1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
3			
4		X : 06-M-1039	
	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
5	v.	: July 24, 2006	
.6	STEVEN ROMBOM,	: 500 Pearl Street	
7	Defendant	: New York, New York :	
8	X		
9	TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE GABRIEL W. GORENSTEIN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
10			
11			
12	APPEARANCES:		
13	For the Government:	UNITED STATES ATTORNEY	
14		BY: MARSHA ISAACSON, ESQ. ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY	
		TIDDIDITIVI OTVITILD DILLELD TITTOTAVEL	
15			
16	For the Defendant:	TODD TERREY, ESQ.	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23	Court Transcriber:	SHARI RIEMER TypeWrite Word Processing	
	Service	356 Eltingville Boulevard	
24		Staten Island, New York 10312	
25			
	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service		

THE CLERK: United States of America v. Rombom. Counsels, please state your names for the record. 3' MS. ISAACSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Marsha Isaacson on behalf of the Government. 5 MR. TERREY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. For Mr. Rombom, Litman Asche & Gioiella, 45 Broadway, New York, New 6 York by Todd Terrey. 8 THE COURT: All right. Please be seated if you're 9 not addressing the Court. 10 Can I have the time and date of arrest? 11 MS. ISAACSON: Your Honor, the defendant was arrested at approximately 4:00 on Saturday which was July 22nd. 12 13 THE COURT: All right. Sir, I'm Judge Gorenstein. Let me begin by telling you that you have the right to remain 14 silent. You're not required to make any statements now or in 15 the future. Anything that you do say can be used against you. 16 17 You have the right to be represented by counsel during all court proceedings. If you could not afford an attorney I would 18 19 appoint one today to represent you. I understand that you have 20 retained counsel. 21 MR. TERREY: Your Honor, I'm actually standing in for Mr. Rombom's retained counsel who's out of the -- I believe 22 23 he's out of the country right now. He's certainly out of town. So I'm standing in for purposes of arraignment only. 24 25 THE COURT: Okay. I have before me a complaint.

complaint contains a single charge. The charge is that in
April 2006 that you influenced, obstructed or impeded or
endeavored to do so the due administration of justice,
specifically that you impersonated an agent of the Federal
Bureau of Investigation in order to intimidate a government
confidential informant in a pending criminal matter for which a
trial is scheduled.

Counsel, have you seen this complaint?

MR. TERREY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Have you reviewed it with your client?

MR. TERREY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Are you waiving its public reading?

MR. TERREY: Yes.

THE COURT: Sir, you have a right to a hearing at which the Government would have the burden of establishing there was probable cause to believe that you committed the crime with which you are being charged. However, there would not be a hearing if you were indicted by a Grand Jury.

I'll hear from the Government next as to detention, bail or release.

MS. ISAACSON: Your Honor, the Government believes that it would be possible to come up with a bail package in this case. I've not been able to come to any agreement yet with Mr. Terrey. I believe it's Mr. Terrey's position as he relayed to me that he thinks there should be no bail, just ROR

with no restrictions at all. It would be the Government's proposal that the defendant be released on a \$400,000.00 recognizance bond co-signed by three financially responsible co-signers and that he surrender all travel documents.

Due to the nature of the defendant's occupation, it's very difficult to keep track of him, Your Honor. The FBI was unable to find an address at which he lived that we could verify he was actually staying at more than very rarely and the defendant by his own admission does not like people to be able to know where he is. In fact, the Government notes that on the Pretrial Services Report the address that the defendant lists as his employer's address is false. Because he listed that address as his employer's address, the Police Department revoked his permit to carry a gun because they investigated whether or not he actually worked at that address and found that he did not.

Also, the Government would note that although the defendant says that he had a juvenile arrest of thirty years ago and doesn't remember the specifics of it, it's the Government's understanding that that arrest was for the interstate transportation of explosives.

Then finally I noted that the Pretrial Services

Agency recommends that the defendant surrender his firearm to
the nearest Police Department. The defendant has more than one
firearm. We know that as of ten years ago I think he had

```
1 purchased an Ozzie and that he has three handguns. That's all, 2 Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Your bail conditions didn't include a proposal with respect to the firearms.

MS. ISAACSON: The Government would request that he turn in all firearms, Your Honor.

THE COURT: To who?

MS. ISAACSON: To ATF or to the nearest Police

Department. The FBI could also take custody of them, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel.

MR. TERREY: Your Honor, could I have one second,

13 | please?

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

14 THE COURT: Sure.

[Pause in proceedings.]

MR. TERREY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'll try to modulate myself as I address the Court but what's going on here is really an absolute, absolute outrage. I can't believe that I'm standing here today in the United States of America having to deal with this particular situation.

Let me just quickly address a few things Ms. Isaacson just said before I get into my main presentation. In terms of the FBI being unable to find a home address of Mr. Rombom, quite a few years ago -- Mr. Rombom has lived in the same apartment for twenty years. Quite a few years ago the FBI

visited him at that address. We dispute and do not believe that the FBI didn't know where his home address was.

In addition, Mr. Rombom has been represented by counsel in connection with this matter for the past almost two months. That attorney volunteered to surrender Mr. Rombom at any point. They could have picked up the phone and asked where is Mr. Rombom's home address. They could have asked me -- I'll get to my role in a second -- or they could have asked his attorney. This is a complete red herring. It's baloney.

In terms of the Pretrial Services Report, Ms.

Isaacson just quoted Mr. Rombom as having said that he didn't remember the specifics. I was sitting with him when he was interviewed by the Pretrial Services Officer. What he said was that he did not remember the specific charge. He told them the date. He told them the courthouse it took place, which was this courthouse, and he told them the disposition. So to that extent that's slightly inaccurate.

In terms of his employer's address, I was also with him when he answered that question and what he told the Pretrial Services Officer is that that was the address and he's in the process of moving his office. So that doesn't appear in the report either but that's what he said.

Let me start with Mr. Rombom's background and then get into the facts of this case. As I said, he's lived in the same apartment in Brooklyn for the last twenty years. He rents

that apartment. He's lived in the same zip code in Brooklyn his entire life. He's now 47 years old. His parents who are elderly and quite in firmed also live in that zip code and he helps take care of them, et cetera. His business is also located in the same zip code. He has no criminal record.

He's a licensed private investigator. He's licensed in the State of New York. He's licensed in the State of Texas. He's licensed in the State of Louisiana. He owns a piece of property in the State of Texas in Curr County. There's a mortgage on that property. He's on the board or a member of 25 or more investigative associations. He's been an investigator for 25 years. He lectures all over the country.

On Saturday he was in the process of preparing to give a lecture to a community of people who included law enforcement people, private investigators when the FBI showed up right before he was about to start his lecture in front of a big group of people and arrested him and they arrested him based on something they claim happened a few months ago and I'll get into that in one second.

Mr. Rombom has been doing investigative work for my firm for approximately 25 years. I've known him for the last seven or eight years I've worked with him on numerous cases.

Your Honor, in a case being prosecuted by Ms.

Isaacson in this building, my firm represents a young attorney who's accused of attempted money laundering. He got caught up

in a government sting operation and the primary defense in that case is the defense of entrapment. In that case, my client was introduced to a gentleman who referred to himself as a Prince of Austria and this gentleman over the course of numerous meetings offered basically the sun, the moon and the stars to our client and then eventually dragged him into what he was charged with and that case is currently pending before Judge Griesa.

We hired Mr. Rombom and his firm, which is Palorium Inc. [Ph.], to do a background check investigation of this government informant who pretended to be the Prince of Austria. His name — the Government turned over to us his name, his NCIC criminal record. His name is Joseph Meyers also known as Joseph Von Hochsberg Lothrengin [Ph.] also known as so many names that it would take me a couple of hours to say it and I won't bother.

In that case, and I think that's very important to the legitimacy of the charges here, the Government has taken the position and told us they are not calling Mr. Meyers, the confidential informant, as a witness. We, the defense, have told the Judge, the Government, everyone else that we're going to be calling him as a witness. So to the extent that we've been investigating him to gather information to undermine his credibility but this -- upon reading the fact of this complaint it may appear to be some sort of attempt to intimidate a

government witness but he's not a government witness. He's going to be a witness called as a witness for the defense.

Over the course of many, many months involving hundreds, if not thousands of hours of investigation, Mr. Rombom has uncovered evidence regarding Mr. Meyers which is really amazing. I'm not going to get into that too much right now but I'll give you a few examples. This evidence will absolutely destroy the credibility of Mr. Meyers at the trial and also we believe this evidence will be devastating to the image of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and that's why Mr. Rombom is sitting here today arrested on what I believe to be completely baseless charges which I'll get into in a second.

Basically, Mr. Meyers has been running around as a government informant for the past twenty or so years and he has been given literally a license to steal by the FBI. He commits crimes up, down and sideways, never does any time for any of it, and we believe we're the first people -- all credit goes to Mr. Rombom -- have uncovered all this information and this gentleman has never, even though he's made cases for the FBI for the past twenty years, has never testified in any courtroom as far as we're aware.

Just one example of something Mr. Rombom has uncovered. As I mentioned before, the Government turned over to us the NCIC criminal history purporting to be the criminal history of Mr. Meyers. Lo and behold, completely missing from

that NCIC is a felony conviction in state court in Michigan, Oakland County, Michigan 1991. Now, we've pilled the court file from that conviction and we have the minutes of the sentencing. Mr. Meyers was faced under the Michigan Sentencing Guidelines facing prison time and the Judge said on the record that the reason he wasn't giving Mr. Meyers any prison time was due to the work that he was doing with the FBI. So we know, we know that the FBI had actual knowledge of this felony conviction of Mr. Meyers and they deep 6'd it and it's not on 9 the NCIC. Judge, there could be, the way this guy operates, 10 twenty, thirty other convictions out there that the FBI has 11 deep 6'd and that's the type of thing that Mr. Rombom's been 12 trying to uncover in the course of his investigation. 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It gets even better on that particular case. The police file in that particular case where Mr. Meyers was convicted of a felony in Michigan, in the police file there was an notation that Mr. Meyers was acquitted after trial which is completely false. How that got in there we'll never be able to prove but it's certainly very suspicious that an FBI informant had a false notation in his file saying he was acquitted when, in fact, he took a plea and was convicted.

Now, Judge, about -- I'm sorry I don't have the exact date. I could get it but it was about a month-and-a-half ago - almost two months ago. The Government served on Mr. Rombom's company a Grand Jury subpoena which sought all -- his entire

defense file in the case that we're defending and Ms. Isaacson is prosecuting. We brought that to the attention of Judge Griesa. We made a motion to quash the subpoena saying among other things this is attorney work product, you cannot do this, and the Government alleged as they allege in this complaint but they did it an ex parte fashion and I believe the only things we were told was that there was some claim of impersonating an FBI agent but we weren't told anything else. But the Government had a lengthy ex parte meeting with Judge Griesa on that date after which we had an ex parte meeting with Judge Griesa on that date and I believe the Government set forth before Judge Griesa all of the facts set forth in this complaint.

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

At the end of that, and I have the minutes of the end of that proceeding where the Judge came back and issued his ruling and I can hand these up to the Court, but just to paraphrase what Judge Griesa said, he said that he was -- he ruled that he was not going to enforce the subpoena until after our trial was completed. He said that he did not want any interference with the defense investigation because we explained to Judge Griesa that Mr. Rombom in addition to having done great work in the case already had a lot of other work to do. So Judge Griesa addressed us and the prosecutors, said a) he said we don't want any intimidation of witnesses, 25 | misrepresentation of identity and so forth to which we said

fine, that didn't happen here and it won't happen anyway but it didn't happen here and he as far as I can see basically instructed the Government to let us do their investigation.

Now two months later nothing has changed yet they decide to arrest our client in the middle of a seminar he's giving to inflict -- basically to ruin his life. That's what they did.

I would like to hand these minutes up to the Court if that's all right.

THE COURT: I'll accept your representations as to what Judge Griesa said.

MR. TERREY: And obviously we're going to have to bring this up with Judge Griesa. I believe he's still on vacation but this is -- I don't even know what this is going to do to this -- to that case.

Now let me get to the complaint for just a minute and then I'll be done. 'I appreciate the patience the Court is showing with me. On Page 2, Paragraph 5 is written something which is very key to understanding what's going on here. The FBI agent relates that in or about April and June, 2006, assisted by a translated when necessary, I spoke individually with each member of the California family. And there are three witnesses set forth in this complaint, W-1, W-2 and W-3, who are, according to the Government at least, the in-laws of Joseph Meyers, the alleged Prince of Austria.

W-1 and W-2, who are Mr. Meyers, the Government says it's his wife. Maybe it is. As far as we know he's still married to a woman in Michigan with whom he has three children and hasn't paid any child support in the last 15 years while he's running around as an FBI informant, but that's a separate matter.

W-1 and W-2 are the step father and mother of the -I'll call her the wife of Joseph Meyers. W-1 and W-2 do not
speak much English at all and they are the ones, according to
the complaint, who are making claims that one says Mr. Rombom
introduced himself to W-1 as a Government Investigator,
whatever that means. W-2 says Rombom introduced himself to her
as an FBI Agent.

Now, when this interview took place, as least in part there was one person there who actually speaks English well and that's W-3. And you look at the complaint and lo and behold there's no allegation from W-3 that Mr. Rombom did anything wrong whatsoever.

So the Government has taken upon -- taken it upon themselves to arrest him in the most public manner possible to make a blatant attempt to ruin his life based on allegations from two people who don't even speak English when the third person who does speak English doesn't back up any of it. I mean how is this happening?

Judge, under these circumstances, I mean it's an

outrage that Mr. Rombom will suffer any consequence whatsoever based on these charges, but he's a person with deep roots in the community, he's determined to fight these charges. He shouldn't be required to post any bail whatsoever. He's a person of very modest means.

In terms of travel restrictions, Judge, I know the Government has already done everything they can to try to put him out of business. But his business is traveling around the country and around the world. He's done a lot of work and he's internationally renowned as a Nazi Hunter, he's traveled all over the world, he's been featured in hundreds of magazines — or — excuse me — newspaper articles and magazine articles as well. And for him to have any travel restrictions whatsoever will be a significant crushing blow to his business to the extent that his business hasn't already been crushed by what I submit to you is outrageous behavior by the Government.

In addition, I mean Mr. Rombom, in connection with his investigations, is often working for various attorneys. I mean to the extent -- he's perfectly willing to inform Pretrial Services whenever he leaves the state, the country, whatever, provide itinerary, provide hotels, provide airlines. No problem whatsoever. What we do not want to happen is for him to have to inform the Government -- the prosecutors -- of his whereabouts because, Judge, they've been trying to investigate our investigation in this particular case and we submit that

for him to be forced to let the prosecutors -- especially prosecutors who are prosecuting a case in which he's an investigator, know where he's going in advance, would have a chilling effect on my other client's ability to defend himself and the other clients of Mr. Rombom for whom he's doing investigative work.

For those reasons, Your Honor, I request that the Court release Mr. Rombom on his own recognizance, not impose any travel restrictions whatsoever. And given both the absolutely weak nature of the charges and combined with Mr. Rombom's standing and roots in the community, I don't see any need for pretrial supervision either. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: A couple of questions. Is there an objection to the request regarding the guns? It sounded like the license had been revoked anyway.

do to this -- to that case.

MR. TERREY: Yeah, I believe the license is revoked mandatorily after an arrest and no, there is no objection to that unless the Court somehow has the power today to quash the arrest, which unfortunately, I think you do not.

THE COURT: If you could just clear up the issue on the office. I -- the Government didn't elaborate when they said the office address was false. How -- what is that address, how long had he been there, was it rented, is it -- was -

MR. TERREY: Sure. Okay. That's an address Mr. Rombom has used to receive mail for the past 20 years. He goes in there approximately once a month. The NYPD took the position that that wasn't a sufficient connection to the office 5 THE COURT: What is it? Is it a post office drop? MR. TERREY: It's an attorney's office. THE COURT: It's an attorney's office that he -MR. TERREY: He's a client of Mr. Rombom -10 THE COURT: Got it. 11 MR. TERREY: -- who lets him use the office when he 12 needs an office. 13 THE COURT: I guess you say he's no longer using that 14 office? 15 MR. TERREY: Well, he's going to change the -- since the NYPD took the position that that can't -- that's not a 16 legitimate office for him to have a permit connected to, he's 17 18 going to change to a different address. 19 THE COURT: The permit -- the gun permit? 20 MR. TERREY: Yes, the gun permit, correct. 21 THE COURT: All right. There was something you said at the beginning and perhaps I misinterpreted it that led me to 22 believe that you were in contact with the U.S. Attorney's 23 Office with respect to the potential of these very charges and, 24 therefore, you said that, you know, they should have contacted

you for a voluntary surrender.

MR. TERREY: Yes. It --

THE COURT: I just wasn't sure if I understood that correctly and if you could describe the nature of your contact with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

MR. TERREY: Absolutely. I -- at the time the Grand Jury subpoena was served on Mr. Rombom, Mr. Rombom retained counsel, whose name is Stanley Rupkin [Phonetic] to represent him in connection with the Grand Jury subpoena.

Subsequent to that -- when it was, I can't remember
it was at least a month and a half ago -- the FBI agents
showed up at the home of Mr. Rombom's elderly in firmed parents
and we believed -- we, meaning myself, Mr. Litman and his
attorney, Mr. Rupkin, believed that the FBI must be looking for
Mr. Rombom to arrest him since they know he's represented by
counsel. At that point Mr. Rupkin - I am told by Mr. Rupkin I wasn't party to the conversation -- called up the Assistant
U.S. Attorney, either Ms. Isaacson or Mr. Feldman -- I don't
know which -- and said I understand that you're looking for my
client to the extent that you're seeking to arrest him. We
would be happy to arrange a voluntary surrender. And that
happened a couple of months ago.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anything else from the Government?

MS. ISAACSON: Your Honor, I'm not going to get into

1 | the merits of this complaint and to try to litigate this matter

2 at this point. I just do want to clarify though that it has

been the Government's position throughout, that we have not

4 decided whether or not we are calling Mr. Meyers as a witness

5 at the trial and that's how we have -- what we've informed them

6 in writing.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. TERREY: Your Honor, that's not correct. I don't have the minutes with me, but she has told the -- Judge Griesa flat out that we're not calling him, but --

THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Isaacson.

MS. ISAACSON: And Judge Griesa did express concern about the effect of this investigation on -- of Mr. Rombom on the ability of Mr. Santoro to conduct his defense, but he also expressed a great concern for the ability of, you know, our witnesses, the Government's witnesses to be safe. It was definitely a balancing concern and the Judge, in no way, told us that we could not move forward with the complaint in this case.

The Government would stand by its request that bond of \$400,000, co-signed by three financially responsible persons, be imposed in this case.

The Government has no objection to the defendant letting Pretrial Services know of where he intends to travel to as opposed to the United States Attorney's Office and providing them with the details. That is fine. If the Government would

request, of course, that he provide them -- if he's conducting business in another state, he provide them with his license so at least for the business that he's going to conduct in the state to make sure that he is not performing private investigative work without authorization. That's all. 5 THE COURT: Did you --6 MR. TERREY: That reminds me of one thing I forgot. They have taken his private investigator's license and seized it as evidence and he needs that back. It's an I.D.? It's an I.D., a private investigator's identification. Excuse me. Not license. 11 THE COURT: Seized it in what context? 12 MR. TERREY: That --13 THE COURT: At the time of arrest? 14 MR. TERREY: I believe so. 15 MS. ISAACSON: We have it at the time of arrest right 16 now, Your Honor. We can make copies of it and return the 17 original to him. 18 THE COURT: And return the original -- I'm sorry. 19 MS. ISAACSON: I believe we -- we have, I believe, 20 still have the original. We have not yet returned the original 21 to him as yet. 22 THE COURT: Well, are you planning to return it or --23 MS. ISAACSON: I have not -- we've not yet reached 24

that determination, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's the mechanism for their getting it back? Is this a Rule 41 Application? I just -- it's not really a Rule 5 Application so I just want to think about the right way to do this.

MS. ISAACSON: Right. The Government may be applying -- Your Honor, if we can make a sufficient copy of it, we're happy to return the original to him. We just have not had a chance to make a color photocopy of it as yet.

THE COURT: Let's say that you aren't able to do that and want to keep it and they want it back, what our mechanism for getting it back if they have one? I mean the application, having been made, I feel I have to now rule on it either by saying I'm not empowered to do it as part of the initial appearance process or to at least say what that process might be, if there is one. I don't know. Maybe there isn't one. I assume it's 41 -- maybe it's a 41G Application.

MS. ISAACSON: Yeah, for return of property, similar to --

THE COURT: I think -- I think --

MS. ISAACSON: -- similar to when there's a search warrant.

THE COURT: I don't think I can be involved in that at this stage.

MR. TERREY: Fair enough.

THE COURT: I mean think, until there's an indictment,

I think the application would come to the Magistrate Judge. just don't feel comfortable with an oral application. So if you want to make a written application, do that. Okay? MR. TERREY: Okay. Hopefully we can work it out in 4 the interim. THE COURT: Now, I got sidetracked. I was about to 6 ask a question of Ms. Isaacson which was whether in fact there had been a call offering a voluntary surrender of this individual. MS. ISAACSON: Yes, Your Honor, there had been and the 10 United --11 THE COURT: Your contention was that you had to do the 12 arrest 'cause you -- 'cause what exactly? You didn't know what 13 his real address -- home address was? 14 MS. ISAACSON: Your Honor, the United States 15 Attorney's Office made the determination that voluntary 16 surrender was inappropriate in this case. 17 THE COURT: I understand that, but if the -- and the 18 reason was -- I mean you're now seeking bail conditions. So 19 you now have to justify why this individual is a flight risk. 20 21 So --MS. ISAACSON: We -- Your Honor, I think part of the -22 23

THE COURT: by the way, you didn't say the basis on

which you were seeking the bail conditions. I assume it's

24

flight risk and now --

MS. ISAACSON: It is flight risk, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. ISAACSON: Because I had also mentioned that it's very -- his ties here are limited although he says he has lived here in the same zip code for a long period of time. The FBI has been unable to located the place where he stays most nights. We did go to the address in Brooklyn where he claims he has lived, but the landlord there says that, at most, she sees him once a month. Accordingly, although it was very nice of his attorney to make that offer, if we notify the attorney that there had been a complaint and the defendant decided not to turn himself in, as the attorney claimed he would have, we would have had a very, very difficult time locating him.

We chose the conference because it was the one time that we believed that he was going to be in this jurisdiction when we would be able to find him.

MR. TERREY: Your Honor, Mr. Rombom's landlord is not a female. It's a male. His name is Steven Williams. I don't know who they spoke to, but that information is totally inaccurate.

MS. ISAACSON: We spoke -- they spoke to the wife, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Having considered all the bail factors including this nature of the charges and the strength

of the evidence, I don't believe that any significant bail conditions are warranted here. So I'm willing to release the defendant without a bond, subject to regular pretrial supervision, no travel restrictions. He will have to surrender a passport, however, and have no new applications. If there's an application to leave the country, I guess that could be considered at a later time. He is to turn in any guns to the FBI, or if they so direct him to the New York City Police Department.

What date should I put for the preliminary hearing?

MR. TERREY: Judge, on the travel restrictions, Mr.

Rombom has a trip planned to China. I don't know if that's something you want to address. Today I would --

THE COURT: When is the trip and for what purpose?

MR. TERREY: He has a meeting scheduled for Wednesday

to -- with his client to set up the trip and it's for due

diligence in Fuchi in Provence [Phonetic] which needs to be

done in the next 30 to 45 days.

THE COURT: Well, any other foreign travel planned?

MR. TERREY: Not at the moment, but as I said before,
his -- he travels internationally very frequently.

THE COURT: Right. Well, I mean I have no reason to believe this individual is going to flee to China.

What I'd like to do is I'd like the surrender of the travel -- of the passport and then an application to be made to

make this trip to China with the documentation of what it's for and the purpose and so forth and then to have the application made on the understanding that at the time the bail conditions were set, I was open to the idea that a legitimate trip to China would be a reasonable thing to permit. Okay? 5 6 Anything -- I asked you about the preliminary hearing date. MR. TERREY: Yes. As soon as possible, Judge. THE COURT: That would be August 7. 10 Anything further from the Government? 11 MS. ISAACSON: I would just inquire if the defendant still will be in China as of August 7. 12 13 MR. TERREY: He'll go after. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Anything further from the 15 Government? 16 MS. ISAACSON: Not now, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. From defense counsel? 17 18 MR. TERREY: No, sir. 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 20 * * * * * 21 22 23 24 25