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 December 14, 2023

2:03 p.m.

LUKE MARSHALL WENKE,

STATUS CONFERENCE

*

Defendant. *

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

V.

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

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: MICHAEL DiGIACOMO,

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,

By MICHAEL DiGIACOMO, 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 FRANK PASSAFIUME, ESQ.,

Assistant Federal Public Defender,

300 Pearl Street,

Suite 200,

Buffalo, New York 14202.

The Courtroom Deputy: KIRSTIE L. HENRY

```
Case 1:22-cr-00035-JLS-HKS Document 208 Filed 06/11/25 Page 2 of 50

USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 12/14/23
```

1	The Court Reporter: BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR, Notary Public, Robert H. Jackson Courthouse,
3	2 Niagara Square, Buffalo, New York 14202,
4	Bonnie_Weber@nywd.uscourts.gov.
5	
6	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
7	transcript produced by computer.
8	
9	
10	
11	(Proceedings commenced at 2:03 p.m.)
12	(110ceedings commenced at 2.03 p.m.)
13	THE CLERK: All rise.
14	The United States District Court for the Western
15	District of New York is now in session, The Honorable John
16	Sinatra presiding.
17	THE COURT: Please be seated.
18	THE CLERK: In United States versus Luke Marshall
19	Wenke, Case Number 22-CR-35. We're here for a status
20	conference.
21	Counsel, please state your appearances.
22	MR. DiGIACOMO: Michael DiGiacomo for the United
23	States.
24	MR. PASSAFIUME: And Frank Passafiume for Mr. Wenke.
25	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Counsel.

```
Good afternoon, Mr. Wenke.
 1
             THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon.
 2
 3
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Good afternoon.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: All right. Let's go across the room and
 6
    see if we have updates from any of you.
 7
             Mr. DiGiacomo --
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, I just received the latest
 8
 9
    update from Mr. Zenger this afternoon at 12:50, and I believe
    there was others.
10
11
             That's the latest update I have and it also contained
    some posts of Mr. Wenke's. So all I have is what the Court has
12
    and what Mr. Passafiume has with respect to an update.
13
             THE COURT: Okay. Any further updates on the -- this
14
15
    Dr. Gupta plan? Is that who it was?
16
             MR. DiGIACOMO: That's through -- that's -- to my
17
    understanding, through Endeavor. That's not through -- that's
18
    not through the lawyers.
19
             THE COURT: That's not the one that the lawyers were
20
    working on.
2.1
             How about the one that the lawyers were working on?
22
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Judge, there's no you update on that.
23
             THE COURT: Okay.
24
             MR. PASSAFIUME: We're hoping to -- the availability
25
    of psychiatrists has been difficult, to say the least.
```

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

Court today in any event.

```
We're hoping that this alternate, Dr. Coggins, is
available to do something after the holidays -- sometime in
January.
         THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Zenger, anything
related to treatment plan updates first?
         Before we get into the posts and that other sort of
thing that we need to talk about -- the posts and letter topic.
         PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes, Your Honor. To
summarize the information I provided to the parties prior to
Court today, the referral to AOT, the Erie County wraparound
mental health program, has been made.
         I have an e-mail out to the coordinator of that
program to just ask as far as the timeline. I've not heard back
yet.
         I did also confirm with Endeavor that they are still
planning to work with Mr. Wenke, but that would depend upon his
admission to AOT. Which, at this point, we don't know if he
does qualify for the program.
         The individuals in the program that came out to assess
Mr. Wenke relating to the behavioral threat assessment are also
planning to present his case to the Erie County Threat
Assessment Team, which could be another program, which I know
very little about.
         I was just informed of this right before coming into
```

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

16

24

```
In the even the AOT does not qualify for Mr. Wenke,
    that could be another wraparound-type service for him, although,
    right now, we don't have any dates or specific information as to
    any of those programs.
             And, yes, Dr. Gupta is the doctor, the psychiatrist
    through Endeavor, but he's not available until potentially early
 6
    January.
             Mr. Wenke did go to Erie County Medical Center on his
    release last week, and he was seen for some kind of initial
    evaluation, although that is not a full psych evaluation.
             And we were told that it takes up to 30 days for that
    written report to be generated. And in the meantime, he was
13
    released, so we know that. And then he met with a social worker
    following that interaction.
15
             THE COURT: Okay. And then, as far as I can tell,
    we've got two sets of things related to Mr. Wenke's activity on
17
    social media over the last few days.
18
             One being something that came to us dated
    November 8th, a letter from Katie
19
                                                 that contains posts,
20
    that my chambers forwarded to the lawyers.
2.1
             Do you have that, Mr. Passafiume?
22
             MR. PASSAFIUME: I've reviewed that, Judge, yes.
23
             THE COURT: And, Mr. DiGiacomo, do you have that?
             MR. DiGIACOMO: I reviewed it, Your Honor, yes.
             THE COURT: And that came directly, I believe, to my
```

```
1
    chambers, so by U.S. mail, I believe.
 2
             Mr. Zenger, you've seen that as well?
 3
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: I have, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. And then, separately is your
 4
    e-mail from a little while ago, Mr. Zenger, to my chambers and
 5
    to the lawyers.
 6
 7
             And have the lawyers seen that as well? Which is an
    update with -- it's at 12:50 p.m. today?
 8
 9
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Yes, Your Honor.
10
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Yes, Judge.
             THE COURT: All right. Should both of these sets of
11
12
    things be docketed, Mr. DiGiacomo?
             MR. DiGIACOMO: I think it would make sense. Since
13
    the Court is referencing them, you know, I think it should be
14
15
    made part of the record.
16
             THE COURT: Does anyone dispute that?
             MR. PASSAFIUME: I guess not. The -- you know, the
17
18
    first document has confidential, sensitive information, so I
    think I'd need to --
19
20
             THE COURT: For example, what? It's been a couple
2.1
    days since I read it. Remind me what --
22
             MR. PASSAFIUME:
                              There's location. It's a letter, so
23
    the heading has an address. Things like that.
24
             THE COURT: Okay.
                                Miss
                                               's address, for
25
    example?
```

```
MR. PASSAFIUME: Yes.
 1
 2
             THE COURT: By the way, particularly concerned about
 3
    people reaching out to her.
             Aren't we concerned about that?
 4
             MR. DiGIACOMO: We've always been concerned about
 5
 6
    people reaching out to Katie
                                           , Judge.
 7
                         Some people that Mr. Wenke was
             THE COURT:
    incarcerated with?
 8
 9
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Well, that happened while he was
    incarcerated, Judge, yes. I mean, I read the content of the
10
11
    letter that, in fact, individuals reached out to her, but that's
12
    all I know.
13
             THE COURT: Well, let's address one thing at a time.
    So we will docket this.
14
             And, Ms. Henry, let's make sure that all the
15
    addresses -- all addresses on this filing are redacted, all
16
17
    right?
18
             And we'll redact the addresses and get this docketed.
    Also, Mr. Zenger's e-mail will be docketed as well.
19
             I don't know. I don't know where to start. This is a
20
21
    mess, Mr. Wenke. So when you left here, you haven't done some
    of the things that I thought you'd be doing, which is to take
22
23
    all of this seriously.
24
             Instead, all that you're doing is talking about how
25
    you've been mistreated by ECMC and by the Court. And talking
```

```
1
    about murder a few different times.
 2
              Somebody else is doing that? Not you?
              THE DEFENDANT: I don't recall talking about murder
 3
    I recall talking about other people who have murdered.
 4
              I did not say anything about murdering at all.
 5
    There's other people associated with the entire situation, which
 6
7
    I, unfortunately, found myself alined with, who murdered.
    That's -- that's what I recall talking about.
 8
 9
              And in the terms of \frac{\mathsf{ECMC}}{\mathsf{CMC}}, it was because a social -- I
    did not know until I left that she is a social worker. And she
10
11
    diagnosed me with something completely differently than
12
    Dr. Rutter did.
              And she just kind of sat there and judged the drama
13
    that brought me to her. And I said I am aware that this is a
14
    very intense situation. I'm trying to recover from it.
15
              And I was very calm when I talked to her. They led me
16
    to a lot of different doctors at ECMC, and then they led me to
17
18
    her. And we waited a few hours. That was fine. It took about
    until 9 o'clock.
19
20
              But it was because she's a social worker, judged the
21
    drama that led me to her, and then she diagnosed me with
22
    something completely different than Dr. Rutter did.
23
              So I questioned her ability to diagnose, but I was
24
    very honest, and I told her the entire story, so that's what I
```

have to say about that.

```
THE COURT: All right. Just stand by for a moment,
 1
 2
    please.
 3
             There are in some of these posts -- there actually is
    a third thing -- and it's just not on my desk right now, so
 4
 5
    we're going to get that.
 6
             But there were also some posts, Mr. Zenger, that you
7
    forwarded to my chambers. Facebook posts late last week.
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: Or a couple days ago. I don't remember.
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes, Your Honor. There
10
11
    were a number of posts. And one thing I wanted to also add were
12
    posts that were concerning the defendant mentioning his rights
    to refuse to take medication.
13
             THE COURT: That's another -- that the kind of topic
14
15
    that I'm eventually going to get to so we don't leave any stone
16
    unturned here.
17
             But has anyone else seen the posts that you sent to me
    a couple days ago? The Facebook posts. Have counsel seen
18
19
    those?
20
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: I believe --
21
             THE COURT: I feel like I read them a couple of days
22
    ago.
23
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes.
24
             THE COURT: Counsel has seen them?
25
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: I believe they have,
```

```
1
    Your Honor. If we could ask the parties --
 2
             Did you receive --
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Do you remember getting them?
 3
             MR. DiGIACOMO: I did get a post last week, Judge. I
 4
 5
    was trying to -- I believe. I mean -- do you know the date?
 6
              THE COURT: So I think it was December 11th is what
7
    I'm looking at.
              Is that about right, Mr. Zenger? So I've got an
 8
 9
    <mark>e-mail</mark> from -- actually, it was an <mark>e-mail</mark> from -- between you,
    Mr. Taberski and Mr. Zenger that was forwarded along, and I
10
11
    wanted to make sure that the lawyers have seen these posts as
12
    well.
13
             So -- and also --
              PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: I'm not sure the defense
14
    has received that e-mail, Your Honor. I'm not sure if the
15
    defense had received those posts, Your Honor.
16
17
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, if I may, I just want to make
    sure -- there's an e-mail that I have that Mr. Passafiume's
18
19
    copied on.
20
             It's dated December 11, 2023. The timestamp is about
21
    1 o'clock. And below that are some e-mails that came in or that
22
    Mr. Taberski had sent to Mr. Zenger on that e-mail also from
23
    December 11th. And that time on that e-mail is 9:26 in the
24
    morning. It's all one.
```

THE COURT: That's what I'm looking at, yeah.

```
1
             Do you have that?
 2
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Yes, Judge. I've reviewed that.
             THE COURT: And so we should be docketing that as
 3
    well. So there's three sets of things that are going to be
 4
 5
    docketed, okay?
             Ms. Henry, just make sure that, if there are any
 6
7
    e-mail addresses of individuals like Zenger, Taberski,
    et cetera, the e-mail addresses need to be redacted on all of
 8
 9
    these, if there are any.
                            's home address and e-mails all need to
10
             Miss
11
    be redacted. That's in a few different places, so we've got to
12
    get all that redaction squared away before we docket these
13
    things.
             So in a couple places -- and I'm talking about all
14
15
    three of these sources now; the two that came from Zenger and
    one from Miss
                            -- Mr. Wenke seems to be trying to talk
16
17
    to me or talk about me.
             And, to me, that doesn't cause much concern, but I
18
    want to ask all of you whether anybody thinks that that fact
19
20
    creates a recusal situation that we need to talk about.
21
             Mr. DiGiacomo?
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, I don't see it. I mean, unless
22
23
    the Court feels there's some conflict that's going to impact
24
    them.
25
             But I don't -- based on the content, you know, I don't
```

```
see a need, because I don't think there's enough there to set forth an actual conflict or even a potential conflict.
```

But, obviously, the Court is reviewing these and has to make a determination based upon, you know, how they feel having look at the these.

But you just referenced that you didn't see it as a big concern, so I don't see it as a concern.

THE COURT: It doesn't create a concern for me, either.

Mr. Passafiume, for you?

MR. PASSAFIUME: No, Judge.

THE COURT: I don't think -- I don't think it's crossed any lines in terms of recusal. I've got to be mindful of the recusal line and the recusal boundary. And if I set it too conservatively, then people can game it.

But at the other -- the other hand, if I can't fairly judge the case, then I've got to recuse, too. So there's a balance. And I don't think we're there. And I just wanted to ask all of you if you thought that we were.

So let's talk about these and the concerns that it gives me and maybe hear from all of you.

Let me start with Probation. So we're looking at three different sorts of inputs.

What do you make of it, Mr. Zenger? What are we dealing with here? And what is Probation's recommendation based

1 on all of these new inputs? 2 And I'll go right to left, to you, Mr. Passafiume, next. 3 PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes, Your Honor. So the 4 probation department is leaving no stone unturned, as far as 5 6 making every attempt we can to bring an evaluation assessment 7 treatment to the defendant, but at this point that resource is not readily available. 8 9 Despite whatever things are being put into motion, Mr. Wenke is still out in the community without that assistance. 10 In addition to that, the -- the online posting is very 11 12 concerning. Between the fixation on murder and his repeated 13 mentionings of his apparent unwillingness to -- or right to refuse medication prescribed. 14 Reservations, grievances with evaluations he has had 15 done and treatment he has had done in the past, this culmination 16 17 of all those things are troubling. 18 And in addition to that, one thing that I had not mentioned in the e-mail update to the parties and the Court 19 20 leading up to court today was there is another law enforcement 2.1 agency that is continuing to monitor the defendant. And it's been revealed that since his release just 22 23 this last Friday, though the defendant did not initiate that 24 contact, he has had contact with the individual in Ohio that

that did assist him in obtaining the firearms --

```
THE DEFENDANT:
                              I did not.
 1
 2
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: -- as part of the incident
 3
    offense.
 4
             THE COURT: All right.
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: So due to all those
 5
    reasons, Your Honor, because -- the issues we're having with the
 6
7
    treatment providers.
             Also, the defendant's unwillingness to engage
 8
 9
    long-term with those providers; postings online; the concerns
    with the victims; the connections he has had with the -- with
10
11
    the past contacts in dealing with the firearms,
                                                     it is our
12
    position that he go back into custody at this time.
             THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Passafiume, I'll ask
13
14
    you to respond to that.
15
             But I also want to ask you to respond -- you're pretty
    good, I think, at taking multipart questions. So, if you need
16
17
    me to repeat it, I'll repeat it, but generally respond, okay?
18
             Also, I want you to respond to some of these things
    that were in the Zenger e-mail from this afternoon, which are
19
20
    posts that look like they're coming from your client, one that's
21
    at the top the second page that says:
22
             Sylvia Browne said by the end of the century, the veil
23
    thins and we can all see spirits. What this means is that, when
    you murder someone, they can just testify against you in court
24
25
    on their own.
```

2

3

4

7

8

11

17

```
The murdered become their own witness. Thanks to what
    happened to me, selenite crystals have become quite a phenomenon
    among Federal officials. And that will help establish deceased
    victim negotiations.
             And then he's writing about printing 3D human bodies
5
    to replace anyone who's murdered against their own will.
6
             And on the next page, it looks like there's a comment
    from Politico -- an article from Politico about: New Hampshire
9
    man charged with threatening to kill Vivek Ramaswamy.
             And it looks like the comment is in response to that,
10
    where Mr. Wenke is writing that: Karmic energy is real. He --
12
    the question I've got is who's "he" in the next sentence?
13
             He is going to be shown by the God sensation that
    there is an afterlife.
14
15
             Who? Who's going to be shown?
             Nobody who actually believes in an after -- I'm asking
16
    who. Nobody who actually believes in an afterlife believes in
18
    murder, because you're going to have to answer to your murder
    victims one day as equal spirits.
19
20
             And a couple other comments elsewhere about murder and
21
    refusing to take medications. Which is, by the way, the
    opposite of what Mr. Wenke told me when we were here last about
22
23
    his willingness to engage and take medication.
24
             So, Mr. Passafiume, what am I supposed to make of all
    of this?
```

```
USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 12/14/23
```

```
MR. PASSAFIUME: This is somebody that needs mental
 1
 2
    health treatment; that has wanted mental health treatment; that
    has engaged in mental health treatment.
 3
 4
             When given that opportunity, that, for some reason
 5
    now, any agency is -- that can give him that treatment that
    they're hired to do, is not doing that.
 6
 7
             That -- that's -- it's incredible, Judge. I don't
 8
    know -- I don't know what -- what to say. He wants treatment.
 9
             He was going before he was arrested on this violation.
10
    He had the psychiatrist appointment scheduled the very next day,
11
    you know.
12
             And now that -- that psychiatrist appointment is
13
    impossible to get. Nobody wants to do it. If he were arrested
    a week later, he would have had that appointment and maybe he'd
14
15
    be on medication right now.
             So that's my, I quess, general response, you know.
16
                                                                  Не
    hasn't received the treatment that he needs -- that we all think
17
18
    he needs and we all believe he needs.
                                            That he wants -- through
    no fault of his own, he's trying to do it.
19
20
             And the postings and the -- the tweets or the social
21
    media -- they're all symptoms of this. And, you know, those
22
    postings, I guess, specifically, Judge, I have a tough time
23
    reading them because, to me, it's gibberish.
                                                   It's incoherent.
24
    These things don't make sense to me.
25
             And they talk about seven different things in two
```

```
sentences.
                I don't know. None of these are any -- like,
1
    actual, overt the threats. They're all just commentary.
 2
             Nobody's really reading them, but the people in the
 3
    Courtroom now. And he hasn't reached out to anybody personally.
 4
 5
    Like, he hasn't violated any order of protections in this week.
             So I get the volume of posts is concerning. I get
 6
7
    the -- you know, that's what led us here today. Or partially.
    But that wasn't going to stop, unless there was treatment.
 8
                                                                 And
    there is not treatment.
 9
             So incarceration just kind of punts this down the
10
11
    road, you know, and -- because we're going to be in the same
12
    boat.
             Unless you're going to, you know, cut ties with him --
13
    you know, sentence him, and then no supervision, and then just
14
    kind of be done with it -- I don't know -- you know, I don't
15
    know if that's a road that you want to go down, Judge, but --
16
    that's it.
17
             He needs treatment. He's asked for it. He wants it.
18
    You've ordered it. He hasn't been getting it. And I don't know
19
20
    what to do.
21
             These posts to me, Judge -- I don't see any -- any,
22
    like,
          real threat. I know that there's a term of art, real
23
    threat.
24
             I -- it's -- they're hard to read out loud because
25
    it's -- they're all non sequiturs to me. I don't know what
```

```
1
    selenite crystals are.
 2
             I don't know what any of that stuff is. And that's
                                                            They're
 3
    what these posts are. And they're one after another.
    commentaries and that's it.
 4
             They're not directives to anybody. They're not
 5
    pointed to anybody specifically. There -- there's no real
 6
7
    threat in any of these posts.
             And if we all thought that was going to end with
 8
 9
    without any treatment, you know, that's -- shame on us. Of
    course that was going to happen.
10
11
             That's been -- that's been the -- you know, the reason
    why we're here. That's been the problem.
12
             And even if you wanted to take away the social media
13
    and the electronics and all the Internet and all that stuff, you
14
15
    can't, because Endeavor said they're not going to treat him in
    person. They're only going to do it online.
16
17
             So in every which way, everybody's boxing him in, and
18
    they're boxing him in to go back to jail, and then nothing
    gets -- nothing gets solved. I think the week -- he looks a lot
19
20
    better. He looks healthier -- Mr. Wenke.
21
```

One of the posts was a video of the family and a child dancing. There are some good moments. There's been periods of real rehabilitation or reintegration at least on the family part of it. And his dad's been with him every step of the way.

22

23

24

25

You know, maybe heightened conditions and -- and

```
1
    directives for social media -- I don't know. There's got to be
 2
    something between, you know, jail and what we have now, Judge.
 3
             THE COURT: But he just -- you know, he just told me
    that he doesn't remember saying anything about murder, and I
 4
    think he's mentioned it four different times, Mr. Passafiume.
 5
             So there's a disassociation between what he's doing
 6
7
    and what he's remembering now?
                               Judge, honest -- kind of.
                                                          If you
 8
             MR. PASSAFIUME:
 9
    are -- if these are manic texts or messages that are just being
    written in that spot, you're not going remember exactly what you
10
11
    wrote because you have so many.
12
             And what he refers to are -- they're commentaries.
13
    They're not any threats of murder or anything like that. He --
14
    he understood your question to be that, you know, has he
15
    threatened to murder anybody?
             Has he indicated somebody was going to get murdered?
16
17
    And that's not it. These are all commentaries, I think, on
18
    the -- on the posts, Judge.
                         Taking away his ability to write these
19
             THE COURT:
20
    things isn't the solution either, Mr. Passafiume.
                                                        In fact,
    it's -- these kind of views into his mind are helpful.
2.1
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Sure.
22
23
             THE COURT: Not -- to me, maybe not to him. But
    helpful to me. So shutting them down doesn't serve any purpose,
24
```

I don't think, because then we have fewer glimpses into his

1 mind. 2 MR. PASSAFIUME: That's a great point, Judge. You 3 know, now we're back to the Minority Report movie, right? I don't -- he needs treatment. And he's not getting 4 5 it. He's not going to get it in jail. He's not getting it now. 6 I don't know why he's not getting it. It's through no fault of 7 his own. And we do this dance --8 9 THE COURT: But it becomes who's going to bear the burden of him not getting treatment? 10 11 Right now, just him. When it's somebody else, then 12 it's on me. What about this Ohio thing? What do we know more 13 about, this contact with the person in Ohio that he's not 14 15 supposed to have contact with, Mr. Zenger? PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes, Your Honor. So the 16 background is that this individual in Ohio met Mr. Wenke on 17 18 online. They had met on some kind of personality-type 19 20 assessment thread and had shared some similar background, as far 21 as time spent in Olean. I don't know what caused this individual to follow 22 23 back up with Mr. Wenke, but I have been told that there has been 24 contact between the two since Mr. Wenke's release this past 25 Friday.

```
I don't have much information beyond that except for
 1
 2
    that this person is cooperating and assisting in a separate --
 3
             THE COURT: But it's your understanding that it
    originated from the person in Ohio, not from Mr. Wenke?
 4
 5
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: That is my understanding,
 6
    yes.
 7
             THE COURT: So back to my specific question,
    Mr. Passafiume, to that page three of that e-mail, where we're
 8
 9
    talking about: Karmic energy is real. He is going to be shown
    by the God sensation that there is an afterlife.
10
             Who is "he"?
11
12
             MR. PASSAFIUME: He is the person accused, right?
                                                                 Ιn
    that article, of making the threats to kill the candidate.
13
             THE COURT:
                         What about his multiple refusals?
14
    least three, maybe more than that. He says he's got a right to
15
    refuse medication.
16
             So different from what he told us the last time we
17
    were together, that he was going to take all this seriously,
18
    isn't it?
19
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Yeah. I talked to him before Court
20
21
    about that. So my conversations with him are very similar to
22
    what he represented in Court.
23
             And he -- he has never -- he's never refused
    medication that's been offered. Nothing has ever been offered
24
25
    to him. He indicates he would take it.
```

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

```
These -- he indicates that he says this stuff online
and in these posts. Basically: You know, I'm going to refuse
until I get a real doctor to -- to evaluate me.
         There's no -- you know -- on their face, they say what
they say. And there's no excuse for that. It is contrary to
what he indicated to the Court.
         But he hasn't had the chance to refuse. And I think
giving him the chance to refuse is -- is paramount.
         And then there's really no excuse if he were to refuse
medication or not take medication that was prescribed by -- you
know, by a licensed psychiatrist.
         You know, there's no excuse for those posts.
                                                       It is
contrary to what he indicated to you.
         He -- he indicates they're -- they were kind of rants
on a specific basis. And he's always indicated to me and to
anybody in my office that he would take medication, if -- if
offered.
         And, in fact, his father has been on board with that
the entire time. And, I think, would ensure and make sure that
he would be taking the medication, if offered, or report to the
Court if he's not doing it.
         THE COURT: Mr. Passafiume -- and then another thread
that runs through the posts is his ranting against the system.
```

Ranting against this; ranting against the Court;

ranting against me. I guess; ranting against the ankle

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

```
USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 12/14/23
bracelet, which he thinks is listening to his conversations.
         And that's, again, different from the contrite person,
who speaks -- when he speaks to me -- that everything's going to
be okay and nothing to worry about here. And then he goes
online and spews all kinds of crazy stuff.
         MR. PASSAFIUME: That's the mental illness, Judge.
         THE COURT: I get it. But what am I supposed to do
with that?
         I get it. That's why I said that the statutory
process starts itself. I don't even need to make -- I mean,
it's like, obviously, the statutory process starts itself. It's
so easy.
         MR. PASSAFIUME: You know, going down the BOP road, I
kind of disagree with -- before we get to that point and I argue
```

against that, I still don't understand why, if you're ordering -- if Your Honor is ordering a psychiatric evaluation and treatment, how Horizon and Endeavor refuse to do it. I don't fundamentally understand that.

When -- when a Federal district judge is ordering treatment multiple times, that they find ways around it and this AOT and all these different assessments and teams and -- you know, this psychiatrist is not the right one; we need somebody else, and we're waiting on this.

He was in treatment with Horizon until his arrest. There was no imminent danger that -- that Horizon was scared of,

2.1

```
that they reported or anything like that. He was in treatment. He was compliant.
```

Those counselors didn't say he was a danger to somebody. They didn't call up and say: Get this guy off the streets. We -- you know, something's going to happen.

They were treating him. He had the psychiatrist appointment scheduled, ready to go, and he was arrested on the -- you know, the day before.

So I don't know why we could not just go back to that and with an order from Your Honor saying: Do what you were doing. And if Horizon doesn't want to do it, I guess, and Endeavor's better equipped, then, Endeavor, do it.

And it gives everybody, you know, peace of mind and coverage, and a glimpse -- a better glimpse into Mr. Wenke's mind.

That's -- that's what I -- I don't understand.

Because there is no -- there's nothing here I could say that's going to, you know, make anybody feel better.

THE COURT: Mr. Zenger, do you want to respond to
the -- the specific comments about psychiatric treatment? And
where are we? And why hasn't it happened? And are we any
closer than we have been?

PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes, Your Honor. So it's not necessarily an unwillingness to work with the defendant.

Psychiatric evaluations take a couple of months, just with the

lead time to schedule these appointments.

And that is why, upon the defendant's last release, when he was in intensive out-patient services with Horizon, it wasn't until he was a couple months into his supervision that that appointment was going to take place.

It was scheduled off the bat. It just takes that long for them to take place. He was taken into custody. Some more background information came to light and was given to Horizon.

And at that time, they just felt that they weren't equipped to deal with his needs. That it would be irresponsible for them, alone, to go forward and continue working with the defendant, without the appropriate wraparound services that they felt that he needed, which is when we transitioned to Endeavor, set up the behavioral threat assessment.

That was conducted. The outcome of that assessment is what generated the recommendation of Endeavor, who is willing to have a psychiatric assessment done with the defendant.

And that is going to take place, what they told me, in early January. So we do have a time frame for that.

Their willingness, though, is dependent upon, again, the wraparound services. They need more support, based upon the background of the defendant, for this AOT program and/or the Erie County threat program to be in partnership with them, to ensure that they have the adequate services to supplement their own services, so that he can be in the community, safe.

2.1

that time.

In addition, yes, he was in compliance with treatment before, but what's concerning is that time and time again we would see online him poking fun, making fun of the treatment and not taking it seriously.

Yes, it was a long drive. I recognize that. But that was not solely the context of what he was presenting online at

And then, since he's been released this time, he's done much of the same with his assessment with ECMC and his apparent fixation on his right not to take medications.

THE COURT: And has he been able to start the psychological part of the treatment? You know, with a counselor or whatever at Endeavor since he's been out?

PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: He has not, Your Honor, because they are not willing to begin services with him until AOT has begun their services in combination with them.

THE COURT: So it sounds like sometimes, to some extent, Mr. Passafiume's right, when he worries about one step forward and two steps back. It seems that's exactly what's happening here.

PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: That could be the case, Your Honor.

The defendant has a lot of unique needs. And as more of those needs are coming to light, it has an impact on what type of programming is necessary. And that programming takes

```
USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 12/14/23
    time to fall into place.
1
 2
             THE COURT: So all of this and everything that we've
    been talking about the past couple of weeks is all about getting
 3
    Mr. Wenke some treatment.
 4
             But the bigger backdrop is the -- and I had to make
 5
    and I did make the findings the last time we were here -- is the
 6
7
    concern for whether there is a danger to the community or not.
             And that's the biggest backdrop. That's where I am
 8
 9
    and have to work on and think about. Getting him some treatment
    is a corollary to that, but that's not the end, itself, right?
10
11
             Mr. DiGiacomo, I haven't had -- I haven't given you a
12
    chance to talk.
             So what's the Government's position?
13
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, the Government's position -- I
14
15
    mean, the Court may recall we were opposed to Mr. Wenke's
    release, last time, until everything was up and running with
16
    Endeavor.
17
             I know the Court wanted him to -- because we couldn't
18
    get the psychiatrist evaluation, the Court took the next best
19
20
    approach and had him self-report to ECMC, but it doesn't appear
2.1
    that we have a report.
```

We're not going to see one for 30 days. And I don't even know if it confirmed that Mr. Wenke even saw a psychiatrist

22

23

24

25

there.

So where we are, Judge, today is basically where we

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

references.

```
were before. Except now, with Mr. Wenke being released into the
custody of his father and on home detention -- I mean, now he
has access back to the computers.
         Which I understand and I can respect the Court's
position that, you know, it gives an insight as to -- whoever
finally does this evaluation, as to what Mr. Wenke's thinking.
         I know there's been conversation about, you know --
brought up with what do we do? Do we take away the computer?
         But as you pointed out, that gives whoever the
clinicians are that are going to eventually treat Mr. Wenke an
insight as to who he is.
         But then there's also been the argument that Endeavor
requires him to have access to a computer for their -- when they
get into the counseling aspect of it.
         But I believe that, when it gets into the counseling
aspect of it, that could be a very limited. He would do a Zoom
conference that specific day and time or whenever that
evaluation is.
         So, Judge -- and I know it's been said by -- you
questioned it and it's been said by Probation, I think, really,
there's two -- there's two things here.
         The references to the murder that the Court has
pointed out and, more importantly, Judge, the multiple
```

And it says -- I know Mr. Passafiume has acknowledged

```
1
    that, you know, some of these -- some of these posts of
 2
    Mr. Wenke's, you know -- they're just kind of rambling.
 3
             But the ones where he's saying he will refuse to take
    medication, we have, quote: We have legal rights to refuse
 4
 5
    medication.
                 In capitalization.
             I mean, that speaks for itself. That's not gibberish.
 6
7
    And so now, really, until we get things going, is it in the
    public safety to have Mr. Wenke out still, in the custody of his
 8
 9
    father? Probation doesn't think so.
             THE COURT: And I assume the Government doesn't think
10
11
    so.
12
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Well, Judge, we were opposed to his
    release before, so, yes. We have our concerns.
13
             And it's not just -- Judge, for the record -- it's
14
15
    clear it's not just what's been happening since.
             I mean, we had our reservations after that evaluation,
16
    although, as Mr. Passafiume pointed out and the Court pointed
17
18
    out, some of it was dated from the underlying offense -- I mean,
19
    the threat assessment.
20
             THE COURT: What is Probation's recommendation,
21
    specifically, in terms of if he's remanded as you're
22
    recommending, Mr. Zenger? Then what? And vis-à-vis treatment.
23
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: May I, Your Honor?
24
             THE COURT: Mr. Taberski --
25
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: Your Honor, our position
```

```
1
    would be that the defendant is committed to the BOP process that
 2
    we previously discussed or that he be remanded up until the date
    that we have scheduled for a psychiatric evaluation in the
 3
    community and he be remanded up until that exact date.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: And does that even assuage your concerns?
    In other words, this isn't -- an M.D. psychiatrist doesn't have
 6
7
    a magic wand either, right?
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: That's true, Your Honor.
 8
 9
    And, especially, if the defendant is unwilling to take
    medication, having a psychiatric evaluation done and medications
10
11
    recommended doesn't go very far.
12
             THE COURT: Can any of this interaction and treatment,
13
    et cetera, with Endeavor, begin while he's in a local county
14
    iail?
15
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: I can ask that question
    specifically. I do think that Endeavor has more of a capability
16
17
    to do that than Horizon, but it would not be through a probation
18
    contract.
             THE COURT: Because I feel like you have told me that
19
20
    they won't do that while somebody's in custody, right?
21
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: And my supervisor just
22
    indicated to me that, no. They do not have the ability to do
23
    that.
24
             THE COURT: See what I mean? So we're going two steps
25
    forward, one step about back again -- or whatever the dance is.
```

```
1
    I forgot the rhythm, but seems like we're in a dance.
 2
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: And somehow, I've got to call the cadence.
 3
 4
             All right. Mr. Passafiume --
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Kind of going back to the dance that
 5
    we're doing -- so, you know, Endeavor says that they're not
 6
7
    going to treat until AOT -- he qualifies for this AOT. I don't
 8
    think he's even going to qualify for that.
 9
             In talking with the New York State mental hygiene
    services lawyer, who gave me the documents that I forward the --
10
11
    to the Court -- and it's in the brochure that Officer Zenger
12
    provided -- the criteria for eligibility requires, you know, all
    of these -- you know, there's, like, five or six different
13
    requirements.
14
             But one of it is history of lack of compliance with
15
    treatment for mental illness, which has either led to -- to
16
17
    either two hospitalizations in the last three years or one or
18
    more acts of serious violent behavior towards others or threats
    within the last 48 months.
19
20
             That's just one of all the criteria he needs.
21
    not going to qualify for the intensive out-of-pocket program
22
    because he is not -- he's not going to meet the -- the
23
    threshold, which is high.
```

We don't -- we don't see these cases here, but a

threshold is high for somebody to be deemed a danger where they

24

```
cannot be in the community.
```

And, you know, to lock him up for saying something that's correct, he can't be forced to take medications -- I understand in the context that sounds awful -- give him a chance to -- to commit the violation before detaining him on that violation. He goes back to jail now, we are in the same exact boat.

And, you know, before the BOP, kind of, path, there's going to be a lot -- I think, you know, I'm going to want a hearing. There's going to be some legal issues, I think, with that part of it.

But I still -- I don't get why this cannot happen here, locally, in Buffalo. That -- what Officer Zenger said and, kind of, one of the options to keep Mr. Zenger -- Mr. Wenke in custody until the psychiatric evaluation.

That was the plan, but then they refused to do it. So we're going to be in the same exact boat.

THE COURT: That was my next question, Mr. Zenger -- was what about that?

In other words, he's at whatever county jail, and then what? Will they actually get the appointment scheduled?

That was part of the trouble we had the last time is they wouldn't get us on the calendar.

PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: That's correct, Your Honor.

And there is the possibility that -- the very real possibility

```
1
    that AOT -- that he does not qualify for AOT.
 2
             And then, hopefully, that other supplemental program
    that was proposed in the e-mail I sent today -- I know very
 3
    little about it.
 4
              I just learned about it about an hour before Court.
 5
    But the threat assessment team wraparound program, that could
 6
7
    then assist Endeavor, would then come into play. But who knows
 8
    what's going to come out of that, too.
 9
             So the concern here is that he does not qualify for
    AOT, in which case Endeavor has basically said that their
10
11
    willingness to work with him is dependant upon that being
12
    accepted.
13
             THE COURT: So where does that leave us? Again, he
14
    still has no access to a psychiatrist.
15
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Can I just -- he wouldn't qualify for
    AOT because he's not dangerous enough.
16
17
             So that makes no sense that they're not going to treat
18
    him, because he doesn't qualify for a more intensive program.
19
    fundamentally don't understand that, Judge.
20
             THE COURT: Maybe you should have a meeting with
21
    them -- with Mr. Zenger and Mr. DiGiacomo -- and make the
22
    argument to them.
23
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER:
                                         These are the same
24
    individuals that had to digest the threat assessment that was
25
    done, too, which does raise concern about the defendant's
```

history, behavior and concerns for the future as well.

1

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

THE COURT: My whole view of ameliorating -- of mitigating the risk is getting him the treatment. And we're moving farther and farther away from that.

He needs treatment because he needs treatment, but the treatment is also a factor in my risk analysis, isn't it? And we're getting farther and farther away from that.

Does anyone have a problem with me calling the next case and taking a recess on this case? I've got Vassar now, and your case, as well, Mr. Passafiume.

Would you be able to stick around, Mr. DiGiacomo and probation folks?

Why don't I take a recess on Wenke and call Vassar so that I can continue to think about Wenke while I'm up here and maybe take a recess off the bench for a few minutes, all right?

MR. PASSAFIUME: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Let's do that. So we're in recess on Wenke.

(Recess commenced at 2:47 p.m., until 3:10 p.m.)

THE COURT: Thanks for the recess. Please be seated.

Everybody back?

Mr. Taberski's in the hot seat now, for some reason, so we'll see. Tell me, for you, Mr. Taberski or Mr. Zenger, is

1 Endeavor going to engage? 2 Do they need some kind of a trigger from the Erie 3 County threat assessment group to prompt Endeavor to engage? How is that going to work? 4 In other words, is there another prerequisite that we 5 haven't even fleshed out? 6 7 PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Your Honor, it seems as though Endeavor directly partners with AOT in that effort. 8 9 So what they've indicated is that their willingness to work with Mr. Wenke is dependent upon AOT -- him qualifying for 10 AOT. 11 12 So I did -- there actually is a field on the referral, itself, for the partnering agency. And I did provide Endeavor's 13 contact information. 14 The clinical director over there is the one that 15 recommended AOT in the first place. So that would -- that 16 17 connection has been made, Your Honor, so -- there's also e-mail 18 threads with the both of them on there. THE COURT: And, Mr. Taberski, is there something that 19 20 you wanted to say? 21 PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: Yes, Your Honor, thank 22 you. 23 I just wanted to discuss how our office has come to 24 the recommendation that we have, for Mr. Wenke to be detained at 25 this point, because that's not something that we take lightly in any case.

And I know that everyone in this room, with their different roles in the system, are all concerned about two things: public safety and Mr. Wenke's mental health, as it relates to his threat to public safety, based on his own conduct, which is why we're here.

Now, I wanted to discuss what defense counsel brought up previously about Mr. Wenke's so-called compliance with the mental health treatment that Your Honor ordered after his last revocation proceeding.

And that was mental health treatment that defense counsel adamantly suggested that he needed to turn everything around. It was put in place.

And what Mr. Wenke did in response was what we refer to in our field, in my office, as surface compliance. It's not engagement. It's not buy-in.

He drove to the facility he was ordered to go to several days per week. And what he did immediately after virtually every session he went to was mock everything about it.

He wasn't engaged responsibly in it. He wasn't showing progress, which is why we're back here today.

So as Your Honor suggested about having a window into Mr. Wenke's psyche, with his very concerning Facebook and Twitter posts, we have a window into his engagement in treatment.

No matter what kind of treatment everyone in this room 1 tries to arrange for him, he doesn't take it seriously. 2 3 And that is why we're all very concerned about public There is only one quarantee for public safety and 4 safety. further intimidation and harassment of all these victims that 5 6 are named in his judgment and the modification order and that is 7 for him to be detained. Otherwise, none of us know what's going to happen when 8 9 he walks out of this courtroom. But what history shows us is he'll be back on social media, mocking Your Honor, mocking the 10 11 prosecutor, mocking our office, and mocking mental health 12 treatment. And he's also pending violation proceedings, 13 Your Honor, for harassing people. People are walking around in 14 And there's only one course of action 15 fear for their safety. 16 that can prevent that today. 17 And we've discussed with the Government the option of 18 the 18 U.S. Code 4244. I'm not that familiar with that, Your Honor, but I think there are two options for -- if you were 19 going to follow our recommendation, rather, is that -- you could 20 2.1 hold Mr. Wenke in detention pending violation proceedings and 22 sentencing on the violations. 23 We could research what mental health treatment is

available in the Bureau of Prisons and we could come back with

those recommendations. Or you could go along with this

24

25

```
1
    18 U.S. Code 4244.
 2
             And I'd be happy to answer any other questions
 3
    Your Honor has about how our office arrived at this
 4
    recommendation.
 5
             THE COURT: What would you research? What treatment
    is available short of the statutory provision we've been talking
 6
7
    about? Separate from that.
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: Right, Your Honor.
 8
 9
    other words, we could reach out to the Bureau of Prisons and
    say: If Mr. Wenke is sentenced to a period of time, what mental
10
11
    health treatment is available in the Bureau of Prisons?
12
    are different programs.
13
             THE COURT: Right. But if he's -- okay. I get it.
             Mr. DiGiacomo --
14
15
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, as we represent, Probation -- I
    mean, we agree. We've had a public safety concern throughout,
16
17
    but we're mindful that Mr. Wenke needs some assistance.
18
             And what I've heard here today is that everybody in
    this courtroom is trying to get Mr. Wenke treatment locally.
19
20
             And so far, I don't believe through the fault of
21
    anybody in this courtroom -- I mean, Probation's gone above and
22
    beyond to get him treatment, we just don't have a treatment plan
23
    in place.
             And so that triggers the public safety exception that
24
25
    we have to examine. I mean, what's the next -- as Probation's
```

```
1
    stated, what's the next move?
 2
             THE COURT: I guess I come at it the other way around.
    In other words, the public safety concern is there -- is there,
 3
    has always been there.
 4
             And can we mitigate or ameliorate it or address it,
 5
    deal with it, feel comfortable about it by getting him the
 6
7
    treatment.
             So it's just inverting what you said, I think,
 8
 9
    Mr. DiGiacomo. And that's where I'm coming from.
             Mr. Passafiume --
10
11
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Yeah.
                                      The easy way out is to lock
12
    Mr. Wenke up and throw away the key. That's what I keep
    hearing.
13
             THE COURT: That's the hard way out, Mr. Passafiume.
14
15
    I sleep with these consequences.
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Okay. Thank you. I like that you
16
    said that, Judge, because that's all I heard.
17
18
             THE COURT: That's why we're struggling. That's why
    we struggled the last time we were here and we struggled today.
19
20
             And we can come back every single day, and then we can
21
    watch him every single day, and he's out there thumbing his nose
    at the system, and he's not taking it seriously. Not at all.
22
23
             And everything he does is volitional. It's not like
24
    he can't control what he's doing.
25
             MR. PASSAFIUME: In the context of his mental illness,
```

```
Judge, I guess -- and we don't know the -- the -- kind of the
1
 2
    scope of that.
 3
             One thing that I kind of overlooked before, that AOT,
    pending, you know, admission into that -- didn't Your Honor
 4
    order that?
 5
 6
             Wasn't that the order that I prepared? That he
7
    qualify and do it so they don't have to follow that order?
             I fundamentally don't -- I keep saying the same thing.
 8
    I don't understand. Locking Mr. Wenke up is not the answer.
 9
             There are two agencies in Buffalo that could treat him
10
11
    to evaluate him, and they're both refusing. And that's the
12
    problem, not --
                         Detention pending sentencing or remand
13
             THE COURT:
    pending sentencing is not the solution to the mental health
14
15
    problem. I would agree with you.
             But it's the only solution that I've got to the
16
    problem of is there a safety concern.
17
18
             And the finding that I've got to make, which I made
    before, is now something that I can't make anymore, which is
19
    that -- based on clear and convincing evidence, that there's no
20
2.1
    threat to public safety or to anyone in the community or the
22
    community generally.
23
             And I can't make that finding anymore and I won't make
    that finding anymore, so he's going to be remanded pending
24
25
    sentencing.
```

```
MR. PASSAFIUME: I guess. What is -- I'm sorry.
 1
 2
             THE COURT: Go ahead.
 3
             MR. PASSAFIUME: I'm sorry. Did I -- I'm talking too
 4
    much.
             What is -- I understand that -- what does everybody
 5
    think he's going to do? That's -- I guess that's what I don't
 6
7
    understand.
             Like, why -- what about a GPS monitor? What about
 8
 9
    conditions?
             Like, I don't know what -- we keep talking about
10
11
    safety, you know, the public --
12
                         Well, we've tried all that. And so -- yet
             THE COURT:
    at a time when we need him to be serious and to show that he's
13
    serious about it and to show that he's taking all of this
14
    seriously, he's -- he's not.
15
             He's making fun of all of it, including the Court;
16
    including Probation; including the monitor on his ankle;
17
18
    including the people that he interacted with at ECMC.
19
              Including the medication issue that I talked to him
20
    about and made sure that he would take it seriously, he's
21
    saying: No -- you know, maybe I won't -- maybe I won't take it,
    because I don't have to.
22
23
             So he is going to be remanded pending sentencing.
                                                                 We
24
    can talk about a sentencing date.
25
             Mr. Taberski, you should do that research and report
```

back to all of us. Hard stop.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Separate topic is in 4244(a), this is the standard -and I said it answers itself -- I, at any time prior to the sentencing, shall order such a hearing -- this is the hearing that we're talking about, that Mr. Passafiume would be entitled to -- if I'm of the opinion that there's reasonable cause to believe that Mr. Wenke may presently be suffering from a mental disease or defect for the treatment of which he is in need of custody for care or treatment in a suitable facility.

That part -- triggering the hearing part -- is easy. That's automatic. So I feel like we ought to be triggering that process, and then you can have your hearing. And then he can go out and get evaluated for the hearing.

But what else am I supposed to do? Certainly, it wasn't my first preference. You saw what my first preference was, and we bent over backwards to accomplish it. And he's not taking it seriously.

So maybe I need you to get some input to me on whether we should trigger the process or not. Because I understand the process is a serious one and somewhat -- once the hearing's concluded, if I make a finding a certain way -- somewhat out of our hands after that, in terms of what BOP does with it.

So should I trigger the process now and set a hearing date? Or should I get input from Mr. DiGiacomo and Mr. Passafiume on whether and to what extent we should be

triggering 4244(a)?

MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, with respect to -- I mean, at the end of the day, whether we go -- whether we start the 4244 process or we kind of, what I'll say, back-court dribble for a period of time, nevertheless, the Government and the defense need to get Mr. Wenke evaluated.

In the statute, it says that he has to undergo a psychiatric or psychological evaluation. I understand everybody
here is trying to do it from a different way.

Now -- so he's going to be remanded. Now the question becomes is there someone local to do it or does he have to go into the BOP facility.

And, quite candidly, as you asked Mr. Passafiume when you opened the initial proceeding, where were we? We're talking and finding those two -- since Dr. Antonius wasn't available, we were trying either Evelyn Coggins or Corey Leidenfrost to do the evaluation.

But, quite candidly, because of their schedules, we haven't been able to talk to them to see -- I know Frank has put in his e-mails what -- the exact quote from 4247, referencing, you know, is he suffering from a mental disease or defect that he would create a substantial risk or bodily injury to another person.

We haven't been told by either one of them directly that they are in a position to conduct that evaluation.

```
So -- the point is -- is that, whether we go forward with the hearing, I think we have to determine can one of these two individuals do the <a href="mailto:evaluation">evaluation</a>?
```

Or does the Government get their own and the defense gets their own, and then we have a hearing on that aspect?

But, nevertheless, Judge, whether we go 4244 or whether the Court wants to make a finding short of that, Mr. Wenke has to be evaluated to see where we stand.

And that's the frustration the Court's had. That's the frustration defense has had and, I think, a lot of people in this room have had, is that it just haven't been able to put in place at a time for the benefit of Mr. Wenke.

But we don't disagree, Judge, that -- the Court's conclusion that, until that happens -- you know, as you point out, he no longer meets the standard.

But the question is -- is how quickly can we do that?

THE COURT: Once the status pending sentencing is decided, the second question is -- and 4247 talks about that very psychiatric or psychological examination.

It doesn't have to be in BOP, right? It could be something else that's local.

Maybe the **evaluation** that the lawyers are working on can suffice and serve that purpose. I don't know.

But you certainly might want to talk to the psychiatrist about whether their evaluation would be sufficient

```
or could be sufficient. Why not work towards that?
```

If you're engaging this person already and the evaluation would be in lieu of what BOP can do, I would say why not, if you can accomplish that? Then he can have the evaluation done locally.

MR. PASSAFIUME: Absolutely. That was the goal. I did all -- everything Mr. DiGiacomo said. That's why, when we're approaching these doctors, we're mirroring the language of the statute.

So Mr. Wenke is remanded. Is the Endeavor evaluation from Dr. Gupta in January not going to happen, then?

THE COURT: I don't know. It sounds like that could be in jeopardy, from what I heard from Mr. Zenger, but I certainly would encourage that.

You can talk to it now, Mr. Zenger or Mr. Taberski, or you can continue to talk about it with Mr. Passafiume offline.

Go ahead.

PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes, Your Honor. I can recommend or try to set it up -- that that continues to happen. But it won't be through Probation at that point.

We have no contract that can function when the defendant is incarcerated. So if AOT and/or Endeavor can function in that matter, I can try to get that ball rolling, but that's as far as I can go.

THE COURT: And they're going to wonder who's paying

```
them for it, right?
1
 2
             PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Correct, Your Honor. AOT
 3
    is a government-funded program.
             THE COURT: All right. Well, why don't we see if we
 4
 5
    can keep the process going.
 6
             Certainly, I encourage you to encourage them to keep
7
    the process going, but I understand how it could be in jeopardy
    because nobody from this building is going to be paying for it.
 8
    But I understand that and -- kind of stuck with it.
 9
             Mr. Taberski, if you can find, maybe, BOP's treatment
10
11
    mechanism about being sentenced and being treated, does it work
12
    backwards to the county jails or no?
             Can he get treatment through BOP now, in the county
13
14
    jail?
15
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: Judge, I know the answer
    to that is no.
16
17
             I mean, this would be if he was at BOP custody and you
18
    were sentencing him with the recommendation that Your Honor
    makes on the judgment and commitment order.
19
20
             Similar to when Your Honor recommends that a person be
21
    housed as close to home as possible, there have been times in
22
    the past that judges have ordered or not ordered.
23
             That's the distinction I'm trying to make. It's a
24
    recommendation that a person participate in a program such as
25
    RDAP. That is something that the Court recommends on a regular
```

basis.

1

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

But what we can find out for Your Honor is what types of programs are available in the BOP; how long does one need to be in custody to participate in such programs; and criteria such as that.

THE COURT: All right. I think that's good input.

Look, I've got no agenda here. Right now, I can't see the conclusion either, because there's five or six or I don't know how many different permutations on where this thing resolves.

But I think we've got to move it one step at a time. So I have today to answer the question about my concerns about public safety.

Next is what are we going to do about getting Mr. Wenke evaluated? And I think that process has to continue among the lawyers for now.

And I'm willing to wait and hear from you, Mr. DiGiacomo and Mr. Passafiume, about whether that process is working or whether I've got to force it, which is what I would do through the statute.

MR. DiGIACOMO: This is just my suggestion, Judge. Mr. Passafiume can -- if he disagrees, and the Court can, obviously, can order whatever they want.

My position would be that we schedule a status conference in perhaps two to three weeks, so that we can --

```
Mr. Passafiume and I can determine -- if we determine prior to
1
 2
    that that the two individuals that I referenced, Evelyn Coggins
    or Corey Leidenfrost, are unavailable or don't have the
 3
    requirements or the training to conduct this evaluation, that we
 4
    would come back and tell the Court.
 5
             I think in two to three weeks, we report back and say
 6
7
    either, A, they think they can do it, and this is how long it
 8
    would take a generate a report, or, B, they can't do it and,
 9
    now, Judge, we have to look at the next provision in 4244 -- is
    sending Mr. Wenke to the BOP, which we know is going to be a
10
11
    lengthy process.
12
             So that would -- that's my suggestion. That's my two
    cents. The Court can give me two cents' change, but that's my
13
14
    feeling.
15
             And, obviously, Mr. Passafiume -- it's his client. We
16
    can obviously agree, disagree, or --
             THE COURT: That sounds -- Mr. Passafiume, does that
17
18
    sound like a reasonable approach?
```

MR. PASSAFIUME: Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. So keep working. Everyone's got homework assignments.

And we will regroup right around the end of the year, it sounds like, Ms. Henry.

MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, can we have right after the 1st of the year?

```
USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 12/14/23
```

```
THE COURT: I think the 2nd is a Monday or a Tuesday
1
 2
    or something like that -- yeah.
 3
             What are we doing on January 2, Ms. Henry? We have
    things -- we have a trial, don't we?
 4
             All right. We're in the middle of a trial then, but
 5
    we can certainly meet here at 9 that day, right?
 6
 7
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Sure.
             THE COURT: 9 o'clock, January 2? And -- that gives
 8
 9
    us a half an hour before the jurors will be looking for
10
    testimony.
11
             So 9 a.m., January 2 will be our status conference to
    see where we are. And, hopefully, have a path forward more
12
13
    clear to us at this point -- at that point, by then.
14
             All right. Keep working, folks.
15
             Anything else, Mr. DiGiacomo?
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Nothing from the Government.
16
             THE COURT: Mr. Passafiume?
17
18
             MR. PASSAFIUME: No, Judge.
             THE COURT: Anything from Probation?
19
20
             PROBATION OFFICER TABERSKI: No, Your Honor.
                                                            Thank
21
    you.
22
             THE COURT: All right. Thanks, everybody.
23
24
                   (Proceedings concluded at 3:29 p.m.)
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>May 27, 2025</u> s/ Bonnie S. Weber____ Signature Date BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of New York