UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, * Docket Number:

1:22-CR-00035-JLS-HKS-1

*

* Buffalo, New York * August 3, 2023

* 9:32 a.m.

*

LUKE MARSHALL WENKE, * SENTENCING ON VIOLATION

OF SUPERVISED RELEASE

*

Defendant.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

V.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN L. SINATRA, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: TRINI E. ROSS,

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
By DAVID J. RUDROFF, ESQ.,

Assistant United States Attorney,

Federal Centre,

138 Delaware Avenue,

Buffalo, New York 14202,

Appearing for the United States.

For the Defendant: FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE

By ALEXANDER J. ANZALONE, ESQ.,

FONDA KUBIAK, ESQ.,

Assistant Federal Public Defenders,

300 Pearl Street,

Suite 200,

Buffalo, New York 14202.

The Courtroom Deputy: KIRSTIE L. HENRY

USA v Wenke - Proceedings - 8/3/23

```
1
     The Court Reporter:
                                 BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR,
                                 Notary Public,
 2
                                 Robert H. Jackson Courthouse,
                                 2 Niagara Square,
 3
                                 Buffalo, New York 14202,
                                 Bonnie Weber@nywd.uscourts.gov.
 4
 5
             Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
 6
                     transcript produced by computer.
 7
                   (Proceedings commenced at 9:32 a.m.)
 8
 9
             THE CLERK: All rise.
10
             The United States District Court for the Western
11
12
    District of New York is now in session. The Honorable John
13
    Sinatra presiding.
14
             THE COURT: Please be seated.
             THE CLERK: The United States versus Luke Marshal
15
    Wenke, Case Number 22-CR-35. This is a date set for sentencing
16
17
    on violation of supervised release.
18
             Counsel, please state your appearances.
19
             MR. RUDROFF: Good morning, Your Honor, David Rudroff
    for the Government.
20
2.1
             MR. ANZALONE: Good morning, Your Honor, Alexander
    Anzalone and Fonda Kubiak from the Federal Defenders Office on
22
23
    behalf of Mr. Wenke. Mr. Wenke is to my left seated in custody.
24
             THE COURT: Good morning, Counsel.
25
             Good morning, Mr. Wenke.
```

```
MS. KUBIAK: Good morning, Your Honor.
 1
 2
             THE COURT: We're here today for sentencing after a
 3
    violation hearing where I found that Mr. Wenke had violated a
    condition of his supervised release back on August 18, 2022.
 4
             Pursuant to the Rule 11(c)(1)(C) agreement, I
 5
    sentenced Mr. Wenke to 18 months of imprisonment, followed by
 6
7
    three years with supervised release with conditions.
             And he began his supervision on March 31, 2023. On
 8
 9
    May 16 of this year, I received a petition for offender under
    supervision alleging a violation of supervised release
10
11
    conditions.
12
             On June 1, we held a violation hearing as to charge
    one in the petition, specifically, that Mr. Wenke failed to
13
    comply with the condition that he not have any contact directly
14
    or indirectly, including through social media, telephone, text,
15
    mail or e-mail with the victim, , his family members, or his
16
    current or prior place of employment.
17
18
             I received post-hearing briefing and continued the
    hearing June 23. At that time, I found that the Government had
19
20
    proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Wenke had
21
    violated this condition.
22
             Okay. Mr. Anzalone, have you received a copy of the
23
    probation officer's final report for violation of supervised
24
    release sentencing, dated July 7, 2023?
25
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
USA v Wenke - Proceedings - 8/3/23
```

```
THE COURT: And did you have a chance to review it
 1
 2
    with your client?
 3
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Mr. Wenke, did you receive a copy of this
 4
 5
    final report?
 6
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 7
             THE COURT: And did you discuss it with your lawyer?
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rudroff, you received it
    as well?
10
11
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.
12
             THE COURT: All right. I will replace -- excuse me, I
13
    will place the report in the record under seal.
             If an appeal is filed, counsel on appeal will be
14
15
    permitted access to the sealed final report, but not access to
    the recommendation.
16
17
             Mr. Anzalone, do you have any objections to the
18
    factual statements contained in the final report?
             MR. ANZALONE: No, Your Honor.
19
20
             All right. And, Mr. Rudroff, same question.
2.1
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: Okay. And I've also received and reviewed
23
    both parties submissions. I adopt the statements, as set forth
    in the probation officer's final report as my findings of fact.
24
25
             Mr. Anzalone, do you have any objections regarding the
```

```
1
    applicable sentencing quidelines discussions in the report?
 2
             MR. ANZALONE: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Same question, Mr. Rudroff.
 3
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT: I adopt the final report's conclusions
 5
    regarding the applicable sentencing guidelines and incorporate
 6
 7
    them into the record.
             Mr. Wenke is found quilty of a Grade C violation and
 8
 9
    under the guidelines, in that scenario, I may either revoke the
    supervised release or extend the term of supervised release
10
11
    and/or modify the conditions of supervision.
12
             According to application note one of guideline Section
13
    7B1.4, the criminal history category used to calculate the range
    of imprisonment for a violation is the same criminal history
14
15
    that category that applied at sentencing, on the underlying
    offense.
16
17
             Mr. Wenke has a criminal history category of one.
18
    Pursuant to the revocation table at Section 7B1.4, a Grade C
    violation with a criminal history category of one results in an
19
20
    imprisonment range of three to nine months.
2.1
             According to Section 7B1.3(c)(1), whereas here, the
22
    minimum term of imprisonment determined under 7B1.4 is at least
23
    one month, but not more than six months, the minimum term may be
24
    satisfied by a sentence of imprisonment or a sentence of
25
    imprisonment that includes a term of supervised release with a
```

```
condition that substitutes community confinement or home detention, according to the schedule in 5C1.1(e) for any portion of the minimum term.
```

Pursuant to application note four of 7B1.4, where the original sentence was the result of a downward departure or a charge reduction that resulted in a sentence below the guidelines range applicable to the offender's underlying conduct, an upward departure may be warranted.

At the time of sentencing, the guideline imprisonment range was 24 to 30 months and the defendant was sentenced to 18 months under the Rule 11(c)(1)(C) agreement.

Pursuant to the -- that agreement and the factors in 3553(a), at that time, I considered the defendant's age, history of gainful employment, presence of family support and lack of criminal history as mitigating factors when I accepted the agreement.

Under 18 United States Code 3583(e)(3), the statutory maximum penalty upon revocation for a Class D felony is two years.

And under Section 3583(h), if supervised release is revoked, the Court may include a requirement that the defendant be placed on a term of supervised release upon release from imprisonment.

And the length of such supervised release shall not exceed the term of supervised release authorized by the statute,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
which is three years for the offense that resulted in the
original term of supervised release, less any term of
imprisonment imposed upon revocation.
         Which brings me to, Mr. Rudroff, what would the
Government like to say regarding sentencing?
         MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor, I'll be brief. I think
I've said most of what we need to say in our sentencing
memorandum.
         As the Court noted, the defendant's underlying
sentence was a result of a downward departure and it seemed to
me, at the original sentencing that the Court was somewhat
skeptical that an 18 month sentence would be adequate to deter
the defendant and to protect society.
         At the time, I assured the Court that 18 months was a
harsh sentence for a first time offender. That the defendant
would take it seriously and that it would be enough to -- to
halt this kind of behavior, the Court had described as the
prelude to a violent crime.
         I believed it then. I think at this point, I am
willing to admit that I was wrong. 18 months clearly was not
enough for the defendant. His behavior resumed almost
immediately upon his release from prison.
         I think his statements on social media, which we
attached to our sentencing memorandum as Exhibit C, clearly
```

demonstrate that the defendant did not take his term of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

true.

sentence. This is the first time.

but I do think it's warranted here.

```
incarceration as seriously as I think everybody in this Court
hoped that he would.
         So given that this was the result of a downward
departure, that the defendant's behavior and his comments since
his release clearly demonstrate that it wasn't enough to deter
him, as well as the concerning conduct that led to this
violation.
         It is a Grade C violation, but the underlying conduct
itself can't be ignored.
         The defendant almost immediately indirectly contacted
the victim of his prior crime, at the same time that he was
posting -- what I would describe as vitriolic posts, on social
media.
         I think taking all of that into account, 12 months is
an appropriate sentence.
         I've been with this office just shy of 12 years. In
that time, I've actually never asked for a non-quideline
```

And it's sort of surprising that it would be a

violation of supervised release, where I would break that trend,

for comprehensive mental health treatment and I think that's

The defense sentencing memorandum talks about the need

I think the defendant probably does need some help in

```
1
    that regard and I certainly hope that he finds that eventually.
 2
             But, first, I think this Court needs to send a message
 3
    that this behavior is not acceptable. That the conditions of
    supervised release are not a suggestion.
 4
             That the defendant won't benefit from his constant
 5
    attempts to push the boundaries of what I would consider a
 6
 7
    violative conduct.
             So against all of that, Your Honor, we do ask the
 8
 9
    Court to impose a 12-month sentence.
             As we noted in our sentencing memorandum, you add that
10
11
    to the 18 months on the first conviction, you get what was
12
    essentially the top end of the guidelines on that conviction.
             And so I think intuitively, logically, it also -- it
13
    makes sense and it's warranted in this case.
14
15
             THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rudroff. Are there any
    victims who would like to speak?
16
17
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
18
             THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Taberski, is there anything
19
    from probation?
20
             PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor, thank you.
21
             I'd like to address something that was brought to the
22
    Court's attention in the defense sentencing memorandum and that
23
    is the assertion that we essentially ignored the mental health
24
    condition for a number of months, after the defendant was
25
    released and it's simply not true.
```

```
Defense could have reached out to us and asked and I would have explained this exactly this way, but they didn't, before filing the memorandum.
```

The fact of the matter is that shortly after Mr. Wenke was released and he was assigned to Officer Zenger, Officer Zenger immediately addressed the mental health condition, along with all of the other conditions.

He made sure that the defendant understood them. That he was going to comply with them, supposedly, and he addressed the mental health condition.

And Mr. Wenke said that he had a mental health counselor that he worked with in the past and that he wished to return to and we said that's great. Officer Zenger said that's great.

Our office's practice is that if someone has a counselor they're comfortable with, we allow them to return to them because they have developed a rapport.

We think that the treatment will be more effective, rather than trying to reestablish a relationship.

And what Officer Zenger did was confirm that Mr. Wenke had an appointment set. Officer Zenger made multiple attempts to reach out to the counselor directly, but received no response.

Which is not uncommon, Your Honor. They are busy people. We understand that. And Mr. Wenke went to that

2.1

counselor. He underwent the substance abuse evaluation that's cited in the sentencing memo.

And at no point did Mr. Wenke return to the subject with his probation officer and say that wasn't a mental health evaluation.

He was able to advocate for himself to begin with and say this is a mental health counselor. That I've gone to mental health counselling to in the past, but this was just them asking me about my substance abuse and they gave me a drug test and I left. He never brought that up.

A number of weeks went by before we received the write-up of that evaluation, which, again, is not uncommon for there to be a delay in time.

But in between that time, when the probation officer then discovered that this mental health counselor actually specializes in substance abuse treatment, Mr. Wenke violated his conditions.

And we submitted a petition and we asked for his supervised release to be revoked and our intention was for him to go to jail and be held accountable at that point.

But I do take issue with this memorandum trying to portray that the probation officer was negligent and just blew off the mental health condition.

That he didn't do anything about it until he was pressed by the Court and defense counsel to finally do something

```
about it. It's simply not the case.
```

You know, the -- the Assistant U.S. attorney brought up the pushing boundaries issue. And all I'll say about that is that this is a very time intensive case.

There is a lot that we could talk about this morning and if, Your Honor, wishes I will, about things that are not in the violation petition that have been taking a great deal of time to address with Mr. Wenke, because he pushes the boundaries of what is or is not violation conduct.

But the bottom line is, all of his conditions were addressed. He decided to violate, perhaps, the most important condition, the most relevant condition in his case, and that's why we're here today.

Thanks, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Anzalone --

MR. ANZALONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

So I'd like to address things set forth by both the Government and probation today, and in the Government's sentencing memorandum, but I'll start with the Government's argument that Mr. Wenke should be sentenced to 12 months.

Your Honor, this argument is self-defeating. As I understand it, the Government argues Mr. Wenke was given 18 months in jail. That jail time didn't work.

He was released and returned to similar behavior and

2.1

```
now, you should put him back in jail and, I quess, just hope
```

now, you should put him back in jail and, I guess, just hope that that works.

They said they hope he eventually gets the help he needs. Your Honor, I think we can do a little better than hope.

I think we can focus on concrete logic and cause and affect and encourage and mandate that Mr. Wenke gets the help he needs.

The report says it itself, Mr. Wenke is quote: "Very motivated to get mental health treatment." That's on page five of the report.

I can't fathom probation's position today that they placed so much faith in someone who has clear mental illness.

Clear mental health issues.

I think it betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of what mental illness is. That's not -- to take someone at their word and not follow up and not confirm that they are receiving mental health care, and that's just in the first month of his supervision.

Let's talk about what happened after May 18th.

May 18th, when Mr. Wenke first appeared before Judge Schroeder on the violation, from May 18th until July 27th, just by pushing by Magistrate Judge Schroeder, by Your Honor, by myself, his initial evaluation at Horizon was scheduled for June 27th -- I'm sorry, so a month and a week.

How can that be? How -- when it's so clear to

2.1

```
everyone involved, when it was so clear to everyone involved a year-and-a-half ago, and it's so clear to everyone involved today, on May 18th, and at the commencement of his supervision on March 31st, how can his first mandated mental health evaluation appointment be arranged by probation for June 27th?
```

Your Honor, we've submitted what we believe is a roadmap to make this stop. The roadmap is not more time in jail. The roadmap is not an above guideline sentence.

The roadmap is to release Mr. Wenke, maybe place him on home detention, maybe show that there's a consequence for these -- these communications.

But to mandate and encourage and put the structure in place to get him the help he needs. And Dr. Rudder spoke specifically to that. He spoke to a mental health evaluation and DBT.

This is not -- this doesn't have to be complicated stuff, but it does need to be followed through on by everyone and that doesn't just include Mr. Wenke.

Your Honor, I -- additional jail time prolongs the inevitable, which is that Mr. Wenke is going to be released. He's going to need treatment.

He wants treatment and he can get treatment. And I would submit that an additional period of incarceration has a limited deterrent affect and I just don't see why we shouldn't start solving this problem immediately and not further on down

```
USA v Wenke - Proceedings - 8/3/23
```

```
1
    the road.
 2
             I'm happy to answer any questions, but that's what I
 3
    have for the Court.
             THE COURT: Mr. Wenke, would you like to have the
 4
    opportunity to say something?
 5
 6
             MR. ANZALONE: So, Your Honor, I can address that.
7
             Mr. Wenke in the report indicates that he's very
    motivated to get treatment. Given the procedural posture of
 8
 9
    this case, I'm advising him to not say anything further at this
10
    time.
             THE COURT: Okay.
11
12
             Mr. Wenke, do you take that advice?
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
13
             THE COURT: Okay. All right. So both sides are
14
15
    right. Now, what do I do?
             Mr. Rudroff is right, 12 months sounds about right.
16
    On the other hand, we'll be right back here.
17
18
             I think I agree with Mr. Anzalone on that. We've got
    to fix the problem, otherwise we're going to be back and back
19
    and back.
20
21
             So how do I help get this problem fixed? And that is
22
    to get Mr. Wenke into his mental health treatment as soon as we
23
    can do that.
24
             So let's kind of talk about how we're going to
25
    accomplish that a little bit. What I'm going to do is adjourn
```

calendar, Your Honor? Thank you.

2.1

```
the sentencing hearing to next week, August 10th at 9:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. ANZALONE: Can I have a moment just to grab my
```

THE COURT: Yeah. That's okay. That's good. It doesn't fail, unless you lose it.

August 10 at 9:00 a.m. And what I'll do is I'll pick up where I left off right here and complete -- and state the sentence.

What I'm likely to do is release him with time served at that point and send him straight to -- where, Mr. Taberski? Horizon in Amherst? Where is that.

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. They had an appointment for intensive outpatient treatment.

At least an evaluation for that program that also incorporates the DBT therapy, that's outlined in the sentencing memorandum from the defense, and that's on August 10th at 10:30 in Getzville.

THE COURT: All right. So he's got to get there.

He's going to be released between 9:00 and 9:20, something like that.

He will be brought in all-property and then he's going to go right to Getzville. And from there, we'll figure out what's going to happen in terms of the balance of the sentence and the balance of the supervised release.

```
USA v Wenke - Proceedings - 8/3/23
```

```
I'll conclude that then on August 10 at 9:00 o'clock.
 1
 2
    Some of the reasons are obviously are -- what I'm hearing from
    Mr. Anzalone, that we need to encourage and mandate this. I'm
 3
    doing that and I am going to do that, and the defendant's
 4
 5
    statements that he's very motivated to get this treatment.
             So to the extent that he understands that he needs it
 6
7
    and he takes it seriously, then I think that we'll get the
    problem fixed.
 8
 9
             So we're going to try to put ourselves on that path,
    so we'll see you all August 10 at 9:00 o'clock and Mr. Wenke
10
11
    will be brought back here all-property.
12
             And unless something changes like, you know, some
13
    bizarre statement from Mr. Wenke out of the jail, then I'll
    release him at that point and we'll get him some treatment and
14
15
    it's going to -- Mr. Wenke, you're going to take that treatment
16
    seriously.
17
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
18
             THE COURT: You know, not that I don't like seeing you
19
    here, but we don't want to see you here anymore.
20
             All right. Very good. August 10, 9:00 o'clock.
21
             Thank you all. Mr. Taberski, go ahead.
22
             PROBATION OFFICER: Judge, would you be able to order
23
    that the evaluation that was done by -- or asked for by the
24
    defense, can be provided to Horizon's to begin their evaluation
25
    process?
```

```
1
             THE COURT: I think that's a good idea.
 2
             Any objections?
 3
             MR. ANZALONE: No. We'll provide it voluntarily.
             THE COURT: How? Now, in advance?
 4
 5
             MR. ANZALONE: We have no problem with that.
 6
             THE COURT: So make sure they have it before the 10th,
7
    then, Mr. Anzalone.
 8
             MR. ANZALONE: Will do. Thank you.
 9
             THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Taberski?
             PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.
10
11
             THE COURT: Anybody have anything else?
12
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
             MR. ANZALONE: No, Your Honor.
13
14
             THE COURT: All right. See you next week.
15
             Thank you.
16
17
                   (Proceedings adjourned at 9:55 a.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

In accordance with 28, U.S.C., 753(b), I certify that these original notes are a true and correct record of proceedings in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York before the Honorable John L. Sinatra, Jr. <u>September 29, 2023</u> s/ Bonnie S. Weber____ Signature Date BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of New York