		2
1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	For Defendant, Kirk Yamatani:	STEVEN H. LEVIN, ESQ. 250 W. Pratt St., Suite 1300 Baltimore, Maryland 21201
5		Baltimole, Maryland 21201
4	For Defendant, Rachel Ondrik:	THOMAS ABBENANTE, ESQ. 1919 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, #200 Washington, D.C. 20006
5		
6		ERIC HATHAWAY, Investigator Federal Bureau of Investigation
7		
8		
9	Audio Operator:	JESSICA IONETZ
10		
11	Transcript prepared by:	JANICE RUSSELL TRANSCRIPTS 1133 Tanager Trail Virginia Beach, Virginia 23451
12		
13		(757) 422-9089 trussell31@cox.net
14		
15	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS THE COURT: 13-149 and the second one is 13-148? 2 MR. AKE: Correct, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 If I could have counsel identify themselves for the 5 6 record? 7 MR. AKE: Thank you, your Honor. Adam Ake for the United States. I'm joined by Special Agent Eric McAllister. 8 9 Thank you. THE COURT: 10 MR. HATHAWAY: Eric Hathaway. 11 MR. AKE: Eric Hathaway of the FBI. I'm sorry. THE COURT: Oh. 12 Thank you. MR. LEVIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Steven Levin 13 on behalf of Mr. Yamatani, who's standing to my left. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Welcome, sir. 16 17 MR. ABBENANTE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Thomas 18 Abbenante on behalf of Ms. Ondrik, and she's present. 19 THE COURT: Thank you. 20 Welcome, ma'am. 21 MR. ABBENANTE: Thank you. THE COURT: Please be seated. Give me a few moments. 22 (Pause) 23 THE COURT: Okay. I have yet to have my fingers 24 around the paperwork, which have just come into my possession, 25

```
but it's my understanding that an agreement has been reached
 1
    between the Government and the defendants, is that correct?
 2
                       Yes, your Honor. So we are, we're here
 3
    today for an initial arraignment and a plea entry hearing.
 4
    There are plea agreements, written plea agreements that have
 5
    been executed in this case and we're prepared to go forward.
 6
 7
    But first, need to have their initial hearing and then we'll go
    through with the -- we're prepared to go through with the
 8
    rearraign, or the arraignment in this case --
 9
10
             THE COURT: Okay.
11
             MR. AKE: -- your Honor.
             THE COURT:
                         Thank you.
12
             Mr. Yamatani and counsel, I assume that you have
13
    received the copy of the charging document in this matter, is
14
15
    that correct?
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.
16
17
             MR. LEVIN: We have.
18
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
             Give me just a moment.
19
20
         (Pause)
             THE COURT: Mr. Yamatani, listen carefully to the
21
    Assistant United States Attorney who will advise you of the
22
23
    charges that you face by way of the Criminal Information, I
    believe, and he will also advise you of other, or, rather, the
24
25
    maximum penalty that you face. I will advise you of other
```

rights that you enjoy.

Feel free to be seated.

MR. AKE: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, both of the defendants have been charged with a single count of making a false official writing in violation of 18 United States Code § 1018. The informations do vary by the dates, but essentially, both are charged with having made and delivered as true a writing containing a statement that they knew to be false. In both cases, that was a voucher made and presented to the Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology, which contained false information regarding a house-hunting trip for which each claimed reimbursement.

The maximum penalty provided by statute for that offense is one year of imprisonment, one year of supervised release, and a fine of up to \$100,000. In addition, the defendants must pay \$25 as a special assessment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3013.

Additionally, the Court may impose a period of supervised release and the defendants may be, if they violated a condition of their supervised release, understand they may be sentenced for a violation of, of such conditions that the Court may impose.

This is a Class A misdemeanor, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Yamatani, do you understand the nature of the 1 allegation against you? 2 DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Feel free to be seated. 4 DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Okay. As you heard the U. S. Attorney 6 7 explain, you're facing a period of incarceration of up to one year, which could be followed by a year of supervised release 8 of up to one year, and if you violate the terms of supervised 9 release you could be sentenced back to jail for a one-year 10 11 period. So it's sort of like two years of jail time with one 12 13 year of supervision in between. As a result of these, this charge, you enjoy the right 14 15 to trial, judgment, and sentencing before a United States District Judge. I'm only a Magistrate Judge and a District 16 Judge has far more authority. 17 You would also be entitled to a jury trial and all 12 18 persons on the jury would have to be convinced that of your 19 guilt beyond a reasonable doubt before they could find you 20 guilty. 21 You should discuss both rights with counsel before you 22 23 decide whether to invoke these rights or to waive these rights. You enjoy the right to testify, the right not to 24

testify, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses, and

the right to compel witnesses to appear in court on your 1 behalf. 2 Should you decide not to testify or should you decide 3 that you want to testify, understand that any statements that 4 you make could be used against you and it doesn't matter 5 6 whether those statements are made here or somewhere else. But 7 no one can force you to say anything. Do you understand these rights? 8 Yes, your Honor. 9 DEFENDANT YAMATANI: 10 THE COURT: You also enjoy the right to counsel and 11 you have secured counsel, so that is a nonissue. 12 Let me turn now to Ms. Ondrik. Is that the proper way to say your name? 13 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you. And, Ms. Ondrik, give me one last thing. 16 17 Mr. Yamatani, any questions that you have about your 18 rights? DEFENDANT YAMATANI: No, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 20 Ms. Ondrik, in this matter you, too, have been charged 21 with the same violation, as noted by the Assistant United 22 States Attorney. Do you understand the nature of the 23 allegations against you? 24

DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You also have the right to trial, 1 judgment, and sentencing before a United States District Judge. 2 You also enjoy the right to a jury trial and all 12 3 persons on the jury would have to be convinced of your quilt 4 beyond a reasonable doubt whether to find you quilty. 5 You also should discuss these rights with counsel 6 7 before you decide whether to use these rights or to lose these rights. 8 And, of course, you enjoy the Fifth Amendment 9 protection against compelled testimony in a criminal case. 10 11 You enjoy the Sixth Amendment right to confront and to cross-examine witnesses and you enjoy the right to compel 12 13 witnesses to appear in court on your behalf. No one can force you to make a statement. 14 15 decide not to make a statement, no one can use that as evidence 16 against you. And that right protects you in this courtroom. It protects you beyond the courtroom, but if you make a 17 18 statement anywhere anytime the Government may attempt to use 19 that statement against you. Do you understand these rights? 20 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: And you also enjoy the right to counsel. 22 23 You have secured counsel, so that also is a nonissue. Do you have any questions about anything I've said so 24 far?

1 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

3 Let me move to the plea agreement.

MR. AKE: Your Honor, I haven't had the honor of doing a plea entry in front of you. I'm not sure which, which style you prefer. Would you like me to go through and summarize the essential elements of the plea agreement?

THE COURT: That will be fine. A proffer of the facts, the underlying facts would be sufficient, and we'll do this under the old misdemeanor rules, Rule 58, if you will. I think is correct, though it's not necessarily as scripted as it would be in front of your classic District Judge --

MR. AKE: Okay. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- since this is a misdemeanor.

MR. AKE: Your Honor, the elements of the offense that the Government would have to prove should -- would -- had the defendants elected to go to trial, were, first, the defendant, an officer of the United States, made and delivered as true a writing and, second, the defendant knew that the writing that he or she submitted contained a false statement.

And in the case of United States versus Rachel Ondrik, the parties have agreed that had the case proceeded to trial the Government would have proven the following beyond a reasonable doubt and they also agree that these are not all the facts that the Government would have proved had the case

proceeded to trial:

The Government would have proved that the defendant,
Rachel Ondrik, was a special agent of the United States

Department of Commerce-Office of Inspector General and that in
2007 Ms. Ondrik was transferred from -- she transferred from
the, the Washington Field Office to the Department of Commerce
OIG Office in Atlanta, Georgia. In 2009, she returned to the
Washington, D.C. office where she continued to work for the
DOC-OIG.

Now as part of this change of station from Georgia to Washington, D.C. Ms. Ondrik defrauded and attempted to defraud the United States and the Department of Commerce by submitting false writings and making material misrepresentations to the Department of Commerce while seeking reimbursement for relocation expenses. She submitted these false writings to the National Institute of Standards and Technology-Office of Finance, Financial Resource Management, which is located in Gaithersburg, Maryland, and that agency processed the DOC-OIG's travel claims.

Now specifically, on or after July 7, 2009 Ms. Ondrik applied for and was granted relocation benefits from the Commerce Department because her transfer from Atlanta to Washington, D.C. was determined to be in the Government's interest. Her authorized relocation benefits included reimbursement for a house-hunting trip, en route travel, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

temporary quarters subsistence expenses and approval of these reimbursements was contingent on Ms. Ondrik's adherence to the federal travel regulation.

And during this time Ms. Ondrik and Mr. Yamatani, a fellow DOC-OIG agent who was also in the process of relocating from Atlanta to Washington, showed that both agents were aware of rules and regulations governing their relocations and the reimbursements to which they were entitled, yet both Ms. Ondrik and Mr. Yamatani attempted to secure payment from the Commerce Department in amounts that exceeded those authorized by the governing regulations. In one e-mail exchange on May 6, 2009, Ms. Yamatani, or Mr. Yamatani and Ms. Ondrik agreed that the travel regulations permitted a certain method of reimbursement known as fixed rate, which dealt with temporary quarters subsistence expenses, for a period limited only to 30 days with no extensions permitted and although they both agreed that their supervisors were unaware of the, the time limitation on this entitlement, they agreed to conceal these limitations from their supervisors and to seek reimbursements in excess of what those regulations authorized.

Later, Ms. Ondrik knowingly submitted a false travel voucher on or about August 20, 2009 which sought reimbursement for a ten-day house-hunting trip that she claimed she and her husband took to D.C. between July 22 and July 31, 2009. She claimed a number of specifics on that voucher but, in fact,

- 1 Ms. Ondrik did not make a house-hunting trip during that
- 2 | period, nor did the actual house-hunting trip she had taken
- 3 earlier in July last a full ten days, nor had she incurred the
- 4 claimed expenses. She nonetheless knowingly submitted that
- 5 voucher containing the false statement and sought reimbursement
- 6 of \$4,000, \$4,058.75.
- 7 Later -- actually, earlier, on August 10, 2009,
- 8 Ms. Ondrik had submitted false travel vouchers seeking
- 9 reimbursement of \$1,531 for her en route travel to Washington,
- 10 D.C.
- And on September 26, 2009, she submitted a false TQSE
- voucher that claimed \$33,973 in expenses, which was more than
- 13 | \$20,000 over what the travel regulation allowed.
- 14 THE COURT: What was that last figure, 33,000 how
- 15 much?
- 16 MR. AKE: \$33,973.50. That was -- that -- that
- 17 | voucher was not, ultimately not authorized, your Honor. Let me
- 18 go a little further.
- On the en route voucher, the, there were inaccuracies
- 20 | in that she claimed she and her family departed their Georgia
- 21 home on August 5, 2009 and had driven their personal vehicle to
- 22 Roanoke, Virginia where they spent the night. On the voucher,
- 23 | it then claimed that they had driven the rest of the trip to
- 24 | Clarksburg, Maryland the following day and on the voucher she
- 25 | claimed reimbursement for meals, hotel, mileage, and

miscellaneous expenses. In truth and in fact, Ms. Ondrik and her family had traveled to Maryland back in July 2008 during the period that she claimed that they were house hunting and did not return to Georgia, as her vouchers falsely claimed.

Ms. Ondrik was aware that both vouchers contained false information when she completed them and submitted them to the DOC-OIG and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Altogether, she submitted at least three false vouchers that sought reimbursement from the United States in an amount totaling \$39,563.25. NIST ultimately denied the claim for the TQSE; instead, only paid \$10,800.15 to which Ms. Ondrik was entitled. Ms. Ondrik, however, then persisted in her claim for reimbursement for the higher amount despite the fact that those earlier e-mail exchanges showed that she knew that her claim had exceeded the 30-day maximum period authorized by regulations.

Subsequently, on several occasions between 2009 and 2011 Ms. Ondrik reaffirmed the earlier false statements contained in her vouchers and made false statements regarding the circumstances of her claims for reimbursement which constituted obstructive conduct. And that's reflected in the, in the plea agreement. The defendants have both stipulated to an obstruction of justice enhancement as one of the applicable sentencing guidelines, your Honor.

Finally, between June 2009 and February 2011

- 1 Ms. Ondrik committed several instances of time and attendance
- 2 | fraud against her agency. The complete loss, when taking into
- 3 account both the overpayments the Government made to the
- 4 defendants from their travel voucher claims as well as the time
- 5 and attendance fraud loss to the Government, in both
- 6 defendants' cases is approximately \$14,000. And that is
- 7 | reflected in the restitution paragraph in the plea agreement as
- 8 | well as serves as the basis for the agreed fine of \$28,000,
- 9 which is a double, double amount that the parties have agreed
- 10 to as being an appropriate fine in this case.
- So restitution of \$14,000 as well as a fine in the
- 12 amount of \$28,000.
- 13 THE COURT: Now that -- most of that went to
- 14 Ms. Ondrik.
- MR. AKE: Yes, your Honor.
- 16 So the -- with regards to, to Mr. Yamatani, the facts
- 17 | are, are very similar. The specifics of his -- I'll go ahead
- 18 and proceed to that.
- 19 Mr. Yamatani was also a special agent in the same
- 20 Department of Commerce-Office of Inspector General office in
- 21 Atlanta, Georgia. In 2009, he also elected to move to
- 22 | Washington, D.C., the Washington, D.C. office. That move was
- 23 also found to be in the interest of the Government. His move
- 24 dates were at a different time. He first applied for
- 25 | relocation benefits on or about May 1, 2009. I'd already

be capped at a 30-day period.

spoken to the Court about the e-mail around that time between
these two agents, which showed that they knew what the, the
maximum temporary lodging, or temporary quarters and
subsistence allowance that they were authorized would be, would

On June 10, 2009, Mr. Yamatani knowingly submitted a false travel voucher that sought \$3,589 in reimbursement for a ten-day house-hunting trip that he claimed he had taken between May 28 and June 6, 2009. He had claimed reimbursement for several other expenses such as lodging, meals, mileage, and parking tolls. In fact, Mr. Yamatani did not make a house-hunting trip during this period, nor did his actual house-hunting trip that he did take last ten days.

Later, on June 10, 2000 -- actually, on or about June 10, 2009 as well, Mr. Yamatani submitted false travel vouchers seeking \$1,531 in reimbursement for his en route travel to his new duty station in which he claimed had taken place on June 7, 2009. He also submitted a false TQSE voucher on July 27, 2009. He was aware that both vouchers contained false information when he completed them and submitted them to the DOC-OIG and NIST and altogether, he submitted at least three false vouchers that sought reimbursement from the United States in the total amount of \$36,305.57.

NIST personnel discovered they had actually paid out most of the claimed expenses, but they determined later that

- his payments were in excess of the entitlements that the federal travel regulation authorized and so began recouping payments. Mr. Yamatani resisted the recoupment. He persisted in his claims for reimbursement despite the fact that, as evidenced by those e-mail exchanges, he knew that, that, particularly, the TOSE voucher was submitted for an amount, or an amount of time in excess of what was authorized and he knew that the other two vouchers for en route travel and the house-
 - And so between 2009 and 2011 Mr. Yamatani continued to reaffirm his earlier false statements that were made in those vouchers and made false statements regarding the circumstances of his claims for reimbursement, which also constituted obstructive conduct.

And similarly, between June 2009 and February 2010 Mr. Yamatani committed several instances of time and attendance fraud and the total loss to the Government as a result of both the overpayments on the travel vouchers, to which he was not entitled, as well as the time and attendance fraud is approximately \$14,000.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

hunting trip contained false information.

We need to reload and start in a different direction because we've gotten a little bit ahead of ourselves.

Obviously, there's a plea agreement that's been struck between the Government and the two defendants and I've got to

- engage in a voir dire, if you will, of the individual
 defendants.

 Speaking first with Mr. Yamatani, you've heard me
 - Speaking first with Mr. Yamatani, you've heard me earlier indicate many of the rights, but I have to go through that a little bit now.
- It's my understanding you're pleading guilty to the

 charge of submission of a false official writing under 18

 U.S.C. 1018. Obviously, you know the maximum penalties 'cause

 we just discussed that.
- Has anyone made any promises, threats, or inducements to get you to plead guilty?
- 12 DEFENDANT YAMATANI: No, your Honor.

4

5

19

20

21

22

23

- 13 THE COURT: Do you understand that if I accept your
 14 guilty plea you could be sent to jail and you could be sent to
 15 jail today?
- DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Do you still wish to plead guilty?
- DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.
 - THE COURT: You'll be given up valuable rights by pleading guilty, including the right to a trial. And at the trial the Government must prove these allegations against you beyond a reasonable doubt You don't have to prove that you are innocent, but by pleading guilty you're giving up your right to a trial. Is that something you wish to do?
- DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: You also enjoy certain trial rights and
 1
 2
    I've spoken to those a little bit earlier today, but those
    rights are, include the right to testify or not testify, the
 3
    right to confront and to cross-examine witnesses, and the right
 4
    to compel witnesses to appear in court on your behalf.
 5
 6
             Do you understand these rights?
 7
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.
             THE COURT: Do you wish to give these rights up by
 8
    pleading quilty?
 9
10
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.
11
             THE COURT: In this matter, you've been represented by
    Mr. Steven Levin. Are you satisfied with his services?
12
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: Are you currently under the influence of
14
15
    any substance that may affect your judgment?
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI: No, your Honor.
16
17
             THE COURT: Are you suffering from any mental
18
    condition, illness, or defect that may affect your judgment?
19
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI:
                                  No, your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty because you are
21
    quilty?
22
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor.
             THE COURT: Are you saying that you're guilty for any
23
    other reason?
24
25
             DEFENDANT YAMATANI: No, your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Do you understand you'll be facing other 1 potential collateral effects of a criminal conviction? It very 2 well could result in your being disqualified for certain 3 government programs or you may be disqualified from certain 4 educational loans or certain professions, certain fields of 5 study. It may deny you access to various permits. It could 6 7 result in your loss of the right to vote, other citizenship entitlements, and if you are not a U. S. citizen it could 8 result in your being deported. It could result in your being 9 denied admission for citizenship or nationalization or anything 10 11 along those lines. All of these things may come into play. Hearing all of this, do you still wish to plead 12 13 quilty? DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: I find that your decision to plead guilty is being made freely and voluntarily. 16 Turning now to Ms. Ondrik, you also have, apparently, 17 agreed to plead guilty to the charge of submission of a false 18 19 official writing under 18 U.S.C. 1018, is that your understanding? 20 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, sir. 21 22 THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises, threats, or 23 inducements to get you to plead quilty? DEFENDANT ONDRIK: No, your Honor. 24 25 THE COURT: Do you understand that if I accept your

quilty plea you could be sent to jail and you could be sent to 1 jail today? 2 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you still wish to plead quilty? 4 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, sir. 5 6 THE COURT: You also have certain rights you'll be 7 giving up, including the right to a trial. And at the trial the Government must prove that you are quilty beyond a 8 reasonable doubt You do not have to prove anything, but by 9 pleading quilty you're giving up that right to a trial. 10 11 that something you wish to do? 12 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: You also enjoy the right to testify and 13 the right not to testify, as I explained to you a bit earlier. 14 15 You also have the right to be present when anyone else testifies. You have the right to make sure your witnesses 16 17 appear and testify. You have the right to ask questions of everyone who testifies, but you're giving all of those rights 18 up by pleading guilty. Is that something you wish to do? 19 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Are you currently under the influence of 21 any substance that may affect your judgment? 22 23 DEFENDANT ONDRIK No, sir. THE COURT: Are you suffering from any mental 24 25 condition, illness, or defect that may affect your judgment?

DEFENDANT ONDRIK: No, your Honor. 1 THE COURT: You've been represented in this matter by 2 Mr. Thomas Abbenante. Are you satisfied with his services? 3 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Are you aware that if you plead quilty, if 5 I accept your quilty plea, you may suffer additional legal 6 7 consequences, including being unable to keep certain licenses, permits, or jobs, being unable to keep public benefits such as 8 housing or education loans or assistance loans? You may even 9 receive a harsher sentence in the future if you get convicted 10 11 of anything else and you could have forfeiture of certain property. You may be unable to vote or possess a firearm and 12 13 if you're not a U. S. citizen you could be subject to departure, removal, exclusion from admission in the United 14 15 States, or denial of citizenship. Hearing all of those things, do you still wish to 16 plead guilty? 17 18 DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: I find that your decision to plead guilty 19 is being made freely and voluntarily. 20 I believe I've already heard a proffer of facts from 21 the Government, is that correct? 22 MR. AKE: Yes, your Honor. It's just -- I, I'd like 23 to just make sure we get on the record there is a waiver of 24

appeal in the plea agreement for both defendants. Both

defendants have knowingly waived the right to appeal the fact of their conviction. They've also given up the right to appeal their sentence so long as the sentence that the Court imposes is at or below the range provided for by Offense Level 10 and the United States Attorney's Office has concurrently given up its right to appeal any sentence that the Court imposes so long as it is at or above the range provided for by Offense Level Neither defendant gives up their right to appeal an unlawful sentence such as one that exceeds one year in prison or one that is a result of any kind of arithmetical technical, arithmetic or technical error.

I'm not sure the -- there have been guideline stipulations as well as there are agreements that the Government has undertaken relative to the, the penalty that the Government agreed to. I recommend to the Court the Government is representing that it will request a sentence of probation as part of the plea agreement when it does come time for sentencing.

And both parties agree to jointly recommend that a fine of \$28,000 in addition to the \$14,000 agreed restitution is the appropriate penalty in this case as a, as the financial element of the, the judgment that the Court will impose.

Both parties contemplate that the, the Court will order the preparation of a pre-sentence report and they have already spoken with the Probation Office. They are prepared to

submit to interview following today's session at a mutually 1 agreeable time with a probation officer. 2 So I think that's all the essential elements I wanted 3 to make sure were out on the record, your Honor. I believe you 4 covered everything else. 5 THE COURT: Fair enough. Thank you. 6 7 MR. AKE: Thank you. THE COURT: Let me go first with Mr. Levin. 8 Is the agreement that I've heard essentially the 9 10 agreement reached? 11 MR. LEVIN: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: And in terms of the proffer that has been provided, is, are there any modifications or corrections by 13 counsel? 14 15 MR. LEVIN: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 16 17 Mr. Yamatani, is what has been told to me factually 18 correct with respect to the Government's allegations of the 19 underlying activity? DEFENDANT YAMATANI: Yes, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 Then I find there's an adequate basis for your plea of 22 quilty and I find you quilty of the charge of submitting a 23

Ms. Ondrik -- well, I quess first I should go to

false official writing.

24

```
counsel.
 1
 2
             Mr. Abbenante, the agreement that has been explained
    to me, is that the defendant's agreement as well?
 3
             MR. ABBENANTE: It is, your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT: Okay. And the underlying factual
 5
 6
    allegations, any modifications or corrections?
 7
             MR. ABBENANTE: No, there isn't.
             THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
             Ms. Ondrik, is what has been told to me factually
 9
    correct with respect to the underlying factual allegations?
10
11
             DEFENDANT ONDRIK: Yes, your Honor.
             THE COURT:
                         Then I find there's an adequate basis for
12
    your plea of guilty and I find you guilty of the charge of
13
    submitting a false official writing.
14
15
             So it sounds as though what is in order is a pre-
    sentence report and we need to set in a sentencing date.
16
17
             Mr. Ake, you've gotten all these other things lined
18
    up.
         Do you have a date already?
19
             MR. AKE: No, your Honor. We, we don't have a date.
20
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MR. AKE:
21
                       So.
22
             THE COURT: All right.
                         What date does your Honor prefer? Any --
23
             MR. LEVIN:
             THE COURT: It's a good question. I think we need to
```

allow time for the pre-sentence report, which I suspect could

24

```
be done in about 45 days.
 1
             Anyone have reservations about that?
 2
             MR. AKE: No. I think that, that'd be right, your
 3
    Honor.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Okay.
             THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: They'll be appearing in June
 6
 7
    for sentencing.
             THE COURT: Oh. Well, then, I have to pull up my
 8
    calendar here.
 9
             Give me a moment, gentlemen.
10
11
        (Pause)
             MR. LEVIN: Judge, is June 19th good for you?
12
13
             THE COURT: Don't know yet. We're --
             MR. LEVIN: Oh, okay.
14
15
             THE COURT: -- reaching my Chambers here --
             MR. LEVIN:
16
                         Oh.
17
             THE COURT: -- and we're seeing what's happening.
             MR. LEVIN: Okay.
18
        (Pause)
19
             THE COURT: I see a June 18th, 19th, or 21. Which did
20
    you indicate?
21
             MR. LEVIN: How's the 19th?
22
23
             THE COURT: 19th? I can give you the afternoon.
             MR. LEVIN: What time, your Honor?
24
25
             THE COURT: Why don't we say 2:30.
```

```
MR. LEVIN: That's fine.
 1
 2
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
                       That works for the Government, your Honor.
 3
             MR. AKE:
             THE COURT: Excellent.
 4
 5
             MR. ABBENANTE: Thank you.
             THE COURT: We'll give you something in writing
 6
 7
    reflecting this.
         (Pause)
 8
                       And, your Honor, the, the Government has no
 9
             MR. AKE:
    objection to the defendants remaining on, or being released on
10
11
    personal recognizance pending sentencing in this matter.
    Pretrial did prepare a report. I don't know if the Court's
12
13
    seen it.
             THE COURT: Yes, I have.
14
15
             MR. AKE: The only issue, I believe, that was
    contentious for the defendants was the, the recommendation that
16
17
    they both surrender their passports. The Government does not
18
    anticipate any, any flight risk, given that the Government has
19
    already bound itself to recommend a sentence of probation in
    this case and given the risk of nonappearance seems to be
20
    rather minimal, the Government doesn't have any objection to
21
    waiving that restriction that Pretrial recommended, if the
22
```

THE COURT: Let me hear from the defendants why it's so important that they have their passports.

Court is willing to go along with that.

23

24

MR. LEVIN: Your Honor, recently Mr. Yamatani resigned 1 his position with the Department of Commerce and has been 2 trying to start a new business venture. As a result of that 3 new business venture, just recently, as recently as last week, 4 he traveled overseas in an effort to obtain business. 5 It may 6 be that in the near future he'll have another opportunity to 7 travel. We can certainly make it as part of his release that he obtain permission or provide notice to Pretrial Services in 8 the event that he wishes to travel for business, but in my 9 experience it's just very time consuming to try to get a 10 11 passport. If permission will be granted to travel, then he would have to go to Pretrial Services or the clerk's office to 12 13 obtain the passport, which just takes more time. And so he came back, obviously, from last week's 14 15 overseas travel knowing that this Criminal Information was pending, that he'd be pleading quilty today. 16 17 So just to echo the words of the prosecutor, I think 18 the risk of nonappearance is extremely limited in this 19 particular case. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 20 I'll hear from the defense. 21 Thank you, your Honor. 22 MR. LEVIN: MR. ABBENANTE: Well, similarly, your Honor, I mean, 23 Ms. Ondrik doesn't have any plans to leave the country and she 24

hasn't left the country. However, it's just been my experience

- 1 | that once a passport is turned in to Pretrial Services even
- 2 | after the conclusion of the, of the hearing, we have to seek
- 3 | the Court to issue an order to get it returned and I just, I
- 4 | just thought it'd be more efficient not to have to deal with
- 5 that.
- And they've been completely cooperative with the, with
- 7 | the matters up until this point. We've met with the
- 8 Government. We negotiated this plea agreement. They're here
- 9 today. They're -- they've made plans to make a payment of
- 10 | restitution. And again, I don't see that there's any risk of
- 11 | flight here.
- 12 THE COURT: Thank you.
- Based upon the recommendations of the Government, I
- 14 | will not require the submission of the passports. However, any
- 15 travel must be approved in advance by Pretrial Services, that
- 16 is, any travel outside of the greater Washington Metropolitan
- 17 | area.
- 18 So I don't expect that they'll be heavy handed about
- 19 | it, but I do want them to stay in the loop, that is, no one
- 20 | should just be leaving because they can leave. They have to
- 21 get permission in advance.
- 22 MR. ABBENANTE: Thank you, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
- MR. LEVIN: Thank you, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Thank you.

```
Do we have any paperwork?
 1
             THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yeah. Curt is on --
 2
             THE COURT: I think we have the paperwork coming at
 3
    you, so bear with us still.
 4
 5
        (Pause)
             THE COURT: I believe we indicated that the hearing
 6
 7
    was 2:30, is that correct?
             MR. LEVIN: Yes, your Honor.
 8
             MR. AKE: Yes, sir.
 9
10
             THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Oh.
11
             THE COURT: Thank you.
12
             Okay.
        (Pause)
13
             THE COURT: Ms. Ondrik, you want to join your counsel,
14
15
    come forward.
             In fact, all four of you can come forward. We'll give
16
    you some paperwork. I'll sign it and then you'll be free to be
17
18
    processed by Pretrial Services.
19
        (The courtroom deputy reviews paperwork with both counsel
    and defendants)
20
             THE COURT: Thank you all. Wish you well.
21
                         Thank you, your Honor.
22
             MR. LEVIN:
             MR. ABBENANTE: Thank you, your Honor.
23
             THE COURT: Indeed.
24
25
             Anything further from the Government?
```

```
MR. AKE: No, your Honor. Thank you.
1
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.
 2
 3
        (Proceedings concluded at 3:51 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
                              CERTIFICATE
             I, court approved transcriber, certify that the
 9
    foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic
10
    sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
11
12
    matter.
    /s/ Janice Russell
                                              June 25, 2013
13
    Janice Russell, Transcriber
14
                                                 Date
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```