Pages 1 - 55

NO. CR 14-00534-CRB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Charles R. Breyer, Judge

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS. )

Raymond A. Grinsell,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Tuesday, May 8, 2018

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## **APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiff:

ALEX TSE

United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco, California 94102

BY: ANDREW MAST

ALBERT SAMBAT MICHAEL RABKIN

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For Defendant:

SIDEMAN & BANCROFT
One Embarcadero Center

8th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94131

BY: LOUIS P. FEUCHTBAUM, ESQUIRE

Reported By: Pamela A. Batalo, CSR No. 3953, RMR, FCRR

Official Reporter

Tuesday - May 8, 2018

10:30 a.m.

2

1

## PROCEEDINGS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

---000---

THE CLERK: Calling criminal action CR-14-00534, United States vs. Raymond A.Grinsell.

Counsel, please step forward and state your appearances for the record.

MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Good morning, Your Honor. Louis Feuchtbaum for Ray Grinsell, who is present in court.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. MAST: Good morning, Your Honor. Andrew Mast on behalf of the United States.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor. Jill Spitalieri, Probation.

THE COURT: Good morning.

This is the second sentencing of a group of co-defendants, 23 in number, involved in these criminal conspiracies.

At the first sentencing, prior to its commencement as to Mr. Giraudo, the Court made a number of statements.

Were you here, counsel?

MR. FEUCHTBAUM: I was, Your Honor, and I have advised Mr. Grinsell of the Court's statements.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'm not going to repeat it, but of course it is the Court's views as to the nature of the criminal offense, as well as the Guidelines, the nature of the

law, and as well as the general deterrent sentence -- service of a sentence, and now we move to the individualized characteristics.

I want to say at the outset -- and I indicated it yesterday -- I am concerned about Mr. Grinsell's health conditions. They are very well-documented. I have read with great care the Presentence Report, as well as the submissions by Defense counsel.

It is not my intention to commit Mr. Grinsell to the general prison population. It is my intention to structure a sentence, after I hear all the factors and if warranted, that will permit Mr. Grinsell to continue with his medical doctors, his medical care, access to hospitals, if necessary, that he is familiar with and has a relationship with.

I wanted to say that at the outset just because I think that has to be a very important consideration and you don't have to address that.

MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, it's -- believe me, I'm not going to -- you can say whatever you want to say. This is sentencing. But you don't have to convince me of the seriousness of your client's medical conditions. I'm aware of it. I'm prepared to address it. I believe it to be genuine, and I think that I can come up with some reasonable situation, reasonable confinement system, if I decide that confinement is

appropriate.

But you already have my views on that subject, at least from a general point of view, so now I think I should listen to the Government and then I will listen to you, counsel, and we'll proceed with the sentencing.

MR. MAST: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Just in the context, the first -- first of all, is there a 5K1 motion?

MR. MAST: There is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court grants the 5K1 motion. The adjusted offense level is 17. The Sentencing Guideline range is 24 to 30 months.

MR. MAST: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, go ahead.

MR. MAST: So, Your Honor, Mr. Grinsell is among the most culpable among the 23 defendants in this case. He has a significant volume of commerce which was stipulated in the Plea Agreement to be between 10 million and 50 million, and the Government submits that his volume of commerce is \$28.66 million.

The Government is making a motion for a downward departure for 20 percent off the bottom of his Guidelines range, applicable Guideline range, and the resulting recommendation is a sentence of 19 months, which the Government recommends be served in custody.

Turning first to the nature and circumstances of the offense. Mr. Grinsell was significantly involved in bid-rigging conduct occurring at the auctions. He knew his conduct was wrong, but nevertheless joined the conspiracy and continued to participate time and time again.

His volume of commerce does not account for all of the properties he rigged and, indeed, was involved in rigging 61 properties in which he received payments not to bid which are not reflected in his volume of commerce.

Grinsell was also a member of the most dominant group of bidders referred to as the "Big 5," which collectively controlled the auctions, and Mr. Grinsell has stipulated to a manager/supervisor role in the offense adjustment which the Court has applied.

Now, Mr. Grinsell's influence within the Big 5 was more limited than the others and certainly more limited than Mr. Giraudo. Mr. Grinsell actually resisted the others joining when he was partnering with Mr. Giraudo initially and resisted the others joining.

But he knowingly participated in this bid-rigging conduct and profited immensely from his participation, so despite resisting some of the criminal overtures, he continued to participate in that conduct.

A sentence will also need to reflect respect for the law and provide a just punishment. And here, as I mentioned,

Grinsell understood his conduct was wrong and, in fact, after initially participating in the more limited form of bid-rigging conduct sporadically in the 1990s, he abruptly stopped after hearing that another co-conspirator, who was charged in the East Bay cases, was being investigated for unknown matters. Yet despite knowing the illegality of his conduct, Mr. Grinsell resumed bid rigging in the mid to late 2000s and continued until 2011.

And at times, it appears he justified his unlawful conduct because the payoffs were not always made in cash form, but were rather credited for prior payoffs or offsetting debts made with prior payoff debts.

As the Court is well aware, a sentence will need to address general deterrence. And as I mentioned at the last hearing, this conduct was rampant, and 23 individuals in this case have pleaded guilty. It's not just been occurring in San Mateo and San Francisco and there have been approximately 60 defendants who were sentenced by either Judges Hamilton or Donato for participating in similar conspiracies, and the Government has prosecuted similar bid-rigging cases that have occurred in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Alabama, and just recently many Mississippi.

This shows that the bid-rigging conduct is profitable at foreclosure auctions, and that unless and until courts impose adequate sentences necessary to deter this criminal conduct, it

will continue. And fines alone, especially as here where a defendant has substantial assets, will not provide an adequate deterrence.

The Government does not believe Mr. Grinsell is likely to reoffend but nevertheless believes a custodial sentence is necessary to ensure as much.

The Government understands that Mr. Grinsell attends the auctions. Unlike Mr. Giraudo, the Government does not believe he partners with co-defendants and he does seem genuinely remorseful for his conduct, which was expressed during his interviews with the Government.

A substantial sentence is necessary to avoid sentencing disparities. As the Court is well aware, the Court will sentence another 21 individuals in this case, and Mr. Grinsell is among the most culpable participants when compared to the whole group of other defendants.

Judge Hamilton varied substantially for first-time offenders who accepted responsibility and cooperated with the Government in the East Bay cases, but in each of those cases, the Government sought custody, and in each of these cases before Your Honor, the Government will be seeking custody as well.

And respectfully, noncustodial sentences for bid-rigging crimes, even for first-time offenders who do cooperate, are not contemplated by the antitrust guidelines, as expressed in the

commentary Your Honor articulated at the first proceeding.

The Guidelines indicate that antitrust offenses should result in custodial sentences and that should be common.

It's also worth noting that Judge Hamilton did impose
Guidelines sentences on some defendants. Michael Marr received
30 months, which was a Guideline sentence at the low range.
Glenn Guillory received 18 months, which was a low-end sentence
of the Guidelines, and he just rigged about 20 properties,
which pales in comparison to the number of properties rigged by
Mr. Grinsell.

Now, both those defendants proceeded to trial, which, of course, Mr. Grinsell did not. But Judge Hamilton also imposed Guidelines sentences for pleading defendants such as Stephan Florida, who received the Guidelines sentence of 10 months, Nicholas Diaz, who received the Guidelines sentence of six months. And Judge Donato sentenced Alvin Florida, another leader in an Alameda conspiracy, to 21 months in custody, although this was a variance. The Government submits that Mr. Grinsell should likewise receive a Guidelines sentence.

Turning to the nature and circumstances of the defendant,
Mr. Grinsell is being sentenced because of what he did, not
because of who he is. And the Government is aware of
Mr. Grinsell's health issues. In fact, the Government
witnessed some of those firsthand when a scheduled interview
had to be rescheduled to accommodate medical appointments in an

issue that arose. But Mr. Grinsell's submissions do not indicate that the Bureau of Prisons cannot handle someone in Mr. Grinsell's capacity, and I do recognize the comments you made up front, Your Honor.

It might not be the same care he receives at this time, but the Government submits that that's a common occurrence for many defendants facing prison who have medical issues.

Mr. Grinsell has pleaded guilty and has accepted responsibility for his conduct, but that does not negate his offense nor justify the dramatic variance proposed by Probation.

Accordingly, the Government recommends a substantial Guidelines level custodial sentence necessary to reflect the seriousness of his conduct, promote respect for law, deter future bid rigging and white-collar crime generally and respectfully requests the Court impose a 19-month custodial sentence consistent with the Guidelines, as well as the Government's motion for a downward departure, serve three years of supervised release, pay a criminal fine of \$20,000 consistent with the parties' Plea Agreement, order restitution of \$156,147, also consistent with the parties' Plea Agreement, and pay a \$200 special assessment.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me just ask you a question about the parties' agreement.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

22

23

24

The Court, on page 6 of the Plea Agreement in connection with the fine, states as follows: "The fine calculated as 1 to 5 percent of the volume of commerce but not less than \$20,000," and then it has a range of 100,000 to 2,500,000. So that's the agreement between the parties with respect 7 I understand that the United States agreed to to the range. recommend a fine between 20,000 and 200,000. MR. MAST: Yes. THE COURT: But the Court is not be bound by that. MR. MAST: The Court would not be bound by it. I also just note that the range as calculated as five percent is actually probably capped at \$2 million, given the statutory max of --THE COURT: Well, if you take the five percent, as I -- five percent of the volume of commerce, the fine would be 17 \$1,433,035. MR. MAST: I trust your math, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Oh, don't trust my math. I relied on the 20 Probation Office. Ms. Spitalieri, is that correct? 21 THE PROBATION OFFICER: I believe I calculated it at \$10 more, \$1,433,045, but \$10 is --THE COURT: Okay. But at any rate, that's the --25 that's the -- that is within the sentencing table, as I

understand it?

MR. MAST: Yes, Your Honor. And --

THE COURT: But the Government has committed that its recommendation would be a fine between 20,000 and 200,000. I understand.

MR. MAST: Right.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

MR. MAST: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. MAST: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Counsel.

MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Good morning, Your Honor.

Your Honor, as I've met with the Government personally probably half a dozen times in preparing for Mr. Grinsell's proffer and I've spoken with Mr. Mast on many occasions about our relative views of the case, and I have to say that from Mr. Mast's representations here, while fully, I think, truthful, it leaves out details that risk creating a misimpression as to the degree of Mr. Grinsell's involvement and it makes some assumptions about others. I don't know that it's necessary to belabor the point, but I do at least want to make mention of them.

Mr. Grinsell was, and the evidence supports and I believe
Mr. Mast would agree -- that within the Big 5, the core group

that had the most influence collectively at the foreclosure auctions, Mr. Grinsell was at the periphery of that group.

Mr. Grinsell in no way contests his culpability and his criminal culpability for being part of that larger conspiracy. However, it would be a misstatement and an injustice to the facts to misunderstand that involvement as Mr. Grinsell having been actively involved in bid rigging 150 properties.

It's clear and uncontested that Mr. Grinsell, as a conspirator, is culpable for all of that. However, what the evidence suggests, and some of which I know the Court has seen in our earlier hearings on the recordings, was that Mr. Grinsell was treated with disdain, disrespect, and pushed out by his business partners.

Of the 150 properties that the Government referred to, there is evidence of Mr. Grinsell having actually been directly involved, meaning going and soliciting people to participate in bid rigging or actively accepting payment on only a handful of occasions. Your Honor, I want to be clear. This is not a defense. Mr. Grinsell does not seek to defend himself based upon that. But it's important for the context of Mr. Grinsell's involvement in this conspiracy.

The Government concludes that from Mr. Grinsell being part of the Big 5, which we know was a group that had immense influence at the auctions, had immense influence through bid rigging, the Government concludes that Mr. Grinsell, even

though he had a peripheral role within that group, is more culpable than every other bidder at the auctions.

Your Honor, having thought of this case every which way possible and looking at the evidence, I don't know how one could reasonably support that conclusion. I think it is an open issue as to what Mr. Grinsell's relative culpability is with respect to the larger group of conspirators.

But it is undeniable that starting in 2008 after a period of ten years, approximately ten years, when Mr. Grinsell had said, "I am not going to do this, I am not going to involve myself in bid rigging," it is undeniable that he made the decision to again participate in that criminal enterprise.

I appreciate the Court's comments when we started about its recognition of Mr. Grinsell's health issues and certainly the majority of our filings were all focused upon that. I think it's important today to address Mr. Grinsell as a person.

Your Honor, with the Court's permission, there are a lot of people who came today to be present to support Mr. Grinsell, and with the Court's permission I would like to ask them to stand.

(Whereupon, people in the gallery stand)

MR. FEUCHTBAUM: And, Your Honor, I would just like to make note of who these people are because I think the greatest testament to Mr. Grinsell's character and his soul are the people who believe in him and some of whom have traveled, you

know, at great distance to be here today and also the length of 1 time that they've known him. 2 Present today -- and if you would raise your hand when you 3 hear your name -- Cynthia Chang, who I will refer to later, who 4 was a client and has known Mr. Grinsell for 35 years. 5 Kathleen Hohalek, a friend who has been friends with the 6 7 Grinsells for 30 years. 8 Bowman Leong, a friend and at one time an employee who has been friends with Mr. Grinsell and known him well for 25 years. 9 Ed Koplowitz, Mr. Grinsell's attorney, who became more 10 than an attorney as they got to know each other through their 11 children going to the same schools. Twenty-five years. 12 13 Mike Larson, who has traveled here from Seattle, a friend 14 for 25 years. 15 Sherman Coultas, a friend for 25 years. 16 Charles Karich, who came up from, I believe, L.A. this 17 morning, a professional associate for 23 years. Brad Lagomarsino, a professional associate for 20 years. 18 Marsha Mayer, a friend for 20 years. 19 Jim Hickey, who I will refer to more later, a friend for 20 21 20 years. Dale Ames, a friend for 20 -- I'm sorry, 15 years. 22 23 Zach Kaufman, a young man who Mr. Grinsell came to know through his son and who I'll comment on more later, but who has 24

known Mr. Grinsell for 14 years.

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Simone Grudzen, who has not known Mr. Grinsell for very long, but for his 70th birthday five years ago, she prepared a legacy video recording Mr. Grinsell's history and has had insights to Mr. Grinsell from doing that. Her father, Dr. Gerry Grudzen, who is a minister, who has got to know Mr. Grinsell through Mr. Grinsell helping in his ministry. Rene Vasquez, an employee who has worked for Mr. Grinsell for 25 years, who I will talk more about later. Jannette Madarang, an employee for 24 years, so I will talk more of later. Beatrice Yuen, an employee for 23 years, who I will talk about more later. Tom Carpio, an employee for 10 years. Rachel Kwok, an employee. Anderson Jones, not really an employee, but a contractor who works almost exclusively for Mr. Grinsell. William Yuen, an employee who I will talk about more later. Merlin Larson, I believe is present with his wife Bianca and his children Sabrina and Christopher, who have been friends with Mr. Grinsell for 30 years. The parents have been friends for 30 years, not the children, Your Honor. Greq Grinsell, Mr. Grinsell's nephew. And Rita Grinsell, his sister-in-law of Mr. Grinsell's

recently-deceased brother, Fritz. 1 Basha Frost Rubin, Mr. Grinsell's daughter-in-law. 2 Mary Gianopoulos, Mr. Grinsell's niece's mother-in-law. 3 Nick Gianopoulos, her husband. 4 Gina Gianopoulos, Mr. Grinsell's niece. 5 And, of course, Scott Grinsell, Mr. Grinsell's son, who is 6 7 here from New York today. And also Gale Grinsell, Mr. Grinsell's wife. 8 THE COURT: You may be seated. And thank you very 9 much for coming. 10 11 MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Let me just note that I have received from 12 13 you many letters from a number of the individuals that you have 14 identified who are here today and I've read those letters. 15 MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Thank you, Your Honor. I don't want 16 to impose upon the Court by presenting more letters at this 17 point in time; however, I do have letters from some of the people who are present and I've brought copies, if the Court 18 would like them. I have them for the Government as well. 19 20 THE COURT: I have them. MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Okay. 21 I think, Your Honor, in understanding not only the context 22 23 of Mr. Grinsell's involvement in the crime, but also Mr. Grinsell as a human being that the Court needs to look at 24 25 in full in imposing sentence, it's important to look at

Mr. Grinsell's background and his life and the key influences in his life.

Mr. Grinsell grew up in a working-class family in Sausalito back in the time where it was still possible for working-class families to live in Sausalito.

His father was a shipyard worker back in the days when there were shipyards there and then became a used car salesman and his mother was a housewife.

Mr. Grinsell had one brother Fritz with whom he developed an extremely close relationship that lasted for their lifetime, and I think that was due in large part to that relationship having been forged in their difficult upbringing.

Mr. Grinsell's father was an alcoholic. And as described in the PSR, it was -- it was not an abusive home. Certainly this would not rank among the worst case I'm sure that the Court sees of abuse, yet it was a difficult upbringing that left, I think, emotional scars for which Mr. Grinsell has been trying to recover his whole life.

His father was distant. Would typically drink on his way home from work. Come home late. Go to bed and have no interaction. That type of involvement that Mr. Grinsell had from his father lasted his whole life.

In fact, the first time that Mr. Grinsell can ever remember his father saying something positive about him was when Mr. Grinsell was already well into his 40s and after a

long period of being estranged from his father, they became reacquainted after the birth of Mr. Grinsell's son Scott, and on that occasion, Mr. Grinsell's father remarked to Ray about Scott's smile and that it reminded him of Ray's smile, and that minimal, minimal praise was something that stayed with Ray for all this time because his upbringing was so devoid of that.

His mother was a housewife and at first very loving, but that presence evaporated over time, as his mother was dealing with the financial stresses of a home that never had enough and also dealing with what ended up being the breakup of her own marriage.

All of this left Mr. Grinsell someone who did not have the type of nurturing that many of us, and I think -- I hope most of us -- enjoy, and I think Mr. Grinsell's been living most of his life in reaction to not having that.

From a young age, Ray had to work from the time he was, I think, about 14 years old. Held a steady job. As a child, he would always turn his money over to his mother to help support the family, and, in fact, as Gale Grinsell notes in her letter to the Court, the -- Mr. Grinsell's brother Fritz and also Mr. Grinsell's mother, up until the time that each died, would talk to Gale about how Mr. Grinsell was such a support and a stalwart in their family by doing that. How grateful each of them felt for his doing that.

In spite of all of that disaffection in going up,

Mr. Grinsell graduated third in his class from Tamalpais High School. He was accepted to both Stanford and Berkeley, but he realized he couldn't afford to go to Stanford so he went to Berkeley. He had no financial support. His father refused and -- during his last year to provide financial support. So Mr. Grinsell worked his way through college.

And he had no guidance when he came out of college.

Didn't know what to do. Wanted to become a teacher and did
that for a time. And he had a little bit of an itinerant life
for a professional life for several years while trying to find
his way. And that itinerant professional life led him to
teaching, to being a guidance counselor, to running a daycare
center, all things, with the possible exception of teaching -I don't think that really resonated with Ray, but being a
guidance counselor, working in daycare for underprivileged
youth were things that really resonated and appealed to Ray's
heart.

And Ray lived that way, and he was married to Gale at that point in time. Where -- and they lived with -- you know, a life of -- I don't want to say "want" because I have no indication that they couldn't meet their basic needs, but a life of, you know -- of things being tight until Mr. Grinsell discovered real estate.

And then finally for the first time in his life, he had a mentor, someone who took him under his wing and showed him the

way that he could work hard, be honest and be successful. And that indeed was Ray Grinsell's life up until the time when he committed bid rigging.

And there was an incident or a period of him doing that in the 1990s. Maybe in the 1980s, though we can't be sure when bid rigging at foreclosure auctions was rampant, and as it's been described, it was a cesspool. The big rigging occurred. It was open, notorious. People didn't even have a need to hide it, and anyone walking into that environment, while not an excuse for the conduct, quickly realized that to do business in that area, one needed to participate in bid rigging or have the wherewithal, the financial wherewithal, to withstand it.

I believe -- I've known Ray Grinsell for seven-and-a-half years now, and I think in the context of this client relationship, I've gotten to know him well. And while I don't vouch for clients in Court and in this case not because I don't want to but because it's improper, I believe that what other people have said about Ray resonates with the person that I know. And what I see from all of that is a person throughout his whole life who has lived trying to fill the holes that were left from his -- his disaffected youth.

Ray Grinsell has spent, I think, much of his life striving for acceptance and respect from other people around him. And Ed Koplowitz, his attorney and then friend, refers to Ray as embodying some of those -- some of those characteristics of

being forthright, honest, reliable, and concerned for the welfare of others.

Sherman Coultas, a friend of 25 years, refers to Ray as a gentleman and a sportsman, but living a life of respectable and admirable conduct that others would look up to has been such a core tenet of Ray Grinsell's life up until the time of these crimes, that is the only exception that I think that anyone would declare would -- where he fell short of those key values.

He has -- he has believed in the virtues of hard work and honesty and generosity. And we know that from what people sitting in this room have said.

Cynthia Chang, a person who has known him for 35 years, relates to the Court in the letter we submitted that when Ray was recovering from major surgery, she was in the process of having her home foreclosed upon, and she called Ray for help. And notwithstanding the fact that he had just gone through major surgery and was recovering and wasn't feeling well, he spoke to her and helped her try to rescue her home. And in doing that, he offered to provide money. Unfortunately, the home was foreclosed upon anyway. But later in life, Ray provided Ms. Chang with financial support to help her.

Kathleen Hohalek, a friend of 30 years, discusses and describes for the Court how when she became a widow at 58, how Ray provided key emotional support and advice to help her and her family get through the loss. And her comment about Ray,

quote -- from that letter, is "Ray is generous with everyone in his family except himself. He does not engage personal indulgences."

Due to that, Your Honor, I can inform the Court for someone of Mr. Grinsell's substantial wealth, he has traveled out of the country on three occasions: Once to go to Mexico with Gale; on two occasions to go visit his son Scott when he was a Marshall Scholar at Oxford.

So the lack of an extravagant life for someone who has obtained the means to have so much I think is a significant testament to what it is that motivates Mr. Grinsell. It's not greed or avarice.

Mike Larson is a friend of Mr. Grinsell's who sadly lost his wife about a year ago in a battle to cancer, and he informs the Court in a letter how when they traveled to Hawaii together for a vacation last year, while Ray was undergoing all the stress and anxiety associated with this case and just needed a break, Mrs. Larson was ill and Mike Larson describes how Ray would sit with her and comfort her and how meaningful and important that was and how unexpected it was, given everything Ray was worried about and experiencing.

Beyond that, Mike Larson informs the Court about the generosity that Mr. Grinsell exhibited to just ordinary staff at the resort. They had been there many times. Mr. Grinsell would talk with them and he would follow up with them on what

was going on with their life or with their lives, what they could do to get over stumbling blocks that were getting in their way.

I've just learned yesterday, Your Honor, of an event that I didn't know of, which tends to be the way it is with Mr. Grinsell. I have learned a lot of great things and I hear something more where I'm not certain if it was at this resort but another place where they regularly stayed, there was a woman employee there who they knew over years who had horrible, horrible orthodontia, and Mr. Grinsell gave her \$5,000 just so she could go get her teeth fixed. Someone to whom he didn't know other than that passingly but saw a need and saw that he had a way to make her life better.

Dale Ames, a friend of 15 years, informs the Court about Mr. Grinsell ensuring that a friend of theirs who had cancer was included in social events and making sure dinners were arranged so that this person would get out of the house and have meaningful outlets.

Dr. Gerry Grudzen, mentioned a little bit earlier, the minister, joined a -- or formed a group for older men who are experiencing different types of distress, whether it's from unemployment or health issues or other sources of misfortune, and Ray joined that group, and he became an informal facilitator for that group because of his openness and generous spirit.

Beatrice Yuen, Mr. Grinsell's accountant for 23 years, described to the Court how when her family was experiencing financial hardship and her husband was laid off, Mr. Grinsell hired her husband to work at his company, and he remains there to this day.

William Yuen, Beatrice Yuen's husband, who Mr. Grinsell hired and who is still there, describes an event where an old woman who was handicapped just showed up in Mr. Grinsell's office late one afternoon wanting advice on real estate, and that without an appointment, without any opportunity to have a business transaction with this woman, there were no other -- there was no possible gain for Mr. Grinsell, he took time to sit and talk with this woman and give her advice, and only afterwards, because it was dark and because this woman could not walk well, Ray drove the woman home.

And another event related by William Yuen where a person unknown to Mr. Grinsell, but a family that was friends with one of Mr. Grinsell's employees, had a death in the family. And Ray overheard how that family was experiencing financial hardship. So even though he didn't know the family, he provided them with financial support.

All of this, I think, really speaks to the character of someone who is so different than the type of person who would normally engage in bid rigging, which shows that that conduct was truly aberrant behavior and does not reflect the person

that Mr. Grinsell is.

Among his reactions in trying to, I think, backfill these holes that were left in his early life are Mr. Grinsell's commitment to the value of family and the value of community and helping people around him. And there are many people who attest to that who are here today.

Bowman Leong, who has known Mr. Grinsell for 28 years, describes how he had become estranged from his family and that Mr. Grinsell, through a lot of talking, encouraged him to mend his family ties because of the importance of maintaining that, and Mr. Leong describes how Mr. Grinsell's mentorship and his warmth and affection changed Mr. Leong's life by getting him to a place where he could forgive and reestablish family contact.

Similarly, Mr. Leong discusses that he had worked for Mr. Grinsell briefly and he wanted to get started in finance. So Mr. Grinsell put Bowman in touch with Mr. Grinsell's own business contacts to get him established in finance.

Several years later being disillusioned and not finding a career in finance particularly rewarding, Mr. Leong wanted to change to photography, and he was concerned that in doing so, Ray would feel let down because he had expended personal capital in getting Bowman established in finance. But Bowman describes that with all that fear, Ray embraced him and told him that he has to do what's going to make him happy in life and again supported him, and Bowman Leong discusses how that

has -- how Ray's presence, both with his family and with giving him the -- encouraging him and giving him the courage to do what he wants, how all that has changed his life.

Charles Karich, who I believe is up here presently, came up from L.A., has known Ray for 23 years, but knew him professionally, and in spite of the relationship being one that was solely professional, the affection, respect that Mr. Karich developed for Ray has led to him to refer to Ray as "Uncle Ray" and looking up to him in the way that one does a benevolent uncle.

Jim Hickey is a friend or has known Mr. Grinsell for 20 years. In a letter to the Court, he describes about how 17 years ago, Mr. Hickey was arrested, and he called up many friends to bail him out and no one would, and even though he -- at that time he only knew Ray professionally, he called up Ray, and without any questions asked, Ray posted \$25,000 bail so that Mr. Hickey would be released.

It turns out for whatever it matters, that Mr.-- it was determined that Mr. Hickey had done nothing wrong. His arrest was based on a false report. But Mr. Hickey describes that after -- as this was all transpiring, once he got out, Ray asked him, "Hey, by the way, where do you live?" So this is a person who was willing to put up \$25,000 at a time when Ray Grinsell did not have as much as he presently does because it was quite a while ago, just to get someone out of jail because

it was a person that Mr. Grinsell knew and knew that that person was in need.

And in encouraging family relationships, Mr. Grinsell told Jim Hickey that an estranged son that Jim had, that that relationship really needed to be repaired, and there was a lot of discussion about it, and Mr. Grinsell's advice, summed up by Jim Hickey, is a son needs a father's love, something that Mr. Grinsell did not have in his life.

Zach Kaufman was a friend -- is a friend of Scott

Grinsell's and he was attending Stanford. So Ray and Gale

Grinsell knew Zach through only passing. And Scott -- I'm

sorry -- Zach became ill and needed assistance, and he recounts

Ray as a second father -- ray became a second father when there

was no need for him to behave as such.

Jannette Madarang, Ray's employee for 24 years, she so strongly believes in Ray's virtues, which she describes at length in the letter to the Court, that she made him godfather to her daughter Khloe.

Marsha Mayer, a neighbor and friend for 20 years, sums up Ray's life as being all about community and family.

And then, of course, Simone Grudzen, who has not known Mr. Grinsell very long, but who bore witness to his life as she made a legacy tape and saw people describing their interactions with Ray and Gale and describing the type of person, member of the community, and the type of father that Ray is. She

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

describes Ray as having relationships that are remarkable and remarkably unusual because of their quality.

Along those lines, having come from a family where there was not a lot of love, except for from his mother for a time before she evaporated and except for the love and warmth that Ray had with his brother Fritz, Ray has backfilled, I think, that hole in his life by being a man committed to his family in ways that I think any of us would admire in spite of growing up in the best circumstances.

Gina Grinsell Gianopoulos, who is here today, we provided the Court with a letter about Ms. Gianopoulos, who had some severe hardship, and without going into the full details here, if the Court -- I'm sure the Court recalls it, but Ms. Gianopoulos had -- was sentenced to prison, and Ray became the force that was always there for her, visiting her regularly, writing letters to her. When she was about to be released, he offered her a job at his business, and rather than being a person with a felony conviction at a young age who would have a hard time getting established in life, instead, Gina is now a licensed real estate salesperson, she is responsible for running many aspects of Ray's office, she's gotten married, had or is having a child, has recently bought a house. Without Ray's presence, Gina's life would have been much different, and she credits Ray with saving her life in that way.

She and her brother Greg discuss how when Ray's brother Fritz died of a heart attack about three years ago and they were suddenly left fatherless, how Ray stepped in and became the bedrock of support for their family and became the second father to them. And that is the sentiment that is echoed by Ray's sister-in-law, Rita Grinsell, who comments that losing Ray, if there were a sentence of incarceration, would be devastating to everyone around him.

All of these family members -- Gina, Greg and Rita -- talk about Ray's commitment to truthfulness and leading an honest life, which seems to be the common theme that so many people attest to for him.

Ray's wife Gale discusses the remarkable man who she met 48 years ago and has been married to for, I think, 47 of those years. As a positive and loving person. She describes how Ray chooses grace and forgiveness, even when he has been harmed by others. And provided a couple of examples, some of which are attested to by other of Mr. Grinsell's employees.

One of those examples was Ray had discovered an employee stealing from him. And while hurt and upset, he came to understand that this person had a drug problem, so rather than call the police, Ray called this person's parents to get them into rehab.

Another employee of Ray's was found accepting kickbacks, and this man was ill and he had children or had a child who he

had to support, so Ray could not take it to fire the man because of the effect that that would have upon him dealing with an illness and upon his family.

I think most significant in Ray's mind in perhaps all of his accomplishments is his son Scott, and from my very first meeting with Ray seven-and-a-half years ago, the central concern, beyond what his own jeopardies were, was how Ray, being investigated for felonies in serious crimes, could harm his son, who at that time had been informed that he would be serving as a Supreme Court law clerk. And Scott's provided a letter to the Court that describes Ray's commitment as a father and how having a father like Ray changed Scott's life.

A true role model is how Scott describes him. Scott suffered with very severe dyslexia when he was a child and he was told and Ray and Gale were told that he would be years behind his peer group, never learning how to read. And instead of acceding to that and accepting that as the reality, Ray committed himself and Gale to ensuring that Scott overcame that severe handicap, and overcome it he did, going to Williams College, graduating with honors, becoming a Marshall Scholar, graduating from Oxford with advanced degrees, and then graduating from Yale Law School and of course going on to serve as a clerk at the Supreme Court.

Most significantly, Scott describes how his mother has suffered through all of this. And I've described what I think

is the greatest pride that Ray has in his life, and I think the greatest shame that Ray has in his life from all that I know of him is how his actions have affected his family, but especially Gale, who has again been his bedrock of support, always present for him, never wavering. And then every once in a while, Ray will get an insight to some of the slights that are -- Gale has perceived from people not being very kind after Ray was accused of a crime, but trying to protect Ray from that and also dealing with seeing the harm that Gale Grinsell suffered from all the stress and worry about how this case would turn out and how it would affect Ray.

Your Honor, I think that the most, perhaps, telling testimonials from the people who are here today are from Ray's employees. And, Your Honor, with the Court's permission, I think it's important for the Court to appreciate the number of people who rely upon Ray for their livelihood. So with the Court's permission, I would like to ask the people who work for Ray to stand: Jannette Madarang, Beatrice Yuen, Tom Carpio, Rachel Kwok, William Yuen, Gina, and then, Your Honor, there are three contractors who do almost all of their work exclusively for Ray. If you would stand, please: Rene Vasquez, Anderson Jones, and Calvin Tran.

Thank you. You can sit down.

Your Honor, beyond these people, the contractors who work almost exclusively for Ray employ about 12 other people, so

there are about 21 people who rely upon Ray for their livelihoods, and all of these people talk of Ray in the same glowing terms that his family does. Refer to Ray being committed, honest, a model landlord, someone who considers the bigger picture in doing acts of kindness for others. And there are a couple that I would like to mention particularly.

Tom Carpio has worked for Ray for 10 years, and he describes Ray as being a supportive boss, a steadfast human being in times of hardship.

Rachel Kwok affirms something that Gina Grinsell or Gina Gianopoulos attests to, that employees are like family.

Anderson Jones, the contractor, talks about Ray's unerring fairness in dealing with employees and tenants.

And, Your Honor, Rene Vasquez, who is probably wearing the -- the most lively of any garments in the courtroom today, came to this country from El Salvador about 25 years ago to flee war there, and the letter Rene submitted to the Court I'm quite familiar with because I transcribed what Rene had reported to me in a meeting in my office. There was concern about whether he would be able to put it on paper. So I did my best to take it word for word.

What Rene describes in his relationship with Ray is that he met Ray through a third party, and Ray saw someone who was in need and thought maybe there was an opportunity by which he could help him out, and he hired Rene to do some odd jobs for

him. And once he saw that Rene was honest and reliable and did good work, not only did Ray hire Rene to work for him very frequently to the point where now, I believe, Rene is solely working only for Ray on projects that his business does, but he describes how Ray would always give him extra money to make sure that he was okay.

And of all the letters I've read, I was most touched when Rene looked at me and with tears in his eyes said something to the effect of "I would go to prison for Ray. People need him and people deserve him."

Your Honor, that's the person who you have to sentence today. I believe that even putting aside the medical concerns, which are substantial and overwhelming, that the reasons for a lenient sentence are justified by the Sentencing Reform Act.

And I would like to address those briefly.

Ray's role in this offense is not one of a person who was instrumental in driving a crime. It was not one of a person who was committed to engaging in crime. It's one of a person who slouched in his morals. And after a period of almost ten years, Ray gave in and decided to start participating in bid rigging.

I do not want to imply by that that Ray was unknowing or that he erred and suddenly realized, "Whoops, there I am. I guess being I've been done it, I might as well continue." That is not what happened.

Ray was working with a business partner who he looked up to as a father figure, and Ray enjoyed the reflected light from being in the presence of the person at auctions who was key, who was respected by all, and who had great influence among others. And after a couple of years of doing business with that person and repeatedly saying to this person, "You will -- "don't bid rig, it's wrong, it's stupid, why are you doing it," and believing that they were not engaged in bid rigging for the first couple of years they worked together, finally one day Joe Giraudo presented Ray with a list of properties, and because of conversations that had occurred around that list, Ray understood that those properties had been purchased with bid rigging, albeit not with his knowledge.

But at that point, for whatever reason that I don't know any of us could really understand, Ray gave in and became a participant. I can only speculate it was influenced by being fatigued by the years of disdain and abuse from others at auctions because Ray would be cursed at when he refused to participate in bid rigging for that nine- to ten-year period, would commonly hear, "Oh, fucking Ray." He would be shoved around. He would be excluded, and people would bid up properties to cost him more money when he wanted to buy a property.

How much of an influence did having a -- an elevation above all of that to work with someone who was well-respected

have upon Ray, we can only speculate, but it is consistent with the character of this person that that would have been a significant influence.

Ray's involvement in bid rigging is -- he is guilty of it, he has admitted to it, and he fully accepts the consequences.

I take to heart the Court's comments in the earlier sentencing today about the need for general deterrence, and I have spoken with Ray about that before coming in here today to inform him what occurred and what the Court's sentiments are, and I know Ray appreciates and understands that need, too. Because the truth is for a period of ten years, Ray would have benefited had there been general deterrence.

So the Court may ask, "Well, if that's the need, doesn't it make sense for Mr. Grinsell to serve as a vehicle for general deterrence to others?" I submit, Your Honor, that it's not for a few reasons.

We know from the Government's -- from the various interviews they've done as documented in the 302s, that since the bid-rigging investigation became public on January 11th of 2011, bid rigging stopped. Most of the defendants stopped buying properties in groups with others. No more joint venturing.

Mr. Grinsell, from the date that he learned of the investigation, has stopped buying properties with anyone else. He has committed himself to doing business as he always had up

until the time when he slouched towards criminality in 2008 and has -- and has committed -- has conducted his business admirably.

But the need for general deterrence is certainly an important consideration, but for the number of convictions that there have been, the number of guilty pleas there have been both in the East Bay and here, certainly we see the general deterrent effect.

The Court has imposed, you know, significant -- a significant sentence this morning and I think will likely have a difficult time in formulating appropriate sentences for the other remaining 21 defendants after the Court sentences

Mr. Grinsell, but undoubtedly the collective effect of all of that is one which has communicated a message to the nation at large even, not just within the Bay Area, that bid rigging is a crime, it's a serious crime, and one will be subject to severe sanctions if they participate in it.

And, indeed, this morning Mr. Mast mentioned many of those instances in recounting where the Department of Justice has pursued these types of bid-rigging cases. And we also know this because these types of cases are always promoted wall great -- with great zeal by the Department of Justice for the purpose, I think, of creating a greater deterrence. And we know from Mr. Mast that in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi, there have been other types of

criminal conspiracies that have been prosecuted.

Here besides here in the Northern District of California, both here in San Francisco and the East Bay, and the Eastern District of California, there were many cases that were prosecuted.

I appreciate the difficulty that the Court has in fashioning a sentence for Mr. Grinsell, but in keeping with the mandate of 3553 that a sentence be sufficient but not greater than necessary to establish the statute's objectives, Your Honor, I submit to the Court that a custodial sentence certainly, without -- even before considering Mr. Grinsell's health issues, is not necessary to accomplish those objectives.

For one, I think it would put Mr. Grinsell in a position where he would be sentenced disproportionately to others who have committed similar types of crimes. In the East Bay for cooperators, almost all have received probationary sentences and two of those people had the same type of volume of commerce that Mr. Grinsell had.

And, again, as I mentioned at the outset and perhaps the point on which Mr. Mast and I have disagreement, I believe that while Mr. Grinsell is undoubtedly criminally culpable for all of the associated bad acts of his conspiracy, that his -- the volume of commerce does overstate his degree of involvement.

And Mr. Mast will certainly speak for himself to this issue, but this was something we discussed at length in the

time that led up to Mr. Grinsell entering into a Plea Agreement and then -- well, it was actually after he entered into the Plea Agreement.

I believe that the volume of commerce overstated Mr. Grinsell's involvement. I don't think it's significant for purposes of the Guidelines. It would not change the Guideline range. I do believe it's significant, though, for determining the relative culpability of Mr. Grinsell to his co-defendants. And in these discussions, I was -- I was trying to impress upon the Government that the \$28.6 million volume of commerce is too high because as compared to two of the co-conspirators, that being Mr. Rezaian Mr. Rosenbledt who have volumes of commerce around 24 million, we know that Ray was much less involved and we know that from a few things.

We know it by the number of auctions in which he was present. There were -- due to health issues, Mr. Grinsell ceased regularly attending auctions in 2008. He still did and he went with frequency, but he was not present at as many auctions as were his co-conspirators. So his -- the number of properties in which he could be involved was necessarily less.

And as I mentioned earlier from things that I know the Court has seen in recordings through the lengthy litigation we had on the suppression issues, it's obvious on videotapes that Mr. Grinsell was not regarded by his co-conspirators as being someone who was within the -- you know, within a control

position within that core group. And the Court may recall there was about a 35-minute audio recording which figured prominently, we believed, in the suppression issue because it went to the issue of whether or not there was an expectation of privacy between two of Mr. Grinsell's co-conspirators for about 35 minutes talking and maligning -- one of them in particular maligning Mr. Grinsell, talking about how he was not pulling his weight, he was not doing what the others were doing, he was riding their coattails.

And, again, Your Honor, there is no contesting -- and I wish there were -- Mr. Grinsell's involvement in the conspiracy. These facts only, I believe, are relative to his -- his relative culpability to his co-conspirators to the extent that is important to the Court in fashioning an appropriate sentence.

I think finally -- I think finally -- Your Honor,

Mr. Grinsell -- I appreciate the Court granting the

Government's motion for a 5K departure. I am not at liberty to

argue any of the factors under the Guidelines because those are

agreed to by us in the Plea Agreement. But I do strongly

believe that under 3553, before we consider health issues, a

variant sentence is necessary to comply with the mandates of

the statute.

If the Court were to impose a sentence as the Government has requested of 19 months on Mr. Grinsell, putting aside the

health issues for the moment, it would be disproportionate because two of the other conspirators -- for two of the other conspirators, the Government is recommending a 12- and 14-month sentence when those people were much more fully involved.

Now, I concede that the Government's lesser recommendation for those two players is a result of a greater 5K recommendation, which the Government is totally within the Government's province and discretion as to what they recommend for a 5K departure and I can't argue the Guidelines, but what I can argue is that it would be manifestly unfair under 3553 to give those defendants, who were more culpable and much more directly involved in this criminal conspiracy, a lesser sentence than Mr. Grinsell, and I say that for the following reasons.

Besides the obvious point that this would result in a disproportionate sentence, Mr. Grinsell was not able to plead early because of my understanding of the case. From my earliest discussions with the Government, we were told that any Plea Agreement would need to include various counts of mail fraud, and I believe there were five counts finally included in the Indictment. Initially, Your Honor, I believed -- before I was fully aware of the facts and thought maybe mail fraud was viable, I believed that the Government's --

THE COURT: Let me make a comment about that because it comes up -- I mean, you're the first one to raise it

verbally with the Court, but it comes up in every context which is that the Indictment, as drafted, contained counts that were unacceptable to a defendant for legal and actual reasons. And I understand that. And I understand how it progressed over time. It was ultimately one of my colleagues -- you know, I don't even know whether it was a formal ruling or a suggestion or how it evolved, but clearly as a result of her either rulings or her suggestions, the mail fraud counts were dismissed. I understand that.

Now, what I don't understand, though, is why a defendant would wait to see how those counts were treated before entering a plea. I mean, I sort of understand that there were tactical or strategic reasons that maybe a defendant wants to wait, but anybody who has practiced in my court for 21 years knows that at any time a defendant can come in and plead to a count and without the -- without the agreement of the United States

Attorney, the Antitrust Division or so forth, they come in and plead. I've had little cases and I've had enormous cases and I have had defendants come in and plead to one count in little cases and one count in big cases. And what the practical effect has been that -- that I have never insisted on -- on a plea to the sheet.

The only impediment I've ever seen to that practice has been mandatory minimums because you run into a real problem there. But other than that, a judge can't simply sentence on

the one count, and then if the defendant remains in jeopardy on the other counts, it really becomes an issue of how did that sentence arrive at at the first count.

And anybody who has been here -- you haven't but others have -- knows that's exactly the way the Court acts, much to the consternation of the United States government. But I'm not here to please the United States government. I'm not here to please the Defense. I'm here to please what my view is of the law, provided that it's consistent with what my appellate -- appellate decisions tell me, as well as my common sense.

So, you know, I don't really want to hear a discussion about "Gee, you know, the Antitrust Division created this terrible obstacle and that's why we waited," nor do I particularly want to hear an argument that they were engaged in unconstitutional eavesdropping. I've ruled on that.

I have subscribed to the view that you urged. I thought that as an independent matter, it was important to say something about that. I've always wondered why they simply just didn't get a search warrant or an appropriate Title III over here, whichever -- now I've forgotten which would be the proper remedy. They didn't. I was very concerned about process, and I ruled accordingly.

Okay. After having said all that, I don't think it affects the sentencing one iota. The fact that he is here today and wasn't here three years ago or four years, that's all

right. That's okay. I don't think it in any way demonstrates a lack of remorse. So you can be satisfied that it's not his insistence that brought him here.

I think whenever a person is charged with a crime, they hire a lawyer. He managed to have a very good lawyer. The lawyer then says "here are the options" and advises, and I don't know whether it's the lawyer's advice that carries the day, the -- the -- you know, it's odd that a defendant would hire a lawyer. A lawyer says do X and the defendant says, "no, I want to do Y." You can do that. You can do that. But why bother hiring a lawyer if you're not going to listen to the lawyer's advice. So I don't attribute it to Mr. Grinsell that we are here so late in the game, if it is late. I have no opinion on that. I think we can set those issues -- I don't think they have any bearing.

MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Your Honor, I appreciate the Court's sentiments so I'm not going to continue on this. Certainly the things that the Court raised, though, were issues for discussion, and if this were a particular issue for the Court's consideration, I would discuss it at greater length, but I see it's not, so I will move on.

Your Honor, ultimately the Court needs to consider the nature and circumstances of the defendant when it imposes sentence. Here we have a person by all evidence -- the many letters that the Court has received, the full gallery of

people, some of whom have traveled a great distance to be here. And from all evidence that we otherwise have from Mr. Grinsell's -- how he has conducted himself throughout his life, we have a person who is a moral and upright citizen who cares about doing the right thing and who at one critical moment made a decision not to. And that is a consequence for which Mr. Grinsell is going to, regardless of the severity of the Court's sentence -- that is something that Mr. Grinsell is going to have to live with for quite some time.

The collateral consequences for Mr. Grinsell are significant, to say nothing of the fact that he will be losing his real estate license, although he arguably will still be able to conduct business so his employees will still have a place where they can earn a living.

But besides that, I think Mr. Grinsell has lost the thing that is most important to him, and that is for a lifetime, he worked hard with a belief that being honest and upright would garner for him the type of respect that he didn't have growing up. He believed that by behaving in that manner, he would serve as an example to inspire others. He believed that by being a committed and good member of society, he would serve his family well. And whatever the reality is and how people look at Mr. Grinsell -- and from the number who have come here today, I want to believe that the severity and judgment of Mr. Grinsell from the people who he cares about most -- I want

to believe that maybe it is not quite so severe.

But nonetheless, Mr. Grinsell has suffered the loss of self-esteem, the loss of his life's definition, the loss of everything he has committed himself to because of the crimes that he committed becoming public and because of coming in and confessing to them and being very open about the nature of his involvement.

Your Honor, for all of those reasons, before the Court considers health issues, I do believe that a noncustodial sentence would be appropriate under 3553.

And I will submit on that.

THE COURT: Mr. Grinsell, do you want to address the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I do, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I am deeply ashamed to be in front of you today. To say that I'm sorry is not enough, but I am sorry. I know that what I did was wrong and that people were hurt by what I did.

I have thought about what I did every day, sometimes several times a day, for the past seven-and-a-half years, and I have regretted and I have mourned my decisions each day. For almost all that time, I was consumed by guilt. I've had many dark nights of the soul. The only reason that I'm still here

and could stay even reasonably together for the past seven-and-a-half years is the love and acceptance of the people who came today to support me. But the reality is I have let them down, each and every one of them.

Much worse, worst of all, I have shamed my wife and son, who are the two best people that I know and love totally and would do anything to protect. It is particularly hard for me to live with the fact that I have shamed my son, who has had amazing academic and professional success and has a good and sweet soul.

My actions forced my wife Gale and my son Scott to endure the difficulties of my involvement in bid rigging becoming public. I know Gale has felt a burden of judgment from social acquaintances. Even though she doesn't talk about it to me, I know it goes on.

Scott, my son, has had to deal with the stigma of understanding that his father's committed felonies while also worrying about how that might be perceived in his professional career and having had to explain it to his future in-laws when he and but sha fell in love and got married.

As a father, betraying the love and respect of your son is unforgivable, and I will never forgive myself for doing that.

I worked very hard all my life. I was driven to give my family the honor and respect I didn't have as a kid. Until the last seven-and-a-half years, I thought I had done that.

Instead, I have tarnished my family name, and more importantly, the names of my wife, my son, my nieces, and my nephews. I have also put at risk the jobs and families of those who work for me and have believed in me even in this difficult time.

Despite having achieved financial success that I or probably nobody else who knew me could have ever imagined for me growing up, especially growing up in a family that struggled so much emotionally and financially, I have lost the pride I had in that accomplishment.

Before, I always felt good about what I had done. Now I don't feel good anymore. I feel that people look at me and see me as somebody who cheated to be successful. All that matters is that I made bad decisions and participated in bid rigging. The most important thing was I had an opportunity to do the right thing and I didn't do it.

I did what was easy and convenient, and in doing so, caused serious harm. I was not brave enough. I thought I was brave, but I wasn't brave enough, and I did not have enough courage to do the right thing or enough integrity to do the right thing.

The kind of sorry I feel cannot be completely expressed in words. I wish it could because I would really like to say it in the way I feel it.

I am very, very sorry. I have felt sorry every day since this started and will wear sorrow and the shame for the rest of my life.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Grinsell, before you sit down, first of all, I think you should remain. I would like you to turn around and I would like you to look at all these people and I would like to tell you that you have made a big difference in their lives, and even though, even though, this terrible thing happened to you and you did something that is truly reprehensible, you have not diminished their lives, you have contributed to their lives, and I would say that they still love you and admire you for what you have accomplished on your own. So I -- I -- this is a very upsetting time for you, Mr. Grinsell.

THE DEFENDANT: I can't --

THE COURT: And I just want you to know that everything -- you have not destroyed your life.

THE DEFENDANT: I --

THE COURT: We have many things in our lives. It consists of many -- it consists of days, it consists of deeds, it consists of struggles, it consists of relationships. That is still there. That's part of you. And if you are not the kind of person that you hope to have been, these people would not be here today in your support, and I just want you to understand that.

THE DEFENDANT: I -- I still can't forgive myself.

THE COURT: I understand that. And I think -
THE DEFENDANT: I don't think I'm ever going to

forgive myself.

THE COURT: I think you have suffered a great deal and I think you will continue to suffer and I understand it.

I would just say to the people here, and especially to your son who has embarked on a career not unlike careers that I have seen over my years of service, that I'm sure it's very upsetting to you. I know it's devastating. It's complicated. But I also know -- and believe me I know, I really do -- that this is not a mark against you and how you react to it, how you deal with it, how you honestly deal with it is extraordinarily important for your entire life going forward.

I'm sure it was difficult for you to tell your prospective in-laws. I'm sure to the extent you have shared this with employers and so forth, it's very difficult, it's humiliating, but you have to be honest about it, and unless you are honest about it, you will never come to terms with it and it will always be out there as something not to disclose, not to come to terms with.

And so I say to you and I say to everybody else here, this is a shameful moment, but it's also a moment that you have to understand happens to people. We're all frail in so many different ways. We have different opportunities, and some of us are very lucky by circumstances that we take path number one

or path number two, and it's not necessarily because of strength of character or -- that we take one or two. It may be set of circumstances.

But I am very sorry, Mr. Grinsell, that when given the opportunity when you had enough courage and integrity and guts to step out of this thing, you didn't understand that you should not have gone back into it, and I think, as your lawyer candidly points out in conversations with you, that had there been the understanding that you rigged bids there is a substantial likelihood you'll go to jail, I think you wouldn't have thought about participating in it for five seconds. And indeed, that's part of the general deterrence that a court must send to the public and intends to by all of these sentences to reflect the fact that if you do rig bids, small, large, whatever it may be, you stand in jeopardy of going to jail.

I would also say one other thing about the -- your comment about obviously to avoid disparities among sentencings. The Guidelines provides in 3553(a)(6) that the Court should avoid unwarranted disparities. And the question is since people did get very different sentences, as you point out, is this a disparity that if I give a different sentence to Mr. Grinsell, is it a disparity that is warranted or unwarranted, and the Court feels that it is a warranted disparity.

I've looked at all of these sentences. I've looked at them all, and I don't pretend to understand what happened in

the East Bay conspiracy or this conspiracy or that and so forth, nor I do know any of the defendants nor do I know what was adduced at the trial. I have no knowledge of any of that. But it doesn't appear to me to necessarily form the conclusion that it would be an unwarranted disparity.

I think I'm far more responsible for avoiding unwarranted disparities with respect to the 23 people that I'm sentencing because indeed it is the same conspiracies.

So the adjusted offense level is set is 17. Criminal history category 1. The Guideline range is 24 to 30 months. The court is granting a departure pursuant to 5H1.4 for health considerations. The Court is also granting a departure with respect to 5K1.1, substantial assistance to the Government.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that -- I'm sorry. I have the wrong one. Let me just get this.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that Raymond Grinsell is hereby committed -- no. I'm doing this wrong. I'll -- wait a minute. Let me start again.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that Raymond Grinsell is hereby placed on probation for a term of three years on the following conditions:

One, you shall reside at a halfway house/residential

reentry center for a period of 10 months and shall abide by the rules and regulations of that facility.

Two, you shall perform 600 hours of community service at a homeless shelter designated by the Probation Department. While on probation, you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime and shall comply with the following additional conditions.

You shall pay any restitution, fine, and special assessment that is imposed by this judgment and that remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release.

You shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the Probation Officer.

You shall not own or possess any firearms, ammunition, or destructive devices or other dangerous weapons.

It is further ordered that you shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$200. Payments shall be made to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36060, San Francisco, California, 94102.

It is further ordered that you shall pay to the United States a fine in the amount of \$1,433,045.

The fine must be paid in a lump sum no later than 90 days from placement on probation. The fine payments shall be made to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Attention Financial Unit, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36060, San Francisco, California, 94102.

It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay restitution totaling \$156,146.79 to the victims set forth in page 6 of the Presentence Report.

Criminal monetary penalties are due immediately and shall bare interest pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3612(f).

You shall surrender on or before July 9th, 2018. In the event that there is some difficulty in designating the facility, which the Court recommends be in the San Francisco Bay Area, then your attorney will contact the Court and we will rearrange for a further extension.

The purpose, so it's absolutely clear --

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, he didn't get sentenced to custody, so there is no BOP facility because you gave him probation.

THE COURT: Yes. So in the event that the Probation

Department is unable -- did I sentence him to the Bureau of

Prisons -- the custody of the Bureau of Prisons?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: No. Because the halfway house is under the probation condition.

THE COURT: Yes, but, I mean, I'm saying in the event there is some delay in designating the community center, the facility, they can come back --

THE PROBATION OFFICER: It's not under the Bureau of Prisons, though. It's a public law referral so it goes to us so we do all of that -- so the Bureau of Prisons has nothing to

do with it --

THE COURT: I know. What I'm trying to say is -- I assume you will find a facility. The Probation Department will find a facility.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Right, Your Honor, but there is no --

THE COURT: Okay. So you do not surrender. I think I got it.

You are not to surrender to the Bureau of Prisons. You are to make yourself available to the -- at the direction of the Probation Office. Once the Probation Office has located a facility that will take -- that -- for which you will be confined for the period indicated, you are to report to that facility.

Is that correct?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I finally got it right.

Look, the purpose of the punishment -- of the sentence is to punish. The purpose of the sentence is to not just punish you, but to provide a general deterrent for this action. The purpose of the punishment is to ensure that other people, when confronted with the choices that you are confronted, do not make the same mistake.

I think, Mr. Grinsell, you are a very decent person. I think these people have truly come forward because of your

respect and admiration for you. 1 But even decent people make terrible mistakes, and this 2 was not just a moment of a mistake. This was a long-term 3 mistake, and regretfully, from your point of view and 4 society's, you didn't stop it when you could have stopped it. 5 So I wish you luck. 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 8 MR. FEUCHTBAUM: Your Honor, if I may, just one clarification? 9 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 MR. FEUCHTBAUM: The Court's order, I believe, is for the residential reentry center to be in the Bay Area, and that 12 13 if we need additional time to find one in the Bay Area, we 14 would come back, but it's limited to a Bay Area facility? 15 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes. Since it's under 16 probation with the Northern District of California, the only 17 facilities we have are in Oakland and San Francisco. 18 THE COURT: The idea is so you are immediately 19 accessible to health treatment, which will be at your expense 20 and the doctors that have been treating you. Anything further? 21 22 MR. FEUCHTBAUM: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 23

24

25

(Proceedings adjourned at 12:06 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Thursday, May 10, 2018 DATE: Pamela A. Batalo Pamela A. Batalo, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter