Case 1:13-cr-00368-DLC Document 127 Filed 12/22/14 Page 1 of 57

ECCKMARS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 13 CR 368 (DLC) v. MARK MARMILEV, et al., 5 6 Defendants. 7 ----x 8 New York, N.Y. December 12, 2014 9 10:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. DENISE COTE, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 ANDREW D. GOLDSTEIN CHRISTINE MAGDO 18 Assistant United States Attorneys SETH GINSBERG 19 Attorney for Defendant 20 21 ALSO PRESENT: 22 TATE JARROW, Secret Service Agent JEREMIAH HAYNIE, IRS Criminal Investigations KEVIN MOSLEY, Department of Justice 23 24 25

1	THE DEPUTY CLERK: United States of America versus
2	Mark Marmilev.
3	Is the government ready to proceed?
4	MR. GOLDSTEIN: We are.
5	Good morning, Your Honor. Andrew Goldstein, for the
6	government, and with me at counsel table is Kevin Mosley from
7	the Department of Justice, Assistant United States Attorney
8	Christine Magdo, Special Agent Tate Jarrow from the Secret
9	Service, and Special Agent Jeremiah Haynie from IRS Criminal
10	Investigations.
11	THE DEPUTY CLERK: For the Defendant Marmilev, are you
12	ready to proceed?
13	MR. GINSBERG: Yes.
14	Good morning, Your Honor. Seth Ginsberg, on behalf of
15	Mark Marmilev, who is standing with me in court today.
16	THE COURT: Thank you.
17	Let me ask you, Mr. Ginsberg, have both you and your
18	client read the presentence report?
19	MR. GINSBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: And you have discussed it with each other?
21	MR. GINSBERG: Yes, in detail.
22	THE COURT: Do you have any objections to it other
23	than what might be contained in your written sentencing
24	submissions to me?

MR. GINSBERG: No, Your Honor.

25

THE COURT: Thank you.

The presentence report is made part of the record in this case and placed under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the sealed report without further application to this Court.

I have a sentencing submission from the government dated December 9th, and that's been filed on our ECF system?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: It has, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And I have a sentencing submission from the defendant dated December 2nd. Has that been filed, Mr. Ginsberg, on our ECF system?

MR. GINSBERG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. My chambers contacted counsel yesterday about time constraints here. I don't believe that's going to be an issue at all, if we don't finish this morning, we can continue this afternoon, but I was concerned about whether or not we'd have enough time given an order I issued yesterday requiring defense counsel to specifically identify to the government those passages in the government's sentencing that the defendant took issue with.

And then I received a letter, also on ECF, late yesterday indicating that the defendant does not seek a Fatico hearing here with respect to any statements in the government's sentencing submission. Therefore, unless the defendant changes

its position this morning, I'm going to accept all those statements as true and not being disputed in a way that would require me to receive evidence more directly and make a finding based on that evidence.

Now, we are constrained here by the nature of the defendant's plea. He pled guilty to a count that carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 60 months, or five years. The guidelines range for this crime is far higher, it is 135 to 168 months. There is no dispute that that is the appropriate guidelines range, but because of the statute, the highest sentence I'm permitted to impose today would be the five-year sentence, and indeed that becomes the guideline sentence because of the interaction between the guidelines regime and the federal criminal statutory maximums.

This is a case in which the defendant played a critical role in an Internet money transfer system. It touted itself, that is Liberty Reserve, as the Internet's largest money transfer system. 15 percent of the user accounts that had an identification of a country of origin are accounts from the United States, so a substantial portion of its business directly related to U.S. commerce. And that includes at least \$2 billion of transactions conducted through Liberty Reserve, and the business of Liberty Reserve, as I understand it, and it's undisputed, involved transactions in excess of \$16 billion.

It's also undisputed that there was very extensive use of Liberty Reserve by criminals and little to no use by any legitimate online businesses. And if that was in dispute, I'd be happy to have a Fatico hearing.

Of the busiest websites referring traffic to Liberty

Reserve -- and this is, of course, a subset, but it is the

busiest -- half were websites trafficking in stolen credit card

data and related illegal businesses. So a very substantial

portion of the business of Liberty Reserve was directly

involved in fraud.

But it wasn't just stolen credit card data and associated illegal trafficking, but also online Ponzi schemes, and they're sometimes referred to as high-yield investment programs, but approximately \$1.4 billion of transactions, so the Liberty Reserve system can be tied to such classes of illegal activity. And indeed, that ties in directly with the defendant's plea, which contained a carefully crafted allocution related to knowledge or conscious avoidance with respect to the Ponzi schemes or the high-yield investment programs.

This defendant worked with two founders of the Liberty Reserve system since 2003, which was before Liberty Reserve itself was founded. That earlier business, Gold Age, was also a digital currency exchange, and it was subjected to a federal search in January of 2006. Certain key participants,

Mr. Budovsky and Mr. Katz, were arrested by New York State authorities in 2006, and they received probationary sentences, I believe, that year.

And then in 2007, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia indicted certain individuals related to Gold Age.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Just to make sure the record is clear, the search that was done in 2006 was of the Eagle offices, which was the larger digital currency system that Gold Age was an exchanger for. We don't -- there's nothing in the PSR about Gold Age offices being searched.

THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you for that clarification.

So by 2006, the defendant and others with whom he was associated were well aware of law enforcement's interest in digital currency exchange activities in this country, and they moved their business offshore to Costa Rica. In 2006,

Mr. Budovsky and Mr. Katz incorporated Liberty Reserve in Costa Rica.

Defendant thereafter worked to help establish the
Liberty Reserve business. His principal role was administering
the website and maintaining a technical infrastructure for
Liberty Reserve. As a reward for his important contribution to

its business, he was given a 30 percent ownership share in 2010.

In 2010, he worked with other principals to design ways to deceive the Costa Rican authorities, particularly the agency that issues licenses for money-transmitting businesses.

There are particular passages of the government's sentencing memorandum that deal with the defendant's deep involvement in the illegal activities of Liberty Reserve and its deceit of Costa Rican authorities, and I flagged three passages, and as I understand from defense counsel's letter of December 11th, the information here is not being disputed. So let me direct this — counsel's attention to these specific passages.

The first one is page 14. And the fourth and fifth full paragraphs on that page, I'll read a portion of that:

"For instance, on June 24th, 2010, Marmilev sent an email to, among others, Defendants Budovsky and Chukharev. The documents set out the purpose and function of the GAA," a reference to the government administrative area, "on Liberty Reserve's computer system. The email indicated that the GAA would allow the Costa Rican government to view a few statistics, but the majority of these statistics are going to be fake."

The next passage is on page 10 -- I'm sorry, I skipped over one. It's on page 12, at the very top of the page, and it describes information from a cooperating witness that Marmilev

would open user accounts on high-yield investment program related websites and discussion forms posing as an HYIP user and offer testimonials praising Liberty Reserve's service, and then it goes on to give examples.

And then the third set of materials that I draw counsel's attention to specifically is the material on pages 20 and 21, and of course, the attached documents in support of this description from which quotations are taken. The government presents its argument here, and facts in support of it, that Marmilev knew that CARDI and HYIP websites, among other criminal enterprises, were a key part of Liberty Reserve's clientele, and he specifically promoted Liberty Reserve on HYIP discussion forums.

And then there are quotations from some of the posts in which the defendant, using his pseudonym, assures people on the site that, among other things, Liberty Reserve is much more tolerant towards shady businesses than one of its competitors.

So I say that because I want to make clear here, and not wait until the end of this proceeding, to advise all counsel of how I read everything in the presentence report, defense counsel's submission, and the government's submission. I don't want to be silent here and surprise you with my reading of where this is going, and I'll give everyone an opportunity to be heard. I would have, and still will, give the defendant an opportunity for a Fatico hearing if he wishes one, but

that's how I understand this material.

So first, let me turn to -- well, I'm sorry,
Mr. Ginsberg, you wanted to rise?

MR. GINSBERG: No. The government -- if you'd like to hear from the government first, that's fine.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to turn now to the entire sentencing proceeding, and I'll hear from the government first, then defense counsel, and then your client.

MR. GINSBERG: Well, with respect to the three passages that the Court has pointed out, then, I would like to respond.

As indicated in the letter that I submitted to the Court yesterday, there are certain underlying facts that we do not dispute. For example, the Court pointed out the email that Mr. Marmilev sent regarding the government administration area. The contents of that email is not disputed. The purpose of creating that administrative area is something that we take issue with and is something that I have argument about. I don't know that a factual hearing about it is required.

THE COURT: Well, I don't have evidence from you, I have argument, and if you wanted to present evidence, I'd be happy to give you a right to do so in a Fatico hearing.

MR. GINSBERG: Well, I appreciate that, Your Honor, but if I may respond briefly to that. The government has presented an email, and the government has said on multiple

occasions that that email was designed to obscure the total volume of transactions going through Liberty Reserve. I don't quarrel with that. The government has then, without evidence, said that that leads to the conclusion that Liberty Reserve was trying to hide money laundering from Costa Rican authorities. That's argument, there's no evidence behind it. We have argument on the other side.

I don't know that there's any evidence one way or the other. If the Court thinks that a hearing is required to determine that, then perhaps a hearing should be held. If the Court wants to hear arguments from both sides and make a determination as to what conclusions should be drawn from the evidence that the parties have presented, that's another matter.

With respect to the web postings that the Court -
THE COURT: Well, let me just deal with that. I don't
want there to be any surprise here. I'm happy to have a
hearing. I've read the materials presented by the government
and defense counsel in which you present your arguments. This
sentencing proceeding is not concluded until you also have an
opportunity to be heard orally. So I'm absolutely happy to
hear anything you have to say today as well, but I want you to
understand that based on my review of the material submitted to
me so far, I'm prepared to find that your client understood the
illegal nature of the business with which he was associated and

worked to promote that business understanding that it would be used by criminals in a variety of different ways.

Now, you may change my mind with your oral advocacy today, but I don't want there to be a surprise about where your submissions have -- the totality of the submissions have led me to today.

MR. GINSBERG: I'd like to make one statement and then confer with my client, but if that's the case, then perhaps we need to have a full-blown Fatico hearing on every single allegation in the presentence report, because as I indicated in my submission to the Court, first of all, the presentence report was written not by probation, but by the government. The defense-conduct narrative was drafted by the government, there's no dispute about that. It was adopted wholesale by probation. It does not provide an independent investigation for the Court.

That narrative is intertwined with many differential conclusions that are essentially advocacy on the part of the government, unsupported by evidence. And there are a lot of things in the report, underlying facts, that we don't dispute. Did the government do an investigation and find there were 1300 or so websites that had the name Hard, or Carter, or CVV, or were involved in forex trading or high-yield investment programs? I'm sure they did, I don't really dispute that.

Was that something that was necessarily known to

Mr. Marmilev? I do dispute whether he knew all of that information.

Was the self-evident nature of those --

THE COURT: When you say you do dispute that, so you're in a position and would like to put on evidence at a Fatico hearing in which you would dispute that?

MR. GINSBERG: No, I would like to challenge the government's evidence. It's their burden to prove it, and I don't believe they've presented evidence sufficient to do so. If the government has witnesses that want to testify as to how — what was in my client's mind, I'd be happy to cross-examine them, but based on the evidence that they've presented, I don't think that they've met their burden.

A Fatico hearing, as I understand it, is a chance for the government to meet its burden. These are allegations propounded by the government. The burden is entirely on the government to prove them by a preponderance of the evidence. In my view, they've not done it in terms of the conclusions that they want the Court to draw. I'm comfortable with many, many of the facts, and that's why I suggested that perhaps argument about the conclusions from those facts would be helpful, because I don't know that there is a witness from the government who can stand up there and say, we know from someone that Mr. Marmilev not only had access to Google Analytics data, but used it in exactly the manner that we suggest he could have

used it.

There's a lot of information that's missing. They refer to Google Analytics data and its ability to provide, for example, information about the types of merchants that were using Liberty Reserve. They don't point out to the Court that Google Analytic data provides approximately a hundred data points per user per use of the website compounded over many, many years, and the volume and density of that data is phenomenal. And Mr. Marmilev, as a technical expert, used that data for an entirely different purpose than the government suggests.

If they have someone that can say not only that he had access to it, but that he used it for that purpose, I'd be happy to hear that, and to cross-examine them, and test the validity of that.

With respect to the --

THE COURT: Excuse me. So you're prepared to put on evidence with respect to the use that your client made of Google Analytics and show that it is a different use than the government papers suggest?

MR. GINSBERG: Perhaps. I would have to hear the government's evidence in the first instance. Again, the government has not presented any evidence of how my client used it. All the government has done is said --

THE COURT: Well, I don't know that it hasn't

presented any evidence. I don't want to make this -- I issued the order yesterday. I don't want to make this proceeding more complicated than it needs to be.

MR. GINSBERG: Nor do I.

suggestion of unfair surprise here, because I want your client to have a full opportunity to be heard in connection with this sentence. And that's why I asked yesterday that you identify in the government's memorandum those specific passages with which you took issue, so we could analyze with specificity if there really was a dispute and what that dispute concerned. And then today, I've pointed out three specific passages that have to do with your client's specific behavior and to just make sure we're focusing with care on the factual evidence.

MR. GINSBERG: I understand that, Your Honor. I received the Court's order, I considered it carefully. The difficulty that I have, frankly, which is why I submitted the letter that I did, is that the way that this presentence report is written and the way that the government's sentencing memorandum is written, every fact is intertwined with a corresponding conclusion.

So the government is correct in its sentencing memorandum that in many instances, we don't dispute the underlying facts, but rather the conclusions that should be drawn from them. I indicated to the Court, and my intention in

doing so was that -- I indicated to the Court that that's true, a lot of the underlying facts are not in dispute, but the conclusions that should be drawn from them are in dispute. I'm now hearing from the Court, I believe, that the Court is adopting all of the conclusions that the government has suggested.

What I --

THE COURT: Why I spoke at some length was to give you a sense of, in outline form, a summary form of my understanding of what happened here and my conclusion that your client had full knowledge of the way in which Liberty Reserve supported and thrived upon the assistance it provided to criminals who needed or desired money transfer services.

MR. GINSBERG: And I respectfully suggest that the only way the Court could have come to that conclusion is by accepting the conclusions that were suggested by the government. For example, the government says —— I'll use Google Analytics again. The Court said you don't believe the government has presented no evidence. Well, I don't know what evidence it's presented other than to say Google Analytics provided certain data, Mr. Marmilev had access to it. The data is voluminous. No one has said Mr. Marmilev used the data to make certain conclusions.

The government has said, we found 1300 websites that had various words in them, and they didn't acknowledge there

are 62,000 merchants in the Liberty Reserve database, and no one said Mr. Marmilev conducted the kind of search that they've conducted. And these are the kinds of things that I would -- I think a hearing could be avoided if we were provided an opportunity to discuss these things and allow the Court to weigh the arguments on both sides before drawing the conclusions that Your Honor is suggesting it's prepared to draw.

THE COURT: Well, as I've said already, the sentence proceeding is not complete until I impose sentence, and before I do so, everyone will have a full opportunity to be heard orally.

So let's turn now to the sentencing proceeding itself.

I'm hearing no request for a Fatico hearing. Am I right,

Counsel?

MR. GINSBERG: At this time, I'm not requesting a Fatico hearing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Goldstein?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. Based on Your Honor's remarks, I won't go on at length.

The government believes that a guideline sentence of 60 months is warranted here because of the breadth and the scope of the conduct not just of Liberty Reserve, but of Mr. Marmilev, and the impact that that conduct had on real

victims of crimes in this country and around the world. The creation and the use of this digital currency, in the wake of what happened with Eagle, allowed a massive criminal infrastructure to continue and to allow criminals to move their money around the world and to profit from their crimes.

And this defendant helped set that up, he helped maintain it, he helped make sure that the technology of the website worked, that users could use it freely. And as we've set forth, I think there is really no way for the defendant to dispute his knowledge of what was happening on the website. The defendant is not going to argue that he was not R-E-D-D, Redd, who was in those talk room chats that Your Honor cited as part of the government's memorandum. It's his own words talking about how Liberty Reserve is more amenable to shady businesses. He knew what Liberty Reserve was allowing itself to be used to do.

And to go back in terms of what happened with Eagle, the defendant was part of an exchanger for Eagle, and Eagle was effectively the predecessor to Liberty Reserve. The government searched Eagle, it did not shut down Eagle, but the founder of Eagle ended up pleading guilty to money laundering and was sentenced to a light term, largely because he wanted — and he told the Court — that he was going to make Eagle legit, he was going to put in the anti-money laundering controls that it didn't have before, and the Court accepted his view that it was

actually -- that Eagle was highjacked by criminal users and was used in that way.

What Mr. Marmilev did, along with Mr. Budovsky and Mr. Katz, was to take Liberty Reserve and market itself to all those criminal users that no longer wanted to use Eagle because Eagle was now legit, it was actually going to check people's identities, and to allow the movement of this massive criminal user base from one entity to another with the only change basically being the fiction that it's incorporating in Costa Rica, and it has bank accounts in Costa Rica. That's effectively the only change that was there.

Mr. Marmilev stayed in Brooklyn. Mr. Budovsky, for the first several years, stayed in Brooklyn. Mr. Katz stayed in Brooklyn. The only thing that changed was that it was incorporated in Costa Rica, and they put bank accounts in Costa Rica. They marketed themselves to this criminal user base, and that's how they profited, and that's how they made money. And for him to do that and to allow that to happen allowed thousands, and thousands, and thousands of crimes to take place.

So we think that given his criminal — his history — his not having a criminal history score, because he was not convicted, but a zero criminal history score understates his culpability, understates his personal characteristics. And the conduct, in terms of the need to deter both himself and the

need to deter others to set up systems like this, there is a huge public interest in sending a message that this is not acceptable.

Finally, Your Honor, 60 months, while a significant sentence, this is a defendant who has the technological capability to start this all up again and to do it from somewhere else that will be harder for the government to get. And given the statements of his attorney and his submission, the sentencing submission here, there is no remorse for the crimes that Liberty Reserve allowed to take place. There is acceptance of responsibility in that he pled guilty, but there is very significant minimization of his own role in what happened.

So we believe there is a real risk going forward, without a substantial sentence, that this defendant will be able to set up shop somewhere else, and to do it overseas, and to do it in a way that will, once again, allow this criminal underworld to have access to financial markets.

THE COURT: Mr. Ginsberg?

MR. GINSBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. I wish I could say I was going to be as brief as the government, but I don't think that's going to be the case. I apologize in advance for that.

I have a number of points I want to make, but before I get to my prepared points, I want to briefly respond to a

couple of things the government pointed out that I think warrant immediate attention.

Number one, it's not expressed in my sentencing memorandum submitted to the Court, but I personally don't believe that it's my job to express Mr. Marmilev's remorse. He will do that. I disagree with the government that there's no remorse, and the Court will hear from Mr. Marmilev about his personal remorse for his failure to take stronger action to prevent criminals from using Liberty Reserve.

I can say that from my own experience of witnessing Mr. Marmilev over 19 months in the Metropolitan Correctional Center, he's sorry for what he did, and he realizes that what he did is a serious crime, and he understands that he's been punished thus far and that he's going to be punished regardless of what the Court does today. He's going to be deported, most likely, he's going to spend additional time in immigration jail. It's not just that he's sorry that he's been punished, but the fact of the punishment itself and the process of the legal system has caused him to reflect substantially on what he's done, and he's extremely remorseful. The fact that the sentencing memorandum doesn't address remorse has nothing to do with Mr. Marmilev's personal feelings of regret over his conduct.

Eagle -- I'll talk about that probably more than once, but I believe that the government has mischaracterized what

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

occurred in Eagle with respect to the sentences in that case. There were, I believe, three or four defendants who were sentenced in that case. The owner of Eagle pled quilty to money laundering and was sentenced to home confinement for six months. His plea agreement with the government -- not in this district, but still the United States Attorney's Office for the District of D.C. -- negotiated a plea in which his guidelines were between 12 and 18 months, and the government agreed not to seek a sentence greater than 14 months, and that was not based simply on the fact that he was going to go legit. government wanted to put him in jail. The Court chose not to put him in jail because the defendant indicated that he intended to continue his company and try to get it on the right track, and that would not be well served by placing him in iail. But the government itself, from the outset -- not the Court, the government -- agreed to a very, very low sentence in that case, which the government now trumpets as the flag that should have warned Mr. Marmilev and his colleagues as to the dangers of the business in which they were embarking.

The government also makes a lot -- today they brought it up, in the presentence report, it's in their sentencing submission -- about their location in Costa Rica. Liberty Reserve was incorporated in Costa Rica. Liberty Reserve at some point along the way did physically move its operations to Costa Rica and was there for a substantial period of its

existence.

The idea that by moving its business to Costa Rica, it was intentionally trying to evade U.S. law enforcement in order to facilitate criminality is an inferential leap that I do not believe is supported by the evidence. Many, many United States businesses operate around the world specifically to avoid particular regulations in the United States. Companies have businesses in other countries to avoid tax issues, companies have businesses in other parts of the world to avoid labor laws in the United States. There are many, perhaps not morally ideal, but perfectly legal reasons for having your business operate in other countries.

After seeing what happened to Liberty Reserve, and after being prosecuted themselves, Mr. Katz and Mr. Budovsky, in the United States, they were wary of operating a business in the United States. More importantly, their business model was not designed primarily for United States customers, it was designed for customers around the world who do not have access to the mainstream financial system because they don't have credit cards, they don't have bank accounts, and they're not able to participate in the global digital economy like the rest of us are.

And, in fact, I submitted to the Court remarks by the undersecretary for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, and the secretary himself indicated that there is

tremendous enthusiasm for virtual currencies, and one of the things that he pointed out, he said that it flows from a belief shared by consumers, businesses, and investors alike that virtual currencies have enormous potential to empower users, lower transaction costs, increase access to capital, and bring financial services to many unbanked individuals around the world.

And that is precisely what Liberty Reserve was seeking to do when it began its business. It was not setting out, as the government has posited, to capture all of the criminal clientele that Eagle was no longer able to serve. It was setting out to be a competitor to PayPal in countries around the world where people didn't have bank accounts and credit cards and weren't able to avail themselves of the system that the rest of us have access to. So the idea that they moved to Costa Rica simply to evade law enforcement, I do not believe is supported by the evidence.

The Court pointed out early on in this proceeding that -- I believe the word was "limited," or "constrained" or in some way the parameters of this case are confined by the statutory maximum penalty of 60 months. The probation department and the government, in their own ways, have both said that the 60-month cap already provides Mr. Marmilev with a substantial reduction below the guidelines that would otherwise apply. Probation mentioned that that was a tremendous benefit

because Mr. Marmilev wasn't required to plead to money laundering. I submit that he didn't plead to money laundering because there's no evidence to convict him of money laundering, and that's irrelevant.

The government didn't make that argument. The government simply stated that by allowing him to plead guilty to Section 1960, or, more accurately, Section 371, for violating — the conspiracy to violate Section 1960, the 60-month cap already accounted for a substantial discount below the otherwise applicable guidelines.

I think this argument misses the point. Congress determined that no one, no matter how much money is involved, should be punished for more than — by more than 60 months' imprisonment for a violation of this law. That's what Congress decided. Congress could well have increased the statutory maximum penalty to ten years, fifteen years, twenty years. It is part of the government's efforts to stem money laundering. It could well have had a much higher statutory maximum penalty, but Congress determined that violations of Section 1960 should not exceed 60 months.

To me, that suggests that only the most serious violations of Section 1960 should warrant the maximum penalty. The question then becomes, in my mind, whether Mr. Marmilev's conduct ranks among those who are the most serious violators of the law. I suggest that it does not. I suggest that people

who are transmitting money for terrorists, narcotics

traffickers, arms traffickers, and other serious crimes of that

nature fall into the category of people who are the most

serious violators, people with extensive criminal histories.

Mr. Marmilev has zero criminal history points, as the

government has acknowledged. Those are people who fall into

the category of most serious violators and warrant the highest

penalty that the statute allows.

There are cases where people were — the government cites one, United States versus Bariek, in its memorandum for a different proposition, the proposition that the entire amount of money transmitted by a money-transmitting business should be calculated under the guidelines, and we understand that's the law. What the government doesn't point out in that case is, number one, that the money being transmitted by the individual in that business was going to Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, and despite those facts, that defendant got a nonguideline sentence.

There are other cases in which there was clear evidence that the defendants were involved in terrorism, and they received higher sentences. These, to me, are the defendants whose conduct is the most serious violation of Section 1960.

Now, there's no dispute that Liberty Reserve involved a substantial amount of money, a staggering amount of money.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And whether it's 16 billion or not, I'm certainly not seeking a hearing as to the quantity of money ultimately involved, but I think it's worth elaborating on that number. The \$16 billion does not mean that \$16 billion actually entered Liberty Reserve. What it means is that money was transferred back and forth from one user, to another user, to another user, to another user, so, yes, there was a substantial amount of money in the system, but I don't believe there was ever \$16 billion in the system, or that even over the course of its existence, \$16 billion actually moved through the system. In fact, even with respect to the money involved specifically with Mr. Marmilev's offense, \$209 million that was used for purposes of the plea agreement, that number was calculated based on the money that entered Liberty Reserve through exchangers from customers who identified the United States as their country of origin, or exited Liberty Reserve through exchangers to customers in the United States, or who identified their country of origin as the United States. The government cites a \$2 billion figure for these same customers, but, again, that involves double, triple, quadruple, perhaps more counting of the same dollars going back and forth.

But the government, in its presentation to the Court, it ignores a lot of evidence. It focuses entirely on the negative evidence and totally ignores any of the positive evidence. It also -- although it gives lip service to the fact

that Mr. Marmilev was primarily responsible for the technical infrastructure of the company, it ignores the fact that Mr. Marmilev was not a compliance officer, was not schooled in the rules of compliance, and was not responsible for that area of the company. There are suggestions that he, nonetheless, knew about these things, and I am going to provide, I hope, evidence to persuade the Court otherwise.

The government, I believe, paints this case as a very black-and-white picture, but I think the reality is, it's a much grayer picture than the government would have the Court believe.

The government has suggested, and the Court has made note of it, that because of Eagle, and because of prior experience, Mr. Marmilev was undoubtedly aware of the need to register in the United States, but there is evidence to the contrary.

One of the things that the Court should be aware of, I believe, is the virtual currency industry is an industry in which things are changing very rapidly, and the rules really are not all that clear. The undersecretary, who I referenced earlier, in the remarks that he made in March of this year, he began jokingly, I understand, but nonetheless, his point is well taken, saying, "I should begin by admitting that I hesitated to draft remarks for today. Developments in the virtual currency world occur so rapidly, I was concerned that

anything I wrote would be overtaken by events before I got here."

He then went on to discuss the FinCEN guidance that was issued in March of 2013, exactly a year prior to his making these remarks, remarked that FinCEN guidance, which the government dismisses in its sentencing submission as merely clarifying existing law. Well, maybe it was clarifying existing law, but I think it's significant that the agency that's charged with enforcing this law considered that there was sufficient confusion around the need for virtual currencies to register, that it issued guidance. It doesn't issue quidance every day, it's a significant event.

And the undersecretary went on to explain that the guidance was issued so that administrators, such as Liberty Reserve and the exchangers that it used, constitute money transmitters that must register and keep certain records with the Department of the Treasury, which by virtue of the need for the guidance, was apparently unclear to people beforehand.

And the idea that because of Eagle and Gold Age,
Liberty Reserve necessarily knew that it had to register, I
think, is also mistaken. In 2011, FinCEN issued a final rule,
which was a rule about money services businesses in general,
not virtual currencies at all, but as late as 2011, July of
2011, FinCEN felt it necessary to clarify with a final rule,
not simply guidance, the registration requirements for

foreign-based money services businesses, such as LR, Liberty Reserve.

These things were not so obvious to people in the industry, and the fact that watching a company such as Eagle be prosecuted and deciding we'd like to be in similar business, but we don't want to take the risks of being in the United States and getting prosecuted, we prefer to set up our business in another country and work with authorities there who might be more amenable to working with us to obtaining a license, is a perfectly legitimate thing to do. And I think the evidence shows that that's, in fact, what they did. Liberty Reserve went through a multiyear process with the Costa Rican authorities. It was not simply, do A through Z, and you'll get a license.

This is a new area, and SUGEF, the authority in Costa Rica responsible for these things, worked with Liberty Reserve over a period of time. Liberty Reserve would submit certain materials, a compliance manual, a know-your-customer questionnaire, and documents of that sort, applications for their exchangers, user agreements, and SUGEF would respond stating we've reviewed this document, it's fine in these elements, but you need to make these corrections. Liberty Reserve then responded in turn, we've made these corrections, we've made these additional corrections, and it went back and forth like that for a number of years. And this process didn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

end voluntarily, as the government suggests in its sentencing submission, because Liberty Reserve decided it didn't want to comply with SUGEF's requirements. I don't think there's really any question that this process ended because FinCEN sent a notice to SUGEF indicating that Liberty Reserve was facilitating criminality, and, in particular, terrorism. It used the specter of terrorism to destroy a company.

It didn't go to Liberty Reserve and say, you know, we know you've helped law enforcement in a few other instances, we've got -- and it wasn't just one, I present to the Court with at least three instances in which Liberty Reserve voluntarily assisted law enforcement in their efforts to track down bad users of their services. But FinCEN didn't go to Liberty Reserve and say, hey, we have evidence that there are bad users using your company, number one, you need to register with the Department of the Treasury, so why don't you get that done, and, number two, if you work with us, we can track down even more of these criminals, rather than shut you down, opening the flood gates for Bitcoin and let them all run free, we could work with you, would you be interested in doing that? No, FinCEN didn't do that. Instead, they sent a notice in secret to SUGEF saying that they were involved in allowing criminals to use their services, including terrorists, which, by the way, there's no evidence that terrorists used Liberty In fact, the government dropped that allegation from

its indictment. It's not in the indictment, it's not in the presentence report, it's not in the sentencing submission, and certainly we never found it in the 32 terabytes of discovery that was provided to us. So it seems to me that the approach that the government took, not the people sitting here, but the FinCEN officers, was to go after Liberty Reserve to shut them down, I suspect, because of a hostility towards virtual currencies, and new technologies are frequently not welcomed by existing technologies.

I don't pretend to know the intricacies of what went on behind the scenes, but I think it's a fair bet that the mainstream banking industry that has quite a lot of pull in Washington had some interest in not seeing virtual currencies thrive. Perhaps that had something to do with it, I don't know.

What I do know is, the government's been telling me for more than a year that, yeah, the notice was sent in secret, but Liberty Reserve knew. Well, you know what, I think they did know. I think SUGEF told Liberty Reserve, we got this notice, we can't give you a license, there's no point in going forward anymore, the United States has targeted you, and there's nothing we can do about it at this point, we can't give you a license. And so at that point, Liberty Reserve voluntarily withdrew its application, much as government officials resigned.

They were forced from Costa Rica by U.S. pressure on the Costa Rican government to eliminate Liberty Reserve. There was no effort to work with Liberty Reserve, there was no effort to try to engage Liberty Reserve to stop the criminals that it states were rampant on Liberty Reserve's system, despite the evidence that Liberty Reserve was willing to work with the authorities, including the FBI and law enforcement officials in other countries. Why they wouldn't even attempt to avail themselves of that opportunity, I don't understand, but they didn't.

THE COURT: I note you're pausing, Counsel, and I want you to feel free to take as much time as you'd like, but I want to remind you of the notice I gave yesterday that this proceeding must end at 11:30, and if it needs to be continued, it will be continued this afternoon.

MR. GINSBERG: I appreciate that, Your Honor.

The government also points to the fact that it's identified approximately 1300 websites that have either the word Carter, or CVV, or are engaged in foreign exchange trading, or online gambling, I think, was one of them, and proxy servers, which they say are used for Internet privacy, and they've identified these sites as self-evident criminal and likely criminal and indicate that Mr. Marmilev would certainly have to have known of their existence.

We pointed out in our sentencing submission that there

were 5 million user accounts by the government's count, and so 1300 or so of these accounts is not a substantial number. The government responded saying, these are merchant accounts, not just user accounts. Okay, there's about 62,000 merchants on Liberty Reserve's website. Still -- it's a far more significant number than 1300 out of 5 million, but it's still not the kind of number that the government would have the Court believe is just blatantly obvious to anyone who looks.

Beyond that, the government says, well, forex traders, that's clearly criminal. Really? If you go on Google right now, same with high-yield investment programs, by the way, type in forex, type in high-yield investment program, the Court's going to find hundreds, if not thousands, of forex traders and high-yield investment programs.

Number one, as far as I'm aware, there's no law enforcement action against those companies to shut them down. If they're so obviously criminal, one wonders why they're continuing to exist. How, if the government can't stop them, was Ms. Magdo supposed to know as a technical officer, by the way, that they were obviously criminal in nature?

Proxy servers? The fact that people want to have offshore web hosting or use virtual private networks to ensure their privacy makes them criminals? I personally find that a bit offensive, frankly. I understand that criminals seek privacy, but the converse is not true. People are entitled to

priory regardless of whether they're criminals, and in this post-9/11 world, I've learned to accept that our country has collectively made a decision that a little less privacy is acceptable in exchange for a little more security. Frankly, I think that's a bad bargain, but be that as it may, the suggestion that the government's making that promoting businesses that allow people to maintain their privacy on the Internet automatically means that you're promoting criminality, I think, is beyond the pale.

And if only criminals are interested in privacy, I suggest the government go speak to the people who posted the billboard on Canal Street that says your data belongs to you, BitTorrent. BitTorrent is one of these Internet service providers that helps people secure the privacy of their data. I don't think there's a billboard on Canal Street that's aimed solely at criminals. I think there are plenty of people in the United States and around the world who want their information to remain private despite the fact that they're not criminals.

The government uses a broadbrush -- high-yield investment program, criminal; forex, criminal; proxy server, criminal; betting site, criminal. Maybe here, not everywhere.

The government also says, well, Liberty Reserve really had no anti-money laundering policy at all, it was a fig leaf designed to hide what was really going on, was the term that the prosecutor used in its sentencing submission.

We submitted documents that show that Liberty Reserve required its exchangers to go through extensive verification. It required passports, notarized copies of their passports, with official translations of their passports, account information to verify their addresses and bank accounts, know-your-customer questionnaires that were required to be submitted. And this wasn't just for a single exchanger, this was for many exchangers. The government seems to think that that's completely irrelevant.

There were multiple exchangers. They were required to fill out this documentation. We submitted an exhibit in which Liberty Reserve sent out an email to all of its exchangers saying that additional verification requirements were necessary, and if they weren't met by a particular date, all of their accounts were going to be frozen. That's verification, that's an anti-money laundering policy.

SUGEF required Liberty Reserve to comply with the United States SDN list, list of specially designated nationals. We provided evidence that Liberty Reserve was, in fact, complying with SUGEF's requirement to meet that obligation.

Liberty Reserve provided SUGEF with information that it was testing its employees with respect to their knowledge of Costa Rica's anti-money laundering law. The test results were pretty good. Liberty Reserve also provided information that it was testing its employees with their knowledge of the

know-your-customer rules. Also, test results were pretty good.

And Liberty Reserve closed or froze 5,000 accounts that it deemed were suspicious, where in some way they received a customer complaint about them that they were somehow bad actors, they were hackers, they were thieves, whatever the reason may have been. Liberty Reserve froze those accounts and required more verification or more information from those accounts.

The government, in its sentencing submission, said we've never been provided that information. Well, until that sentencing submission, they never asked for it, number one.

Number two, if Mr. Marmilev, on an antiquated laptop in the law library of the Metropolitan Correctional Center, was able to conduct a search to find these closed accounts, I'm quite sure that the FBI, with its vast resources and the discovery material that it managed to go through, could have found these accounts. Moreover, had they asked us how that search was conducted and what was necessary to do it, we would have provided them that information.

Mr. Marmilev printed out for me a list of the 5,000 accounts or so that were closed for various reasons because they were suspected of hacking, because they were believed to be engaged in some bad act. And the list, as Mr. Marmilev points out, as explanations as to why these accounts were frozen, the government just glosses right over that.

It also ignores the fact that the compliance officer sent a letter to SUGEF about a particular account that Liberty Reserve was pursuing because of their belief that the person was engaged in illicit activities.

Liberty Reserve also, Mr. Marmilev himself, created something called Liberty Guard, which was designed to prevent its customers from being victims of identity thieves. And the government says, well, apart from ignoring all of that, it says after they left Costa Rica, after they ceased their application process with Costa Rica, there is no evidence that they continued any anti-money laundering efforts. That's not true. Exhibit 21 and 22 to our sentencing submission are dated in September and December of 2012, and they're both examples of Liberty Reserve going after customers who, for one reason or another, had been identified as engaged in some form of improper activity, and Liberty Reserve froze their accounts, requested additional information, doesn't appear from the documents we reviewed that they ever got it or that the accounts were ever released.

So Liberty Reserve, it's not so black-and-white, as the government would have the Court believe. Liberty Reserve did a number of things.

But I'm not going to stand here and suggest that there's no bad evidence. If there were no bad evidence, Mr. Marmilev would not have pleaded guilty. There is bad

evidence, that's why he pleaded guilty, because he is guilty. He stood before the Court, and he admitted that he was in a managerial role in a company that was required to have a license in the United States, which did not, and that he's, therefore, guilty of that crime, and he acknowledged that, yes, Your Honor's correct, it was a carefully negotiated and worded allocution, not to avoid any particular responsibility for his actions, but because it's somewhat of a complicated statute that required that he hit every element of the offense. And we used high-yield investment programs as an example of one type of business that Mr. Marmilev had a pretty good belief were fraudulent and didn't really do anything about it. He did that. And that's why he's here, that's why he's facing the punishment he's facing. We're not hiding from that. We don't suggest that he somehow didn't do that.

The government points to web posts that it claims show that Mr. Marmilev was advertising and promoting Liberty Reserve to criminals. I don't know, I admit they're not all ideal, but one of them is a web post in which it says high-yield investment programs, that's a synonym for gambling, the rules are simple, put your money in, get your money out before the company closes. He's not advocating the use of high-yield investment programs. If anything, I read that as a warning to people that high-yield investment programs are likely fraudulent, and people should be careful, and nowhere in that

post is he saying, I'm from Liberty Reserve or Liberty Reserve is a great place to find these programs, or if you're going to do it, transact your business through Liberty Reserve. There's no promotion of Liberty Reserve there.

He acknowledges in that web post exactly what he acknowledged to the Court, that there was a high probability that these high-yield investment programs were fraudulent, and he's warning if you're going to play this game, be careful.

Before I address the other web posts, just as an aside, one thing I note is that the government's been telling me for over a year that Mr. Marmilev was on web forums used by criminals advertising and promoting Liberty Reserve, and I kept saying I'm not finding that in the discovery, would you care to direct me to it? I'm not sure we want to give you that information just yet. You know when I got it? When they submitted their sentencing memorandum.

When I looked at the web posts, and I saw how many web posts the user name Redd and the user name Vintage had combined, it's over 1200. The government gave you four, Your Honor. I haven't had a chance to go through all of those other posts, but I did find some others, which I'll share with the Court.

THE COURT: Give me a sense of how long you're going to be, Counsel.

MR. GINSBERG: I can probably finish by 11:30. I

think we will need to come back.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GINSBERG: I imagine the government's going to want to respond to some of what I am going to say, and Mr. Marmilev is going to need to speak, and Your Honor is going to need to consider everything.

THE COURT: I'm considering as we're going along here. How long is your client going to speak?

MR. GINSBERG: Maybe ten minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. So why don't you wrap it up, then, in another five minutes.

MR. GINSBERG: Okay.

The other post the government points out is the post regarding the mutual legal assistance treaty between the United States and Costa Rica. That post was a response to a post that was incorrectly put up by probably a competitor of Liberty Reserve in which the person said that due to a mutual legal assistance treaty with the United States, Costa Rica had closed Liberty Reserve, which at the time was not true. Mr. Marmilev corrected that. He didn't say anything that suggests to me that Liberty Reserve was a good place for criminals. He said, in response to the post, which was cited to direct people away from Liberty Reserve, Liberty Reserve is a company that's in a country that's not subject to the United States rules, which, okay, if you want to say that that shows he's trying to evade

U.S. law, I don't think that that shows he's trying to evade it, I think he shows he believed he was in a country that wasn't subject to it. It turns out he was wrong, but it cuts against the notion that he knew. I think his post at the time, which was back in 2009 or so, demonstrates that at that time, he didn't know that they were supposed to register. He was telling people, you don't need to register.

Similarly, in another post, he was asked whether
Liberty Reserve was required to or should obtain greater
verification of individual users as opposed to merchants. He
said, no, that's only required in the United States. The
government has responded again saying that shows he's trying to
evade U.S. law enforcement. I say, no, it shows that he didn't
believe he was subject to law enforcement, again, proving that
he was wrong, but also proving that he didn't know back then,
as the government would have the Court believe, that he was
subject to it.

The government also points out that Mr. Marmilev said Liberty Reserve is more tolerant of shady businesses than some other web transfer money company. That's the worst one.

Certainly I wish I were not standing here having to defend that particular statement. In any situation like this, there is evidence that you wish didn't exist. Shady, I would submit, in Mr. Marmilev's translation from Russian, really applies more to a gray area of business as opposed to what we would consider

necessarily illegal business. But, again, Mr. Marmilev acknowledged that he knew that there were bad actors using Liberty Reserve, and he turned a blind eye to it.

But that doesn't mean, and I disagree with the government's assessment, that all of or most of the customers using Liberty Reserve were criminals. In fact, we presented evidence to the Court in the form of surveys conducted by Liberty Reserve and an article from the BBC that indicated that there were users, legitimate users, who were using Liberty Reserve.

The government said, well, we posted a notice, and 32 people came to us and asked for their money back. I don't know why that is. It doesn't mean necessarily, however, that it was because everybody else was a criminal. It could mean that there were a lot of people in countries all over the world, in Africa, in Asia, in various places, that didn't have the wherewithal to contact the United States Attorney's Office to get back what may have been a minimal amount of money in some of their accounts.

The government wants to paint this case as black-and-white, as I've said a number of times. It's not. Liberty Reserve was neither all good, nor all bad, and Mr. Marmilev was certainly not all bad. And the fact that he was aware that Mr. Budovsky and Mr. Katz had been prosecuted for operating an exchanger, not a virtual currency company

itself, but an exchanger, in the United States, was sentenced to probation for not having a New York State license at the time when he was in this country for three years, much younger and less sophisticated than he is now, certainly an intelligent person, but not legally savvy, does not mean that when they created a new company and moved to another country, that he was aware that what they were doing was setting out to achieve the goal of stealing or obtaining the illegal customers that were now homeless because Eagle had been closed down.

Liberty Reserve was a pioneering company on the frontier of a new industry. It wasn't the first, and it wasn't the only one, but it was operating in an area where the regulatory agencies themselves acknowledged the law was unclear, there was confusion, there was not certainty, there was not clarity. The law is continuing to develop. There is just now, in New York, the first in the nation proposed license for virtual currencies.

The wholesale brushing aside of all of the evidence of the efforts that Liberty Reserve made to impose anti-money laundering policies to comply with Costa Rican rules and regulations and to work with the authorities there, to me, suggests that the government just wants to have it one way. In my view, Mr. Marmilev certainly committed a serious crime, there's no doubt about that. He's before the Court to be sentenced on a felony conviction. There are grades of how

serious a felony conviction could be, but being in front of a federal judge to be sentenced on a felony conviction is about as serious as it gets in my opinion. He's well aware of that.

And I am not trying to minimize the fact that he committed a crime, nor am I trying to minimize the fact that the system was used by a substantial number of people who victimized a substantial number of individuals, but I don't believe that that places Mr. Marmilev at the highest level of the individuals who violate Section 1960. I don't think that places Mr. Marmilev in a position of those who sponsor terrorism and use money-transmitting systems to get money to Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Yemen directly designed to harm U.S. citizens, physically harm. I don't believe it equates him with people who have extensive criminal records that might have similar guidelines and who face the same maximum penalty. I don't think it equates him with people who are involved in drug trafficking and arms trafficking and use these money services businesses for those reasons.

The business perhaps should have been more careful from the outset. It certainly should have had greater legal guidance and tighter compliance efforts, and, yes, there is some evidence here that indicates that Mr. Marmilev knew certain things, was culpable, and that's why he's pleaded guilty. But I respectfully submit that it does not demonstrate that he is among the most serious offenders, and I think that

the government has tried to completely eliminate anything that shows the good things that Liberty Reserve has done and focused strictly on the negative, and, in my view, the truth is somewhere in between.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Counsel. I appreciate your advocacy for your client.

Mr. Marmilev, is there anything that you would like to say upon your behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

Good day, Your Honor. As a computer guy who usually communicates by emails, I'm not very good at public speaking or expressing my feelings in English, and English is not my primary language. Nevertheless, I will try my best to show exactly how I felt for the past 18 months.

First of all, I would like to apologize for the size of the memorandum I have submitted. My intentions were to provide you with as much information as possible and show you what really happened. I timed this speech, and it should not take more than ten minutes.

In the beginning, I would like to tell you my history and what defines me as a person. Then I will explain my job at Liberty Reserve and where I made my mistakes. As I will explain later, I'm taking full responsibility for my conduct. I regret the decision I have made. I would like to express to all the people that were hurt by my decisions how truly sorry I

am.

I would also like to speak about the lessons I've learned and my future plans to pay my debts, both financial and ethical.

I was born in Ukraine before it split from USSR. At the age of 10, I immigrated with my mother and grandmother to Israel to avoid the harsh treatment of Jews in Russian army. In Israel, my mother decided to rent an apartment in a middle class neighborhood instead of renting an apartment in a poor area. We lived with roommates for seven years. My mother worked two jobs to support me and my grandmother.

I did not understand why we needed to live in such a relatively expensive neighborhood until much later on. My neighbors were doctors, lawyers, professors, and successful businessmen. Imagine getting help with your homework from a professor. Some of them gave me small jobs, like cleaning stairwells — stairwells, washing cars, and watering their gardens. But the best thing? They gave me the right advices.

On one such job, a lawyer named Yakov gave me an advice that changed my life. He said, "Houses, gardens, cars, money will only make you happy for a moment. You have to find something that will make you — that will never stop making you happy." I was 12, I did not understand what he meant, but I remember his advice. Later in my life, I realized that what makes me happy is to help people by solving the problems that

make them suffer. It's that simple. It might sound naive, stupid or cliche, but if you look at the person who is suffering and then solve the cause of the pain, you will see so much happiness, that it spreads to everyone, including me.

I helped different people with different things. I never cared for race, gender, or religious beliefs. I never asked for money or favors, I just helped, and my fee was their happiness. I believe in karma, you do good things to others, and good things will happen to you.

After I moved to the United States to study programming in Brooklyn College, I started working in construction to help support the high tuition fee. I never backed down from any job. One evening I dropped a heavy sheetrock on my foot, and I could barely limp back to the car. While driving home, my employer told me to stay home, and that he will call me back. I was out of the job and needed money for the college. Before even I reached home, I received a phone call. It was Arthur Budovsky offering me a job, a customer support job that I can do from home. I ask him how he found me. He told me that mutual friends whom I helped recommended me. Nothing happens for no reason.

For a guy that was always -- that always loved computers, it was a dream job. In 2006, I started working with a team of programmers in Ukraine on developing Liberty Reserve's software and infrastructure. I knew that Liberty

Reserve would be successful because its purpose was to allow people who did not have international credit cards to shop online. Back in Israel, I was one of these people. I had to ask my aunt, who was living in the United States, to buy and ship me some things for my computer. Even though I had saved money, I had no way to buy them. Israel merchants did not have those items.

During my work, I was requested more and more to investigate hack attempts on our clients' accounts. Hackers were tricking our clients via fake emails and fake websites into giving their login information to Liberty Reserve and other banks. As a person responsible for cyber security of Liberty Reserve, it was my job to make sure that everyone was safe. As someone whose own identity was stolen from an online merchant with sub-par security, I took security of clients' identities and funds very seriously. I traced the attacks, I identified all intrusion methods, I froze hackers' accounts in Liberty Reserve, I contacted their hosting companies and entered them into black lists, but they never stopped. And although we warned and educated our clients as much as possible about these cyber attacks, Liberty Reserve could not protect its clients beyond its website.

In my spare time, I created a small program called Liberty Guard to protect the clients, all clients, any person, from hackers and identity thieves. Instead of dealing with

each and every attempt by myself, I recruited the help of our clients. It worked. More and more of our clients started to report these attacks using Liberty Guard instead of falling prey to them. Once a client -- once one client reports a hacking website, all other clients are automatically protected. I was happy, just like Yakov's advice had promised. Liberty Reserve was so impressed with it, that they put it on every page of their website. I kept on working with Liberty Guard and updating it until the last day of my work.

During this time, there was another problem, the scale of which I just could not know. Some investment companies utilizing Liberty Reserve were defrauding customers in the same manner as Bernie Madoff did later on. I saw a warning on the front page of Liberty Reserve explaining to our customer what a Ponzi scheme is and to be careful when you invest online.

I now guessed the problem was so hard to solve, that Liberty Reserve had to actively warn its clients about it. Liberty Reserve had a compliance department, verification department, and legal department with pretty experienced and bright managers. I did not know how successful they were in stopping or producing Ponzi schemes, but I guess they were too slow to stop them. Not knowing this back then, I willfully ignored this problem and let them do their work alone.

As an IT guy, I did not know anything about investing or compliance. I now know that this was a wrong decision and

my biggest mistake, for which I'm standing here in front of you. I promise you, Your Honor, my decision was not malicious, but nevertheless, it was a mistake.

I am not an expert in Ponzi schemes, and I am not sure anyone is. Even SEC could not recognize Bernie Madoff's Ponzi scheme for decades, but it doesn't mean I shouldn't have tried. I'm a pretty intelligent and stubborn guy. I will not rest until I solve a problem. I am sure I could have created something for Liberty Guard that utilizes the knowledge of the whole Liberty Reserve user base to single out suspicious investment businesses. I don't know if it would work or not, but that's not the point. I failed to try to fix a problem, a problem that made people suffer. And I am not a guy that lets people suffer. It's not who I am. Now I see it as my personal failure, and I would like to apologize to those that lost their money to criminals.

My failure to register Liberty Reserve with FinCEN and the failure to find a solution to Ponzi schemes have made me and my family suffer for 18 months, with a possibility of extra 42 months to go in the federal prison, up to one extra year in immigration prison, possible deportation and separation from my family, a complete forfeiture of everything I have and my family have. I'm not a perfect human being, but I'm not a criminal. I have made mistakes, but I am taking responsibility for them. I will continue to pay the price for them for the

rest of my life by being labeled money laundering felon all over the Internet, which is where I actually work.

As the only man in a family full of women, I cannot even explain how bad I feel about my actions that left them alone, forced them to get second jobs to support themselves, and worsened their health due to stress. But the worst thing is when my wife could not get a cup of warm tea because of severe hip injury while I was locked behind the thick walls, not able to help her or ease her pain. The pain I felt was ripping me apart, especially when the cause of this pain were my own actions. I will never do anything to experience this pain or hopelessness again.

As I said in the beginning, I'm very sorry for my decisions. I never expected those actions to hurt anyone, but they did, and many people, including people very dear to me, got hurt. And it hurts me, more than anyone can imagine, to know that I hurt someone. I will never make this mistake again. It is too painful to bear.

I understood my licensing violation in the first meeting with my lawyer when he explained it to me, and I learned a very hard lesson from my mistake. I will continue to help people not only in the way I know, but I will also do my best to educate myself and help people in other ways. Never again I will ignore anything or anyone due to my limitations. No matter what company I will work for, or if I open my own

business, I will always make sure that the company is fully registered and fully compliant with all the laws in all the countries it is accessible from.

My plans for the future are already defined. I will finish a website that delivers homemade hot foods to those that cannot get to our family's grocery store, like mothers with small children and older people. Most of the work, I completed before my arrest. I ask Your Honor for leniency and to allow me to serve the public in a more productive way.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Marmilev.

I want to just confirm that there is no forfeiture component as a portion of this sentence?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: That's correct, Your Honor. Because of the nature of the assets, the government is going to be filing a civil forfeiture complaint against the assets that are tied to the Liberty Reserve money.

THE COURT: This isn't about online currency or digital currency, this was a money transfer system that was run in a way that was of great assistance to a variety of criminal enterprises. And the suggestion by Mr. Marmilev that he didn't understand that and understand the scope of it, I don't find to be credible. I think there is a very serious need for deterrence here, individual deterrence and general deterrence, besides appropriate punishment.

The fundamental facts from which I draw my conclusions are not in dispute, including the passages that I directed counsel to at the beginning of today's proceeding, which is more than an hour and a half ago.

Mr. Marmilev, please stand.

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

I am going to impose a term of imprisonment of 60 months, to be followed by a term of supervised release of three years, with the following special conditions: That you report to the probation office in the district to which you are released within 72 hours of release from custody; that you not commit another federal, state or local crime; that you not illegally possess a controlled substance; that you submit to the regular drug testing program; that you are prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous weapon; that you cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer; that you pay the fine that I am going to impose; that you comply with the standard conditions of supervised release; that you submit to a reasonable search by the probation department; that you seek and maintain full-time employment; that you comply with the immigration laws and cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security; that you provide the probation department access to any and all requested financial information; that you not incur any new credit card charge or open any new credit line without approval of the probation department; that you notify the United States Attorney's Office

for this district within 30 days of any change of mailing or residence address that occurs while any portion of the fine I'm going to impose remains unpaid; you shall be supervised by the district of your residence; you shall pay a special assessment of \$100. I impose a fine of \$250,000. I'm going to require payment of the fine at the rate of 15 percent of your gross monthly income.

Counsel, is there any legal reason why the sentence I have described on the record cannot be imposed as stated?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: No, Your Honor.

MR. GINSBERG: No, Your Honor.

With respect to the fine, however, I would ask if the Court would consider staying any interest on the fine until Mr. Marmilev has concluded his term of imprisonment?

THE COURT: Yes, I will stay the interest until he's released from prison.

MR. GINSBERG: And the fine becomes due when he becomes released from prison? I couldn't quite hear everything Your Honor said.

THE COURT: I said it would be paid at 15 percent of his gross monthly income. If he is employed while in prison in a non-UNICOR work program, he shall pay \$25 per quarter. If he participates in a UNICOR program, he shall pay 50 percent of his monthly UNICOR earnings.

MR. GINSBERG: I understand the terms of the Court's

judgment, and what I have seen happening in recent cases is that when there are fines imposed or other financial things imposed, the civil forfeiture division of the United States Attorney's Office then starts serving subpoenas, and seeking to file judgments, and seize assets, and I would ask that those efforts not be able to be done until he's released from prison. If he's working in prison, he will certainly pay it, but the additional aspects of paying the fine, I would ask they be stayed until he's completed his sentence.

THE COURT: Your application is denied. Obviously, if something happens, and you have a legal application to make, you have an application that sounds under the law that can respond to a particular act that has taken place, but you have -- I'm not suggesting that you don't have a right to come to court and seek relief, but I'm not going to enter an order denying the government the ability to do whatever it is entitled to do under the law when I don't know specifically what it might undertake.

MR. GINSBERG: Well, the government --

THE COURT: So, Counsel --

MR. GINSBERG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- I'm not entering some kind of general injunction against the government or a general stay. I don't think -- I'm not even sure I'd have authority to do that. But if the government acts, and you believe it has acted

inappropriately, I'm not going to suggest that you shouldn't come to court and seek any relief to which you are entitled at that time. And at that time, any court would be in a position to look at precisely what's happened and to understand any legal arguments by the government or by Mr. Marmilev that would relate to that specific action, which is the context in which I think this issue should be addressed, when it's concrete.

MR. GINSBERG: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I want to advise the defendant of his right to appeal. If you're unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the filing of the judgment of conviction.

I believe there are open counts against this defendant.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ GOLDSTEIN: Yes. The government moves to dismiss the open counts, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Those open counts against this defendant are dismissed.

Mr. Goldstein, is there anything else we need to do at this time?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Ginsberg, is there anything else we need to do at this time?

```
ECCKMARS
                MR. GINSBERG: No. Thank you, Your Honor.
 1
                THE COURT: Thank you.
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```