1 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT 2 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE 3 WESTERN DIVISION 4 5 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 6 Plaintiff, 7 vs. NO. 2:17-cr-20238 8 OLUFOLAJIMI ABEGUNDE, 9 Defendant. 10 11 12 13 SENTENCING HEARING 14 15 BEFORE THE HONORABLE SHERYL H. LIPMAN, JUDGE 16 17 Tuesday 18 22nd day of October, 2019 19 20 21 22 23 CANDACE S. COVEY, RDR, CRR OFFICIAL REPORTER FOURTH FLOOR FEDERAL BUILDING 24 MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103 25 UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

2 APPEARANCES 1 2 3 4 5 Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff: 6 MR. TIMOTHY FLOWERS United States Department of Justice 7 1301 New York Avenue NW Suite 600 8 Washington DC (202) 353-0684 9 MS. DEBRA IRELAND 10 United States Attorneys Office 167 N. Main St. 11 Suite 800 Memphis, TN 38103 12 (901) 544-4231 13 14 15 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant: 16 MR. JOHN KEITH PERRY Perry Griffin, PC 17 5699 Getwell Road Bldq. G5 Southaven, MS 38672 18 (662) 536-6868 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

| | | 3 | |
|------------|--|----------------|--------------|
| 1 | WITNESS INDEX | | |
| 2 | WITNESS | PAGE | LINE |
| 3 | ANNE MAPLES | | |
| 4 | Direct Examination By Ms. Flowers Cross-Examination By Mr. Perry Redirect Examination By Mr. Flowers | 10 24 28 | 6 9 25 |
| 5 | _ | 20 | 25 |
| 6 | KARINA GARCIA Direct Examination By Mr. Flowers Cross-Examination By Mr. Perry | 30 39 | 6 20 |
| 7 | MARCUS VANCE | | |
| 8 | Direct Examination By Mr. Flowers Cross-Examination By Mr. Perry | 44 58 | 6 7 |
| 9 | Redirect Examination By Mr. Flowers | 68 | 16 |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 4 J | | | |
| | | | |

EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBIT NUMBER PAGE LINE Certificate Winner's Certificate Wells Fargo Bank Transaction Receipt Wells Fargo Bank Transaction Receipt Wells Fargo Bank Transaction Receipt Bank of America Customer Receipt Bank of America Customer Receipt dated 7/25/17 Copies of Chats Deposit Ticket PNC Bank Copies of Chats Copies of Chats Copies of Chats

1 Tuesday 2 October 22, 2019 3 The continuation of the Sentencing hearing in this case began on this date, Tuesday, 22nd day of October, 2019, 4 5 at 1:00 p.m., when and where evidence was introduced and 6 proceedings were had as follows: 7 8 9 10 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 11 MS. IRELAND: Afternoon, Your Honor. 12 MR. FLOWERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 13 14 THE COURT: All right. I'm determined that this 15 is going to be the last day that we set for this sentencing. 16 We are going to get it done. All right. Are y'all ready to 17 proceed? 18 MR. PERRY: Yes, Your Honor. 19 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: I am going to sort of start again to 21 reflect everything that's now in the record. So I've got a 22 presentence report with three addenda. I've got the 23 Government's position paper, the Government's response to the Defendant's motion that was to exclude the information they 24 25 had submitted. And then the most recent Government's

supplemental position paper.

For the Defendants, I've got that initial position paper. I've got the memo to exclude the demonstrative conduct. And then I've got the most recent supplemental sentencing memo. Anything else I should have related to the sentencing?

MR. FLOWERS: I believe that's it, Your Honor.

MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Perry, have you and Mr. Abegunde read and discussed the presentence report?

MR. PERRY: We have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The Defendant objected first, and I think I noted this before in the two other times we've been here. The Defendant objected to numerous factual assertions which don't go to the calculation of the guidelines. And we talked about those before. Those are noted for the record, but there's nothing for me to determine related to those objections. Do you all agree?

MR. PERRY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So the first objection that we keep getting to -- or the next objection goes to paragraph 47. And that goes to the amount of the loss. It is my understanding from reading you all's submissions that we have additional proof today on that issue. I think that's one of the issues. Mr. Perry had mentioned at the last

sentencing that the Defense wanted to offer proof. I think also the Government has proof today too; is that correct?

MR. FLOWERS: Yes. And if I may add a point to

that. We have two witnesses here, both of whom are in the courtroom. I don't know if the Court has a preference on asking them to -- one of them to sit outside the courtroom while the other testifies or anything along those lines. That's point one.

Point two, am I on? Are you sure you can hear me?

THE COURT: I can hear you. I think you're on. Yeah, you're on.

MR. FLOWERS: We had a third witness, Ms. Rachel Aller who missed her flight. So she was unable to make it in time. So we dismissed her from the subpoena. We would ask that Special Agent Marcus Vance relay the summary as relayed to him in an interview that he conducted with her just about her experience. It will be very brief, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FLOWERS: It was a very brief interview is my understanding. Special Agent Vance would also, depending on the two witnesses who go before him, also potentially introduce some exhibits for the Court's consideration. Just a few. No more than probably four to five, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. As to the first question, are

the witnesses related to the same matter?

MR. FLOWERS: No more than just being the same case. But they don't have overlapping conduct or anything like that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Perry, your position?

MR. PERRY: As it relates to the witnesses -relating, I guess, to a summary of what a witness plans to
testify to, I understand that in these proceedings that some
of the hearsay rules are somewhat relaxed, but if it's going
to proof regarding loss in this particular instance, I think
it goes -- I feel unless the proof is going to be that the
witness was a part of some business e-mail compromise and
that's the summary, I would say that the Court could relate
that, but anything as it relates to a particular witness, the
loss, how that witness had a loss that was connected to
Mr. Abegunde, I don't think it's fair, Your Honor. As it
relates to the missing witness.

Now, to the evidentiary presentation that the Government has, as long as I have the ability to cross examine, at this point I don't think I'm in a position to object to it. But as it relates to a witness that's not here, I don't think it's fair for the Court to consider that.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's -- I'll hear the testimony and address the weight of the testimony based on the fact that it would be hearsay as we go along. But it

sounds like you don't have an objection to the two witnesses 1 2 who are connected, I guess, to two different things both 3 being in the courtroom at the same -- while the others 4 testify. The first being in the courtroom while the 5 second is -- one being in the -- you know what I mean. 6 You're not going to call for the rule. 7 MR. PERRY: Right. I'm not going to call for the rule in this instance. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. You may proceed. 10 MR. FLOWERS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. The 11 Government calls Mrs. Anne Maples. 12 And may I approach, Your Honor, to be at the lectern? 13 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 Come on up, ma'am. If you would, stop at that 16 podium. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES 10 1 ANE MAPLES, 2 3 was called as a witness and having first been duly sworn 4 testified as follows: 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. FLOWERS: 8 Q. Good afternoon, ma'am. 9 Α. Good afternoon. 10 Could you please state your name and spell it for the 11 record? 12 Α. My name is Anne, A-N-N-E. Maples, M-A-P-L-E-S. 13 Q. And where are you from? 14 Α. Mobile, Alabama. 15 Do you also live there? Q. 16 Α. Yes. 17 And how old are you, ma'am? 18 Α. 72. 19 Q. And what was your career? 20 I'm a retired schoolteacher. Α. 21 And what do you do now? Q. 22 Α. I sit for elderly people. 23 What does that mean? Q. 24 Α. I'm a caregiver. 25 Now, Mrs. Maples, I want to take you back to 2016. Q. UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES

- 1 | you remember getting a facebook invitation from someone you
- 2 | went to school with?
- 3 A. Yes, I do.
- 4 Q. Would you please explain the circumstances of that?
- 5 A. Well, I had gotten a facebook friend request from a
- 6 | former classmate, and I had forgotten that I had friended her
- 7 | already, so I friended her, thinking it was my classmate.
- 8 And that's how it started. And I was thinking I was talking
- 9 on facebook to my classmate.
- 10 Q. Now, Mrs. Maples, you said that is how "it" started.
- 11 What do you mean by "it"?
- 12 A. That is how the conversation began between the scammer
- 13 and myself.
- 14 Q. Now, were you told that you had won a prize,
- 15 Mrs. Maples?
- 16 A. Yes. I was told I would win \$250,000 if I did certain
- 17 things.
- 18 Q. So -- and were you sent any documentation to prove
- 19 | that you had won that \$250,000?
- 20 A. I was sent two certificates with my name on it. One
- 21 | saying that I could win a prize for \$250,000.
- 22 Q. Now, at that time, did you have any reason to doubt
- 23 that message that was coming from someone you thought was
- 24 | your friend?
- 25 A. Not really. No, sir.

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES 12 1 Why not, ma'am? 2 Well, I just thought my friend had received it, so I 3 thought maybe that I could. 4 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, may I approach? 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 MR. FLOWERS: May I question from the witness 7 stand? THE COURT: Yes. 8 BY MR. FLOWERS: 9 10 Let me show you this first document. Do you recognize 11 that? 12 Α. Yes, I do. What is that, ma'am? 13 14 That is the certificate that they sent me that I was 15 the beneficiary of \$250,000. 16 Is that a true and accurate copy of what you saw? Q. 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 Does your name appear on that? Q. 19 Yes, it does. Α. 20 Does the amount also appear on that? Q. 21 Α. Yes, it does. 22 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time I'll offer 23 this into evidence for the Court's consideration at 24 sentencing. 25 THE COURT: Exhibit 1. Any objection, Mr. Perry?

```
TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES
                                                          13
 1
                 MR. PERRY: No objection. No objection, Your
 2
    Honor.
 3
                 THE COURT: Okay.
 4
                 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
 5
    marked as Exhibit Number 1.)
 6
    BY MR. FLOWERS:
 7
            It's the same with regards to this one, ma'am.
 8
    showing you this document. Do you recognize that?
 9
    Α.
            Yes, I do.
10
          And what is that?
11
            That is a winner's certificate with my name on it
12
    saying that I have won $250,000.
13
            Is that a true and accurate copy of the certificate
    that was sent to you?
14
15
          Yes, sir. It is.
16
                 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the
17
    Government moves to admit this for the Court's consideration.
18
                 THE COURT: Exhibit 2.
19
                 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
20
    marked as Exhibit Number 2.)
21
    BY MR. FLOWERS:
22
            I'll show you both of these, Mrs. Maples.
23
                 THE COURT: Could you bring them around and let
24
    her mark them, or are they already marked?
25
                 MR. FLOWERS: I just put the stickers on them.
```

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES 14 1 didn't put the numbers on them, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. FLOWERS: May I move this? I'm sorry. I didn't ask. 4 5 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, yeah. 6 MR. FLOWERS: That's -- my apologies. I should 7 have known to ask ahead of time. I'm sorry about that. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. I can see it over here. 9 It's not up there. 10 MR. FLOWERS: Okay. I can see it in front of me 11 as well, so... Mr. Perry, are you able to see it there? 12 MR. PERRY: I can see the screen. Yes. I can 13 see your hand. Thank you. BY MR. FLOWERS: 14 15 This is what has been admitted as Government's 1. So 16 down here in the right-hand corner, do you see my finger, 17 Mrs. Maples? 18 Yes, sir. Α. 19 It mentions an Agent Horn. Do you know an Agent Horn? 20 No, I do not. 21 And it also -- does it indicate that you have been Q. 22 approved? 23 Yes, it does. 24 Okay. I'm going to switch to Government's 2 then. 25 Are you able to see that on your screen, ma'am?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. And again, I will point my finger to an Agent Horn.
- 3 Is that the same Agent Horn that was on the first document,
- 4 Mrs. Maples?
- 5 A. Yes, it is.
- 6 Q. Do you know that Agent Horn?
- 7 A. No, I do not.
- 8 Q. Now, Mrs. Maples, you also mentioned that you had to
- 9 send things. What exactly were you asked to send?
- 10 A. Well, the first thing I was asked to send was \$300 so
- 11 | that it was a fee to be approved.
- 12 O. And where were you supposed to send that money from?
- 13 A. I was supposed to send that from -- well, it wasn't
- 14 | Wells Fargo. It was from...
- 15 Q. Do you have notes with you, ma'am?
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, may she refer to her
- 18 notes?
- 19 THE COURT: Yes.
- 20 A. It was sent from -- I do not have that on my notes.
- 21 It was sent from -- not Wells Fargo but it was sent from...
- 22 BY MR. FLOWERS:
- 23 Q. Are you familiar with Western Union, ma'am?
- 24 A. Yes, sir. It was sent from Western Union.
- 25 Q. Are you also familiar with MoneyGram?

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES

- 1 A. Yes, I am.
- 2 Q. Were you told to send money from either of those
- 3 services?
- 4 A. Yes. I was told to send to both of them. Western
- 5 Union did not accept, but the MoneyGram did accept the 300.
- 6 Q. Now, did you know the individuals to whom you were
- 7 sending money?
- 8 A. No, I did not.
- 9 Q. Were you also asked to deposit money into Wells Fargo
- 10 accounts?
- 11 A. Yes, I was.
- 12 Q. What were some of the reasons you were given why you
- 13 | needed to send money, Mrs. Maples?
- 14 A. Well, I needed to send money first of all because of a
- 15 registration fee, which was \$300. And then I was asked to
- 16 | send money to pay for television fees and cameras when they
- 17 presented me the check of \$250,000.
- 18 Q. So can you speak a little bit more about that?
- 19 Television fees, what exactly does that mean?
- 20 A. Well, that included the cameras coming to my house.
- 21 The representatives -- the people giving me the check for
- 22 \$250,000.
- 23 Q. Did you ever send off the money for that fee, for the
- 24 TV fee?
- 25 A. Yes, I did.

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES 17 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, may I approach? 1 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 BY MR. FLOWERS: I'm showing you a document, ma'am. Do you recognize 4 5 that? 6 Yes, sir. I do. Α. 7 Q. What is that? 8 Α. That is a receipt from the check that I deposited into a unknown person's account. 9 10 And for what amount? Q. 11 Α. For \$4,500. 12 Now, there's a notation at the top. Do you see that? Yes, I do. 13 Α. Do you recognize that? 14 Q. Yes. That's my handwriting. 15 Α. 16 And is this a true and accurate copy of that deposit Q. 17 slip? 18 Yes, sir. It is. Α. 19 MR. FLOWERS: At this time the Government would 20 move to admit this into evidence for the Court's 21 consideration. 22 THE COURT: Exhibit 3. 23 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am. 24 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was 25 marked as Exhibit Number 3.)

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES 18 1 MR. FLOWERS: And Your Honor, I have two more 2 exhibits for Mrs. Maples. 3 THE COURT: Could you show me that one just on 4 the screen? 5 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, absolutely. Can you see that, 6 Mr. Perry? 7 MR. PERRY: I can see it here. I'm just trying to see if we can turn it. 8 9 BY MR. FLOWERS: 10 Now, Mrs. Maples, do you see my finger on the screen? 11 Α. Yes, I do. 12 To what is it pointing? It's pointing to the account number that belonged to 13 Α. the person that I put the money in. 14 15 Did you know that individual? 16 No, I did not. Α. 17 And after depositing that money, did you receive 18 \$250,000? 19 No, I did not. 20 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, may I approach? 21 THE COURT: Yes. BY MR. FLOWERS: 22 23 Do you recognize that, Mrs. Maples? 24 Α. Yes, sir. I do. 25 What is that? Ο.

- 1 A. This is -- they asked me to send them some money.
- 2 | \$5,500 for fire services because the truck had caught on
- 3 fire.
- 4 Q. And what was the -- I'll get to those guestions in a
- 5 | minute. My apologies. At the top, there's handwriting.
- 6 Whose handwriting is that?
- 7 A. That's my handwriting.
- 8 Q. And is this a true and accurate copy of the deposit
- 9 receipt?
- 10 A. Yes, sir. It is.
- 11 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the
- 12 Government moves to admit this into evidence for the Court's
- 13 | consideration.
- 14 THE COURT: Exhibit 4.
- 15 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
- 16 | marked as Exhibit Number 4.)
- MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, I will place that on
- 18 | the Elmo.
- 19 THE COURT: Okay.
- 20 BY MR. FLOWERS:
- 21 Q. Mrs. Maples, can you see that?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Again, my finger is pointing to an account number.
- 24 | What account number is that?
- 25 A. That's an account number that I deposited \$5,500 in

Case 2:17-cr-20238-SHL Document 331 Filed 12/05/19 Page 20 of 144 PageID 1786 TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES 20 for fire services on the truck. 1 2 And did you deposit your money? 3 Α. Yes. I deposited my money. 4 And did you know the individual into whose account you were placing money? 5 6 No, sir. I did not. 7 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, may I approach? 8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 BY MR. FLOWERS: 10 Do you recognize that, Mrs. Maples? 11 Α. Yes, sir. I do. 12 What is that? This is a receipt for sending them \$15,000 -- \$15,650 13 that they requested because the truck did not have fire 14 15 insurance. So I had to pay for the truck that caught on 16 fire. 17 Now, do you see handwriting at the top of that 18 document? 19 Yes, I do. Α. 20 Whose handwriting is that? Q. 21 Α. That's my handwriting. 22 Q. Now, is this a true and accurate copy of the receipt? 23 Yes, sir. It is. MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the 24

Government moves to admit this into evidence.

25

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES 21 THE COURT: Exhibit 5. 1 2 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was 3 marked as Exhibit Number 5.) 4 BY MR. FLOWERS: 5 Mrs. Maples, do you see my finger? 6 Yes, I do. Α. 7 Q. Could you please read those four numbers? 8 Α. 7132. And was that the account into which you were told to 9 10 deposit money? Yes, it was. 11 Α. 12 Did you know the individual who owned the account? No, I did not. 13 Α. Now, when you paid the \$15,650, whose money was that? 14 Q. 15 Α. That was my money. 16 Now, in stepping back, were these the only -- the Q. 17 transactions we just discussed, were they the only times that 18 you sent money, Mrs. Maples? No, sir. 19 Α. 20 All told, how much of your own money did you send? Q. 21 Α. I sent 70,000. 22 Q. Did you ever receive \$250,000? 23 No, I did not. Now, from where were you pulling this money, from 24 25 where were you getting this money? UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

- 1 A. I was getting this from my savings account, and then I
- 2 | was getting it from a line of credit that my husband and I
- 3 set up before he passed away.
- 4 Q. Now, why did you ultimately stop sending money,
- 5 Mrs. Maples?
- 6 A. Well, I had -- one of my daughters had an insurance
- 7 policy for my husband and me and for me after he passed away
- 8 | that we could pull money from. And so I asked her if I could
- 9 | borrow \$30,000 from that. And with my daughter being an
- 10 attorney, she was kind -- she said mom, what have you done.
- 11 And I told her.
- 12 Q. Now, Mrs. Maples, you mentioned that your husband
- 13 | died. When did your husband die?
- 14 A. He died March the 31st, 2016.
- 15 Q. Now, when you were sending all this money, what was
- 16 your state of mind at that time?
- 17 A. Well, I was in so much grief. I was not really
- 18 | cognizant of all that I was doing. I was just kind of like
- 19 in a daze.
- 20 Q. And when you finally stopped sending money, how did
- 21 you feel about what you had done?
- 22 A. Well, I felt -- I felt betrayed. I felt -- I quess I
- 23 | felt quilty because I knew my husband would not have allowed
- 24 | this to happen if he was living. And I just felt violated.
- Q. How has -- how, if at all, has this impacted you since

1 | your experiences?

- 2 A. Well, it has affected me physically. I was in the
- 3 | hospital in January and in March -- or May. And it just
- 4 | affected me physically. I wasn't taking care of myself. I
- 5 stuffed my emotions, which that's what I've done all my life.
- 6 And it's affected me spiritually, and it has affected me
- 7 | emotionally. And I just really felt bad about doing it
- 8 | because I knew even though my husband is in heaven, I knew --
- 9 somehow I knew he knew that I betrayed what I thought -- what
- 10 he thought I should have known better.
- 11 Q. Now, are you still bearing the financial consequences?
- 12 A. Yes, I am. I have to work in order to pay my bills.
- 13 Q. And do you know who did this to you, Mrs. Maples?
- 14 A. I do not.
- 15 Q. If you had an opportunity to say something to the
- 16 people who scammed you, what would you say?
- 17 A. I would let the person know that he violated my
- 18 integrity. My emotional, spiritual, physical, medical issues
- 19 in my body. And I do not want this ever to happen to anybody
- 20 else because I know how I was very vulnerable at that time
- 21 because I was not in the best state of mind. And I do not
- 22 | want this to happen to anybody. And I'm -- I just feel
- 23 violated.
- MR. FLOWERS: May I have a moment, Your Honor?
- THE COURT: Yes.

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES

1 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, the Government passes

2 the witness.

THE COURT: Mr. Perry?

MR. PERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. FLOWERS: May I retrieve my notebook? I'm

24

sorry.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FLOWERS: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PERRY:

- 11 Q. Mrs. Maples, a few moments ago you were asked about
- 12 the person who might have done this to you. Do you see to my
- 13 | right a man that's sitting at that table in the brown
- 14 uniform, do you see him?
- 15 A. Yes, I do.
- 16 Q. And you're here today, this is a sentencing hearing.
- 17 He had a trial several months ago, like six or seven months
- 18 ago, and he was found guilty of money laundering, amongst
- 19 | things, and we're here today because the Court is trying to
- 20 | consider what amounts of money might have had anything to do
- 21 | with him. Okay? Do you understand that?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And has it been explained to you what a sentencing
- 24 | hearing is? I heard you say that your daughter is an
- 25 attorney?

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 Q. I'm assuming that you've also met with people from the
- 3 Government?
- 4 A. Yes. I did this morning.
- 5 Q. Do you understand that Mr. Abequade at no time during
- 6 this investigation has ever been accused of sending anything
- 7 | via facebook or any information like that to you or anyone
- 8 else? Do you understand that?
- 9 A. I'm not aware of that.
- 10 Q. Likewise, do you understand that he's never been
- 11 accused of having had any sort of sweepstake or identified
- 12 himself as somebody who's trying to get money from a
- 13 | sweepstake? Do you understand that?
- 14 A. I don't know anything about that.
- 15 Q. Okay. And here today as it relates to Mr. Abegunde,
- 16 I'm going to ask some questions of you because that's my job.
- 17 Do you understand?
- 18 A. Okay.
- 19 Q. All right. You said something a few moments ago about
- 20 some of the receipts. And you said that something had to do
- 21 | with fire services. Did the fire services have something to
- 22 | do with a sweepstake?
- 23 A. Yes. Because the money was in the truck.
- 24 Q. What truck?
- 25 A. That was going to come and be delivered to Mobile.

- 1 Q. And is that your understanding of what the sweepstake
- 2 | was? It wasn't, in other words, a cash sweepstake?
- 3 A. Yes. It was a cash sweepstake.
- 4 Q. You were supposed to receive a truck also?
- 5 A. I was supposed to -- the truck was bringing the money,
- 6 they said.
- 7 \mathbb{Q} . Did you ever talk to the person or anybody over the
- 8 phone directly, or was it all through some application
- 9 involving facebook?
- 10 A. All through facebook.
- 11 Q. Did you -- when you said that there was an insurance
- 12 for a truck, did you ever actually see a truck?
- 13 A. No, I did not.
- 14 Q. And did anyone ever indicate that they were trying to
- 15 | sell you a truck?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. You said that you sent money, and it seems that money
- 18 | went to two different accounts. Can you see that on your
- 19 screen?
- 20 A. Yes, I can.
- 21 Q. Do you see the account that has 7132?
- 22 A. Yes, I do.
- 23 Q. That's a Wells Fargo account. Is that the account
- 24 | that you sent the money to?
- 25 A. That's the account that I sent the \$15,650 to.

TESTIMONY OF ANNE MAPLES

- 1 Q. Okay. And I'm going to show you another account here
- 2 in a second. This 5626?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And did you also send money to that account?
- 5 A. Yes, I did.
- 6 Q. And it appears to be slightly different than the
- 7 \$15,650 transaction?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. All right. I want to show you just the other receipt
- 10 that I see, and it's been marked as Exhibit 3. This seems to
- 11 bear the same account number, that 5626 number.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. That seems to have the same identifiers as the place
- 14 where you sent the money that was allegedly for the fire
- 15 services, right?
- 16 A. Yes. It's the same number.
- 17 Q. And I've just -- just out of an -- what we're trying
- 18 to do, and I also want to make sure that the record is
- 19 | correct that on the money, the \$15,000, that seems to have
- 20 | gone to one specific account that's different. That's all
- 21 | that I'm trying to point out.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. All right. Have you ever had any conversations with a
- 24 person regarding buying and selling money or any sort of
- 25 funds in another country?

- 1 A. No, I have not.
- 2 Q. Related to this transaction. Not at any point in your
- 3 life but as relates to these transactions that were
- 4 | supposedly a part of you receiving a sweepstake. Did anybody
- 5 ever talk about anything as far as selling money or trying to
- 6 buy money from another nation?
- 7 A. I'm not aware of it.
- 8 Q. And on the facebook post, you said you received
- 9 something via facebook, I guess an invitation, and you said
- 10 | that you knew that person at the time. In other words, you
- 11 | thought you were connecting with a person on facebook, a
- 12 classmate, an old friend of yours?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. It turns out, I'm assuming, that that person was not
- 15 | the person who you were sending this money to, right?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. But you're clear that it was via facebook?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- 20 MR. PERRY: I don't have anything further at this
- 21 time.
- THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perry.
- 23 Mr. Flowers, any redirect?
- 24 MR. FLOWERS: Just very briefly, Mrs. Maples.

25 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA 30 1 KARINA CARCIA, 2 3 was called as a witness and having first been duly sworn testified as follows: 4 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. FLOWERS: 8 Q. Good afternoon, ma'am. Good afternoon. 9 Α. 10 Could you please state your name and spell it for the 11 record? 12 Α. It's Karina, K-A-R-I-N-A. Garcia, G-A-R-C-I-A. Where do you currently live? 13 Q. In Phoenix, Arizona. 14 Α. 15 How are you employed, ma'am? 16 I work at Banner hospital in Phoenix. I'm a medical 17 assistant. 18 What is that, ma'am? 19 Oh, I assist nurses with patients. Α. 20 And have you always lived in Phoenix? Q. 21 Α. No. 22 Q. When did you move there? 23 I moved in August 2017. Α. Now, before we get into your move, can you tell us a 24 25 little bit about your family? UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

- 1 A. Yes. It's my husband and I, and we have ten children
- 2 | together. Three are in college, and we currently have seven
- 3 | children with us.
- 4 Q. Now, when you were moving from California, why were
- 5 you moving?
- 6 A. We were in the process of moving to Phoenix. My
- 7 husband got a job offer there. And we were in the process of
- 8 moving from Modesto to Phoenix.
- 9 Q. How would you describe the circumstances of moving
- 10 from California to Phoenix? What was it like?
- 11 A. It was very stressful.
- 12 Q. And did you find a place to live?
- 13 A. We were in the process of finding a place to live. My
- 14 | husband and I were looking for houses on craigslist. And we
- 15 | actually did find a couple of houses.
- 16 Q. Now, did you actually come to what you thought was an
- 17 | agreement for a house on craigslist?
- 18 A. I did.
- 19 Q. Could you please describe the circumstances of that?
- 20 A. Okay. So we found a house for rent. We were thinking
- 21 of moving to the city in Phoenix, Arizona. We found a house
- 22 on craigslist. It had a pretty good paragraph stating that
- 23 the owner of the house was looking for somebody to take care
- 24 of his home. And it was renting for 1400 rent and 1400
- 25 deposit.

- 1 Q. And did you all come to an agreement about that house?
- 2 A. Actually my husband spoke with this individual, I
- 3 | believe once. And a couple of times text each other, and we
- 4 did come --
- 5 Q. Did you hear any of those conversations?
- 6 A. I did. I was in the room with my husband.
- 7 Q. And now, was a deposit ever made?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Based on that transaction?
- 10 A. There was two deposits made.
- 11 Q. Could you please describe the circumstances of those.
- 12 A. Yes. So the very first time, it was in the beginning
- of July. The individual spoke with my husband. Told him he
- 14 | had a house for rent in Phoenix in good condition. That if
- 15 | he could deposit \$700 under his account, and at that point
- 16 they would communicate and maybe mail the key. My husband
- 17 and I share our banks together. We have joint accounts. So
- 18 my husband decided to send the individual \$700 to an account.
- 19 Q. Now, to your knowledge, was a text message sent
- 20 | confirming that transaction?
- 21 A. He did. The very first transaction after he deposited
- 22 | the money, he did send a text message confirming the \$700.
- 23 Q. Now, did the text message contain a photograph?
- 24 A. Yes, it did.
- 25 Q. Have you seen that photograph?

TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA 33 1 Α. Yes. 2 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, may I approach? THE COURT: Yes. 3 4 Yes. I have seen this. Α. 5 BY MR. FLOWERS: 6 What is that? 7 Α. It's a Bank of America receipt of my husband sending the individual to this account number \$700. 8 9 Now, is it a true and accurate copy of the photograph? 10 Α. Yes, it is. 11 How do you know that? Q. 12 Α. Because I saw it, and I was there. 13 Q. Do you know the circumstances under which this 14 photograph was taken? Where was it taken? 15 Α. It was taken in our room after he came from the bank. 16 How were you able to recognize that? Q. 17 The background. We were in the process of moving. 18 And I can tell it's the bottom of the bed. 19 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the 20 Government moves to admit this for the Court's consideration. 21 THE COURT: Exhibit 6? 22 THE CLERK: Yes, ma'am. 23 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned photograph was 24 marked as Exhibit Number 6.) 25 BY MR. FLOWERS:

TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA

- 1 Q. Are you able to see that, ma'am?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Can you see the date on that photograph? What is the
- 4 date?
- 5 A. It's July 7, 2017.
- 6 Q. Is that consistent with around the time that you were
- 7 moving?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Do you see my finger there, ma'am?
- 10 A. Yes, I do.
- 11 Q. What are those four numbers?
- 12 A. 8489.
- 13 Q. What account is that?
- 14 A. That is the account number of the money sent to the
- 15 individual.
- 16 Q. Now, after sending the \$700, what happened?
- 17 A. So after sending the \$700 in the picture, my husband
- 18 took a picture of this and forwarded it to the individual.
- 19 And they communicate among each other and stated that after
- 20 this, he was going to mail the key of the house.
- 21 Q. Okay. Was the key ever mailed?
- 22 A. It was never mailed to us.
- 23 Q. Was the remaining \$700 ever sent? Now, you mentioned
- 24 | earlier that the house was for \$1400?
- 25 A. Correct.

TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA

- 1 Q. This is \$700?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. What happened to the remaining balance?
- 4 A. Okay. So two weeks after that, my husband -- we were
- 5 in the process of moving -- was communicating with this
- 6 individual. Two weeks passed by. And he decided to call my
- 7 husband and say where are the remaining of the other \$700.
- 8 At that point, I was the one that went to the bank. It was
- 9 towards the end of the July and deposited another \$700 to
- 10 this individual.
- 11 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, I may I approach?
- 12 THE COURT: Yes.
- 13 BY MR. FLOWERS:
- 14 Q. Do you recognize that?
- 15 A. Yes, I do.
- 16 Q. What is that?
- 17 A. This is a Bank of America receipt from my bank to the
- 18 individual's account.
- 19 Q. Did you take that photograph?
- 20 A. I did.
- 21 Q. Is it a true and accurate copy of the photograph that
- 22 was taken?
- 23 A. Yes.
- MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the
- 25 Government moves to admit this for the Court's consideration.

TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA 36 THE COURT: Exhibit 7. 1 2 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned photograph was marked as Exhibit Number 7.) 3 4 BY MR. FLOWERS: 5 Q. Are you able to see that, ma'am? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. For how much was this deposit, ma'am? 8 Α. For \$700. 9 And into what account was this amount paid? Ο. 10 Α. To Account 8489. 11 Could you please note the date of that, ma'am? Q. 12 Α. It's July 25th, 2017. 13 Q. Now, was this photograph ever sent to the individual? 14 No, it wasn't. I actually took it just, you know, for 15 me to have proof of something, but it was never sent to him. 16 I had my husband, you know, take over. 17 Q. Now, you mentioned that your husband was 18 communicating. Refresh my memory, did you also say you were 19 there for some of the communications? 20 Yes, I was actually. I was there for three times that they spoke with each other. 21 22 Q. Now, what was this individual's name, to the best of your knowledge? 23 24 Back then I am not -- all I remember there was a

Richard name involved. I am not sure what other names there

25

- 1 was. But for sure I do remember Richard.
- 2 Q. Now, after the second \$700 was sent, did you receive
- 3 the key?
- 4 A. No. So what happened after the \$700, my husband Oscar
- 5 was in the room. He had him on speaker. I was there. I was
- 6 trying to pressure my husband. I actually told him I had a
- 7 | bad feeling about this, but he wouldn't listen to me. They
- 8 | spoke and he said he changed everything. First, when we send
- 9 him the \$700, he said the key was going to be mailed after we
- 10 | sent that. Two weeks passed by, nothing.
- 11 You know, we were naive enough to send him the other
- 12 \$700 thinking, you know, something was going to happen.
- 13 | Well, what ended the conversation was that he said I'm going
- 14 to have someone show you guys the house in Arizona. When are
- 15 you guys able to go to Arizona and meet with this person.
- 16 Oscar and I were in the process of moving, packing. I told
- 17 Oscar well, tell him this date. We tried to call him back
- 18 | after sending the \$700. He never answered.
- 19 Q. Did you ever hear from that individual?
- 20 A. We never heard anything from him again.
- 21 Q. Did you ever receive your \$1400 back?
- 22 A. I never did.
- 23 Q. Did you actually live in the house that you put the
- 24 deposit on?
- 25 A. No. We actually end up moving to Arizona in the

- 1 | middle of August and a family of nine, we rented a
- 2 | three-bedroom apartment. We were financially not stabled.
- 3 We were -- it was just very hard for us.
- 4 Q. And are you still feeling effects of that, ma'am?
- 5 A. I do. I honestly feel very angry. Very betrayed. I
- 6 | feel like my family and I were victims of this. Like I said,
- 7 I just feel anger.
- 8 Q. Now, you mentioned a Richard. Do you actually know
- 9 who victimized you?
- 10 A. I don't know.
- 11 Q. If you had the opportunity to speak with that
- 12 | individual or individuals, what would you tell them?
- 13 A. Like I said, I'm feeling very angry. I am a mother of
- 14 | seven children. My husband has two jobs. I have one job.
- 15 And I just feel betrayed very -- I feel like we're victims,
- 16 and I don't have nothing to say. I just feel very angry.
- 17 Q. Now, Mrs. Rodriguez, if someone were to tell you that
- 18 | it was only \$1400, how would you respond to that?
- 19 A. \$1400 is a lot of money for a big family like ours.
- 20 We have children in college, and we have little ones that,
- 21 you know, that I have to support. Like I said, my husband
- 22 has two jobs. I know that that it's been over two years.
- 23 Unfortunately it's tooken us a long time to get back on our
- 24 feet.
- MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, may I have a moment?

- 1 Q. No, no. You talked to a person named a Richard
- 2 | Alhassan or something?
- 3 A. I didn't talk to nobody.
- 4 Q. Okay. And do you understand that -- you heard me ask
- 5 questions from the lady that was up here before you?
- 6 A. Uh-huh.
- 7 Q. You realize that he's here on a case where he's being
- 8 sentenced after being found guilty by a jury, and during that
- 9 trial it was asserted and the jury found him quilty that he
- 10 had received funds that other people had defrauded some
- 11 people out of. Never that he had tried to defraud or take
- 12 | somebody's money for a deposit. Do you understand the
- 13 difference in what you're here on?
- 14 A. I understand.
- 15 Q. All right. And had you ever met the person who you
- gave your \$1400 to, had you ever met him before?
- 17 A. No, I never did.
- 18 Q. You talked about the fact that it was a lot of money
- 19 for a family of any size. \$1400 that you all earned. That's
- 20 hard-earned money, right?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. You didn't receive that money from any sort of
- 23 | somebody telling you that you had won a sweepstakes or
- 24 | anything like that, right?
- 25 A. Correct.

TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA

- 1 Q. You didn't receive that money from somebody who was
- 2 overseas saying that they were trying to get oil and asking
- 3 | you to receive money and then send some back to them,
- 4 correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. Did any money come out of any account based on what
- 7 | might be a breach of that account? In other words, you had
- 8 | \$1400 in an account and somebody takes it out of it. None of
- 9 the money was taken from you like that, right?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. This was a deal where you were trying to get into a
- 12 home?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. And there was somebody who I'm assuming held
- 15 themselves out as some form of a Realtor or the homeowner.
- 16 I'm not quite sure from what the Government had submitted and
- 17 | from the questions, was this guy saying that he owned that
- 18 home, or was he saying that he was a person that buys and
- 19 | sells and rents to individuals?
- 20 A. No. This individual had the house for rent on
- 21 | craigslist as the owner of the house.
- 22 Q. And you contacted him, and then that's how the
- 23 exchange came?
- 24 A. Correct. And we Googled the house. And I mean, the
- 25 | house in the outside, it didn't have no sign for rent or

TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA

- 1 anything. It just looked like a decent house for a big
- 2 family like us.
- 3 Q. And based on that though, that's how you ended up
- 4 | sending your money?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. In expectations that you would get a key and be able
- 7 to rent that property?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And do you remember, the amount was \$1400. Was there
- 10 anything more than that amount?
- 11 A. It was 1400 rent and \$1400 deposit.
- 12 Q. I thought it was 700 and 700?
- 13 A. Right. But that was the beginning. We never sent the
- 14 other half.
- 15 Q. Okay. And maybe I might have said the question wrong.
- 16 My question is total, how much money did --
- 17 A. 1400.
- 18 Q. 1400. All right.
- MR. PERRY: I don't have anything further.
- THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perry.
- 21 Any redirect, Mr. Flowers?
- MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Garcia, right?
- THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
- THE COURT: Thank you.

```
TESTIMONY OF KARINA GARCIA
                                                          43
 1
                 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 2
                 THE COURT: I think you said Ms. Rodriguez at one
 3
     point, Mr. Flowers, or maybe I just heard you wrong.
 4
                 MR. FLOWERS: Oh, did I? I'm sorry.
 5
                 MR. PERRY: That's why I was scared to ask your
 6
     name.
 7
                 THE COURT: Okay. I got you. Thank you.
 8
                 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time it's just
 9
     Special Agent Marcus Vance.
10
                 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Come on up, Agent.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE 44 1 MARCUS VANCE, 2 3 was called as a witness and having first been duly sworn testified as follows: 4 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. FLOWERS: 8 Q. Good afternoon, Special Agent Vance. Good afternoon. 9 Α. 10 I feel like we've been here before, Special Agent 11 Vance. 12 A. We have. 13 THE COURT: We all feel like that. 14 BY MR. FLOWERS: 15 So I'll get right to it. Did you interview an 16 individual named Rachel Aller? 17 I did. Formerly known as Rachel Grumbian. 18 What were the circumstances of that interview? 19 I believe that she was the victim of a scam, and I 20 reached out to her to confirm that. 21 MR. FLOWERS: I guess, Your Honor, I forgot for 22 purposes of the record. 23 BY MR. FLOWERS: Could you please state your name and position for the 24 25 record, Special Agent Vance? UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

- 1 A. I'm a special agent with the FBI named Marcus Vance.
- $2 \quad M-A-R-C-U-S \quad V-A-N-C-E$.
- 3 Q. And getting back to the questions about Ms. Aller,
- 4 after you reached out to her, what happened?
- 5 A. She said that she met a man named Chris Anderson
- 6 online. They began to chat. They developed what she
- 7 described as a romantic relationship, and that carried on for
- 8 a while.
- 9 Q. Did he profess to have difficulties over the course of
- 10 | those communication?
- 11 A. Yes. He told her that he worked overseas doing some
- 12 type of construction work. And for whatever reason, he had
- 13 trouble accessing funds. He needed to pay his employees, fix
- 14 | equipment. He had a lot of various costs that needed to be
- 15 paid off.
- 16 Q. Did Ms. Aller, did she send her own money?
- 17 A. No. She told him sorry. I'm a working mom with three
- 18 kids. I don't have any money to send basically.
- 19 Q. So what happened after that?
- 20 A. So he said no worries. I have other associates. And
- 21 | he explained basically that they couldn't -- for whatever
- 22 | reason, they could not send him the money directly, but they
- 23 | were able to send her the money and asked if she would be
- 24 | willing to accept that money and then send it on to
- 25 | recipients at his request.

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE

- 1 Q. How was she communicating with this individual?
- 2 A. I think it was Google Hangouts. It was chats.
- 3 Q. And did she ever send and receive money, Special Agent
- 4 Vance?
- 5 A. She did.
- 6 0. What were the circumstances?
- 7 A. She did it on a few different times. Mainly money
- 8 orders. Specifically one time in March of 2017, she received
- 9 approximately \$4500. Was given instructions to send \$1500.
- 10 So cut it three ways to three different individuals. One of
- 11 | those individuals being Gboyega Ajayi.
- 12 O. Did she know any of those individuals?
- 13 A. She knew none of those individuals. I read off the
- 14 | three names that I knew she sent money to. She confirmed
- 15 | those were the names, but she didn't -- they were just -- she
- 16 just took the instructions and sent them.
- 17 Q. Now, did she eventually stop sending money?
- 18 A. Yes. At one point she -- when she went to go do a
- 19 | money order at Walmart, they were asking her various
- 20 questions, and I think they basically figured out that she
- 21 was part of a scam, advised her to stop. And she did so.
- 22 | She changed her e-mail address so she couldn't communicate
- 23 | with them anymore and ceased the activity.
- Q. Did she ever log back into her Google account?
- 25 A. No. Once she was warned, I think this was a few

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

November 7, 2016.

25

Α.

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE

- 1 Q. And who is sending it?
- 2 A. Baja Fresh.
- 3 Q. What does he ask?
- 4 A. "You need 15K."
- 5 Q. And could you read the following two messages?
- 6 A. So he says, "You need 15K,445." Mr. Abegunde
- 7 responds, "440." And Baja Fresh responds "LOL."
- 8 Q. Are we still on the same date, Special Agent Vance?
- 9 A. We are.
- 10 Q. Could you please read starting here?
- 11 A. So Baja says, "When you ready, holler." Mr. Abegunde
- 12 says, "I've told you how serious I am." Goes back to saying
- 13 "440." Baja responds, "I don't hear you. Mean just sell for
- 14 | 440. Am selling 445." And then there's a phone call.
- 15 Q. And then towards the bottom?
- 16 A. "You don't remit" and then "Yep."
- 17 Q. So turning to this third page, do you see
- 18 Mr. Abegunde's F.J. Williams account number?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- 20 Q. Have you reviewed that account?
- 21 A. I have.
- 22 Q. Did you specifically review that account for
- 23 transactions around this time frame -- time period?
- 24 A. I did.
- 25 Q. Did you locate any?

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE 49 1 I did. Α. 2 MR. FLOWERS: May I approach, Your Honor? 3 THE COURT: Yes. 4 BY MR. FLOWERS: 5 Could you take a look through those pages, Special 6 Agent Vance? 7 Α. (Witness complies.) 8 Q. Do you recognize those? 9 Α. I do. 10 How many pages are in that exhibit? Q. 11 Α. Three. 12 And what is reflected in that exhibit? The first one, it's a deposit ticket into the 13 14 F.J. Williams account at PNC Bank ending 6791 for \$15,000 15 dated 11/8/2016. The second page is the corresponding check. 16 It is a check from Wells Fargo Bank, the Baja Fresh LLC 17 account ending 7132. And it is for \$15,000 made out to 18 F.J. Williams with the memo purchase, and the date is 19 11/8/16. The third page is the corresponding F.J. Williams 20 account November of 2016 statement for the account ending 21 6791. Under the activity detail and deposit section on 11/8, 22 there is a \$15,000 deposit made into this account. 23 Are they true and accurate copies of those records 24 from PNC Bank? 25 They are.

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE

1 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the

- 2 Government moves to admit this into evidence.
- THE COURT: Exhibit 9.
- 4 MR. FLOWERS: I believe so. Yes, Your Honor.
- 5 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
- 6 marked as Exhibit Number 9.)
- 7 BY MR. FLOWERS:
- 8 Q. Now, are you familiar with Ms. Anne Maples?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. How so?
- 11 A. She's a victim in this case.
- 12 Q. And have you traced some of the moneys -- excuse me --
- 13 some of the funds that she sent to individuals in this case?
- 14 A. We have.
- 15 Q. I'm going to show you what has been previously
- 16 | submitted as Government's 5. Show you an account number.
- 17 | Could you please read that last four of that account number?
- 18 A. Yes. This is for a Wells Fargo account ending 7132.
- 19 Q. Are you familiar with any other accounts at issue in
- 20 | this case that end in 7132?
- 21 A. The check written by Baja Fresh LLC is a Wells Fargo
- 22 account ending 7132.
- 23 Q. Now, I'll point your attention to the date here. What
- 24 | is the date of this deposit?
- 25 A. November 7, 2016.

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE

- 1 Q. I'll direct your attention now back to Government's 9.
- 2 What is the date of that check, sir?
- 3 A. November 8, 2016.
- 4 Q. And how much is that check for?
- 5 A. \$15,000.
- 6 Q. What is in the memo line, sir?
- 7 A. Purchase.
- 8 Q. And I'll show you this page. I'll direct your
- 9 attention to deposit on 11/8/2015. What is reflected here?
- 10 A. A \$15,000 credit into the F.J. Williams account.
- 11 Q. Are you also familiar with Karina Garcia Rodriguez?
- 12 A. I am.
- 13 Q. How so?
- 14 A. She a victim in this case.
- 15 Q. Now, have you reviewed financial transactions and chat
- 16 | messages associated with her account, with her description?
- 17 A. With her description of the events, yes.
- 18 Q. Yes. My apologies.
- MR. FLOWERS: May I approach, Your Honor?
- THE COURT: Yes.
- MR. FLOWERS: Can I have just a moment to pour
- 22 | myself a glass of water?
- THE COURT: Yes.
- 24 BY MR. FLOWERS:
- Q. Do you recognize that, Special Agent Vance?

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE

- 1 A. I do.
- 2 Q. What is it?
- 3 A. These are chats between Money Guy Dejobo and
- 4 Mr. Abegunde.
- 5 Q. And are they true and accurate copy of the chats
- 6 between Money Guy Dejobo and Mr. Abegunde?
- 7 A. They are.
- 8 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the
- 9 Government moves to admit this into evidence.
- 10 THE COURT: Exhibit 10.
- MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am.
- 12 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
- 13 marked as Exhibit Number 10.)
- 14 BY MR. FLOWERS:
- 15 Q. I'll direct your attention here to this date. What
- 16 date is this, Special Agent Vance?
- 17 A. July 7, 2017.
- 18 Q. Then what appears to be reflected here?
- 19 A. It's a thumbnail of a Bank of America deposit slip.
- 20 Q. And what does the Defendant say that he -- what's the
- 21 Defendant doing here?
- 22 A. He appears to be on vacation.
- 23 Q. So I'll direct your attention to the bottom. Starting
- 24 here with Money Guy Dejobo, what does Money Guy Dejobo say?
- 25 A. He says, "They did 1400 to that account. I'm waiting

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE 53 1 for the second slip." 2 MR. FLOWERS: Can I go to the next page, Your 3 Honor? 4 THE COURT: Yes. BY MR. FLOWERS: 5 6 And starting up here at the top of page 2 of this 7 exhibit, what date is reflected here? 8 Α. We're still on July 7, 2017. 9 And what does Mr. Abegunde say? Ο. 10 Α. "What's the account name? You foretell me ahead." 11 Okay. And then what account does Money Guy Dejobo Q. 12 give out? 13 Α. Kayode Alhassan. Bank of America account ending 8489. 14 Ο. And then? 15 I'm sorry. "Do you know how long it took you to 16 respond when I sent you that slip? The money would have been gone by the time you got back." And then they have a phone 17 18 call. 19 Now, have you also reviewed chats between Mr. Abegunde 20 and Mr. Kayode Alhassan? 21 Α. I have. 22 Q. What did they show? 23 Similar discussions. 24 Okay. Did Mr. Abegunde send a picture of this bank

25

slip to Mr. Alhassan?

Case 2:17-cr-20238-SHL Document 331 Filed 12/05/19 Page 54 of 144 PageID 1820 TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE 54 1 Α. Yes. 2 Was it around the same time as the conversation 3 between Money Guy Dejobo? 4 Α. Yes. 5 MR. FLOWERS: And Your Honor, those portions of 6 the conversation were attached to the Government's 7 supplemental response. 8 THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. FLOWERS: 9 10 Are you familiar with the -- Mr. Alhassan's account, 11 Special Agent? A. 12 I am. 13 MR. FLOWERS: May I approach? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 BY MR. FLOWERS: 16 Do you recognize that, Special Agent Vance? Q. 17 Α. I do. 18 Q. What is that? 19 These are chats between Mr. Abegunde and Gboyega 20 Ajayi. 21 Q. I'll ask that later. Are they a true and accurate 22 reflection of the chats between Mr. Ajayi and the Defendant? 23 They are. 24 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

Government moves to admit this into evidence.

25

```
TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE
                                                          55
 1
                 THE COURT: Only if you spell the name on the --
 2
                 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am.
 3
                 THE WITNESS: Gboyega Ajayi is G-B-O-Y-E-G-A.
 4
    Ajayi, A-J-A-Y-I.
 5
                 THE COURT: Thank you.
 6
                 MR. FLOWERS: You're welcome.
 7
                 THE COURT: Exhibit 11.
 8
                 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
    marked as Exhibit Number 11.)
 9
10
    BY MR. FLOWERS:
11
       Okay. So what's the date on this, Special Agent
12
    Vance?
          9/28/2017.
13
    Α.
14
            What's Mr. Ajayi appear to ask?
15
            He says, "Are you there? What's up with the Alhassan
16
    account?"
17
    Q.
            What does Mr. Abegunde respond?
18
    Α.
           "Closed."
19
         What does he say is the reason?
    Q.
20
            "Fraudulent transaction."
    Α.
21
            Okay. And then what does Mr. Ajayi say?
    Q.
22
    Α.
            "Hmm. How? How much?" He goes on. "Hmm. Don't
23
    know what to say. Hand to hand 355."
24
            Okay. On 9/28, what does Mr. Ajayi say?
25
    Α.
           He continues, "There is this person who will get you
```

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE 56 1 the entire 40K between today and tomorrow, buh it's an 2 account and he's giving me reassurance. Say nothing will 3 happen, O." 4 MR. FLOWERS: I had accidentally stapled two 5 together, Your Honor. So this would be Government's 11 has 6 one, one page. 7 THE COURT: Okay. MR. FLOWERS: Just for clarification on the 8 9 record. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. FLOWERS: That is completely my fault. 12 May I approach one more time, Your Honor? 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 BY MR. FLOWERS: 15 Do you recognize that? 16 I do. Α. 17 What is it? 18 Α. These are chats between Mr. Abegunde and Mr. Ajayi. 19 Are they true and accurate reflection of the chats 20 that appear -- that occurred between Mr. Ajayi and 21 Mr. Abegunde? 22 Α. They are. 23 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, at this time the 24 Government moves to admit this into evidence.

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

THE COURT: Exhibit 12.

25

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE

- 1 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am.
- 2 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
- 3 | marked as Exhibit Number 12.)
- 4 BY MR. FLOWERS:
- 5 Q. What is the date on these chats, Special Agent Vance?
- 6 A. July 3rd, 2017.
- 7 Q. Okay.
- 8 A. So that would be about four days before Ms. Garcia
- 9 Rodriguez sent the \$700.
- 10 Q. And starting with this chat, what does Mr. Ajayi tell
- 11 Mr. Abegunde?
- 12 A. He says, "Give me a Bank of America account fast,
- 13 | please."
- 14 Q. Which account does Mr. Abequade give out?
- 15 A. He gives out Mr. Alhassan's 8489 Bank of America
- 16 account.
- 17 Q. And then what does Mr. Abegunde say?
- 18 A. Then he says, "Let's agree on the breakdown."
- 19 Q. And what do they then do?
- 20 A. They appear to be cutting the transaction to four
- 21 different individuals.
- 22 Q. Now, are you aware from over the course of your
- 23 investigation that Mr. Alhassan goes by -- is connected to
- 24 any other names?
- 25 A. I believe his full name is Richard Kayode Alhassan.

TESTIMONY OF MARCUS VANCE 58 1 MR. FLOWERS: May I have a moment, Your Honor? 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MR. FLOWERS: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Flowers. 4 5 Mr. Perry? 6 MR. PERRY: Yes. 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. PERRY: 9 Has Mr. Alhassan been charged by the Government with 10 anything? 11 Not that I know of. 12 And has Baja Fresh or the gentleman that owns Baja 13 Fresh, has he been charged by the Government? 14 I believe he's been approached by the FBI. I don't 15 believe he's been charged yet with anything. 16 If I tender to you that trying to search in the areas 17 that they stay, at least at this point, they've never been named in this case as a codefendant and neither in any other 18 19 district named as defendants in any indictment that I'm aware 20 of. I mean, I think you just answered the question, but are 21 you saying that there's a pending indictment at least against 22 one if you're indicating that they were approached by 23 somebody? 24 Not necessarily. They have not been named in any

indictments that I'm aware of. I'm aware that he was

25

- 1 approached by the FBI.
- 2 Q. And I've seen, I want to say thousands of pages of
- 3 chats between different individuals in this case. When you
- 4 testified at trial, you indicated that you did not see any
- 5 | sort of social media accounts belonging to Mr. Abegunde,
- 6 right?
- 7 A. I don't recall any.
- 8 Q. Any facebook, any Instagram, things like that. Some
- 9 of the people that were -- that you've testified were
- 10 victimized, were victimized by facebook, for instance?
- 11 A. Yes, certainly.
- 12 Q. And none of that stuff ended up when you all searched
- 13 Mr. Abegunde's computer in all of his information, none of
- 14 those documents ever produced anything indicating his
- 15 instructions for anyone to try to take any money nor his use
- of facebook or any sort of social media to try to take
- 17 | anybody's money or defraud anyone?
- 18 A. I have never seen anything associated with his social
- 19 media that he would be the ringleader of that, no.
- 20 Q. In all of the individuals that you're talking about
- 21 | right now, the various WhatsApp communications, it seems to
- 22 be from time to time and rather often that Mr. Abequade is
- 23 | indicating, you know, do you know the sources of this income
- 24 or this money and makes the questions -- I mean, answers --
- 25 asks rather a series of questions of the individuals about

- 1 | the money that they're asking him to deposit, correct?
- 2 A. From time to time, does he ask them about the source
- 3 of funds, yes, he does.
- 4 Q. He asks and wants assurances regarding the sources of
- 5 the funds, right?
- 6 A. From time to time, yes.
- 7 Q. And you never hear of him indicating or asking anyone
- 8 to try to take money from someone regarding, I guess, a
- 9 rental agreement, right?
- 10 A. No. I never saw him mention anything about a rental
- 11 agreement.
- 12 Q. And likewise, you never saw anything from Richard
- 13 Alhassan indicating that I took this lady and her husband's
- 14 | hard-earned \$1400 from a rental agreement, right?
- 15 A. That was never reflected in the texts, no.
- 16 Q. There were texts though between the individuals
- 17 discussing the value of naira and the exchange rate for
- 18 naira, right?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 O. And there were consistent communications between both
- 21 Mr. Alhassan as well as -- and I'm just calling him Baja
- 22 | Fresh because I can say that better than the actual name.
- 23 But the individual that owned Baja Fresh, he's constantly
- 24 talking about the exchange rate regarding naira, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. In fact when there was a situation where Baja Fresh
 was trying to get his money under a \$10,000 amount or what
 have you, Mr. Abegunde told him that if what we're doing is
 legitimate, there's no reason to try to structure your money
- 5 under \$10,000. Do you recall that?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I don't recall that -- I know there was definitely
 instances where they would make recommendations to stay below

 \$10,000. I don't remember the circumstances.
- 9 Q. Was it Mr. Abegunde or did Mr. Baja Fresh indicate
 10 that he was trying to stay at a certain amount under \$10,000?
 11 Because I recall seeing specific communications between
- Mr. Abegunde saying it doesn't matter. Source of money is legitimate money.
- 14 A. I do not recall that text message offhand.
 - Q. You have described, I think this morning we've seen two different types of situations. You see one situation where the first lady who testified indicated that her money was taken from her based off of a relationship with an old friend from facebook and the perception that she was to receive some form of a sweepstake, right, where a truck was going to deliver, I guess, \$75,000, and she was asked to send certain amounts of money.
 - A. Yes. She essentially thought -- met someone on facebook. She believed that she knew this individual from school. Believed that she had won \$250,000. And believed

- 1 | that she was then going to also win \$250,000 that was going
- 2 to be delivered via a truck and some other obstacles, yes.
- 3 Q. None of that money was, I guess, money taken from a
- 4 business e-mail compromise, correct?
- 5 A. No. That was Ms. Maples' money.
- 6 Q. Right. And none of that money that Ms. Maples had
- 7 | came from a business e-mail compromise, correct?
- 8 A. Not that I'm aware of.
- 9 Q. I'm sure that Ms. Maples, we're not putting words in
- 10 her mouth, but she indicates that that was her hard-earned
- 11 | money through life, and her husband had recently passed away
- 12 | while she was sending this money off for the sweepstake?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. Likewise and I believe she said -- is it Ms. Garcia or
- 15 Ms. Rodriguez?
- 16 A. Garcia Rodriguez.
- 17 Q. Ms. Garcia Rodriguez indicated that her money was
- 18 money that she and her husband were depositing in the
- 19 attempts to rent a home, right?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. And that money -- there's nothing in your
- 22 | investigation indicating that it was part of a business
- 23 e-mail compromise, correct?
- A. And I would assume it's hard-earned money.
- Q. Right. And it was hard-earned money. There was no

- 1 | romance scam involved in that money, was there?
- 2 A. No. I would call it a rental fee scam.
- 3 Q. It was a rental fee, but there's nothing that you have
- 4 | to indicate to this Court that Mr. Abegunde knew by a
- 5 preponderance of the evidence or beyond a reasonable doubt
- 6 where the source of that money had come from, is there?
- 7 A. Can you state that again?
- 8 Q. There's nothing that you have to offer this Court to
- 9 indicate that Mr. Abequade would have known whether that
- 10 money was hard-earned from the family that tried to rent that
- 11 | money or whether or not that money was money that was earned
- 12 by Mr. Alhassan as far as trying to give that house to those
- 13 | individuals and turn the key over. There's not a
- 14 | communication, in other words, indicating that there's any
- 15 | way that Mr. Abegunde would have known the source of those
- 16 funds, is there?
- 17 A. I did not see a text message where he knew the exact
- 18 | source of those funds, no.
- 19 Q. But there was text messaging corroborating the fact
- 20 | that what Mr. Abegunde was planning to do with those funds is
- 21 | batch it to buy naira on the open market and do an exchange.
- 22 In fact, Mr. Alhassan asked when can I expect remittance and
- 23 | things like that, correct?
- 24 A. Yes. Mr. Abegunde is certainly trying to do a
- 25 | financial exchange with that money.

- 1 Q. And there's nothing that is innately -- that would
- 2 have brought Mr. Abegunde here for sentencing, simply off of
- 3 exchanging naira and buying naira, correct?
- 4 A. If done properly, no.
- 5 Q. If done properly. And I'm not saying that you're
- 6 agreeing with me on whether or not it was done properly, but
- 7 | what I am saying is none of those funds were the product of a
- 8 business e-mail compromise, right?
- 9 A. Can you say that again?
- 10 Q. None of those funds that we're talking about right
- 11 | now --
- 12 A. As of today.
- 13 Q. -- were the byproduct of a business e-mail compromise
- 14 or anything along those lines that would make Mr. Abequade
- 15 have stood for trial back during the month of March which got
- 16 us into this Court. There's nothing by Mr. Abegunde taking
- 17 | that money and trying to buy funds in another country that in
- 18 and of itself says that he knew the source of where those
- 19 | funds were coming from and whether or not they were procured
- 20 | legally or illegally, right?
- 21 A. In and of itself, no, but I think when you look at it
- 22 | from a much larger perspective, it's clear what was going on.
- 23 Q. It's clear to you today having investigated. I
- 24 understand that. But at that time, as far as what you have
- 25 and you presented your case, you presented the fact that you

investigated and spent hours investigating. And I think that we both concede the fact that I know I looked at nearly 50,000 pages worth of documents. Maybe \$50,000. But 50,000 pages worth of documents in this case.

And what I am trying to establish is that as of right now, other than that one business e-mail compromise that brings us here, do you have anything that indicates that their case was in any way interconnected with that business e-mail compromise?

- A. No. I do not believe that they are tied to the business e-mail compromise.
- Q. When you discuss the fact that in the communications that there were attempts to trade and sell this the money that was received for naira, there was nothing that I ever saw, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, that seemed to indicate that any of that money was going towards anything other than the attempts to purchase naira. Do you know of anything today that you could offer this Court that the moneys that he received, and we agree to disagree on what he might have known about the sources of it, but at any point other than purchasing naira with any of the individuals that you're saying that he was receiving these funds from, was there anything else other than purchasing this unit of money from the country of Nigeria?
- A. Can you state that again? I'm not sure if I follow

- 1 the question.
- 2 Q. He wasn't attempting to buy elephant tusks or
- 3 anything, right?
- 4 A. No. He was doing financial exchanges. And he
- 5 | appeared to be getting -- he would negotiate the rate and get
- 6 some sort of a cut based on the market as the money passed
- 7 | through his accounts.
- 8 Q. And that seemed to be a consistent thing is all that
- 9 I'm saying from everybody who he was receiving these funds
- 10 from. He was attempting to take that money and purchase --
- 11 do an exchange regarding, I guess, trying to buy from Nigeria
- 12 in naira. He wasn't, in other words, trying to buy a pound.
- 13 He wasn't trying to buy yen or anything along those lines.
- 14 It was all consistent with him trying to purchase from the
- 15 | country that he indicated, right?
- 16 A. The best I could tell when he was doing the exchanges,
- 17 it was naira and dollars, yes.
- 18 Q. When you investigated Baja Fresh or at least when his
- 19 name came up in it, did you not see the text that had a
- 20 | number of cars and things like that? Remember seeing it
- 21 | might be a car, a Maxima sticks out in my mind for one reason
- 22 or another, for \$15,000 or for \$12,000. In other words, he
- 23 | was actually in the car exchange business, was he not?
- 24 A. He appears to be, yes.
- 25 Q. And you said that he had not been -- well, he had been

approached, but you don't have anything indicating that that business was less than a regular business, do you?

- business was less than a regular business, do you?

 A. I believe that he's operating a car business of some
- 4 sort, just as Mr. Abequade is operating a foreign currency
- sole, just as in. imaganae is operating a loreign carrent,
- 5 exchange business. That's what they appear to be on the
- 6 surface, at least, I'll give you that.
- 7 Q. Do you have anything where Mr. Abegunde would have
- 8 known whether or not his cars -- the car exchange that he had
- 9 was an attempt to really sell and buy and -- buy and sell
- 10 cars?

3

- 11 A. I don't know what Mr. Abegunde's impression was.
- 12 Q. Now, you know that at one point and this was part of
- 13 | your investigation or at least in the discovery, Mr. Abegunde
- 14 was asking for specific types of cars from him to purchase.
- 15 One car for personal use, I guess I'll go back to an Acura.
- 16 Do you remember the description of an Acura in that?
- 17 A. I don't remember the Acura, but I certainly remember
- 18 them talking about vehicles. Even in the texts I was looking
- 19 at today, there was something that Baja Fresh said are you
- 20 | interested in a truck, something like that.
- 21 Q. And so in other words, this just wasn't the appearance
- 22 of someone trying to hold himself out as having a car to
- 23 the -- or having cars for sale to the public, but this was a
- 24 person who was actually actively involved in buying and
- 25 trading cars?

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

25

Α.

A romance scam is essentially a form of an advanced

1 So you're going to develop that relationship, and 2 then you're going to make requests of that person. 3 person is romantically involved with you. They're invested 4 in you, so they're going to be willing in a lot of cases to send money in hopes of helping you or getting you over here. 5 6 Now, are you familiar with vehicle purchases being 7 used in the course of money laundering? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Ο. How so? 10 It is not uncommon for these advanced fee scams for 11 people to receive the money and clean it by buying a asset 12 such as a used car and then shipping it overseas. 13 MR. FLOWERS: May I have a moment? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 MR. FLOWERS: No further questions, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, Agent, you may 17 be excused. Well, I don't know excused, but at least step 18 down. 19 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. 20 THE COURT: Any other proof, Mr. Flowers? 21 MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Perry, any proof today? 23 MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor. We stand on our 24 submission. 25 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Argument?

MR. FLOWERS: Just very briefly with regards to what was just shown. The incidents involving Ms. Maples and Ms. Garcia Rodriguez are two microcosms of the structure of the scheme of what we've seen throughout. I'll direct the Court's attention back to what was going on with Mr. Ramos-Alonso and the business e-mail compromise in October of 2016. It was that a fraudster procured cash, used an intermediary like Mr. Ramos-Alonso and then split it and sent the money out. Two accounts for which were destined --where the funds were destined to go were actually under the control of Abegunde.

With the incident involving Ms. Maples that the Government has been able to trace to Mr. Abegunde's F.J. Williams account, that's essentially what we have there. A fraudster directing a victim in this case and the Government would also remind the Court that at one point Mr. Ramos-Alonso was also there. But here, Ms. Maples a victim to direct money into various accounts, including one bearing the last four, 7132, the day before a transaction for \$15,000 with Mr. Abegunde and Mr. Baja Fresh.

Now, the transaction by Ms. Maples was for \$15,650. The transaction the next day between Mr. Abegunde and Mr. Baja Fresh was for \$15,000. Following and tracing the money from a known fraud victim through an intermediary to Mr. Abegunde. Now, with regards to the incident involving

Ms. Garcia Rodriguez, individuals who were tricked into paying fees up front went through an intermediary account and ultimately to Mr. Abequade.

How do we know the intermediary or who the intermediaries were meant to be? We have a text from Money Guy Dejobo, one of the individuals with whom Mr. Abegunde was using various third party accounts, directing money into that intermediary account which was the Bank of America account, with those four ending in those particular four digits and then ultimately through Mr. Abegunde for a financial exchange.

Now, from all of this and the other structure of transactions, we can see that Mr. Abegunde was a one-stop shop for taking money that was in the United States and getting it to Nigeria. This and of itself is a smaller version of this debate that Mr. Abegunde had with Special Agent Kevin Hall when he went to the Defendant's residence all the way back in March of 2017. Where they discussed there's a problem with supply, and eventually the fraud money comes into it. And that's exactly what we see. Fraud money going from the United States to Nigeria. And that was the Defendant's role.

Mr. Perry, I appreciate Mr. Perry's advocacy.

The Government does not believe and it has never been the

Government's theory that Mr. Abequade is the person behind

the facebook account or that Mr. Abegunde is the person behind the e-mail account, spoofing an e-mail address and redirecting real estate transactions. The Government's theory has always been that he is a downstream money launderer. Sometimes he's the man behind the curtain. Sometimes he's the man behind the curtain behind the curtain.

And that's why it's so difficult to identify victims. The Government concedes that Ms. Maples' name and Ms. Garcia Rodriguez's names are not on those transactions. That's because of the intermediaries that were set up to adjust the account numbers, specifically the last four account numbers. Effectively providing an environment in which individuals are able to move money, hide themselves, obfuscate their conduct before it ultimately gets to the person who could clean those funds and get it overseas.

And that's what we see here. Showing those individuals just strengthens the Government's theory that the individuals and transactions that are reflected in the third party account are highly probative of fraud. At least in a preponderance of evidence, highly probative of fraud. Do we know that for sure? Can we trace each individual transaction? The Government has always conceded that we cannot, but the scheme is structured that way. It is set up that way to make it difficult to track.

Now, the Government has also in its papers and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we'll largely rest on what was said in those with regards to the individuals third party accounts and clients themselves. There were numerous indicators of fraud. There were numerous indicators that the Defendant knew what he was doing was wrong. And I'll go back to the situation of Money Guy Dejobo. I certainly appreciate Mr. Perry attaching those chats to his response and saying that there were times in which Mr. Abequade did inquire about the source of the funds. One of the chief times was in the Government's original papers in this case where we pointed to a series of conversations in which Mr. Abegunde, speaking to Money Guy Dejobo, they were discussing trade secrets of these funds. And how they did not want to discuss the particulars of transactions, and Mr. Abegunde said, "Okay. I quess we can't do business together." Unfortunately he did not follow through with that.

He did do business. And when he did do that business, the Government has been able, through

Ms. Garcia Rodriguez, trace the structure and architecture of that scheme from Money Guy Dejobo, Mr. Abegunde, Mr. Alhassan and presumably that financial transaction that goes overseas. That's the shape that takes place.

Now, with all those factors considered, the Government submits that it's on a preponderance of the evidence at least considering that Mr. Abegunde was convicted

of conspiracy to commit wire fraud. Conspiracy to commit money laundering, that those amounts should be included. And also, Your Honor, and based on the testimony here today, that the Government respectfully requests that we include at least the \$15,000 from Mrs. Maples as well as the \$1,400 from Ms. Garcia Rodriguez, as the Government has been able to trace those transactions ultimately from their fraud source through the intermediaries and to Mr. Abequade himself.

In terms of argument about all this, the

Government has no doubt that Mr. Abegunde started with good intentions in his financial transactions. We have no doubt that he's a smart individual. We have no doubt that he is an educated individual. But at some point somewhere, he decided to make a bad decision and a series of bad decisions that compounded with him providing the situation was ripe for fraud funds to funnel through. And we've seen the effects of that today. The individuals who've testified of them losing money. And how it affects their well-being. How it affects their emotional state. How it effects sometimes their physical state with regards to Mrs. Maples. And that conduct absolutely should not be tolerated. Even if the conduct that he was taking part in was that of a facilitator. And with that, the Government will rest this portion.

THE COURT: Let me ask you one --

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- specific question about the portion of the guideline that you're operating under with regard to these third party transactions. As I have gone through it, looking at relevant conduct, looking at 1B1.3. There certainly are some things in this case -- well, let me just focus on these third party transactions right now. The chart and then these additional two items. I'm assuming you're operating under 1B1.3(a)2, meaning that these are matters that would have been part of multiple count grouping. That they were part of either same course of conduct or a common scheme or plan.

MR. FLOWERS: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Mr. Perry?

MR. PERRY: May it please the Court and Counsel opposite. As the Court is well aware and has pointed out, we've gone down every argument I think that's foreseeable down this particular tree. I've read more conspiracy cases in the last month than in years, just getting into the minutia of the cases. And Your Honor is aware of the trial -- presided over the trial fairly, I thought, and we disagreed on certain things. And I'll try to get that taken up.

As far as today as it relates to Mr. Abegunde, I will say this. There's a clear, I think, distinction between

every conspiracy sentencing case that I've looked at and what is going on here. There was not a presentation in the case that involved the -- a communication or anything that made it understandable that he should have said that well, if these funds come from this person and I ask him about these funds, I ask him are these legitimate funds, I probe and based on what I'm trying to do from a business perspective, just like Agent Vance said a few moments ago, that his thing was to sell the funds and to get a cut out of selling those funds, which is something that he learned the value of when he was in school. He's from this country that has some bad occurrences politically, and because of it, the value of that dollar diminishes to a way that he can make a good income off of. That's all that I have seen in reviewing any of this.

And when we talk about people like Money Guy
Dejobo who's uncharged, there's not a case out there pending
regarding whatever actions he was taking. Mr. Alhassan,
there's not an opinion of the doctor up in Seattle. There's
nothing where he went to -- that he's been charged with
anything, other than what came before this Court, what brings
it to Memphis, Tennessee is this business e-mail compromise
and the tree that involves that case and whether or not those
things were foreseeable.

All of the cases that I've seen, those cases that were quoted by the Government, the cases that I tried to

submit and tried to do a little comparison or what have you, they seem to show where it's clear. It's not something that is an assumption that well, if this person has this type of money going into these accounts and he has guys that might be listed by a nickname, Money Guy Dejobo, that means it must be something nefarious under play. These are, in the cases that I have seen, the hair-splitting part that comes down to it at sentencing is whether or not things that that person might not have engaged in within that same conspiracy effort can be counted against him for sentencing purposes.

What we have here is if -- and I think that the inquiry, out of fairness, should have stopped on the first day. The thing that we conceded to is that if there was some form of fraud that took place that I guess had money that ended up coming to -- or a piece of that money coming to Mr. Abegunde at some point, that it would be fair for the Court to consider things that Mr. Abegunde didn't necessarily profit from, but it was from that same conspiracy stream.

Now, I plan to argue as hard as I've ever argued in life, if I'm given a chance to at the Sixth Circuit, that that was not in fact a conspiracy. But taking it in the light most favorable to what the jury found, that is the stream that the Court is supposed to consider.

When you start looking for unindicted things outside the course of that particular case that to this date

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

78

and with all due respect to both of the witnesses, Ms. Maples, I believe, is just like what she said, a hard-working individual who was at the point in life where she should be enjoying herself and for whatever reason, she gets defrauded. But there's nothing indicating that Mr. Abequnde at any point in time either did one step or another to try to help that process. And to say that well, he received \$15,000 after he asked questions about the \$15,000 for the purpose of selling it, that's the only thing that he wanted to do. So if Mr. Dejobo decided to take this money. you take the Government's argument at face value. Mr. Dejobo decides to take this lady's money, this hard-earned money and goes to buy a car and says hey, you know, we talked last week about buying this Mercedes I want. I got the down payment today. And he goes in and buys it. There's no way that that person, if he asks the questions to Mr. Dejobo should be found to be a conspirator. There's nothing in that particular transaction that they're showing. And I'm going to isolate the money part of it. But even before you get to the fact of whether it should be 15,000 or if you take Mr. Flowers' position that if it's 15,000, it has to be 80,000 that he's given credit for at this point, there's no logic to that. But more importantly, there's nothing that in the stream of cases that

the Court is considering from the Sixth Circuit that says that that is supposed to be a part of the calculus that goes into sentencing him.

Likewise, you go across country to another transaction that a person who is like -- knows Mr. Abegunde is trying to sell this money in order to buy naira that invests through Mr. Abegunde in the attempts to buy the naira. But there's nothing that indicates that Mr. Abegunde would have known that this person was taking money for a rental agreement and not giving the people the keys to that house.

So if you look at all the different transactions that would go on if he has \$1400 and he wants to go out and batch and buy naira, then you have to question well, what else was this person doing, and what other things was he doing once he received the funds and with whom was he spending this money. If you can't determine whom he's spending those funds with, you can't determine all of the ways that this person is taking money and then somehow linking it to this case, then it shouldn't be considered.

I think the Court is clear in the six-part test about the conspiracy. And how you look at whether or not they're using the same modus operandi. What Mr. Flowers wants the Court to do is say well, if money went to Mr. Abegunde, then there you go, that's it. But no, you go

into whether or not the funds were received from the same source. Did they come from a business e-mail compromise.

The first page that's involved in this particular case describes business e-mail compromise. The first time in my 46 years that I had ever heard that particular term used. I always thought it was e-mail fraud. But business e-mail compromise is a good, fancy term for taking money out of somebody's account and then spending it and knowing where that money is supposed to go. And the term -- well, he's a downstream participant in it. Well, who isn't a downstream participant in anything? You take a dollar out of your pocket, there's like a 70 percent chance that it has had something to do with drug commerce. 70 percent. That's downstream, and I'm a downstream participant probably closer to 95 percent because --

THE COURT: No admissions here, Mr. Perry.

MR. PERRY: No admission. But a downstream person that doesn't know exactly what the source of those funds are from. In this case if the jury found -- and they did, they found that they took the position that the Government says, and that's why you can go above it sometimes and ask, and they might see it the same way. And I'll be dead wrong.

But I know that if you don't take it from that same commerce stream, that same type of transaction within

that same conspiracy tree, then how do you get it -- how do you just jump and say well, he must be a conspirator with this person over here for this same similar reason. That doesn't make sense. It doesn't add up. And it's not relevant to this case.

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

And it doesn't -- and if the Court does say well, I'm going to find that Ms. Maples was defrauded from \$15,000 that did end up and it being spent with Mr. Baja Fresh, that's still not conclusive proof that that same \$15,000 is what ended up with Mr. Abegunde. It's just not. But if the Court takes the position that well, that can be relevant conduct. That in and of itself cannot say that every other transaction that Money Guy Dejobo, who does have a legitimate business, that the money that he's receiving from those businesses that he's spending on trying to buy naira, which has a good exchange rate, a good return for profit, that that is a part of that conspiracy. And that's what we're asking. We're saying that well, if you say well, they did bring proof of these two people. Add those two pieces of proof up. 15,000 plus 1400. That still doesn't get that whole chart into play to say that all of those transactions should be used to calculate relevant conduct in absence of the fact that we're saying that this is -- we're trying to determine how much was lost.

Because if Number 51 on that chart is wrong, was

a legitimate -- Mr. Baja Fresh was legitimately taking money that came from an arm's-length sale of a vehicle and he took that money and said hey, I want to invest it with Mr. Abegunde and if the Court jumps to the assertion or the assumptions that the Government is making, that's an atrocity. It's not supposed to happen that way.

There's no -- if there's no proof of the loss or that it is in fact loss, then it should not apply for relevant conduct purposes. It's a simple point I've tried to drive a nail in it or whatever. But I don't see how that can apply in this particular case to Mr. Abegunde. When looking at the factors in whole, there's no consistent scheme. There's no time proximity that's the same. There's no agreement between the parties regarding what they're trying to do, what they're going to do with the money at Level 1 or Level 2 of it or Level 10, I guess, with Mr. Abegunde. But there's no proof of it in this instance.

At trial, the Court considered and the jury considered the proof that they had at that particular point in time that this money came, and nobody from the jury bought the argument that it got in that account by mistake. That's an argument, like I said, we'll have down the road. But it's that amount that ended up with him connected to a person at trial that he had never met before. Never had a communications with. Never had any sort of conversation

whatsoever. That there was no proof that he knew anything about what business e-mail compromise would have taken place in Memphis.

But under the Government's theory and under the findings of the jury, it should be isolated to that and to moneys that were taken from that business e-mail compromise and from the lady who owned the mortgage company. If the Court is adding that because it was all the same. That's all the same tree. But you can't just say well, these are some other things that could have happened to these other individuals.

And if the Court says that I am going to take that, well, I at least ask that even though I don't agree with that, that the Court will at least not jump to the assumptions that the Government asked the Court to jump to. That if \$15,000 ended up -- if the Court says I believe that that was money spent from Mr. Dejobo, and that was part of what could happen if you're trying to sell naira, et cetera, that's fine. But that should be that \$15,000. Likewise, if Mr. Alhassan sent 1400, it should be isolated to that. You can't say all of the transactions in that case have to be a part of this scheme that the Government is trying to ask the Court to consider.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perry.

Any brief response, Mr. Flowers?

MR. FLOWERS: No. The only thing I will say is the Government has only asked for the \$15,000 for Mrs. Maples and the \$1400 for Ms. Garcia Rodriguez. I believe it's specified in the Government's supplemental response.

THE COURT: I think he's referring to the fact that you shouldn't use that to get in that whole chart or everything that went through Baja Fresh.

MR. PERRY: Correct.

THE COURT: And everything that went through Money Guy Dejobo.

MR. FLOWERS: So I just wanted to clarify that portion of it. But otherwise, the Government just rests on its submissions.

THE COURT: But you're still asking for the whole chart, right?

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am. Yes.

THE COURT: All right. First of all, I want to highlight that right now what we're talking about is the chart, the third party transactions because we're going to get to -- there's some other issues to deal with individually or another issue to deal with in terms of the Crye-Leike BEC. The 15,000 and the 1400 that we heard about today I would consider part of this group of transactions that I want to try and deal with as a whole.

Again, the section that the Government is

pointing to to say that this is relevant conduct is not the jointly undertaken criminal activity that would trigger those six factors. It's the -- it's Section 1B1.3(a)2, which involves conduct that the -- that has not been charged but that the Government contends is same course of conduct or common scheme or plan as the offense of conviction. The offense of conviction being the conspiracy to commit money laundering.

So I want to sort of acknowledge at first that while I've read the cases too that you all have cited me to, there really isn't another case like this. The cases that you cited me to, first, they were, for the most part, interpreting that jointly undertaken criminal enterprise.

And then there's also the couple of cases that the Government uses to say that it's okay for the Court to extrapolate. I think that -- I mean, that point is clear in the case law.

What's weird or different -- I won't say weird.

What's different about this is we're not really talking about extrapolating loss. We're talking about extrapolating conduct, which is sort of Mr. Perry's point all along, that yes, we can look at all these numbers, and we can see how the money flowed, but you can't assume fraud. I think that is sort of in essence the way I'm taking Mr. Perry's argument. Not the only part of it but, in essence, a big part of it.

So looking at how you interpret what a common

scheme or plan is or the same course of conduct, do you want to pick one, Mr. Flowers, or do you want me to analyze both?

MR. FLOWERS: I think it's probably safer to analyze both, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's start with common scheme or plan. Under common scheme or plan, we look at whether there's a substantial connection between -- again, we're talking about what's sort of reflected in that chart, those transactions and the offensive conviction, which is the conspiracy to commit money laundering. In the trial the basis for the conspiracy to commit money laundering was the conversations on WhatsApp, an encrypted messaging platform between Mr. Abegunde, the messages between Mr. Abegunde and various other people, at least some of whom were directly connected to the business e-mail compromise.

The conversations talked about cleaning funds.

The conversations talked about bank transfers in manipulative ways. The conversations talked about money going into the accounts, named accounts with the names of which were people who were not involved at all in the transaction. So they're going into peoples' accounts who, going by their name, have nothing to do with the transactions.

The evidence at trial also included

Mr. Abegunde's documents from Mr. Abegunde's creation of

F.J. Williams. And one of the documents included -- and I'm

sorry. I don't have the exhibit number, but the document that was an effort to comply with various regulations related to how a business like Mr. Abegunde's should be run. In that document, it talks about making sure you know the source of the funds.

There were several important key factors in the -- reflected in that document that talked about making sure that regulations were followed. That one knows that the source of the funds is legitimate. And Mr. Abegunde talks about that a fair amount on the messaging platform. The problem is he's never given an answer that he could rely on as showing that the funds came from legitimate sources. And he did the transactions anyway.

So if I look at that proof at trial of what he was convicted of, the offensive conviction, it was -- and this is the Government's language, but I think it's accurate. It was a downstream middleman money launderer who accepted funds where he could not verify where the funds came from. There were indications along the way that the funds weren't legitimate funds. Bank accounts closed on a regular basis, for one, as an indicator. He was running the money through a series of accounts with different peoples' names on it that had nothing to do with the underlying transactions. Again, on -- communicating on an encrypted messaging platform.

I'm trying to see if I've missed anything. And

manipulating the ways in which the moneys would be structured. Mr. Perry is right. I think I recall sometimes that conversation came from other people. And Mr. Abegunde, on occasion, would say you don't need to worry about that. But the problem is he also said other things at other times where he did worry about that.

I'm going to try and stay on track with this.

But Mr. Perry pointed out the conversation with Money Guy

Dejobo where at one point Mr. Abegunde walked away from him.

Again, the problem is he walked back to him. And walked back to him without being able to verify the source of the funds.

So that -- and let me say one word. Again, I'm going to try and be fairly analytical in this and stay on track. But one point that Mr. Perry makes about if you go buy whatever car you're going to go buy and write a check for it and give it to the dealer, the dealer doesn't need to check to see where that money came from, and that's true. If the check is from my account, I'm writing it on my account and give it to the dealer to buy the car, I don't think the dealer is going to -- has any legal obligation to go find out whether I made that money legitimately or not. That's not the situation here.

In this situation, we're having moneys being moved from all sorts of different accounts with names not attached to the underlying transaction. It's moved in a way

that indicates by those different facts that something wrong is going on. So this is not the same as, you know, Mr. Perry may have made some of the dollars in his pockets by representing someone who may have done something wrong, and that money may have been gotten wrong. It's not the same thing. Mr. Perry earned that money legitimate and could prove to anyone he earned it legitimately.

Here, you know, every time the question of where the money came from comes up, and it does come up,

Mr. Abegunde rightly asked the question. No one ever gives that information. No one ever provides the proof that shows oh, no, this was a legitimate transaction. This person just sold their house, and here are the proceeds from the real estate transaction. That's never shown. And given all of the other indicia of fraud, it's just not acceptable to go on with that transaction without providing that evidence.

So that's the offensive conviction against which we look at whether these other third party transactions are a common scheme or plan. And we have to have at least one common factor such as common victims, accomplices, purposes or similar modus operandi. Here I don't think we have common victims. We have different victims around the country. And accomplices are frankly different too. Mr. Perry rightly pointed out that this -- these people don't know the other victims. There are different other individuals involved as

accomplices.

However, the purpose is always the same. The purpose is to obtain money from people fraudulently. It happens in different ways. And I think that's another way in which this is not your average case. And you know, certainly the Sixth Circuit may disagree with me on this point. But I think that the purpose here of having a scheme that takes money from people in various fraudulent ways, there are -- I think Agent Vance has outlined through today's testimony and the proof at trial, there, I guess, may be three or so different ways. And maybe we can, I don't know, characterize them all as an advanced fee scheme, and then there's subsets within that.

But there are different ways it's done. It's the romance scheme. It's the business e-mail compromise. It's the rental scam. And there are different things that happened. But the goal is always the same. To fraudulently take someone's money. In terms of modus operandi, that's similar. So the money comes to someone fraudulently, and it is various people who Mr. Abegunde comes into contact with. And his role is the same. His role is to strike a deal with them to turn the dollars into -- I'm not going to say it correctly -- naira. Is that close to correctly?

MR. FLOWERS: Naira.

THE COURT: Naira. Thank you. His role is to

turn the dollars into naira. That's what happens, and then that moves it overseas and allows everyone to take their cut in it along the way. So applying -- well, let me say that's the common scheme or plan. So I think it is based on that description that I gave of the offensive conviction in comparing it to what's going on in the chart. In a minute we're going to go through the chart though carefully, and I want to make sure that nothing is included in the chart that doesn't fit what I'm outlining.

I want to emphasize -- I think I've said
everything, I'm just looking at my notes. I want to
emphasize that in terms of what we can see is Mr. Abegunde's
knowledge of what is going on and his -- the foreseeability
that he could be tagged with as to what is happening here,
I'm relying a lot on his specific words that he writes in the
WhatsApp messages and again, comparing those words to what he
stated in the company documents as to what should be
necessary in a situation like this to ensure that the funds
that are the basis for these transactions are not fraudulent.

In terms of same course of conduct, here we have an ongoing series of transactions. To test whether something is the same course of conduct, we look at similarity, regularity and timing. The similarity is outlined -- is really the same as what I've outlined as the modus operandi. It's Mr. Abegunde serving as a middleman and as a money

launderer of fraudulently acquired funds. He's, quote, cleaning the funds by arranging for their deposit into accounts, giving instructions at times on the way in which those funds should come out of that account. In doing so, manipulating the funds.

The deposits, he's directing into accounts of people who are unrelated to the financial transaction. There are times in the messages we can see where he becomes aware that an account is closed, and he quickly directs them into another account, again, of a person unconnected to the financial transactions. His knowledge and foreseeability as to what's going on is again, shown by his own words on the messaging app. He is conducting all the business on this encrypted messaging service. And the fact that many of the accounts are closed over time for fraud is another indicator here. In terms of regularity, in the chart, we have 81 transactions. And as to timing, those transactions are continuous over a two-year period. So I do think both of those criteria are met as well.

So in essence, I think it fits both of the definitions under this particular section of relevant conduct. However, I don't want to -- what I've done is kind of looked at the evidence that was presented as to the people involved and compared what I just outlined as a similar course of conduct to the people involved. To go through the

chart and ask myself whether I feel like by a preponderance of the evidence that that shows that each of those transactions should be looked at as relevant conduct.

So looking at the chart -- and I'm looking at the third addendum. First an overall comment. Other than where it says that the client is not available, the client and the name on the account never match. And that's one of the indicia of the fraud that I've pointed to. There are communications about each of the -- well, several of the people involved here in the Government's response to the Defendant's motion. And I relied on those descriptions and the points they made in that filing to determine which of these sort of groupings should be included in relevant conduct.

First, I find that by a preponderance of the evidence that the Money Guy Dejobo amount of 74,500 should be included. And I'm going to refer back to the Government's response to the Defendant's motion to exclude that evidence as the place where I found the evidence that shows that these are transactions that should be considered relevant conduct. I'll try and point out a couple of things specific to each of these groups, but for example, with Money Guy Dejobo, these transactions or at least the transactions that are included in the 74,5- occur after the FBI interview with Mr. Abegunde where the agent and Mr. Abegunde have this sort of

philosophical conversation about what constitutes fraud and who should be responsible for it. And frankly,

Mr. Abegunde's description is just wrong as to who should be responsible in that situation. Despite that, he interacts with Money Guy Dejobo in a way where he doesn't have the proof he should have that the sources of the funds there are legitimate.

So what I did is went through the chart and everywhere Money Guy Dejobo was involved in the transaction on the chart, I checked that off. Frankly, I'm going to assume the Government's math is right, and if it's not, I'm going to assume Mr. Perry is going to tell me it's not right. I didn't go through the chart and add it up to make sure the numbers equalled 74,5-. As to Gboyega Ajayi, the guy we were talking about today.

MR. FLOWERS: Gboyega Ajayi.

THE COURT: Gboyega Ajayi.

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: All right. That's 155,200. I also find that by a preponderance of the evidence that the transactions that that person was involved in with Mr. Abequade also constitute relevant conduct.

Again, the Government's submission points to several places that indicate conversations between the two that include those indicia of fraud or questions regarding

the source of the funds that should have told Mr. Abegunde that these funds were not legitimate. Bode BDC Yankee, I also find by a preponderance of the evidence that those transactions were relevant conduct, relying on the Government's motion -- or submission of those conversations again. That's 55,350. Baja Fresh Autos 80,500. Again, find by a preponderance of the evidence that those amounts should be included based on the same factors. Abioye Osiberu.

MR. FLOWERS: Abioye Osiberu, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. There I included 13,5-.

I think in the Government's submission, not the most recent
one but the last one, it included a larger number, but the
larger number includes transactions that are included under
the Bode BDC Yankee category. So those transactions from the
chart that I included include 13,500.

Olubunmi Makinwa.

MR. FLOWERS: Olubunmi Makinwa, Your Honor.

THE COURT: There I included 10,200. There were some other transactions that could have been listed under her, but again were included in some of the categories I've already listed. But the transactions related to her accounts I also conclude had those same characteristics that would make them relevant conduct in this matter. Debo Gre MTN 9,500. That was, I think, just one transaction maybe.

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am. Yes, Your Honor. One

transaction.

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

THE COURT: And again, the Government's next to last submission talks about the conversation that was had there regarding the cash that that gentleman wanted to sell. And again, indicators that it was part of that -- the same scheme, the same conduct that I've already discussed.

Next is Abayo \$30,750 were the total transactions I have listed for him. Again, I find by a preponderance of the evidence that his -- that these transactions have those same indicia that make them part of the same course or conduct in a common scheme or a plan. Then the money that went into Caffey's account, Edchae Caffey, \$24,840.01 also is indicative of this same types of transactions. And specifically she testified at the trial to seeing those transactions coming into the accounts that she was connected with and realizing that she wasn't connected to the transactions and didn't know -- feared that it was fraud and didn't know why those moneys were coming through her account. I think some of that 24,5- may be moneys that were paid as part of the marriage fraud itself though, which kind of puts it in a different category but still makes it part of relevant conduct.

MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, do you mind if we have our phones out to use the calculator for those portions?

THE COURT: Mind if what?

MR. FLOWERS: We use our phones for the calculator?

THE COURT: No problem. I was using my phone a

lot as I was going through all of this. So that leaves some things that I haven't addressed yet on this chart. And let me go through and tell you what that does not include. I haven't yet included Numbers 1 and 2 on the chart. I'm looking — the chart that was attached to the Government's submission numbers the transactions, so I had been working off the addendum, but I switched because it was easier to refer to the number.

So for example, Number 1 is the -- 2,550 is the amount. The date is January 19, 2016. Mosummola Odunuga. Close enough. Is the person -- is the third party name. So are we all at the same place at least? All right. So one and two I've not included yet. Number 8 I have not included yet. 12 and 13, 24, 29 and 30. 31, 36 and 53. 73, 74 and 79.

Starting with -- starting at the end first. On the last page of the chart, there are three transactions, 73, 74 and 79, that -- where the third party name is Igoche Mark.

MR. FLOWERS: Igoche Mark, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That appears to be the same account that was used several times by people whose transactions I have included. For example, you can look above on that same

page and see that Money Guy Dejobo and Gboyega Ajayi -- close enough, Mr. Flowers -- used that account for transactions that have been included. So given the fact that that account has attached to it transactions that I believe are -- should be included as part of the common scheme or plan or same course of conduct, I will include those three transactions as well. So those three would equal 6400, if my math is right.

MR. PERRY: Of the Igoche Mark transactions?

THE COURT: Yeah. The ones that involve that account. Just the three, Numbers 73, 74 and 79. The other transactions involving that account have already been included in the number. Does that make sense?

MR. PERRY: That makes sense.

astray because this was challenging to get through. All right. The Koko-Ete Obott account was also already used -- already included in the figures through the Debo Gre MTN transaction, including an Abayo transaction. So again, that account has been shown through other transactions I have already included to be one that's been used for these types of transactions. For that reason, Number 24 and 29, which also use that account, I'll also include in the calculation. And those two equal \$10,000.

The Theodore Nwanne account was used at least once that I see when I included Bode BDC Yankee in the

calculations. That account was used as Number 9. Again, I have yet to include Bioye Yankee as a whole. The transaction -- the transaction reflected at line 8 but that same account was used, and so for that reason, I'll include Number 8.

And again, the basis for this is the fact that these third party accounts are ones that are used for these -- for the transfer of funds that have been gotten through fraudulent means where Mr. Abegunde could not, did not verify the source. Didn't -- and also was -- for all the other reasons I said that they were indicia of the same sort of scheme or common plan that was going on related to the underlying offense here.

So the Number 8 that I've now included is the \$10,510. If we look at the transaction in line 29 that I've included because the account is the same account as was previously shown to need to be included in the calculation, the client connected to that account in Number 29 is Mrs.

Bee. So at some point, as I was looking at this, my conclusion was where we have a reason to include one transaction because of an account being used where that client related to that account, related to that transaction, I don't know anything about that client, but I do know that they used this account that is -- was being used for these types of transactions.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

100

It leads me by a preponderance of the evidence to conclude that the client was someone who was connected to these transactions as well. And so without any other proof regarding Mrs. Bee, it calls into question all of those transactions on this chart that show that person as a client. So that would cover the transaction in line 12, line 13. Line 13, I also will note that Meredith Grundy, that's the person who Mr. Abegunde's first wife married as part of what has been alleged to have been a fraudulent marriage. MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor. And Mrs. Bee is actually Ms. Makinwa. But that's how it was listed as in the phone. THE COURT: As his wife? MR. FLOWERS: Yeah. THE COURT: Okay. Any argument related to that, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: Same objection. No. THE COURT: Nothing more? Nothing else? MR. PERRY: Right. Nothing additional. THE COURT: Okay. So this would include again the transaction number -- line 12, line 13. Line 29 we've already included. Line 30. And line 31. So I get 22,3- for That leaves lines 1 and 2. Line 36 and line 53. that total. Line 36 is the \$50,000 transaction that the Government alleges is Mr. Abegunde's payment to Mr. Ojo related to their

business in some way that went into -- Mr. Flowers, you've got a pronunciation? Opeyemi?

MR. FLOWERS: Opeyemi Odeyale.

THE COURT: Odeyale. That went into that account. And the -- let me put that amount aside for a minute. Any -- oh, I just realized that line 53 is the same account that was used by Money Guy Dejobo. So that one would be included. All right. Mr. Flowers, anything that -- any argument you would like to try and make as to Numbers 1 and 2?

MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor. Other than the same modus operandi. But I'm not seeing the same overlap with those third party names as what we see throughout the chart. And I think it's been several weeks since we wrote that response, but my memory is that I said that there was limited chats surrounding those messages as well. Given that, I mean, we have just the same modus operandi, and if we extract that from the chart, the Government won't really argue against.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, without -- I'm going to leave those out for now. And if the Government wants to come back and try and argue to include them in at some point, well, I'll hear from you. Wants to try to point me to specific information but for now I'm going to leave them out. All right. Let's talk about the \$50,000 that is the payment

from Mr. Abegunde to Mr. Ojo through a third party account.

And let me hear from you on that, Mr. Flowers.

MR. FLOWERS: That follows the same modus operandi. Mr. Ojo is one of his coconspirators who was directly related to the business e-mail compromise. It's our contention that that, based on the preponderance of the evidence, represents money that, in some way, shape or form, came from fraud and was eventually transferred back to Mr. Ojo. I will concede in making that argument that the amount does stand out versus the others where they're just in variations between five and \$10,000 or some smaller amounts, but we believe based on the modus operandi and the relationship between Mr. Abegunde and the end recipient Mr. Ojo would on the preponderance of the evidence support including that.

THE COURT: Anything, Mr. Perry?

MR. PERRY: I just would like to remark this was something that I want to make sure on the dates, but from my understanding, that money, that \$50,000 was given back after the FBI came because he didn't want anything associated with something that he knew that was -- you know, that didn't come in that was wrong. And that was something that -- a point that will be made down the road as well.

But he paid this money back because he was trying to make sure that the business as it's getting off the ground

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

103

doesn't have any connection to anything that might be wrong. And that was to Ojo. Ojo came to the United States, deposited this money, and the FBI came as a part of the deposit that he -- that after the call came in and I think the testimony was pretty clear. We don't have a transcript, so it might go back and forth on that. But after the money was deposited into Mr. Ojo's account by Mr. Ojo and the Government confirms that he's the person that did it, he's the person that used that account, his connection with F.J. Williams was something that Mr. Abegunde didn't want. And he paid that money back. He paid him out of that business. And that was just, you know, I just bring that to the Court's attention. I just don't think I have enough at THE COURT: this point to include that amount. I don't -- I realize that there certainly was proof that Mr. Ojo was a coconspirator. I think he was the one whose account the Whatcom money went into, and Mr. Abegunde pretended to be Mr. Ojo on the account or in the phone call, but I have no proof of how that's connected to this \$50,000. So I'm going to leave that out. All right. And then I am including the 15,000 related to Ms. Maples and the 1400 related to Ms. Garcia So I need a calculator. Rodriguez. MR. PERRY: Your Honor, did the Court include the amount from --

1 THE COURT: Hang on one sec. 2 MR. PERRY: Okay. 3 THE COURT: Let me finish this one line. 4 Yes, sir. 5 MR. PERRY: I might have been confused, but I 6 thought that the money from Alhassan had already been 7 calculated. But I think I was looking at money from Alhassan 8 to Money Guy Dejobo. \$2,000. 9 THE COURT: Yeah. I don't think so. In fact, I 10 think that the proof was that --11 MR. PERRY: Yeah. 12 THE COURT: -- the 1400 didn't go into one of these third party accounts. It went into F.J. Williams. 13 14 MR. PERRY: Right. 15 THE COURT: If I recall right. All right. I get 16 \$528,933.01. Is that the same figure you all get? 17 MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, I'm at 528,823. So I 18 will re-add my numbers, but I think we're in the same place. 19 And this is not yet including restitution to TRICARE and 20 Whatcom, which Your Honor --21 THE COURT: Yeah. I haven't gotten there yet. 22 Well, let me tell you the figures -- the nine groups Money 23 Guy Dejobo. I'm not going to try and pronounce these names 24 again, but Ajayi. There were nine different groups that I 25 included through Caffey. I added that up and got

\$454,340.01. Then the other ones we just went through where 1 2 I matched people and included those figures based on common 3 accounts used, I got \$58,193. Then I added 16,4- for the 15-4 plus 1400. Now, tell me if you all are getting a different 5 figure. 6 MR. PERRY: Just read through the cumulative 7 numbers that you just said one more time. 8 THE COURT: Do you want me to go through the nine individual that I included? 9 10 MR. PERRY: I think I have those all. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I added that and I got 12 \$454,340.01. 13 MR. FLOWERS: Please, one more time, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: 454, 340, and one cent. 15 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. 16 THE COURT: Then those additional. The Igoche 17 Mark, Koko-Ete Obott, you know, those other figures that we 18 talked about, I added those and got 58,193. And then finally 19 is the 16,4-.20 I've just checked it again and got the same 21 figures. 22 MR. PERRY: I got that amount. 528,933.01. 23 Yeah. The Government all right? THE COURT: 24 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I already at the

last hearing found that the Whatcom BEC, which I have is 1 2 \$60,563.51. The Government in the most recent filing said 3 \$63,563.51. 4 MR. FLOWERS: I think it was a typo on my part, Your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. FLOWERS: My apologies. THE COURT: All right. So the 60,563 I'd already 8 found and TRICARE of 7429.59, which together equals 9 10 \$67,993.10. So together that's \$596,926.11. Are we all on 11 the same page? 12 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. The two -- I'm sorry. 14 Just the one other issue is the Crye-Leike BEC. And the 15 Crye-Leike BEC is \$154,371.58. This is to be evaluated under 16 the jointly undertaken criminal conduct section of relevant 17 conduct, as far as I'm concerned. There weren't specific 18 actions of the Defendant that were connected to this. 19 guess it could be part of the common scheme or plan. But the 20 argument that actually you both really make and address is 21 jointly undertaken criminal conduct. I assume the Government 22 still wants me to address this issue, even though I think 23 we're into that category. Are we into the? 24 MR. FLOWERS: We're in 550 to 1.5, Your Honor. 25 To the extent you take it up, the Government will simply rest

on its submission from its supplemental memorandum. We didn't have anything additional to add. But yes, we did -- and the papers evaluated under the Donadeo factors which would be the conduct associated with others rather than the 1.1 -- 1B2 factors.

THE COURT: Since -- let me make sure I understand. Mr. Abegunde's not connected to this in any way. There isn't proof that any of this money went through him, went through one of the accounts tied to him, correct?

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor. That we could trace. We could not trace funds directly from that to Mr. Abequnde. We trace it to Mr. Ramos-Alonso.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. FLOWERS: And then from there to cash essentially.

THE COURT: And so given the fact that this BEC happened actually before the other one, this is the first one. I guess I'm -- I was struggling a little bit with why -- how we know he's at the point that this is done, part of this same jointly undertaken criminal enterprise or criminal scheme.

MR. FLOWERS: We believe he was moving money as early as, I believe it was January 2016.

THE COURT: Right. And actually I found that by including the other accounts. I do understand the argument

that the way in which this money moved, it's hard to detect whether something may -- connected to this BEC may have gone through him. I'm just -- I'm struggling more with this because it happened before the other one, and so the proof that he's really part of this jointly undertaken activity frankly doesn't quite make sense to me.

MR. FLOWERS: It would be the connections to Tammy. Connections to Mr. Ramos-Alonso. They were both involved.

THE COURT: But we connect them after, not -MR. FLOWERS: Not before. Yes. That we could
tie at the time. And directly trace. Yes. We just submit
on the factors that we discuss in the papers.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm not going to include this amount. I think these situations, for all I know, I think this is probably the case. There are lots of these different situations going on with lots of different people. While the proof at trial and the jury found he was certainly connected to the Whatcom BEC that happened in October, I don't think I can look backward and say that's proof that he was connected to an earlier, this earlier BEC when I don't otherwise see a connection directly to him. So I'm not going to include that amount. So the amount of the loss then is the \$596,926.11. All right. Anything else on that?

1 MR. FLOWERS: Not from the Government, Your 2 Honor. 3 MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: We've tested my math skills. All 5 right. Mr. Abegunde -- well, let me say then. So the 6 finding on that, the total amount of the loss is adjusted in 7 the -- we should adjust that in the presentence report, but 8 it doesn't change, I don't think, from what -- it doesn't change the number of points for the amount of the loss, which 9 10 remains at 14. 11 Mr. Abegunde also objected to paragraph 48, 12 saying that he wasn't guilty of money laundering. We do have the jury verdict there. And the four points in paragraph 48 13 are -- reflect that money laundering conviction. Then he 14 15 objects to paragraph 51, the obstruction of justice 16 adjustment. However, given the witness tampering conviction, 17 that alone justifies the two points. 18 In addition, the presentence report reflects that 19 Mr. Abegunde or states that it's the belief that Mr. Abegunde 20 committed perjury at trial because he testified. Certainly 21 the jury's verdict is different than what Mr. Abegunde 22 testified to. And so from that perspective, it could be 23 concluded that he committed perjury. That's an independent 24 basis for the two points. Any other objections I've missed? 25 MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor.

MR. FLOWERS: Not from the Government, Your Honor.

then with the changes to the actual amount of the loss. As to all matters in the presentence report, I'll adopt them as the findings of fact. So from the presentence report, we do have the total offense level of a 28 and a criminal history category of one. We get to the 28 by starting with the base offense level of an eight. Adding 14 points for the amount of the loss. Four points for the money laundering. Two points for obstruction of justice. That gets us to 28.

Mr. Abegunde is criminal history category of I. So the guideline range is 78 to 97 months. Supervised release range for Count 1 is two to five years. For Counts 3, 4 and 5, it's one to three years. The fine range is 25,000 to 1 million. Restitution is sought in a total amount of \$55,011.62 broken down as for TRICARE 74,000 -- excuse me -- \$7429.59. Whatcom \$34,082.03. Crye-Leike 13,5-. There's a mandatory special assessment of \$400. No mandatory minimum, Mr. Flowers?

MR. FLOWERS: No. Your Honor, on the restitution, I apologize for interrupting. But we do have Ms. Maples' 15,650 as well as Ms. Garcia Rodriguez's \$1400 that the Government would respectfully submit should be part of the restitution.

1 THE COURT: Okay. So that makes the amount 2 sought \$71,411.62, I think. 3 MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am. I believe that's correct. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. Any other objections for 6 the record at this point? Any additional objections? 7 MR. FLOWERS: Not from the Government, Your 8 Honor. Nothing additional, Your Honor. 9 MR. PERRY: 10 THE COURT: No arguments for departures are made 11 in the filings? 12 MR. PERRY: I just made the standard -- the objections that we did to it because we went to trial. 13 14 will make an argument as it relates to him and sentencing. 15 don't know if this is the appropriate time or not to address 16 it if we can. 17 THE COURT: Well, I assume your argument is a 18 variance. 19 MR. PERRY: Variance. If you want me to hold off 20 at this point --21 THE COURT: Yeah. 22 MR. PERRY: -- until you go through the factors. 23 THE COURT: I ask them separately. Departures 24 and variances separately. 25 MR. PERRY: No departure. UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2 MR. PERRY: I apologize.

3 THE COURT: No problem. All right.

Mr. Abegunde, in every sentencing decision, there are several things that the judge has to take into account. One is the guidelines. They're advisory but we've established now what that range is. I'm also to consider what we call the 3553 factors. Those include nature and circumstances of the offense and the seriousness of it. Things about you, your history, your background.

A sentence that would send a message to you and to others of deterrence to not do this anymore. To respect and follow the law going forward. A sentence that would protect the safety of the community if that's an issue here. A sentence that would be a just punishment. A sentence that would help you in your life going forward. So I'm to look at all those factors and to listen to what everyone has to say at the sentencing hearing.

Mr. Perry just referred to variances. This is the time that the lawyers are allowed to make arguments that I should vary in some way from the guidelines, based on one of those factors or based on any argument they want to make. So what I'm going to do now is let the lawyers say anything they want to say, argue whatever they want to argue about what they think the sentence should be. After I've given the

lawyers a chance say anything or present anything they want to, I'm going to give you a chance to say anything you want to say. And then I'll make my decision. Okay?

Mr. Flowers?

MR. FLOWERS: I just will be very brief, Your Honor. From the moment the Defendant was first approached by law enforcement, from when he was first doing conduct in prison and when he has been before the Court and effectively lying on the stand, he has demonstrated a lack of respect for the law. As shown by the various victim testimony from Ms. Baldwin all the way back in March and the effects of cybercrime and moving the money related to the schemes as well as what is going on with Crye-Leike, as well as today with Mrs. Maples and Mrs. Garcia Rodriguez, there is a significant need to protect the public.

In general from these types of schemes but specifically, the movement of money is very serious here. The ease with which people could do it. The ways in which people can hide themselves. It is significant. And the Defendant's lack of remorse for all of this -- and I understand his contention that he's arguing innocence, and he'll continue to argue innocence. I'm not impugning that whatsoever. I'm simply saying that his conduct has demonstrated from day one a lack of respect for the law. So there is a need to protect the public from the Defendant's

actions.

The nature and circumstances, it can be a bit of a head scratcher, given that he's such an intelligent, educated man. Why he went down this road. Why he thought he could get away with something like this. Why he felt the need to lie. Why he felt the need to try and essentially defraud the FBI agents who were interviewing him at first. Why he would do these things.

It just -- all of those factors consider add up to circumstances in which there is a significant need, based on his history and circumstances, based on the individuals whom he defrauded and the consequences of all of these actions that the Defendant should be held accountable. And accordingly, the Government is respectfully asking for a guideline sentence. I believe he falls within 70 to 87, so the Government would respectfully ask for a sentence of 87 months in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Flowers.

Mr. Perry?

MR. PERRY: May it please the Court. Your Honor, no matter how many times I do this, when the Court mentions a departure and if I think that a client is a -- that I'm going to ask for a variance, I always get antsy because I don't want to miss the opportunity to beg you to depart or to vary. And in this particular instance, I think a variance is not

only desired, but I think that the trial that the Court listened to just like I did, I argued during it. I've been involved in this case since, I think, a little bit earlier than this time last year. And because of the speed that my client wanted to go to trial, took a lot of work to get to the point of being able to try it.

There's a lot of submissions that we had to get on board with looking at and not only looking at, I guess, line after line after line of conversation between he and, you know, 20 different people at different points, but we're trying to find out how, in fact, is he in any way related to either a business e-mail compromise or the Whatcom theft that took place. And to be frank, I remember receiving some additional discovery after the initial round of discovery that was the computer download that the Government had done for Mr. Abegunde. And what that computer download showed was a person who had invested all that he had in the world to try to get to the United States. To make himself a better person.

Now that, when he took the stand, I don't think anybody in this room or anybody that heard it could indicate that he -- or could come to the belief that he was trying to perjure himself on the stand. He took the stand. The Government asked questions after I asked my questions, and the people who heard him at trial did not necessarily --

obviously didn't believe his version of it.

But I don't think there was a single point in time that the Government caught him in something that, as they're saying now, well, he lied or perjured himself in testimony from the trial. That's once again, an assumption. That's a huge assumption. Because I can testify -- and if the Court doesn't or if a jury doesn't believe that I knew or should have known something, that doesn't mean that I'm giving perjured testimony. That's me laying out what I learned and in this particular instance of putting myself in Mr. Abegunde's shoes, what he learned in school regarding finance and international finance and international arbitrage and the ability to engage in taking money from point A and sending it across the world and coming back within a number of days with a nice profit for individuals.

Now, when it gets to the point of well, he went down this wrong road because he's trying to open accounts, and he's trying to do the things that he should have known where the funds, based off of who he was dealing with, he should have known that these funds were being procured illegally. There's not a single person who he received funds from that the Government has named that's ever been accused of any crime. There's not one. Even with his codefendant, that codefendant who he sat in trial at, I don't think he had prior to trial any sort of felony.

So this codefendant who he never knew, never had an exchange of words with at all, he's supposed to have somehow known that moneys that he sent to a friend of Mr. Abegunde who in his own country is a banker that's well respected and these funds end up coming to the United States and being deposited into a source that Mr. Abegunde had no way of knowing, other than the fact that when Mr. Ojo, who flew from Nigeria to the United States was absolutely the person that opened the account.

But when he gets a call, instead of him talking with Mr. Ojo or saying well, let me put a three-way call together, he simply said if there's something illegal in the bank account, reverse it. That's it. That's what happened. And we're here today and the Court has added up and taken the majority of the different transactions and said that those should apply as relevant conduct. We respect that fact. We understand what the Court did and absolutely believe that the Court gave an analysis that engaged in looking at the chart and applying what the Court understood to be things that the law allowed to apply to Mr. Abegunde.

But that in no way says that a person with a point -- that has a one criminal point history should be at the high end of the guidelines. And like Mr. Abegunde or not. And particularly in this instance, Mr. Abegunde says -- you know, I was familiar when I came into the case with the

fact that Mr. Abegunde had done a number of writings and had said different things at different times because he had never sat in a jail cell before. He had never been anything other than a person that when he comes to the United States, starts out at the lower end of his class and ends up towards the upper end of the middle of his class. Took him a while because of the language barriers, et cetera, to learn how to learn in the United States in a master's program and get his MBA in finance.

But other than that, he's always been an achiever. He'd always been a person that people said he's doing good, he's going places. And all of a sudden, that part of his world gets shaken upside down. He's supposedly tried to leave the country is what I read from the detention transcript. From day one. And he's basically doing exactly what he said. He's at the airport with a friend with a pair of shorts and a T-shirt on trying to do what he knows to do, which is to change your flight there because you save hundreds of dollars. Not trying to leave the country. They had a stakeout for him. He had no reason to think that I'm going to leave the country when he's changing his flight plans on a vacation that's four months down the road. But that is the impression that the agents gave the Court when they talked about what Mr. Abegunde was doing.

And then you look into the factors of what he did

as its relates to this particular case. He received funds from sources that he did not validate right. And the Court doing what the Court will on it -- what message is going to be sent by putting Mr. Abegunde in jail more than 70 months on a situation like that? How many individuals will go through an MBA finance program, get out and try to engage in arbitrage with individuals of the same nationality and try their best to make a buck by buying this money that he knows about and trying to turn that money around for profit? That's where we are.

So whatever the message that the Court has to send, I think it could be done by a sentence substantially less than 70 months, let alone 80-odd months at the top end of the guidelines. I think in this particular instance,

Mr. Abegunde has been in jail now since 2017. He's learned whatever there is to learn by -- regarding this. As far as it relates to looking into transactions if he's ever -- goes to another country. Because in the United States, he wouldn't be able to start the company that he has started and see that dream go far.

But if he's ever engaging in any sort of activity as it relates to receiving money, obviously he would know to go into the same inquiry and not allow individuals to talk him out of going into that same inquiry. Once he says I'm not going to fool with you if you can't validate these funds

and he's asking those questions again, the Court says well, he did go back to that person. And I agree, he did go back. What we don't see is the fact that there are phone calls between the individuals during that time.

Should he have allowed himself to be convinced of it at that point? No, he shouldn't. And I -- obviously he's learned that lesson. He's sitting here now in a brown outfit as opposed to the suits and the things like that that the photos that the Government got from his computer would suggest. The computers and that information suggests a person who was trying to do something in his field that he had learned in order to procure or to get funds to make a profit. Not to try to tell somebody or try to help somebody get further along from defrauding people.

And there's no -- there's never any mention in any of those conversations of anything that would lead one to believe that he should have known that the money was coming from sources that were illegal. There's not a conversation or a communication about yeah, I'm getting -- people are engaging in sweepstakes, wink, wink or anything like that. Or yeah, I got a guy that -- I got a family who thinks that they're going to get a key from me. You know, things like that. There's none of that in the communication. There's nothing -- and if you go -- and the Court said it better than I ever could. This case is different than every sentencing

case that I have seen as it relates to fraud. As it relates to fraud and conspiracies.

There's not a communication. There's not a codefendant coming in and saying oh yeah, we put this together, you know, two or three years ago. That I would act like I was Tammy and I was in love with Mr. Ramos-Alonso and get him to send his savings to me. And then I would get a little money, and I would say hey, I'm going to give this to you, and now I need you to send me this money back. And then I'll send this money to another source to make it clean.

And without those types of things, we're here today sentencing this man, and I'm just asking the Court to consider the track record prior to anything to do with this and consider that what did he make out of it. What did he benefit from any of it other than the money that was made in trying to sell naira. There was never any testimony or any proof that he received money from allowing people to use different accounts or anything like that. The money that he made was off of the exchange of naira. And in order to do it, he needed accounts to try to do that.

And we're here today. He understands where the law is in that regards. I don't think there's any sort of fear that he would engage in any of those types of things. You have the, I guess, the final -- when you take away the fraud count as it relates to the case and the wire fraud and

the money laundering counts, then you're dealing with the marriage fraud. And Your Honor, I don't think that there's a fear that he would try to marry another person if he gets back into the United States in order to lengthen his stay in the United States inappropriately.

In this particular instance, the Court -- the jury found him guilty of that. There's not a lot of argument with it. He married this lady. He wanted to be in the United States. He wanted to do what was best as a family. And the Court is well aware of the position that I have in that regards, that I don't think the jurisdiction possibly should have been here. That's not a sentencing consideration. I think he's learned whatever lessons regarding that based off the time that he's been in custody as of right now.

And Your Honor, I would just ask the Court to —
if I had to give a number to the variance, what would a
sentence of above 40 months serve to show him a lesson or to
strike a greater fear in the public of individuals who have
never received any sort of criminal history points? What
lesson would a person who's similarly situated to
Mr. Abegunde need more than a 30-month sentence on something
like this? And I don't know how you can drive that lesson.
Because he wanted to at least take his matter to trial. And
that he wanted to tell his side of what happened from his

perspective. Those aren't things that I think that he should be penalized for.

He understands where he is right now. He understands that the Court holds, you know, the future as it relates to this case in Your Honor's hands. And all that we're asking for is give a sentence that makes sense for this type of case. You know, a first-time offender that was trafficking heroin might not get 80 months, depending on the amount or depending on whether or not safety valves apply and things like that. You know, to give a person an 80-month sentence. And I have all due respect for the two individuals that came in and testified today regarding what happened to them.

I simply say that although he's guilty of being a -- to use the Government's phrase, a down the road participant, there's nobody who's testified that he has done something to be a first-hand taker of money from anyone. Or somebody who's acting like they're somebody on the Internet trying to lure recent widows out of their money. Or trying to lure a couple with a number of children out of their money. There's nobody that's indicated that.

And this person who's well downstream on it, the Government is asking to punish as if he's the person that came up with the -- whatever the schemes are for the business e-mail compromises, for the scam to defraud a person out of

their home and rental money and things like that. And I just ask that the Court look at the person as a whole. Look at his background. Look at the individual that has come to the country to try to be educated.

He went down the wrong road as related to try and get married to lengthen the stay and all of those things.

We're not trying to argue that. But I ask that he not be punished any greater than what's necessary to send the message that the Court will have for deterrence and also to teach the lesson, and I think that a variance to the point that I'm asking around the 40-month range would meet all of those objectives, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Perry.

Mr. Abegunde, anything you'd like to say?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. I've been

locked up for about 20 months now.

THE COURT: Hang on one sec because I want to make sure. Sorry. We've been in here a long time. We're going to take a ten-minute break. Okay? And give you time to gather your thoughts and other people time to do various things. So it's five after 4:00 almost or a little bit after. Let's come back at a quarter after 4:00, and we'll finish up. Okay?

(Short break.)

MR. FLOWERS: Your Honor, when Mr. Abegunde gets

out here, may I correct one thing that I said when he gets out here?

THE COURT: Yes.

So Mr. Flowers wanted to correct something.

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor. In the Government's sentencing recommendation, Probation alerted me to the fact that I misspoke. The range is 78 to 97, and the Government's advocating for a sentence of 87 months, right in the middle of that. I wanted to clarify that I did not want it to seem as if we're asking for the high end of the quidelines.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FLOWERS: The other issue is, without that big of a deal, my flight is at 6:00 to go back. There's a chance that I may slip out, depending on how long we go, and Ms. Ireland will handle the end of this with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: I'm hoping we don't get in the middle of that, but we'll see. All right. Mr. Abegunde.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. As I was saying, I've been locked up for 20 months. Out of the 20 months, I spent 16 months in a cell in Mason, Tennessee. And in that cell, about seven different people have come and gone, you know, but in the last five days unfortunately I've not been able to sleep. And the reason why I have not been

able to sleep is they brought in a new cell mate for me about a week ago. And each time I sleep, just because I have -- I don't know if I call it a deficiency or a defect. I snore, you know. So every time I'm sleeping, he always wakes me up and says if I snore, you know, he's going to keep waking me up because if he can't sleep, I shouldn't be able to sleep.

So as I stand before this Court today, I'm drowsy. I can't -- I don't have a feel of myself. And the main point I'm trying to drive is, you know, the Government has made this case about a lengthy sentence for me. But in a prison system, a detention system, there are lots and lots of dangers. I'm in a dilemma right now. What do I do? I need to sleep. It's natural if I want to sleep.

You know, I've tried to approach this gentleman and say please, you know, can we work something out. I don't mind. He's gets aggressive. He's challenging me to fight.

And I can't get into a fight, you know. Should I, you know, tell the authorities, I'll be looked upon as a rat or of the police. And you know, with a lengthy sentence, only God knows the amount of dangers I face going forward.

Your Honor, regarding this entire case, I just want to point out something. And I don't know if that fact is missing or, you know, is being overshadowed. And is that as soon as I became aware that \$9,000 had gone into a friend of mine's account, immediately I became aware, I did

everything to make sure the funds were returned. It was never my intention, it was never my -- I never, I never, I never anticipated that fraudulent funds would come through me.

And you know, even the Government has stated its case, you know, I stated categorically it was never my intention. I didn't knowingly receive any fraudulently obtained funds. And the only fraudulently obtained funds that came into a friend's of mine account, it didn't come to my account. It didn't come to me. Right? Because as a matter of business policy, all of the facts that have been presented in this court came from my phone. Came from communications I had.

And there's no single communication, there's no single bank deposit slip that shows a \$9,000 transaction.

That \$9,000 transaction from the presentence report, finding of fact says it came from Alika Deniga. My friend Ojo said Alika Deniga put money into his account. And I strongly admonished him for not being — taking steps to ensure the innocence of the funds. In my view, you know, I made phone calls, made all those chats to ensure, hey, I don't want any trouble. I'm trying to stay out of trouble.

I made phone calls. I chatted. I was trying to make sure there was no fraudulently obtained funds done within any transaction I was involved in. However, you know,

I wouldn't be here right now. And you know, the Honorable 1 2 Judge has a job to do right now. And I just beg, I just 3 plead, you know. I'm not the only one doing jail time right 4 now. My mother. My mother is a widow. She's been a widow for close to 30 years. My mother is doing -- serving jail 5 time with me right now, you know. I have a brother that has 6 7 sickle sell. THE COURT: Say that again. Your mother is what? 8 THE DEFENDANT: My mother is a widow. 9 10 THE COURT: Right. 11 THE DEFENDANT: Has been a widow for close to 30 12 years. THE COURT: Right. 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. She's doing jail time with 15 me right now. I don't mean directly. I mean, in terms of --16 MR. PERRY: Figuratively. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 18 THE DEFENDANT: My brother, my older brother, 19 sickle cell. He's about 35, you know. He's doing jail time 20 with me right now. My first wife is doing jail time with me. 21 My daughter is doing jail time with me right now. So I 22 plead, with this Honorable Court, I plead that this Honorable 23 Judge in dispersing the judgment, I plead for leniency. 24 plead that you give me an opportunity to go back and pick up the broken pieces of my life and restart again. Thank you. 25

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Abegunde. All right. 2 Anything from anyone else? 3 MR. FLOWERS: Not from the Government, Your 4 Honor. 5 MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor. 6 I assume nothing from Probation? THE COURT: 7 PROBATION OFFICER: No, Judge. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. So my job is to consider the Advisory Sentencing 9 10 Guidelines and the 3553 factors to make an individual 11 assessment about Mr. Abegunde's sentence to impose a sentence 12 that's sufficient but not greater than necessary to 13 accomplish the purposes of sentencing. Looking at the 3553 factors, first the nature and circumstances of the offense 14 15 and the seriousness of it. This was of course an economic 16 crime. No violence was involved. But it was still a very serious crime. 17 18 It's one of those, it's a series of events that 19 affects peoples' lives for a very long time. Whether they 20 are the people who were directly defrauded, the victims of 21 the business e-mail compromises, wherever the victims plugged 22 in, they were hurt in significant ways. Ms. Maples today 23 talked about physical ways, and that certainly plays a part. 24 But also psychological, economic, all those other ways. And 25 I'll note that the -- we heard from the owner of Whatcom at

-- was that Mr. Alonso's sentencing?

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, ma'am. That was Mr. Alonso.

THE COURT: And she wrote -- they wrote a statement in the presentence report too, I think, of just what it does to a company. Because of actions like this, because of the fraud and the cleaning of the money that comes from a fraud, it all affects our banking systems. It affects our e-mail systems. It affects our social media. It makes all of those things less stable.

It affects the way in which ordinary people -- we all are ordinary people -- it affects the way we communicate with one other and the level of trust that we can have among us. It has lasting effects beyond the mere dollars. And the, quote, mere dollars in this case is -- I also have to point to is significant. It's, you know, just under \$600,000 that I have found is relevant conduct related to Mr. Abegunde.

I didn't say this when I addressed that issue, but the Government has consistently argued that this is a very conservative amount. We don't know what else went through other accounts, Mr. Abegunde's business account that may have been part of fraud. So I'm just going to rely on the number that I found. That's a significant amount of money that was part of fraudulent conduct affecting a great number of people.

I also have to address the -- both the marriage fraud and the witness tampering counts. Those are also very serious convictions. Marriage fraud, trying to stay in this country through illegitimate ways, marrying someone in the service, certainly Ms. Caffey made her own decision. She was an adult. Mr. Abegunde didn't -- I can't tag him with her making her own decision. But he also was a part of that and made the decision to marry someone in our military, ending up ruining her career in order to stay in this country illegally. And that, it is a serious matter.

Frankly what's even more serious is the witness tampering though. Writing the document and making it seem as if that came from previous counsel to try and convince her not to cooperate with the authorities is making a mockery of our system. That's serious behavior that has to be recognized.

In terms of Mr. Abegunde's history and characteristics. No criminal history. We do know from the interview with the agents that Mr. Abegunde's view of what constitutes criminal behavior in this setting is different than frankly what the law says, and that's disturbing. I'm kind of with Mr. Flowers on the point that Mr. Abegunde is obviously very bright and very hard working. Has had and I hope still has high hopes for his life and high, big dreams about what he hopes to accomplish in his life. Still a young

man. 32. Are you still 32?

THE DEFENDANT: My birthday is tomorrow.

THE COURT: Your birthday is tomorrow?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Well, happy birthday, sir. Still a young man. And with a lot of your life ahead of you. And I hope that this -- all of this doesn't cause you to lose the dreams that you hope that you achieve in your life one day. But it is sort of unfortunate, and really I can't kind of wrap my arms around why you made some of the decisions you made here.

Born in Nigeria. Raised in a middle class environment by your parents until your dad's death. And then by your mother and other relatives. According to the presentence report, active in lots of endeavors. College degree in Nigeria and then the MBA from Texas A&M.

You're married to Ms. Makinwa. Had a child. And although I'm not sure we have ultimate proof, but it seems like you probably have two children with Ms. Makinwa. And certainly you mentioned her, mentioned at least the one daughter. Certainly have, it appears to have family who are very supportive of you and care a great deal about you. And I hope -- I point that out because I hope that is one of the things that helps you as you move forward. As you work through the situation, get it behind you and see that life

that you have for you going forward.

Have a good work history. Worked for other people. But more time working for yourself. I think to achieve some of those things that you've dreamed about in your life. A lot of consumer debt. I don't know if maybe some of that is tied to trying to get a business going and a way in which money was obtained to try and support the startup of a business. You're smart enough to figure out how to -- once all this is behind you, how to start a business in a legitimate way and start a legitimate business that provides those things for you in your life going forward.

In terms of adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protecting the public from further crime, promoting respect for the law and providing a just punishment, I had written in my notes, I always have notes coming in, and then I listen to what everyone says. But I had written in my notes I was unclear about deterrence going forward because of some of the views you've expressed here. The view that — and I guess I'm primarily relying on this conversation you had with the FBI early on. This view that someone who touches the money way after the fraud happens is not guilty of anything.

And then, you know, I look to -- I look at the marriage fraud and again, even more so at the witness tampering, and I think is this a situation where this is

someone whose moral compass is just off. It's just not in line with the way in which, at least in this country, business operates and the way in which courts operate from a perspective of the witness tampering issue. And you know, ultimately I don't know.

I mean, Mr. Perry makes the point that you've learned a great lesson here and realize sort of where the mistake was made in terms of verifying the source of the funds. That's not the only lesson here. I mean, obviously that's a huge one. But it's a bigger issue here that deals with all the ways in which people are making decisions that are not in line with the law and how it is you're going to make sure — to the extent you stay in this country, make sure that you never participate in those practices at all. And that goes to specific deterrence. Deterrence that applies to you.

Mr. Perry also makes the point that there aren't other people who would engage in this. It's not like there's a set of people out there who are waiting to convert money, and there needs to be a message related to those people.

It's probably right. As to people who are going to exchange this -- engage in this particular act. But the larger message is people who participate in any way in these various kinds of scams that defraud people of their hard-earned money, whether it's a business e-mail scam, a romantic scam,

an advanced fee scam of another kind, there does need to be a message that the courts take these situations seriously and react to these situations in a serious way. And there's a price to be paid for it.

In terms of educational/vocational training, things we can help with. I really don't know. I mean, I don't think the Defense has asked for anything in particular. I think Mr. Abegunde has all the tools he needs to be successful in life. It's just a question of him making the decisions to do so.

So in determining what sentence to impose, I consider the presentence report and the other documents filed in the case as well as the positions taken by the parties. Let me say one other word about Mr. Abegunde made the point that his family is sort of in prison with him. I do -- although you said it more poetically than a lot of Defendants say it, it's certainly something I hear from other people of the suffering that's done by the family because of a sentence that a defendant receives. Unfortunately, my response to that is while I'm very sympathetic, I'm very sympathetic that your mother is suffering and that your brother and the other people you love in your life, unfortunately, those are the unintended consequences of actions that people engage in.

Our families often -- we often bring our families joy, and we sometimes bring our families suffering. I can't, as

sympathetic as I am to your family and how they feel about it, I can't adjust a sentence because of the effect on them. I have to address an appropriate sentence for you, given all the factors I've outlined.

Based on the factors I've outlined and the advisory guidelines, Mr. Abegunde, I'm going to sentence you to 78 months. It is a guideline sentence. It's the low end of the guidelines. I think it's an appropriate sentence, based on the different actions engaged in here. Not only do we have the conspiracy to commit money laundering, we have other actions of fraud through the marriage fraud as well as the -- what is essentially fraud in the witness tampering. A great deal of money was at issue here. And I think that's the appropriate sentence from a deterrence standpoint, both specific and general. As well as given the nature and the circumstances and the other factors I've outlined.

It is for counts -- excuse me -- for Count 4, it would be 60 months. 78 months as to the other counts, all to run concurrent with one another. I'm not going to impose a fine, but I will order restitution in the amount of \$71,411.62 with the amounts for the entities that I outlined at the beginning. I'll note that the TRICARE restitution is joint and several with Caffey. The Crye-Leike restitution is joint and several with Mr. Alonso. And then there's the 15,000 for Ms. Maples and 1400 for Ms. Garcia. Mandatory

1 special assessment of -- excuse me -- supervised release 2 next. Let me -- before I go on, so do we need to talk about 3 the Crye-Leike amount of the restitution, given that I did 4 not include that amount in the relevant conduct? 5 MS. IRELAND: First, Your Honor, you said 6 restitution to Crye-Leike. Did you intend to say Crye-Leike, 7 or did you mean to say Whatcom? 8 THE COURT: Well, Whatcom is in there too. MS. IRELAND: Okay. I don't have an answer to 9 10 that, Your Honor. I'm not sure how it should be addressed. 11 Any ideas, any thoughts? 12 MR. FLOWERS: Perhaps it's safer not to include 13 it and to possibly do a motion to reconsider the restitution 14 at a later date if we find authorities that would direct 15 that, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay. I think that is the safer 17 course. I assume you don't have an objection, Mr. Perry? 18 MR. PERRY: No objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. So the 13,5- for 19 20 Crye-Leike will not be included, but the TRICARE amount will 21 be included joint and several with Caffey. The Whatcom 22 amount joint and several with Mr. Alonso. And then the 23 Maples and Garcia figures. 24 Supervised release, the range for Count 1 is two 25 to five years. The range for Counts 3, 4 and 5 is one to

1 I'm inclined to impose a three-year term with three vears. 2 collection of DNA. Officer access to all financial 3 information. No lines of credit without officer approval and 4 the standard conditions. Does anyone wish to be heard about 5 any of that? 6 MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor. 7 MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Any objections before I impose the 9 sentence? 10 MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor. 11 MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Perry, have I addressed all of the Defendant's arguments? 13 14 MR. PERRY: You have, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act 16 of 1984, it's the judgment of the Court that the Defendant 17 Olufolajimi Abequnde is hereby committed to the custody of 18 the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 78 19 months. Upon release from imprisonment, the Defendant shall 20 be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. 21 Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of 22 Prisons, the Defendant shall report in person to the 23 probation office in the district in which the Defendant is 24 released. 25 The Defendant shall abide by the following

conditions of supervised release. The Defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA. The Defendant is prohibited from opening additional lines of credit without the probation officer's approval. The Defendant shall provide probation officer access to all financial information. The Defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime. The Defendant shall not possess illegal controlled substances. The Defendant shall not be in possession of firearms. All other standard conditions shall apply. There'll be no fine.

Restitution in the amount of \$57,911.62 is due and owing to the following victims: \$7,429.59 to TRICARE joint and several with Caffey. \$34,082.03 to Whatcom Land Title Company joint and several with Mr. Alonso. 15,000 to Ms. Anne Maples. 1400 to Ms. Karina Rodriguez Garcia. Did I get that first name right?

MR. FLOWERS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Restitution should be paid in monthly installments in the amount of ten percent of gross income, which is total income from all sources before deductions, exemptions and other tax reductions. Interest requirements are waived pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3664(k). The Defendant shall notify the Court and the United States attorney of any material change in economic circumstances that might affect the Defendant's ability to pay restitution.

It's further ordered that the Defendant shall pay to the 1 2 United States a special assessment of \$400 which shall be due 3 immediately. 4 Mr. Abegunde, defendants have a right to appeal a 5 If you wish to appeal, the notice has to be filed 6 within 14 days of when we enter the judgment here or 14 days if the Government were to appeal. F you wish the clerk to 7 8 prepare and file your notice of appeal, you can make that 9 request. If you wish to appeal and can't afford the cost of 10 an appeal or the cost of a lawyer, you can seek to appeal in 11 forma pauperis without paying and seek the appointment of 12 counsel. 13 Mr. Perry, could you come and grab that packet? 14 MR. PERRY: I'm sorry. 15 THE COURT: That's all right. 16 Mr. Abegunde, that packet has your appeal rights 17 in it. 18 First, any mistakes or problems with the 19 sentence? 20 MR. PERRY: I didn't hear the last part. 21 THE COURT: Any mistakes or problems with the 22 sentence? 23 No, Your Honor. MR. PERRY: 24 MR. FLOWERS: I don't believe so, Your Honor, no. 25 THE COURT: Any issue with the sentence as

141 1 pronounced? 2 MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor. 3 MR. PERRY: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Request for the judgment, 4 5 Mr. Perry? 6 MR. PERRY: Yes, Your Honor, if I may. 7 THE COURT: What do you got? 8 MR. PERRY: And I might be thrown off. 9 THE COURT: Request for the judgment, is there a 10 location? 11 MR. PERRY: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Programs? MR. PERRY: As it relates to proximity to family, 13 I'm not sure. I know that the consulate from Atlanta is 14 15 here. If I could have just a moment. 16 Your Honor, in this area just because I 17 anticipate a pretty detailed appeal effort, I would ask that 18 he be in an area as close as possible -- as his categories 19 and proper -- whatever he's categorized as and I'm sorry. 20 THE COURT: It's all right. I know what you're 21 saying. 22 MR. PERRY: Wherever he's -- that he qualifies to 23 be as close to this area is what we want so I can travel to 24 him if -- as possible. 25 THE COURT: So as close to Memphis as possible to

```
be near appellate counsel for a complicated appeal.
 1
 2
                 MR. PERRY: Correct.
 3
                 THE COURT: Would that be good language?
                 MR. PERRY: That is precise. Thank you.
 4
                 THE COURT: I'm not sure you want to include
 5
 6
     anything else because it might contradict that.
 7
                 MR. PERRY: No. I guess the only other thing is
 8
     the fact that, you know, I would imagine that a security
     level. He hasn't had any kind of infractions since he's been
 9
10
     out. And he's a Category 1 on a finance case, so that being
11
     the case, whatever the Bureau of Prisons says in regards to
12
     that, if it's close. I don't want him, in other words, being
13
     close but in a place where it's a category he shouldn't be.
14
                 THE COURT: I don't think they would do that
15
    anyway. And I mean, I typically don't comment on the
16
     security classification because that's going to drive a lot
17
    of it.
18
                 Anything else that you all need to address, we
19
    need to address today?
20
                 MR. FLOWERS: No, Your Honor.
21
                 MR. PERRY:
                            No, Your Honor.
22
                 THE COURT: Anything else?
23
                 Mr. Abegunde, do you have any questions for me?
24
                 THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
25
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you all.
```

```
143
                  Mr. Abegunde, I do, I wish you good luck, sir.
 1
 2
     Thank you.
 3
                  (Adjournment.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                          UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT
```

CERTIFICATE I, CANDACE S. COVEY, do hereby certify that the foregoing 144 pages are, to the best of my knowledge, skill and abilities, a true and accurate transcript from my stenotype notes of the Continuation of the Sentencing hearing on the 22nd day of October, 2019, in the matter of: United States of America VS. Olufolajimi Abegunde Dated this 3rd day of December, 2019 S/Candace S. Covey CANDACE S. COVEY, LCR, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of Tennessee