(The following proceedings were held in open court beginning at 9:36 a.m., reported as follows:)

DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

THE COURT: We're here today in Cause

Number 2:15-CR-72. It is United States versus Kash Lee Kelly. We are here for the sentencing of Mr. Kelly, who is here with his lawyer, Mr. Adams. We have Mr. Nozick here for the government.

Mr. Kelly appeared before the Court way back in -- I think it was 2017, if I'm not mistaken, June 26 of 2017, and he entered a plea of guilty at that time to one count of a nine-count Third Superseding Indictment. And he was adjudged guilty on that count.

After the plea, I ordered the preparation of a presentence report, which I received the final version on March 6 of 2020.

That's Document 2536. I have studied the report and the addendum to the report in advance of the hearing today.

There's a whole host of other material that I have reviewed, so let me just make a record of that and make sure that everybody is in agreement with that.

So as I mentioned, there was an initial revised presentence report; and then, of course, there was an addendum to the report that set forth a number of objections. Then

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                      NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
                            HAMMOND DIVISION
 1
 2
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 3
         Plaintiff,
                                    2:15-CR-72
 4
     vs.
 5
     KASH LEE KELLY,
 6
         Defendant.
                    TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING
 7
                            February 11, 2021
                  BEFORE THE HONORABLE PHILIP P. SIMON
 8
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
 9
10
11
     APPEARANCES:
12
     FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
                          DAVID J. NOZICK
                          United States Attorney's Office
                          5400 Federal Plaza, Suite 1500
14
                          Hammond, Indiana 46320
15
                          (219) 937-5500
16
     FOR THE DEFENDANT:
17
                          JOSHUA B. ADAMS
                          Law Offices of Joshua B. Adams PC
                          53 W Jackson Blvd.
18
                          Suite 1615
                          Chicago, Illinois 60604
19
                          (312)566-9173
20
                          Sanjin Bosnjak, U.S. Probation
21
     ALSO PRESENT:
22
23
24
25
```

there was a second addendum to the presentence report, then a third addendum to the presentence report.

I received an initial sentencing memorandum from Mr. Kelly's previous lawyer, Ms. Sonya Scott-Dix, that was filed back in August of 2019, and then attached to that was a number of letters that were on the defendant's behalf. And then Mr. Adams himself submitted a sentencing memorandum as well. It's 2859 on the record.

The government initially filed, first, a motion under 5K -- that's Document 2200 -- and then an initial sentencing memorandum back in August of 2019. And then they supplemented it, it's actually called an Amended Sentencing Memorandum, from February the 8th of this year. It's Document 2864. And then Mr. Adams filed a response to that filing.

And then in addition to that, I have received just a number of other correspondence, whether it was by way of letter, email, voice mails, et cetera. And those are all set forth in the record; Docket Entry 2710; 2711; 2727; 2728; 2729; 2847; 2854; 2858; 2861 was a spiral bound kind of notebook that was a compilation of comments that were culled from Mr. Kelly's, I guess, social media accounts and sort of put in one handy packet for me; 2862 is another compilation of many, many letters that we have received over the last several months; 2865; 2867; and 2868.

So that's the totality, I believe, that delineates what I

1 have received and reviewed in advance of the hearing today. 2 And then, actually, I should note just this morning I 3 received a voice mail from Kim Whitaker of Cherokee, Iowa, and she made known to me what her opinions were on the case. 4 So I have brought that out here to share with you; but 5 just by way of full disclosure, I received that. 6 7 So, Mr. Nozick, does that sound like a fair summary of the 8 material that's been presented to me for my consideration for 9 sentencing today? 10 MR. NOZICK: It does, Your Honor. THE COURT: How about from your perspective, 11 12 Mr. Adams, does that sound like a fair summary --MR. ADAMS: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: -- of what I have? 14 All right. Mr. Adams, can I assume that you have had an 15 opportunity to sit down with your client and thoroughly review 16 the contents of the presentence report and those various 17 addenda sometime before the hearing today? 18 MR. ADAMS: We did, Your Honor, yes. 19 THE COURT: Is that true, Mr. Kelly? Did you have a 20 chance to do that, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Nozick, can I presume you 23 have also reviewed the presentence report prior to the hearing 24

today?

25

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

THE COURT: All right. So the presentence report and those addenda are placed in the record under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal will be permitted access to the sealed reports.

Can I also presume that all of you received Mr. Bošnjak's, our probation officer's recommendation, sentencing recommendation in this case?

Mr. Adams?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Nozick?

MR. NOZICK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. The addendum to the presentence report does set forth a number of objections that have been raised that I need to resolve.

But two of the objections -- and this is one of the things
I want to talk to you about, Mr. Adams, because I know you came
into the case, you know, sometime later, and this is a little
irregular, and it shouldn't really have occurred this way.

But Ms. Scott-Dix lodged certain objections. So the first two -- number one was to the drug weight and the second one was to the gun possession. But then later on -- and this is not the way things should operate, but it's the way it operated, and we should have clarified this and put it officially on the record -- we received an email from Ms. Scott-Dix saying, "I'm

withdrawing these objections." But I have no idea whether you intend to press those objections or not.

I will note that in the plea agreement they were agreed to, so why don't you tell me -- let's use that as the jumping off point here.

Do those remain contested issues?

MR. ADAMS: No, Your Honor, they do not. Since

Mr. Kelly agreed to this in the plea agreement in June 2017, I

don't believe there's a basis to object to them now in the PSI,

so we are not raising those objections.

THE COURT: Okay. So I will show objections number one and number two as being withdrawn.

The third objection deals with whether or not Mr. Kelly should be assessed an aggravating role under 3B1.1. This, of course, is an upward movement in the guidelines, and the burden would be on the government.

So, Mr. Nozick, tell me, you know, what I can expect to hear as it relates to that issue and proof as it relates to that.

MR. NOZICK: Your Honor, I had a discussion with defense counsel yesterday on the phone, or a number of them, to help, sort of, hone us in on what's actually being disputed.

My understanding is he's waiving that objection as well. The defendant has admitted to holding different positions in the Latin Kings, and I believe the only issue today is whether he

loses the points for acceptance of responsibility, as far as guidelines go.

So my understanding is there's no guideline dispute other than three points for acceptance of responsibility based on him being charged in Washington D. C. at the U.S. Attorney's Office there and then just, sort of, argument.

As far as the objections --

THE COURT: I'm surprised by that. Because I have to say, the evidence seems a little bit weak about his aggravating role, candidly.

MR. NOZICK: Judge, I will -- there is no evidence that I'm going to raise, other than what is in the PSR. We could review what is in the plea agreement, the plea transcript. Should we take a minute and take that out then?

THE COURT: Well, he certainly didn't admit to having an aggravating role in the plea agreement.

MR. NOZICK: He didn't say, "I admit to aggravating role," but he said, "I admit" -- Mr. Lanter laid out he was an Enforcer or an Inca, et cetera, and he admitted to all those facts, which is admitting to an aggravating role.

Judge, we could go back and look, but each and every person who has held a role of a position in a chapter has gotten an aggravating role.

I mean, I see you shaking your head.

THE COURT: I'm not sure about that.

В

MR. NOZICK: Okay. I mean, it's our position that if you're an Enforcer, if you are an Inca, that you have an aggravating role.

Now, we could argue about -- I think maybe sometimes we agreed to two points instead of three; but if you are an Inca and you are in charge of a chapter or you are an Enforcer in charge of -- if you are anything other than a soldier, anything other than rank and file --

THE COURT: So tell me what the evidence was. Just proffer it for me. Because in the presentence report all that it says -- it's just a conclusion. It simply says, "A review of the offense conduct shows that the defendant was a manager/supervisor." That's not particularly help --

MR. NOZICK: Sure, Judge.

THE COURT: -- to me.

And based upon -- let me just say that the factual statements in the presentence report, you know, they're not particularly elucidating on that point.

MR. NOZICK: Okay, Judge. To be candid, on that point, since I was told that there's not going to be an objection, I don't have my notes from our drafting that. I thought we were not, you know, litigating it today. But I will tell you that numerous Latin Kings -- if you want, I could take a five-minute recess and tell you who they were, run downstairs and print something, my prosecution memo, and tell us who they

Fegr 9

1.0

were. But a number of cooperating Latin Rings said he held down, whether it is Enforcer role, Inca role, et cetera, and then in the factual basis, that was laid out as our factual basis. And he was asked, do you agree to all of that, and he says yes.

Now, what he did as an Inca or an Enforcer we would only be relying on the general knowledge of the case of what an Inca does, what an Enforcer does, at cetera. But certainly -- you know, we're not talking about Treasurer who just sort of keeps the books. An Enforcer beats people for not following the rules of the Kings, and an Inca is the number one of that chapter.

THE COURT: I'm not being argumentative. I'm just searching my memory here. We've had nearly 40 defendants that we've sentenced. I thought there were some defendants that were labeled Incas but when the rubber met the road it was a little bit in name only.

Am I not remembering that right?

MR. NOZICK: I mean, look, there's some people that might have been the -- the Regional person and would be, sort of, in name only. Yeah, there are some people that were -- some of them were more figureheads than others; but, certainly, all of them have the power to order people violated, et cetera.

I will tell you that Mr. Kelly -- I don't have knowledge, off the top of my head, of people he ordered beaten, people he

beat. Maybe there's stuff in our prosecution memo. Again,
since I was told this was being -
THE COURT: Let me see if I can cut through this.

Let me talk to Mr. Adams for just a second.

MR. NOZICK: Absolutely.

THE COURT: So you tell me, Mr. Adams. I was prepared to deal with this objection. Did you advise -- are you in agreement with what Mr. Nozick is saying here, that from your perspective he did play a leadership role for that period of time?

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, it's my understanding -- I spoke with Mr. Kelly prior to this week -- that that was not going to be an objection. I think his position has changed on that, that he would like to object to this. Yesterday I believed it was not going to be objected to. Today I think that position has changed, so he would like to raise an objection to the leadership role.

THE COURT: Then I'm going to give the government some time.

MR. ADAMS: For sure.

THE COURT: It's not fair to Mr. Nozick to, sort of, pull the carpet out from under him --

MR. ADAMS: I agree.

THE COURT: -- when he was led to believe one thing obviously.

MR. ADAMS: I agree.

THE COURT: Mr. Nozick, I'm not trying to create issues here, but I walked out here thinking this was a contested issue.

MR. NOZICK: Of course, Judge.

First, let me note, when you said, "I don't mean to be argumentative," you're the one in court that's allowed to be argumentative.

THE COURT: I'm trying to be polite though.

MR. NOZICK: I get it. I get it. I get it.

The second thing is, we can do it however you want. I could take a five-minute break and get a printout and tell you who told us he held those positions.

We could either do it now or we could do some more of the sentencing and then when you feel like we could use a break, bathroom or whatever, then I could go and print it out and we could circle around and come back to that issue. However the Court wants to handle it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. NOZICK: And there are, sort of, in betweens, right. Sometimes people get a two-point enhancement, et cetera. It's not an all or nothing. I'm not going to argue that he was a big leader in the Latin Kings, but he did hold positions. And for everyone that held a position, we did argue that they get some points for it.

1 THE COURT: All right. 2 Mr. Adams, you were trying to get my attention. Did you 3 want to say something? 4 MR. ADAMS: Judge, may I have a brief moment to talk 5 to Mr. Nozick? Is that okay? THE COURT: 6 Sure. 7 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. ADAMS: (Discussion held off the record between counsel.) 8 9 (The proceedings resumed in open court, reported as 10 follows:) 11 THE COURT: Did you want to address the Court, Mr. Adams? 12 13

May I, Your Honor? MR. ADAMS:

THE COURT: Sure.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ADAMS: Judge, I spoke with Mr. Nozick outside just now. I spoke with Mr. Kelly prior to that and after, and it's Mr. Kelly's intention to waive any objection to the enhancement in paragraph 28 of the PSI for the three-point enhancement for manager/supervisor.

THE COURT: Okay. Then I'll show objection number three in Document 1479 as being withdrawn by agreement. defendant did play an aggravating role in the offense by way of being an organizer/leader or supervisor of an endeavor involving more than five responsible participants.

The next objection deals with behavior, it's called in the

presentence report, and I really think this is kind of a misnomer. It's not really -- I'm not being critical of Mr. Bošnjak, but I don't think it's a fair description. It is offense behavior not part of relevant conduct.

And it delineates a whole host of, you know, serious episodes involving the defendant that if they are true then they would be relevant conduct, as far as I can see.

I think what Mr. Bošnjak is really saying is that this is offense behavior that he finds is not substantiated and that's the reason it's not being scored under the guidelines, that it's not fair to call it not part of relevant conduct because if Mr. Kelly, for example, you know, with one of his co-defendants Black Tone kidnapped the owner of this liquor store and held him, you know, as part of the conspiracy, well, that would plainly be relevant conduct. But I think what the probation office is telling me is that they didn't score it because they didn't find it was substantiated.

Mr. Nozick.

MR. NOZICK: Thank you, Judge.

I can't get in probation's mind. The way I was reading it was that since he was charged in the RICO -- strike that. He was charged with a drug conspiracy and not the RICO. I thought that Mr. Bošnjak was saying it's stuff, it's violence, it's not really germane to the count that he was charged with and pled to. Maybe I was, sort of, misreading it or reading too much

into it.

It is stuff that is germane to a drug conspiracy, right?

If it's Latin King stuff, violence, et cetera, it is germane to the drug conspiracy even though he's not charged in the RICO.

However, it could -- I'm not objecting that he's not scored on it, so I didn't object and say, you know, yes, it's germane to the drug conspiracy, I want points added for violence, et cetera. You know, we could get very far in the weeds on some sentencing issues. I chose not to -- he's agreeing to a substantial amount of narcotics, which are driving the guidelines.

So at this point those issues do not affect the sentencing guidelines in that I have not tried to hold him responsible for that under the sentencing guidelines. It would be my burden to bring forth evidence on that. I am not.

As far as a legal matter goes, I don't think it's outside the scope of the drug conspiracy and, you know, not relevant conduct.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. NOZICK: I get that the Court, as part of 3553 and, sort of, the holistic approach, and you have said this before, even when stuff doesn't drive the guidelines, you would like to know if it were true for the whole picture. And all I can say to that is the government is not presenting any other evidence on that today or, obviously, at any time.

To the extent you would want it fleshed out to have a whole picture of the defendant, there's nothing else that the government is choosing to present on that, and it does not affect the sentencing guidelines.

So in my mind it doesn't need to be litigated today unless this Court needs to hear more on it, and I could have someone flesh it out.

THE COURT: Mr. Adams, did you want to respond to that?

MR. ADAMS: Yes. Thank you, Judge.

The way I read this nonrelevant conduct was that it was unsubstantiated. I went back and looked at the proffers and the discovery that were, sort of, tied to these allegations starting in paragraph 35, and the conclusion I came to, too, was that these were unsubstantiated claims, such that Mr. Kelly participated in a kidnapping. Again, I don't have any proof of that. The government had not raised it in their sentencing memo. I had not responded to it in our sentencing memorandum, and I had not considered it to be part of the 3553 factors that were driving the sentence.

I was going to address it at my sentencing speech,

Your Honor, to the Court about Mr. Kelly's conduct. But a lot

of this -- which would focus on -- a lot of this happened

pre-2010. A lot of it's pre-Indictment.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Nozick.

MR. NOZICK: If I could just add, Judge, I'm not saying that any of those cooperators are being untruthful, but just so the Court or the public doesn't have the perception that we're letting him get away with all sorts of violent acts, I think it's unlikely we would be able to prove things such as that kidnapping by a preponderance of the evidence and some of the other things. I think it is unlikely that I would be able to prove it, so I don't want the Court to have the impression that we're, sort of, letting him get away with other violent acts.

THE COURT: The one I was interested in, if you can flesh it out for me, is the one dealing with Jeremy Farmer. Do you have any additional information on that?

MR. NOZICK: Judge, again, this is going to be one I have to go back. You have to realize -- I know we are set for sentencing today, but there are so many facts and so many episodes.

THE COURT: I totally appreciate that. What I'm trying to do -- listen, there's a reason we have addendums and facts get objected to. And in my way of thinking, if they're going to be presented to me, I need proof. Otherwise, I'm just going to discard them because there's no evidence to support them.

MR. NOZICK: Judge, there is -- other than one

cooperator saying it, there would be no evidence to support it.

It is unlikely we would prevail on that by a preponderance. If

it was something where we had two, three, four, five people

telling us that, I would be going forward on it and pushing it.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to sustain the objection to everything that is contained in objection number four in Document 1479, and that keys back to paragraphs 35 through 41.

I'm going to order those stricken from the presentence report --

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: -- as just not being substantiated.

There's no evidence to support them, and I will not take those into account in my ultimate disposition of the case.

I'll just state, for the record, those are the kind of things that -- I mean, you, Mr. Nozick, certainly should know those are the kind of things that resonate with me that are important in, sort of, telling the whole story of who is in front of me. I appreciate the candor, that if you can't prove it, you can't prove it.

Okay. So based on all of those findings, then the guidelines -- well, there is, of course, the issue of acceptance of responsibility, which isn't delineated in the addendum but which resulted from actions that took place after the addendum was put together, and then it's reflected in the third addendum to the presentence report.

So for acceptance, the burden is on the defendant because it is a downward movement in the guidelines. And so, Mr. Adams, why don't you tell me what you intend to do as it relates to that issue.

MR. ADAMS: Judge, with respect to acceptance, we believe that Mr. Kelly has satisfied the requirements under 3E1.1. He pled guilty timely, and the Court did admonish him at the change of plea if he were to commit another crime while on bond acceptance could be revoked. Part of the colloquy did say, though, we interpret it to be crimes related to this case.

He pled guilty to the 2015 case in 2016, and from 2016 through early 2021, he was a model defendant. He was on bond. No violations. I think there was one early on in the case, but after that, he cooperated fully and truthfully and honestly with the government, accepted his responsibility for his actions to which he pled guilty in this case.

The charged conduct out of D.C. is unrelated to anything with the Latin Kings or related to any drug conspiracy. It is our position based on his conduct before this Court as it relates to cooperation with the government and the information he provided and his own admissions of guilt related to his conduct in this case to the probation office and to the government is that he fully accepted responsibility with respect to this case 2:15-CR-72; and, therefore, he should still get the benefit of the three points for acceptance of

responsibility.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Nozick, do you want to respond?

MR. NOZICK: Yes, Judge. I think -- respectfully, I understand defendant's arguments, but I think he's, sort of, conflating a number of different issues here. As far as cooperation, the government is still standing by its 5K motion. It's under seal, but the Court has named it a 5K motion. The government is standing by that, and he has been fully cooperative.

However, there is nothing in the plea agreement, nothing in the plea colloquy -- when he's admonished and warned that you can lose acceptance of responsibility points for new criminal conduct, there's nothing in that that links it to criminal conduct related to this case.

As this Court knows, there are people who go -- you could be in on -- you could be pending a bank robbery and test positive for drugs and lose acceptance of responsibility.

Now, that would be, sort of, a chintzy case of someone losing acceptance of responsibility. And, you know, to be candid, I might feel sheepish arguing for it. I might not argue for it.

If this Court is wondering, are there situations where someone commits new criminal conduct where you haven't argued for loss of acceptance of responsibility? Yes, there has been.

It is in the Court's discretion, and, obviously, the government has discretion whether we want someone to lose acceptance of responsibility.

So let me say that it is of no import that the new criminal conduct is unrelated to this case, right? We wouldn't be here -- if he robbed a bank while out on bond, we wouldn't be saying, well, that bank robbery has nothing to do with the Kings or the drug conspiracy. So I think the Court can agree -- unless you have concern about it, I think the Court can agree that it's immaterial whether or not the new criminal conduct is related to this case or not.

Defense didn't argue it, but if this Court is concerned,
well, he's only charged with misdemeanors, he's not charged
with a new felony, I think it probably goes without saying that
the government views what he is charged with extremely serious.

He was a part -- I'm not saying the driving part, I'm not saying he was violent, but he was part of a violent insurrection on our nation's Capitol, an attack on our nation's Capitol, while Congress was meeting. And the intent of that insurrection -- I can't get in his mind -- but the intent of the insurrection was to disrupt the peaceful transfer of power in our democracy. That is as serious -- to me, that is much more serious than many felonies.

And he has done a lot of good, and we are going to talk about the good in a while. And I'm not saying that this wipes

out the good, and I'm not saying that he was involved with killing a police officer, that he was involved with trying to get Mike Pence or any other members of Congress. But on that day -- he has done a lot of good, but on that day he wasn't part of the solution. On that day, he was part of the problem. The government views that extremely serious.

And the fact that he did that -- I agreed to leave him out on bond after a plea. That is always a risk for us when you leave a defendant, after he pleads, out on bond. It's extremely disheartening to me and extremely disappointing to me; and, you know, there's a level of misleading the Court and misleading the government. The motion said that --

In addition to the criminal conduct, he wasn't even supposed to be in Washington D.C. His motion said, "I need to go to Texas." I agreed to it. The defense can make their arguments whether it was a miscommunication between them; but, certainly, there's a reasonable inference that he didn't tell the Court and tell probation he was going to Washington because they knew what was going on in Washington and, you know, so he says he went to Texas.

There's the misleading the Court; but in my mind, much more concerning, is the shocking events that happened at our nation's Capitol, Judge, and his role. This Court, I believe, has read the complaint and has seen the photos. I don't think there's going to be a dispute as to that being him, as to him

being inside. They can speak to that. He has a pending case.

They may not want to. But the government views it as egregious whether it's charged as a felony or misdemeanor.

THE COURT: Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Your Honor.

If we're going to take away acceptance for other conduct it's going to almost double Mr. Kelly's low end of the guidelines, and then it becomes a question of whether he's being punished today for his conduct in this criminal case, in the drug conspiracy which he pled guilty to, or if now he's going to be punished for pending charges that have not yet been resolved.

I think by withdrawing acceptance -- and he even cooperated after he was charged in that case, so he's continued to accept responsibility I think as it's defined in 3E1.1. By taking away acceptance of responsibility, I think it sets a bad -- or it sets a precedent that you can still cooperate but we're still not going to give you acceptance no matter how much information you do give.

And I do recognize that the government has not withdrawn their 5K and they are still going forward with that. So our response to the government's position is that we're starting to punish Mr. Kelly based on other conduct, not on his conduct related to this case.

THE COURT: All right.

Do you want to say anything else? I thought you were signaling to me.

MR. NOZICK: Just very briefly, Judge.

I know this Court -- you said many times you take a holistic approach and you come up with a sentence that you believe to be just.

Regardless of the effect on the guidelines, he should lose acceptance of responsibility and this Court, in its discretion, will weigh the factors, 3553 factors, and come up with a sentence that it believes to be just. And you're going to hear a lot about the positive that he's done from the defense, and you're going to hear a lot of the positive he has done from the government. That doesn't change the fact that he should lose acceptance of responsibility for the criminal conduct that he's done, Judge.

This Court is well aware, right -- we're having hearings in Washington today on the effect -- the egregious conduct and the effect of that on our nation. He needs to lose acceptance, and then we can deal with a final sentence at the end.

THE COURT: All right. I overrule the objection. I do not believe that the defendant is entitled to acceptance of responsibility.

He came in and pled guilty back in 2017, and I'm very meticulous, I think, at my plea hearings when I question the defendants. And I go through the plea agreement and I talk to

them about the value of acceptance of responsibility, and I always give them the example that -- especially for people who are out on bond where there's a substantial risk, but even for people who are in custody, I tell them: Let's say, for example, you assault another inmate next week, heaven forbid, or if you are out on bond, if you go out and commit another crime, I tell them that that might be an example that would reflect somebody who is really not fully expressing contrition, not fully accepting responsibility for their criminal behavior.

And, of course, the guidelines themselves support that in Application Note 1B to 3E1.1 when it states that -- you know, one of the data points on whether or not somebody has accepted responsibility is whether they have voluntarily terminated or withdrawn from criminal conduct or association, and so that's, of course, why I specifically tell defendants, listen, you've got to mind your Ps and Qs and turn square corners until sentencing and then you're going to be rewarded for that, as a way to incentivize them to tow the line.

We'll talk about this a little bit later. This isn't the sentencing for what you did in Washington. I'm cognizant of that. But I also don't operate in a vacuum either. And it is really breathtaking. It's breathtaking to me that somebody who is, you know, 30 days away from facing a federal judge in a courtroom for a serious drug conspiracy and knowing that that date was looming, knowing that and fully appreciating it, that

you would think that it's a good idea to, one, not -- to tell Magistrate Judge Rodovich that you were going to Dallas. I'll hear from you. And maybe that was some misunderstanding.

But throughout this case, you were released -- and probably one of the only defendants that was released pretrial -- but, you know, Mr. Nozick in his discretion and the magistrate judge thought that this defendant was worth taking that chance on, despite there being a presumption that would be a presumption of detention, but fair enough.

And then throughout the many years since you were first brought into the case, on many times we gave you a wide berth because I think it was -- you were demonstrating straighting to us, to Magistrate Judge Rodovich and to me, that you were kind of heading in the right direction. Wow, this is real positive.

I think you were originally on home detention. That was removed. You repeatedly asked for permission to travel around the country. We repeatedly gave you that permission because it seemed like what you were doing was positive and you were getting some traction, and terrific.

One thing I know for sure, whether you were lying when you told Judge Rodovich you were going to Dallas when you really intended to go to Washington, what I know for certain is you did not ask for permission to go to Washington, and that's not reflected on the record, despite having many times before asked for permission to travel.

I know you want to talk to me. You are going to be given a full opportunity to address me.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: But it's really breathtaking to think that in that environment that you would think it's a good idea to go to Washington. And I don't know what role you played exactly, but I can believe my lying eyes here.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: And I have photos of you on the wall of the Capitol waiving an American flag. It's just the most ironic thing. The irony of that is so amazing to me. I can't even put it in -- there's no words in our lexicon to describe that irony.

And then pictures in the rotunda of you up on a pedestal of one of our Founding Fathers, I suppose. I don't recognize who it is. And then having the temerity or the, maybe, arrogance to post these things on your social media feed and to be proud of it.

I don't know, man, it's really disturbing to me. It's really disturbing. So I don't think in any -- there's no way in good conscience that I can say that you have voluntarily withdrawn from criminal behavior when you did these things. That would be crazy, that decision, in my opinion.

And the fact that these are only misdemeanors, I can't even get my mind around that; but perhaps that's the only thing

that fits the behavior. I don't know. That will be for a judge in Washington to sort out. But as it relates to the specific legal issue before me, has the defendant "clearly demonstrated acceptance of responsibility in the language of 3E1.1A," the answer is no, so the objection is overruled.

So based on those findings, the guidelines in this case are as follows: There's a total offense level of 33. That's derived at as follows. There's an initial offense level of 28 based on the drug quantity; two points were added because of the possession of the firearm under 2D1.1(b)(1); three points were added because the defendant was in agreement that he's a manager/supervisor of criminal activity involving five or more participants under 3B1.1(b). So the total offense level is 33. The criminal history category is III. And that leads to a range of suggested incarceration under the guidelines of 168 to 210 months. Supervised release is two to five years. The fine range is 15,000 to 5 million. Then, of course, there's a \$100 special assessment.

Based on all the rulings that I have made, is that accurate?

MR. NOZICK: Yes, Judge, prior to the government's sealed motion.

THE COURT: Sure. Of course. We haven't talked about the government's motion for a departure, but prior to consideration of that; is that accurate?

MR. NOBICK: It is, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Adams, is that accurate?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, Judge. After reviewing the PSI, it is accurate.

THE COURT: All right.

3

4

5

6

7

8

3

1.0

11

12

1.3

1.4

13

1.6

17

18

13

20

21

22

23

24

25

I do now accept the plea agreement entered into between the United States and the defendant filed with this Court back in 2017. The judgment and sentence will be consistent with it because the agreement adequately reflects the seriousness of the actual offense behavior and that accepting the plea agreement will not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing.

I also now adopt the factual statements contained in the presentence report, and I also have already set forth what the guidelines are in this case.

Lastly. I do now grant the government's motion filed under in a few minutes, but for now the motion is granted.

Okay. Why don't you guys tell me what you intend to do note by way of witnesses and other presentation as it relates to the 3553 issues.

Mr. Mosick, I'll let you go first. Are you calling any witnesses, or are you just going to --

MR. NOZICK: I'm not calling any witnesses.

THE COURT: I thought you had maybe --

MR. NOZICK: I have Task Force Officer Gootee if the Court needed anything clarified. I don't believe that I'm going to be calling him. You are granting the government's motion. If you have concern about the levels, perhaps I could address it, or we could talk to Task Force Officer Gootee, but at this point no witnesses.

I believe the defense has witnesses on the phone, perhaps, and I will just have argument.

THE COURT: Okay.

So, Mr. Adams, I was told that you do have some witnesses who are listening in who wish to be heard on the defendant's behalf; is that right?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you for making the accommodation.

THE COURT: Sure. Why don't we do that first. Why don't you tell me who these people are, and I will call upon them, and which order you would like them to speak.

MR. ADAMS: The first witness is Anthony Russo,

R-U-S-S-O; second witness is Katie Fitsusis, F-I-T-S-U-S-I-S;

the last witness is a pastor, Jay -- I believe the last name is

Calaway.

THE COURT: Calaway?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, Your Honor. I believe they are on

25 | the line.

The second secon

The state that the same and the

the married distance.

do positi i decida de de ciclo

All break to the death of the country of

del standar il dei recepi ricera cono

while died also admired topological

the street of

SEE STREET

and the second of the second that the second the filter and the second

AND ADDRESS OF A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE P

SHE SERVED IN MARKET PARTY A THREE

(ES) single

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Russo, are you on the phone there, sir?

(No audible response.)

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ADAMS: I believe he was muted.

THE COURT: I think he has to unmute it.

MR. RUSSO: I am, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Russo. I'm going to ask you to raise your right hand so that you can be sworn in. My assistant here will swear you in, okay.

(The oath was administered.)

MR. RUSSO: I do.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Adams, I didn't know if you were going to, sort of, question him or just allow him to take the floor and be heard.

MR. ADAMS: If it's okay with the Court, I believe he wanted to make a statement, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Oh, sure. That's fine.

Mr. Russo, why don't you tell me who you are, how you know Mr. Kelly, and then I'm happy to hear anything that you wish to say on his behalf.

MR. RUSSO: Thank you, Judge. Thank you, again, for allowing me to make a statement on behalf of Kash. My name is Anthony Russo. I'm the founder of #BeTheChange, Kash's friend, business partner, and to his newest child, Nova's godfather.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUSSO: May I continue?

THE COURT: Yeah. Anything that you wish to say on his behalf, sir. The floor is yours.

MR. RUSSO: Thank you so much, Judge.

On paper, Kash and I come from a very, very different place, different lives. One of us, being me, grew up in the suburbs outside of St. Louis, and Kash grew up in gang-riddled neighborhoods in South Chicago and Northern Indiana.

Somehow we're here together hand in hand, and in June, this is where our friendship started. Somebody sent me a video of Kash talking about self-responsibility of those in his community, and I was just beginning to get traction with my own movement and my current business, which is #BeTheChange, which preaches action over awareness and constant kindness and positivity.

I reached out to Kash via Facebook Messenger and asked if he would like to do and be on one of our shows, and, miraculously, at the time when he was getting thousands of requests, he responded because my last name was that of a friend from juvy over a decade ago, and he was hoping to reconnect and show what he had done with his life.

With that, an unlikely and accidental brotherhood was born, and my life, personally, will never be the same. He came on the show and quickly we became friends. Within two weeks, I was at his house with my mother, 800 miles away, actually,

driving to move her to Michigan. Him and I talked and grew closer, and it wasn't about politics. It was about creating positive change and helping people.

With that, Kash was 100 percent honest about his past, his acknowledgment for his previous actions and those that we heard about again today as long ago as these were. But at the same time, he was incredibly thankful for where he had come from; and I know this may beg the question of responsibility, but he knows he now has the ability with his changes to be able to speak and be heard by anyone, including the gangbanger wanting to get out of that life all the way up to the 78-year-old woman looking for someone that just speaks to her and feels like she's not alone.

He has potential that most don't have to speak to everyone. It's a gift and a blessing that I don't have the ability for. His innate ability was forged from his mistakes and previously flawed life that allows us no matter how -- no matter what our flaws are, we can relate, and we get to see the good in humanity and potential in our lives.

Your Honor, I ask you: What's the purpose of going to prison? Is it just serving time, or is it to become the man Kash has become? To make someone the father that he is to his children, to become the human that causes people to write letters that say, without you, I would not be here today, and to say, you got me through 2020, which is what we all know is

driving to move her to Michigan. Him and I talked and grew closer, and it wasn't about politics. It was about creating positive change and helping people.

With that, Kash was 100 percent honest about his past, his acknowledgment for his previous actions and those that we heard about again today as long ago as these were. But at the same time, he was incredibly thankful for where he had come from; and I know this may beg the question of responsibility, but he knows he now has the ability with his changes to be able to speak and be heard by anyone, including the gangbanger wanting to get out of that life all the way up to the 78-year-old woman looking for someone that just speaks to her and feels like she's not alone.

He has potential that most don't have to speak to everyone. It's a gift and a blessing that I don't have the ability for. His innate ability was forged from his mistakes and previously flawed life that allows us no matter how -- no matter what our flaws are, we can relate, and we get to see the good in humanity and potential in our lives.

Your Honor, I ask you: What's the purpose of going to prison? Is it just serving time, or is it to become the man Kash has become? To make someone the father that he is to his children, to become the human that causes people to write letters that say, without you, I would not be here today, and to say, you got me through 2020, which is what we all know is

the worst year that any of us have probably ever lived through.

I know you received a large number of letters, letters that literally reminded me what we are doing together, Kash and I, is making a difference, most of which we had to send directly. Because of the direction of counsel, we were suggested to only send two, which I find odd.

We had to -- we were supposed to leave out the ones about teachers impacting their students with Kash's words, people choosing to turn their lives back to God, people saying they had quit their nursing jobs, given up, they were hopeless until they heard him speak, and, yes, even those that would have committed suicide and wouldn't be here in this horrible year that was 2020. His impact, now that I have read all of these, is larger than I even imagined.

Kash's children are some of the most amazing kids I have ever met. They're fun, bright, energetic, and insanely respectful; and, yes, we know that Kash has a lot of kids. He has a large brood. Each one of them are unique. Each one of them intensely loves their father, all eight of his own children and the ones that he helps raise. Let him come home to them.

For anything that I can ask, for Kash to not leave the house for a long time. They will actually enjoy that. Taking him away, I just -- it hurts.

People should be accountable for their crimes, no doubt;

but as we have heard today, he's been cooperative, followed the requests of the Court, made a plea, and done everything asked. And he has had one actual parole violation, which we brought up, and that was because -- and I'm sorry to say it, and I hate deflecting minimal blame, but whether it was the defense or prosecution, somebody made an error because I don't understand where logic would say why would Kash only ask for 16 hours to leave town. I was on the other line with him when he got granted permission. I think we all heard that mentioned earlier.

I just -- I had to touch on it because I think it's unfair, and I think it's part of the new issues that become an ideological political discussion, and I don't think that's fair here. Although this is just the sentencing phase, this is a huge issue, as his own team possibly is the reason why he has not been able to prepare for this day on the outside with his family because I do know that he did request the proper amount of time.

I hope -- although these are questionable mistakes, I hope the words that Niki, his pastor, and me, and, of course Kash, have to say today hold as much weight as humanly possible. I do feel as though Kash has felt alone in this with his legal team.

We have been the ones in communication with Kash. We have been the ones video chatting. We have been the ones listening

to Kash's own requests. His counsel did not want to set up a video chat with Kash. The day before his hearing Kash tried to speak to him, and his call was not answered. I hope this won't be needed, but I want it said on the record as I believe some things have not been fair to Kash at this point. But I don't want to deflect anymore because I do believe in self-responsibility.

For me, I have to be totally honest, this year was very hard for me. In the past, I have headed a very successful company, had a ton of friends, and traveled the country. And I have been a part of the event world, which as we all know, everything was taken away this year. And for the first time in my life, I felt alone. Add the division in this country, the loss of friendships, Kash became my best friend and vice versa, I hope.

Somehow some guy from a completely different part of the country and different background became such close friends that I ended up becoming his newest daughter's godfather. This is what our country, change, and progress in supposed to look like. This is the positive that comes from souls like Kash. Without Kash, I would have been alone, facing depression, and with him I have a brother and unconditional love that could pull me out of very difficult times.

If he is what we all need, why would it be justice to put him away for any period of time? Thank you so much for your

1 time, Your Honor. That's all I have.
2 THE COURT: Thank you very

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Russo. If you would, please mute your phone again, but I greatly appreciate it.

I should ask: Mr. Nozick, do you have any questions for Mr. Russo?

MR. NOZICK: I do not.

THE COURT: Okay. So, again, Mr. Russo thanks so much for your words, and, you know, if you would, please, mute your phone again.

All right. Ms. Fitusis, can you hear me, ma'am?

MS. FITUSIS: Hello.

THE COURT: Ms. Fitusis, can you hear me?

MS. FITUSIS: Yes, I can hear you.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, ma'am. Let me just ask you, if you would, state and spell your name and tell me how you know Mr. Kelly.

MS. FITUSIS: My name is Niki Fitusis; N-I-K-I; F, as in Frank, I-T, as in Tom, U-S, as in Sam, I-S, as in Sam. And I volunteer for the Streetlights Unity Movement, and Kash is my friend. And I work for him -- I volunteer for him and Anthony for Streetlights and #BeTheChange.

THE COURT: Okay. I will give you a few minutes now to tell me anything that you wish to tell me that you think is germane to my undertaking today.

MS. FITUSIS: Ckay. Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of Mr. Kelly.

In order for my friendship and working relationship to make sense, I have to go back a bit to the beginning of 2020.

I had just recently lost my job working at the Lake County Prosecutor's Office for over 29 years. I worked as a victim witness assistant.

Soon thereafter, I saw a video of Kash. I kept following him and eventually reached out to him as he was starting to work with Anthony and they needed volunteers for the Streetlights and #BeTheChange.

From the beginning, Kash talked openly about his past and how he was recruited by the Latin Kings. He talked openly about his childhood, the trauma he faced.

The reason he talks about his past life is to educate our youth so they know they have other options. He talked about how he was changing his life and wanted to continue changing for God, his children, Erika, and for the country. He made the decision to start this movement.

Kash wanted to have a community center -- or wants to have a community center where children, women, men, people in need can come, have food, warmth, shelter, protection; and I wanted to be a part of that change. That is how our friendship began.

There was something in him that I felt and still feel is truly sincere and transparent. I reached out to him, and

eventually, we just started working closely together. I met Erika; I met the kids. I went to his house. We had a bonfire.

Having worked in the criminal courts, I can say that Kash has and is doing what he can to do better and be a better man and father. I have spent time with Kash registering people to vote. We spent time looking for a building for our first Streetlights building here in Lake County. We have even gone grocery shopping together. We've been on Zoom calls together. I spent time with him and Erika and the children, and it's just amazing to see a man who came from a very different life than I grew up from.

I grew up with two immigrant Greek parents and two parents in the household, and his life was very different. Much like Anthony, it's -- even though we are 15 minutes apart -- I live in Crown Point; he's in Hammond -- it was worlds away. And it was just amazing to me that our worlds just came to together.

I've seen a lot of defendants over a 29-year span, but I can't speak of anyone who has helped himself to be a better person than Kash. He works daily to be better.

I have never seen anyone start a movement for God, unity, and love. He has brought people from all over the world together.

Kash supports our law enforcement, and I think so many people find it so ironic because of his past and because he was a Latin King. He encourages people to, you know, quote,

1 "snitch." He tells people, "Help the police. If you see 2 something, say something."

He helps -- there was a homeless lady, her name was Lisa, he helped her, gave her food, gave her gift cards for food. He went to check on her, him and Erika both, for days and weeks after that to make sure she was safe.

Kash is kind and giving with whatever he has. He knew I was behind with my NIPSCO bill, and he helped me as well. That is the Kash that I know.

There's so much more that I can say about him, but I realize we are on a time limit, so I just want to say thank you once again for allowing me to speak today. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you so much, Ms. Fitusis.

MS. FITUSIS: You're welcome.

THE COURT: So we have Mr. Calaway or Mrs.?

MR. ADAMS: Mister.

THE COURT: Mr. Calaway, are you on the phone there,

sir?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

24

25

MR. CALAWAY: Yes, I'm here, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, sir. Could you just state and spell your name and tell me how you know Mr. Kelly.

MR. CALAWAY: Yes. It is J-A-M-E-S, James Calaway,

23 C-A-L-A-W-A-Y. And I go by Pastor J or just "J."

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CALAWAY: I have been a pastor in Hammond for

1 over 32 years. THE COURT: Pastor Calaway, I neglected to do this 2 with Ms. Fitusis, but I don't think anybody is going to give us 3 a hard time here, but can I ask you to raise your right hand to 4 be sworn in, sir. 5 6 MR. CALAWAY: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Noel. 8 (The oath was administered.) 9 MR. CALAWAY: I do. THE COURT: All right. Pastor Calaway, the floor is 10 yours. I'll hear from you, sir. 11 12 MR. CALAWAY: Okay. So, as I stated, I've been the 13 pastor of The Gate in Hammond, Indiana, located on Sohl Avenue in downtown Hammond. The church has been on this street for 14 over a hundred years, and I have been the pastor of the church 15 16 for over 32 years. Back, oh, 20, 25 years ago we started a program called 17 Adopt a Block. It was in the area of Sohl Street, and through 18 the course of what is known as Jacob Square now, and we would 19 go in each week and clean up the streets, and just go to 20 21 (indiscernible), and I met Kash over 20 years ago. THE COURT REPORTER: Judge, can you ask him to slow 22 23 down. THE COURT: Yes. 24

25

Sir, honestly, we're having a very, very difficult time

```
1
     understanding you. So I need you to speak really slowly and
 2
    more clearly because my court reporter is really struggling,
 3
    and so am I, frankly, in fully, sort of, consuming what you are
 4
    saying, okay.
 5
         MR. CALAWAY: Oh, yes. I apologize. Is that better
 6
    now? Can you hear me now?
 7
          THE COURT: Yeah. Just make sure you get right into
 8
    the phone. And if you are on the speaker, take it off of
9
    speaker.
10
           MR. CALAWAY: Okay. Great. I will do that.
11
         Hello?
12
             THE COURT: Okay. You may proceed.
13
             MR. CALAWAY: Okay. Great.
14
            THE COURT: Oh, boy. He may have cut himself off
15
     there.
16
        Pastor Calaway, are you there?
17
              DEPUTY CLERK: Melanie is calling him.
18
             THE COURT: Okay.
         Pastor Calaway, are you there now, sir?
19
20
         Oh, boy.
         Pastor Calaway, are you there?
21
          MR. CALAWAY: Yes, I am here now.
22
             THE COURT: Okay. We lost you there, sir.
23
              MR. CALAWAY: I am so sorry. I have moved to a
24
    better place. Hopefully, my signal is better now.
25
```

THE COURT: Yeah, it is still a little dim, so I really want you to speak up and speak slowly, okay.

MR. CALAWAY: Okay. All right.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. CALAWAY: Okay. So I'm not sure where I lost you, but just to recap, I met Kash over 20 years ago. He was a kid on the street. He was part of our children's group and after-school program as well as (indiscernible). He would be part of many of our different programs, and so I have been the pastor the entire time through the up times and the down times.

And even though Kash would stray away and go and do the things that we have addressed here today already and do that through his guilty plea, he has always come back to his faith and to his responsibility to answer for the things that he had done.

So, Judge, Your Honor, I really believe that Kash does stand before you to pay for his indiscretions today, but I do ask you to be as lenient as you possibly can. I believe over the last many months and few years Kash has become a productive part of the community, and he has added value to the community. I believe that he's added value to his children as a father and to his family.

I understand that we must pay for our mistakes of our past, and I also believe there can be grace for those who have proven to repent and move toward a better self, and I believe

that's exactly what Kash has done. In this case, he has repented. He has come clean, and he has accepted responsibility. And he continues to move toward making himself and those around him better.

And through the course of the last few months, I have been in constant contact with Kash, been a part of walking through accountability and times when he just needed advice or he had spoken to me. He calls me. I'm at his -- he's at my disposal, and I'm at his, as his pastor. And he does follow when I give him -- when I give him direction and guidance.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, very much, pastor. I much appreciate it. If you would mute your phone so we are not getting any background noise, I would appreciate it, okay.

Okay. Mr. Adams, as the lawyer for the defendant, is there anything that you wish to say on his behalf before I sentence him?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ADAMS: I think the theme today, especially in the briefing and also through the witnesses and the letters the Court has received, has been rehabilitation and, I think, redemption to some point.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Mr. Kelly, his last case prior to the 2015 Indictment, was 2009. He was a teenager, and I think it's significant after 2009 he has no contact with the criminal justice system until

this case is indicted. And even at the time he was indicted, he was not a member of the Latin Kings. He did give up that lifestyle. He turned away from it.

I think he's tried very hard to become a different person than the teenage boy that he was. He's a man now. He's a father. And I think -- I know fatherhood changes people. It changes how they look at life, how they look at their own actions and what actions they do, how it affects their children. Now he's not living for himself anymore. He's living for people that are very dependent on him and can't depend on themselves.

I think based on all of these people that have contacted the Court, he's had a positive impact on them in terms of his speaking about loving each other, unity, respect of law enforcement, respect of authority.

I think he also -- Judge, I think it's important not just to look at what he's doing now but look at the person he came from. And in the PSI it details a very, very, very traumatic childhood, and I'm talking about paragraphs 57, 58, and 59.

His father was murdered when he was very young, and I think as a young boy, the impact that has on somebody I think is -- it can't be counted; it can't be measured. And I think the fact that Kash is now a dedicated father himself speaks volumes about the person that he has become and that he's not the same person that was in the Latin Kings that was dealing