THE COURT: All right. So one thing I want you to
12
13
    think about -- I don't know that that would change their
    recommendation. They have -- they have recommended that your
14
    client be detained in this case.
15
16
              One option for you is to continue this and -- and
    submit further information to them and see if that changes
17
    their recommendation. I don't know that it would, but I
18
    wanted to --
19
20
              MR. WILLIAMS: I appreciate that, Your Honor. Now,
    it --
21
22
              THE COURT: -- have -- have you consider that as an
23
    -- as an option.
24
              MR. WILLIAMS: It had been my hope here to go on
25
    vacation next week, but --
```

1 THE COURT: Oh, I --MR. WILLIAMS: -- if the Court would be willing to 2 3 let this go over to Friday, that would give us the ample time, I think --4 THE COURT: Yeah, and I know that they're all --5 6 many of them are here today. And -- and it -- and it's 7 inconvenient for them to have to return, but I just wanted to 8 have you consider that as one -- one possibility. 9 MR. WILLIAMS: Will -- I will indeed, thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Axelrod, you've heard their -- the 10 position of the defense and the proffered sureties and release 11 conditions. What's your response? 12 13 MR. AXELROD: Thank you, Your Honor. Well, I -- my response is -- it is -- this is not a situation where we have 14 (inaudible) fashioned a set of conditions that will work. 15 16 There's a couple things I want to talk that address that. And -- and I want to say at the outset, you know, I 17 raised the issue of the -- all of the bank accounts, and the 18 fact that the Pretrial Services report includes a portion of 19 the financial activity. And the response was, you know, that 20 21 Mr. Williams doesn't know what to say about it. 22 Well, actually his client does and can, and I think that the absence of that information, absence of a discussion 23 of that is disconcerting. 24 25 We also raised the issue of their ownership of

property in China. That wasn't addressed.

And -- and I want to point out and I -- that the connections to China and the Chinese Government is actually a lot more involved than that. Let me explain what I mean by that.

In the first instance, we've obviously been talking to a number of witnesses in this case. One of them is a gentleman named Tim Spitler, who was a former employee of DuPont, who worked with Mr. and Mrs. Liew. And what he explained was that Mr. Liew told him that his wife, the codefendant, Christina Liew, is the niece of the governor of a large province in China, and they're essentially connected and that's how he gets business over there.

That -- that is not the only person who's made some statement to that effect because we've also spoken to the Chinese customer that Mr. Williams alluded to who was here.

One of those individuals is gentleman named Juong Chi (phonetic)

And according to Mr. Chi, Mr. Liew told him that his wife -- excuse me -- not -- I believe it's -- what he was told was that Mrs. Liew's father was a high ranking Chinese official.

And so -- and -- and we -- in the course of going through the materials that we've obtained in the search warrant, we've also found, you know, documents that lend

credence to this, is phone lists with page after page of contacts with -- of Chinese officials with home numbers and office numbers, and so the connections to China are deep. And I don't think that those issues have been addressed by the defense, and I think they're quite serious.

And I think that -- I certainly appreciate that there are a number of people here in support of Mr. Liew and that are willing to make the -- pledge certain assets, but you know, the picture here is in the tens of millions of dollars.

And -- and one of the things that Mr. Spitler told us was that back in about 2005 or 2006 Mr. Liew told him "Hey, we've got 50 million dollars in the bank." I don't -- I can't verify that right now, but when I look at the rest of it, and it raises questions.

And then the -- the -- that -- and frankly, I just - given his ties to China, given his travel to China, given
the fact that his businesses are in China, I don't see any way
that that can be addressed.

Even if it would -- even if it could be, the concern that I've got with the surety proposal is -- this is a de minimis amount, given the scope of that activities that we're talking about.

And if the Court were ever -- if it were inclined to go further, I would -- I think I would want to make inquires, given the underlying witness tampering involved in it. I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

16

19

22

```
mean, you know, remember, on the civil case they've already --
    they've out -- you know, according to the indictment, entered
    a hearing with witnesses, so I would really want to make sure,
    if the Court is inclined to go that way, what the arrangements
    are in -- in -- between them. But in short, that's -- that's
    my response.
              THE COURT: But you don't have any -- you don't have
    any evidence of -- of surety tampering at this time?
              MR. AXELROD: No. No, Your Honor, and I'm not
    making that allegation.
              THE COURT: What -- what is your feelings about the
11
    appropriateness of release on electronic monitoring? Why --
12
    why couldn't electronic monitoring address the concerns raised
    in the Pretrial Services report about risk of flight?
14
15
              MR. AXELROD: Because what you have at that point --
    and I think at that -- if the Court were inclined to go that
    way, I think that would -- we would want to revisit Mrs.
17
    Liew's release conditions, and -- and -- and let me explain
18
    why.
20
              THE COURT: Uh-huh.
              MR. AXELROD: I think if both of them are out on
21
    electronic monitoring gives them ample opportunity -- and I
23
    can actually articulate now concerns about Mrs. Liew and her
    ability to evade surveillance and her counter surveillance
25
    techniques and what's been going on in the last, you know,
```

month or two as this has been playing out.

So my concern about his release at all is that once you put him out, it doesn't take much to cut that thing off and get out of dodge.

And she has demonstrated the ability over this past period of time to engage in very erratic driving behavior, take counter surveillance measures, to pull over on the side of the road, to cut across lanes of traffic, to do the kinds of things that one, you know, would allow her to -- to lose people that, you know, may be pursuing her, but it also creates a situation where there is a real danger that they would be successful in leaving and leaving this country and going back to the place where they have property, connections and business relationships, and possibly a lot of assets.

So -- and they -- they -- you know, I don't think that having them both out -- I think that creates an entirely different picture that is a much more risky situation than we're in right now.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Williams, there are a few things that Mr. Axelrod said that you had not addressed whether volitional or not, and I want to give you a chance to

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- to respond on those.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Liew doesn't own any property in

```
1
    China. I don't know anything about that. Okay. It's very
    difficult when you come to these hearings and you're here for
2
    the first time, "Oh, he owns a house in China." Well, I know
3
    he does. Okay.
4
              But he's got 50 bank accounts? I haven't seen them.
5
6
    Give me a list of them and we can talk about them.
7
    know that he has -- I -- I still think -- don't know that
8
    that's the case. I don't want to cast dispersions on what Mr.
9
    Axelrod has said, but I haven't seen anything like that.
              He disclosed to the -- the Pretrial Services the
10
    bank accounts that I'm aware of. If there are 46 more, you
11
    know, let me see them. Let's talk about them.
12
13
              What was the other issue? The other issue had to do
    with his wife's father is a high ranking official. I don't
14
15
    think that's correct either.
16
              You know, people in trouble say all sorts of
    interesting things. They got 50 -- you know, he told me he
17
    had 50 million dollars in the bank and so on and so forth.
18
    Well, how are you going to respond? We're not going to
19
    respond. He doesn't have 50 million dollars in the bank, as
20
    far as I know, either than Mr. Axelrod thinks he has 50
21
22
    million dollars in the bank.
              If the -- if -- if -- what is valid about the
23
    position the Government has taken is he's got property
24
25
    overseas, he's got money overseas and he travels a lot.
```

```
1
    accept all that. That's all correct. I don't contest any of
2
    that, but the point is you can address those issues.
3
              And if the Court is not comfortable -- if Mr.
    Axelrod is saying, "Look, if you've got both of them out,"
4
    despite the fact that neither of them have passports and they
5
6
    got a ten year-old minor child that doesn't have a passport
7
    either -- the FBI has got them all -- if that is not adequate
8
    security for the Court and if my sureties aren't enough
9
    either, put him in a halfway house.
              If you don't want them both out on electronic
10
    monitoring, put him in a halfway house. That's fine. That's
11
    fine too. I think that's a workable solution.
12
13
              MR. AXELROD: Can I address --
              THE COURT: Yes.
14
              MR. AXELROD: -- two points? First of all, on the
15
16
    issue of whether Mr. Liew owns property in China, that is an -
    - that's an insufficient answer because he's married.
17
    are two people who are working this business together.
18
    appears that, you know, the financial activities she's heavily
19
    involved in.
20
              So it is -- to suggest, "Well, hey, he doesn't own
21
22
    the property," I don't think that addresses the question at
    all because if she does, or if they've got some other
23
    arrangement, that -- and I'm not -- I'm not saying he's --
24
```

what he's stating is factually inaccurate. I don't have --

have enough information to respond, but it's broader than that.

And I think that the halfway house is also unworkable because, as the Court knows, the controls on somebody in a halfway house are quite different than with custodial controls. And somebody can walk out the door of the halfway house, and they might never be seen again and it does happen, and in this case where there's somewhere to go with business and family ties, that's a real concern.

MS. WALTON: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. WALTON: I might add -- LaDreena Walton for Pretrial Services, for the record. We actually don't have availability for the halfway house. Due to limited funding, we're not able to house anyone there until after October 1st is what we've been informed.

THE COURT: And I -- I am aware of that. You undoubtedly were not aware of that. That's something for -- for you to consider. Obviously, your position is that you're requesting release on electronic monitoring?

MR. WILLIAMS: It is, and Mr. --

THE COURT: No. I -- I -- I understand the -- the arguments on the -- having them both be released. I don't need any more information on that component at this time, unless you think it's needed.

One issue that came up from both ends was the issue of the financial assets in -- in China, and there are certain -- there's certain information in the Pretrial Services report. I don't know if that was based -- my sense is it came from information provided both by the defense and from the Government.

If there is more information that either party thinks that Pretrial Services should consider and the Court should consider, and anyone thinks that would change the Court's analysis, then, of course, you're welcome to submit that to Pretrial Services and the Court, and of course, it should be disclosed to the other side.

## UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Understood.

THE COURT: I -- I feel like I have sufficient information to address the issues, but if either party, you know, does come upon more evidence in the future that makes -- that you think would change the analysis, that can be exchanged with each other and -- and provided to the Court and Pretrial Services.

I am -- at this point, I have no information beyond what's been presented in court, what has come from the Pretrial Services report. It sounds like both parties might have potentially more information they discover as the investigation continues, both the Government's investigation and your own analysis of what's been provided by the

1 Government and what you might out internally that could change the Court's analysis as the case goes on. 2 3 But as we stand here right now, is there any further information that either party wants to present? 4 5 MR. AXELROD: No, Your Honor. MR. WILLIAMS: I have none as well. 6 7 MR. RAMSEY: Your Honor? 8 THE COURT: Mr. Ramsey. 9 MR. RAMSEY: I just wanted to address briefly one issue of the question of whether there is a property that is 10 owned in China. Just for the Court's information, Mrs. Liew 11 does own a hundred thousand dollar home in -- or house in --12 13 in China. THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. 14 MR. RAMSEY: The only other thing -- one other issue 15 16 that I may just address briefly is the allegations of counter surveillance methods, etcetera, employed supposedly by my 17 client. 18 When the DuPont civil case was filed, DuPont hired 19

When the DuPont civil case was filed, DuPont hired several private investigators who were extremely aggressive in terms of pursuing the Liews, in terms of -- in terms of they talk to them, in terms of they talked to employees, former employees, families of former employees, and having (inaudible) who were following Mrs. Liew, along with when she was with her ten year-old son. You know, the aggressiveness

20

21

22

23

24

of the investigator obviously caused her concern. 1 2 She saw that people were following her. She 3 believed that they were following her. She had no idea who they were. Quite frankly, they were creating a dangerous 4 situation at a time when they were -- I believe were 5 6 represented by counsel, were -- were dealing with the case directly. And their -- they were represented parties. They 7 8 could have been contacted through their lawyers. 9 And there were times where she did not know who was following her, and she pulled over on the side of the road or 10 took some actions to just -- to determine whether someone 11 actually someone was following her, but that was far from 12 13 counter surveillance methods. That was just a matter of her trying to provide for the -- her own safety and the safety of 14 her child. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Ramsey. I 16 don't -- I don't think I need to take any further action as to 17 18 that component of the presentation. Anything else further from the parties? 19 20 MR. WILLIAMS: No, Your Honor. Thank you. Submitted. 21 22 THE COURT: All right. I think this is a close 23 case. It's one where there are serious charges, a Defendant who does not have a prior criminal record. 24

And it's not a danger to the community question.

It's a question of whether there are conditions or a combination of conditions that would assess -- would address the risk of flight, and that's where the Court's focus is on.

On the -- on the record before me I'm going to adopt the recommendation of Pretrial Services and order the Defendant detained pending the charges in the case.

Now, I emphasize this on the record before me because there has been some surety information that was presented late yesterday, and some sureties that have been proffered that are not here today. And it's possible that the -- with -- with additional investigation from the parties and additional information that the Court would revisit that issue with more information.

But on the record before me, it's the property and ties to China, the assertions from the Government supported by the charges in the case of risk of flight to China or elsewhere in Asia.

The fact that the defendant's wife is released -- and I'm not taking a significant factor to the allegations that she has tried to evade supervision in some way, but the fact that she is released, I think, adds to the danger of risk of flight.

Now, in mitigation, there are many sureties who are here in the courtroom and who have been proffered to -- who could be in the courtroom, and those are strong mitigating

```
1
    factors, and in a different circumstance that would be a
    sufficient security, I think, to assure the appearance of the
2
3
    Defendant in Court.
              But here, I think it's a very close question, but in
4
    balance, I think that the concerns raised by the Government
5
6
    and found by Pretrial Services for a risk of flight outweigh
7
    the mitigating factors, and on that basis I will order him
8
    detained.
9
              Now, Mr. Liew, you have a right to appeal this
    decision, and you can seek review by the District Court Judge.
10
    That's Judge Breyer.
11
12
              MR. HEMANN: (Inaudible) Judge Seeborg.
13
              THE COURT: Judge Seeborg?
14
              MR. HEMANN: The case --
              THE COURT: Oh, because it's been assigned to Judge
15
    Seeborg?
16
              MR. HEMANN: Yes.
17
              THE COURT: I -- I appreciate that. Thank you. All
18
    right. You still have a right to appeal, but it's to the
19
20
    District Court Judge who's currently assigned, and that's
    Judge Seeborg.
21
22
              Thank you, Mr. Hemann, for -- for correcting me.
              MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, I wonder if the Court
23
    would --
24
25
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
```

```
1
              MR. WILLIAMS: Does the Court have a calendar this
2
    Friday?
              THE COURT: I do, and if you'd like to -- to return
3
    then for further presentation, I -- I will entertain that.
4
5
              MR. WILLIAMS: I will do that, but I would just --
6
    if the Court is willing to let me do that. And what I would
7
    do is have those remaining sureties contact Ms. Walton at the
8
    Pretrial Services so that that might be incorporated into the
9
    report.
              And if there is further information about, for
10
    example, bank accounts we can provide the Court, we would
11
12
    attempt to do that also.
              THE COURT: Mr. Axelrod, is that scheduling
13
14
    available to you?
              MR. AXELROD: This Friday --
15
              THE COURT: Yes.
16
              MR. AXELROD: -- is just fine, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: All right. So that's what we will do.
18
    We will -- the order of the Court will be that the Defendant
19
    will be remanded to the custody of the U.S. Marshals.
20
21
              And Mr. Axelrod, I'm going to ask you to prepare an
22
    order setting forth the risk of flight and the factors
23
    identified in the Pretrial Services report and by you today --
              MR. AXELROD: Understood.
24
25
              THE COURT: -- reflecting the Court's order.
                                                             And
```

```
1
    then if the parties want to assess the appealability to the
2
    District Court, you can consider that as well after Friday.
              MR. AXELROD: And I just want to add in -- we'll
3
    have these further proceedings on Friday. We may submit
4
    additional information, and if we do, we'll probably be ask
5
6
    that it sealed, so we'll submit all the appropriate paperwork
7
    to give (inaudible) information that will (Inaudible - - audio
8
    malfunction.)
9
              THE COURT: And when you say sealed, sealed and
    produced to the defense or --
10
              MR. AXELROD: Of course. Yes, absolutely. Yes.
11
              THE COURT: All right.
12
13
              MR. AXELROD: Sealed from the public record.
14
              THE COURT: Very well. That motion to seal is
15
    conditionally granted, well, as long as it's been shared with
16
    the defense. And is that something Pretrial Services can
    review as well?
17
              MR. AXELROD: Yes.
18
              THE COURT: All right. The Court will entertain any
19
    further submissions from either party that might issue on the
20
    release or detention.
21
22
              And it will be the order of the Court that the
    Defendant is detained based on the -- and -- and I adopt the
23
    findings of the Pretrial Services reports.
24
25
              MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Your Honor. Appreciate
```

1 it. THE COURT: Do we need to set a date before Judge 2 3 Seeborg? MR. WILLIAMS: Well, there is one other issue that 4 we do need to discuss with the Court. 5 6 THE COURT: Yeah. 7 MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, both Mr. Ramsey and I 8 have made general appearances on the complaint. Since that 9 time, we've been informed that there may be issues relating to his forfeiture on the case, and those issues might affect our 10 ability to represent our clients in this matter. 11 12 I don't think that we're at a point yet where we can 13 make a representation to the Court what those issues really are, but I'm not prepared to make a general appearance on this 14 15 indictment because of that reason. MR. RAMSEY: The same, Your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. And how do you propose that we address that procedurally beyond -- beyond noting it? And are 18 you forecasting that something is going to occur in the 19 future? Is there some remedy you're asking for now? 20 21 MR. HEMANN: It's -- with all due respect to counsel 22 and the issue, which I -- is -- is a valid one, I -- the 23 Government will at least have a position on -- on this. I think that the issue will be forced at the first 24 25 appearance in the District Court, and we will be -- the case

is assigned to Judge Seeborg. The underlying civil case that the Grand Jury found was instructive is Judge White's case.

So we will be filing in those related cases and we'll leave up to Judge White whether he takes it or not, but the issue will probably be raised appropriately as to the general appearance or special appearance when -- when we get to the district Court. I don't know that we need to resolve it before Your Honor until that -- until we get to District Court.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, that's agreeable to me, Your

Honor, as long as it's clearly understood that if there are

any forfeitures, it might affect our ability to proceed in the

matter and I don't want (Inaudible - - audio malfunction.)

THE COURT: All right. Well, the Government has heard -- has -- has heard your notice. I take notice of it as well. I think it's appropriate to remind both Mr. and Mrs. Liew that they do have a right to an attorney at all stages.

And so if it turned out that they could not afford an attorney, one would be provided to them at no cost to them and at taxpayer expense, so if the case gets to a point where they could not afford counsel and need to seek appointment of counsel, they need to alert the Court that they're seeking that and, of course, we'll take action at that time.

MR. WILLIAMS: Could we go over to the week of the 12th of September then for initial appearance. Is that

```
1
    agreeable?
2
              THE COURT: Is that agreeable to the Government?
              MR. HEMANN: That -- that -- that -- that's fine
3
    with us, Your Honor. We've, obviously, like to exclude time
4
    between now and the date that is set before Judge Seeborg on
5
6
    the basis of effective preparation of competent new counsel.
7
              THE COURT: All right. And has there been discovery
8
    produced to the defense to support that?
9
              MR. HEMANN: Our intention was to provide discovery
    between now and the date of -- of the initial appearance
10
    before the District Court. We will be doing that.
11
12
              THE COURT: All right. And is Judge Seeborg
    available?
13
14
              THE CLERK: He is, Your Honor. That's Tuesday,
15
    September 13th, at 2:30.
              THE COURT: All right. So we'll set the initial
16
    appearance for both Defendants, Tuesday, September 13th, 2:30
17
18
    p.m. before Judge Seeborg.
              The Government has suggested that it will file a
19
    notice of related cases, which could cause the matter to be
20
21
    reassigned. If it is, then that appearance will change.
22
              Any objection from either Defendant to an exclusion
    of time from today until September 13th for effective
23
    preparation of counsel?
24
25
              MR. WILLIAMS: Not behalf of Mr. Walter Liew, Your
```

```
1
    Honor.
              MR. RAMSEY: No objection, Your Honor, on behalf of
2
3
    Christina Liew.
              THE COURT: All right. So it will be the Court's
4
    order that time will be excluded until September 13th for the
5
6
    effective preparation of counsel, and I find that the
7
    interests of justice support that.
8
              MR. HEMANN: Your Honor, would you like for us to
9
    provide the Court with a written order on that or just --
              THE COURT: You don't -- I don't feel that you need
10
         I've said it on the record and the reasons, but if -- if
11
12
              MR. HEMANN: No, that's fine.
13
14
              THE COURT: -- in your interest, you'd like to, I
15
    will sign such a proposed order.
16
              MR. HEMANN: Thank you.
              THE COURT: All right. Anything else we need to do
17
18
    today?
19
              MR. WILLIAMS: The appearance Friday would be at
20
    9:30?
              THE COURT: 9:30 this Friday, correct.
21
22
              MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Your Honor.
23
              THE COURT: And you know, is -- I don't know that
    Mrs. Liew needs to be here on Friday, Mr. Ramsey, unless you
24
25
    feel like it's --
```

```
MR. RAMSEY: I think that she's going to want to be
1
2
    as right now.
              THE COURT: She'll welcome to be here. I just
3
    wanted to -- to let her know.
4
              MR. HEMANN: Your Honor, do you need interpreter
5
6
    because if she's -- if her presence is optional, then we need
7
    you to make it clear if you need an interpreter.
8
              MR. WILLIAMS: And we would request there be an
9
    interpreter.
              THE COURT: All right. I will request then that
10
    there be an interpreter on Friday. All right.
11
12
              So we're continued to Friday at 9:30.
13
              MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
14
              MR. AXELROD: Thank you, Your Honor.
15
              MR. HEMANN: Thank you, Your Honor.
16
              THE CLERK: Court is in recess.
17
                 (Proceedings adjourned at 11:24 a.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the above pages of the official electronic sound recording provided to me by the U. S. District Court, Northern District of California, of the proceedings taken on the date and time previously stated in the above matter. I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken; and, further, that I am not financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of the action. Stay Nigner 7/19/2012 Signature of Transcriber Date