

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
v.	*	November 19, 2024
	*	2:30 p.m.
	*	
LUKE MARSHALL WENKE,	*	STATUS CONFERENCE
	*	
Defendant.	*	
	*	
* * * * *	*	

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., FONDA KUBIAK, ESQ., Assistant Federal Public Defenders, 300 Pearl Street, Suite 200, Buffalo, New York 14202.
--------------------	---

The Courtroom Deputy:	KIRSTIE L. HENRY
-----------------------	------------------

1 The Court Reporter: BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR,
2 Notary Public,
3 Robert H. Jackson Courthouse,
4 2 Niagara Square,
5 Buffalo, New York 14202,
6 Bonnie_Weber@nywd.uscourts.gov.

5

6 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
7 transcript produced by computer.

7

8

9

10

11 (Proceedings commenced at 2:30 p.m.)

12

13 **THE CLERK:** All rise.

14

15 The United States District Court for the Western
16 District of New York is now in session, The Honorable John
17 Sinatra presiding.

17

THE COURT: Please be seated.

18

19 **THE CLERK:** We're on the record in United States
20 versus Luke Marshall Wenke, Case Number 22-CR-35.

20

This is the date set for a status conference.

21

Appearing for Probation is John Taberski.

22

Counsel, please state your appearances for the record.

23

24 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** Michael DiGiacomo for the United
25 States.

25

MR. PASSAFIUME: And Frank Passafiume for Mr. Wenke.

1 **THE COURT:** Good afternoon, Counsel and Mr. Wenke,
2 Mr. Taberski.

3 I have the report that was filed under seal,
4 Docket 164, concluding that Mr. Wenke is **competent**.

5 And so we're here for a status evaluation -- or status
6 conference, rather, to discuss that and discuss what our next
7 steps might be.

8 Do either of you lawyers want to tell me what you
9 think our next steps ought to be before we get going?

10 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** Go ahead, Frank.

11 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Judge, I think Your Honor should just
12 adopt this report, find Mr. Wenke **competent**, and sentence him
13 out.

14 So our plan today was just to make that request: to
15 adopt this report, finding Mr. Wenke **competent** and get a
16 sentencing date.

17 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** Judge, I guess, what -- I understand
18 Mr. Passafiume just wants to get this case resolved.

19 But what I don't see what the Court can leave empty at
20 this point is, if you go back and look when we were before you
21 back on April 16th of 2024, there was a dangerous, I guess,
22 finding by **Dr. Leidenfrost**.

23 And back in April of this year, you were in the
24 process of ordering a hearing -- in fact, did set a hearing --
25 under 18 U.S.C. 4244.

1 And that hearing was set for -- I believe it was
2 supposed to be some time in October of this year, the 17th, I
3 believe it was.

4 And then, in the meantime, at some point, thereafter,
5 I believe, based on the docket, sometime in mid to late July,
6 obviously, Mr. Wenke raised some concerns to Mr. Passafiume that
7 resulted in the 4241 request, which we now have, as the Court's
8 noted -- that they found Mr. Wenke **competent**.

9 So my position is, Judge, is I don't know how we just
10 proceed forward and ignore everything that happened on the 16th
11 of April, when the Court clearly had concerns about Mr. Wenke
12 dangerousness.

13 So I don't know if the Court's in a position just to
14 go ahead and ignore what happened on the 16th and be like:
15 Let's set a sentencing.

16 **THE COURT:** Well, let's take them one step at a time.
17 And I probably could have premised the conversation that way.

18 4241 -- we've got the report, first step. Do we need
19 to have a hearing or should I just find him **competent** and get
20 past the 4241 process?

21 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** Judge, I had no information for the
22 basis of request, so I have no reason to dispute what's in that
23 report -- that Mr. Wenke is **competent**.

24 **THE COURT:** All right. On that point, Mr. Taberski,
25 just on that point -- 4241, **competency** of Mr. Wenke -- anything

1 to say?

2 **THE PROBATION OFFICER:** Judge, I just feel like I need
3 to be careful what I say, because I'm not a lawyer; so I'm just
4 really giving my feedback on the report.

5 But I do have concerns about the report, and that is
6 why I wondered, coming in here today, if there was going to be a
7 hearing that would allow the opportunity for Your Honor to ask
8 questions of the doctor who issued the report.

9 Because I see glaring inconsistencies throughout the
10 report, for example, and also some pretty significant
11 differences between Dr. Leidenfrost's report and Dr. Rutter's
12 report with this one.

13 **THE COURT:** For example?

14 **THE PROBATION OFFICER:** For example, there's this
15 repeated indication in this most recent psychological evaluation
16 that Mr. Wenke's statements and thoughts that he's articulating
17 don't rise to the level of, quote: Delusional.

18 But we've all seen the letters that he writes that
19 indicate things -- for example, all the parties in this
20 Courtroom are colluding together against him.

21 His defense attorney was involved in a sex party on a
22 yacht with people involved with the case. Katie [REDACTED] is
23 now Matt Zenger's girlfriend, in the letter that was filed
24 yesterday with this Court.

25 So how anyone perceives that as less than delusional,

1 I don't know. But Dr. Leidenfrost seemed to think that there
2 was delusional thinking present. And those are just a couple of
3 examples, Your Honor.

4 **THE COURT:** Okay. Mr. Passafiume, 4241, sounds like,
5 at least on that point, I don't have anything else to work with
6 at this point.

7 And I probably ought to just find him competent and
8 move on to a 4244 conversation, shouldn't I?

9 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** That's correct, Judge. And the
10 Government is correct.

11 The request came from the defense, so there's nothing
12 to, kind of, counter my request. And the only thing in front of
13 you, Judge, is that he's competent.

14 **THE COURT:** Okay. All right. So I will -- as to that
15 issue, 4241, I will find that Mr. Wenke is competent based on
16 the report that was received and is docketed.

17 And I had the docket number -- Docket 164 from
18 Drs. Nelson and Watkins out in Chicago.

19 But I do have some of the same concerns that
20 Mr. Taberski just referenced and Mr. DiGiacomo just referenced.

21 We were on one path, which was 4244, when
22 Mr. Passafiume raised the 4241 competency issue.

23 So I don't know how we go back. I really haven't seen
24 anything to justify going back. My concerns are still there.

25 In fact, just from the letter that we received and

1 docketed yesterday, Docket 165 -- there were three letters.

2 There was one addressed to me, one addressed to
3 Judge Vilardo and one addressed to Judge Arcara. And
4 Docket 165-1 -- have you seen that one yet, Mr. Passafiume?

5 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** I haven't, Judge, candidly.

6 **THE COURT:** Does anyone have an extra copy?

7 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** I don't have an extra copy, but I did
8 read them yesterday, Judge.

9 **THE COURT:** Just stand by. Jessica will print it out.
10 165-1. Print it all out. It's not that long.

11 While we're waiting for that to be printed out, I
12 guess, probably not a bad idea to just relay to you, Mr. Wenke,
13 I would rather do exactly what your lawyer just said and
14 sentence you and be done with this and let you go on your merry
15 way.

16 But I took an oath to the Constitution and to the laws
17 in these statute books that I need to do, what I think is right
18 on these facts, irrespective of what might be easier or the path
19 of least resistance.

20 So that's why we're still here talking about this
21 other session, about whether you might have a mental disease or
22 defect that requires you to be hospitalized for treatment, which
23 is what 4244 talks about.

24 So just stand by for just a moment. Docket 165-1 is
25 the letter that was addressed to Judge Vilardo.

1 It's a three-page letter. Well, it's three pages --
2 two-page letter, and the third page is the envelope.

3 It looks like it was mailed out of Oklahoma City
4 November 12th and received here in the building yesterday.

5 And it reads: Digital footprint evidence showing
6 State Assemblyman David DiPietro and State Senator George
7 Borello texting each other, hedging bets on whether they think
8 Judge Vilardo and Judge Sinatra's family members will follow
9 through on murdering each other, as they both try to cover up
10 Judge Arcara's family's drugs and sex trafficking business.

11 David and George are also documented as texting each
12 other about the upcoming Andrew Jackson-style duel that's going
13 to apparently take place between Judge Vilardo and Judge Sinatra
14 as neither of them can currently agree on which of them is going
15 to swear Carl Paladino into office as U.S. ambassador to Brazil
16 when Trump, thank F-ing God, comes back.

17 And that's at the top of that, page one. At the
18 bottom of page one, it reads: Luke Wenke is allegedly afraid of
19 being murdered in custody, when he arrives back in New York
20 State.

21 At the top of page two, it reads: Since he is
22 refusing to cough up the blueprints on how to completely replace
23 interstate threats and cyberstalking situations across state
24 lines -- et cetera.

25 And then, it's signed: Handwriting claimed to be Luke

1 Wenke's. With a parenthetical that says: Katie [REDACTED] is
2 known to smudge copies of Luke Wenke's fingerprints all over her
3 thighs and claim that Trump raped her.

4 So I don't know. I mean, maybe, in the right state of
5 mind, perhaps some of that stuff might be funny, but it is
6 pretty delusional talk to me. I don't know. I'm no
7 psychiatrist.

8 But I think we need to take 4244 seriously and resume
9 where we were on that process, so -- that process hasn't gone
10 anywhere, and I don't think there's anything based on the
11 Leidenfrost report that we've got and seen and based on the
12 report that we just received from Chicago.

13 I still have, in my judgment, reasonable cause to
14 believe that Mr. Wenke may presently be suffering from a mental
15 disease or defect for the treatment of which he is in need of
16 custody for care or treatment in a suitable facility.

17 So the hearing that I ordered way back when is, to the
18 extent I need to order it a second time, I'm doing that.

19 So now we need to talk about what's next. We have the
20 report from the doctors in Chicago. We've all read it.

21 We can hear from those doctors, too, but they weren't
22 really asked the ultimate question that's relevant to 4244,
23 which is, does he have a mental disease or defect that requires
24 hospitalization for treatment? They weren't asked that
25 question.

1 Leidenfrost doesn't really give that opinion, but I'm
2 curious about whether he could give the opinion. He gives the
3 opinion about mental disease or defect.

4 And I wonder if Leidenfrost, if you -- you, the
5 lawyers -- reached out and asked him could he opine on that and
6 he could, then perhaps that testimony is sufficient for the
7 hearing.

8 I don't know what that person's opinion is going to
9 be -- Leidenfrost, but maybe he can give us that opinion.

10 If he can't -- if he can't opine on that issue about
11 whether hospitalized treatment basically is necessary, then we
12 need to order another psychological evaluation.

13 I don't see -- I mean, I guess I could do it without
14 any of that, but I think we'd be going in too skinny of a record
15 that way.

16 Mr. DiGiacomo, am I missing anything?

17 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** No, Judge. You're not missing
18 anything, actually.

19 As you pointed out, if we can't get there, yeah. Then
20 the next -- the next step the Court could order is basically
21 send Mr. Wenke back to the Bureau of Prisons to conduct the 4244
22 determination.

23 Because under the 4241, it was really for the limited
24 purpose, as the statute provides, to determine if Mr. Wenke
25 could understand the nature and consequences of the proceeding

1 against him and assist properly in his defense, which, they
2 said, he apparently can, under this report.

3 When Mr. Passafiume and I -- and he'll correct me if I
4 misstate anything, but when Mr. Passafiume and I spoke with the
5 folks down at the BOP, we tried to get them to see if they would
6 do both -- the 4241 and the 4244 -- and they said no.

7 They said they'd have to have -- in essence, the way I
8 understood it -- and Frank can correct me -- but they would
9 need -- it's two separate and distinct proceedings and two
10 separate, distinct requests and different evaluations.

11 And that's why we were waiting to see if there was a
12 way to do it, so that, if we had to go down that road, Mr. Wenke
13 wasn't inconvenienced to have to come back up and potentially go
14 back down.

15 I guess, Judge, as you point out, then if -- we could
16 see if Mr. Leidenfrost can make that assessment. But if not, I
17 agree with the Court. We're, kind of, boxed in and need to send
18 him back.

19 But then that begs the next question, Judge -- is
20 that, when Dr. Leidenfrost's report came out, defense counsel,
21 Mr. Passafiume, was going to speak with another potential
22 evaluator to kind of refute, I would gather, or to determine if
23 there's points that could be refuted in Dr. Leidenfrost's
24 report. But, then again, that never came about because we had
25 the 4241 request.

1 So I think for next steps, the first thing would be as
2 to do we reach out to Dr. Leidenfrost?

3 And then, if he can't offer such an opinion, then do
4 we send him back?

5 Or does Mr. Passafiume now wish to go back and try to
6 find an expert or have an expert that he had indicated he spoken
7 with to refute Dr. Leidenfrost's report?

8 **THE COURT:** I think, by the way -- before you speak,
9 Mr. Passafiume -- back to Leidenfrost, he opines pretty clearly
10 that psychiatric treatment is necessary.

11 But he doesn't -- nobody was ever asking him the
12 pointed question of the standard in the statute, which is, is it
13 the kind of treatment that the statute says needs to be in the
14 BOP hospital.

15 So do you want to respond to what Mr. DiGiacomo said?

16 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Sure. Sure, Judge.

17 The report from the BOP is frankly so far opposite
18 from Dr. Leidenfrost's report. And although, based on
19 Dr. Rutter's report, Dr. Leidenfrost's report -- I believe, when
20 we were going down that 4244 hearing, I said we have nothing to,
21 kind of, present to counter the mental disease or defect portion
22 of the statute.

23 But I think now this BOP report does counter that
24 where they call this, basically, related to character.

25 I can't pronounce that word -- characterological --

1 but it's stuff that's unlikely to significantly change in the
2 near future.

3 And they diagnose Mr. Wenke with a personality
4 disorder. Very, very different than bipolar or anything like
5 that, where you don't treat personality disorders with
6 medication.

7 And I think the report here -- although it doesn't say
8 that explicitly, but -- basically says, again, nothing's going
9 to change; this is a character flaw, whatever -- whatever you
10 want to call it.

11 So -- so I -- so I do, if Your Honor is going to go
12 down that 4244 road, I -- we do have to have a hearing.

13 You know, it's on me, it's on the defense if we decide
14 to, you know, retain another expert to evaluate and go down that
15 route, you know. That's fine.

16 But I do think, if Your Honor is not inclined to just
17 proceed forward with sentencing, we do have to have a hearing.

18 To -- does that make sense, Judge?

19 **THE COURT:** It does. I think that what we've got --
20 Leidenfrost.

21 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Yeah.

22 **THE COURT:** And we've got the doctors from Chicago
23 that just gave us their report. They can all testify, all of
24 them.

25 And I'm only asking now in advance of this process:

1 Is that enough? Do we need more?

2 You can certainly bring an additional person, if you
3 like, but I'd like to know from **Leidenfrost** in advance if he
4 feels like he can give us an opinion one way or the other.

5 And I, again, I don't care what it is. But can he
6 opine to the statutory standard or not? Has he seen enough that
7 he can give an opinion on 4244?

8 I don't know the answer to that. Because if he can't
9 opine to that, then we've got nobody speaking to 4244. And then
10 I would have to send him down, back into evaluation custody.

11 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** What does that mean, Judge?
12 Evaluation custody?

13 **THE COURT:** I would have to reinstate another
14 **psychological evaluation** specifically for 4244. And I'm
15 reluctant to do that.

16 I'm sensitive to the fact that this is an onerous
17 burden on Mr. Wenke and he's been in custody for 13 months and
18 change -- 13 and a half months.

19 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Sure. But --

20 **THE COURT:** So I'd rather not do it, if we don't have
21 to do it.

22 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Okay. I got you. After the hearing
23 and --

24 **THE COURT:** No. No, no. What I'm saying is right now
25 I'd have to order it. Unless **Leidenfrost** tells me he's got

1 this.

2 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Yeah. I guess --

3 **THE COURT:** You see what I mean?

4 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** And I would contest that now, based
5 on the BOP report.

6 **THE COURT:** Contest what?

7 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** I would -- I would say that there's
8 not reasonable cause to believe that Mr. Wenke's suffering from
9 a mental disease or defect where he needs to be kept in custody,
10 based on the report from the BOP doctors.

11 **THE COURT:** That's for later, right? You can argue
12 that at the hearing ultimately, but I'm ordering the hearing.

13 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** He doesn't get sent, though, pending
14 the hearing? Under 4244.

15 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** I think --

16 **THE COURT:** He can be, if I think it's necessary,
17 right? Am I reading the statutes wrong?

18 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** I think what you're -- Judge -- and
19 correct me if I'm wrong.

20 If I'm understanding the Court, you're saying: If
21 Leidenfrost can opine as to the statutory requirements of 4244
22 and defense counsel's okay with that opinion, whether it's good,
23 bad or indifferent --

24 **THE COURT:** Right. He can cross-examine it; he can --
25 yeah.

1 **MR. DIGIACOMO:** Then you don't have to -- then, unless
2 Mr. Passafiume wants another examination, then you don't send
3 Mr. Wenke back under 4244.

4 However, if **Dr. Leidenfrost** cannot opine as to the
5 statutory requirements of 4244, then the Court has no choice but
6 to send Mr. Wenke back and ask for the -- to make a
7 determination under 4244, which was different than the
8 **evaluation** of which they just submitted this report on
9 November 13th.

10 That's the way I understand the Court's position.

11 **THE COURT:** Does that make sense? I think he did a
12 better job explaining than I did.

13 In other words, if **Leidenfrost** tells us that he is
14 capable -- because of his time that he spent with Mr. Wenke and
15 everything that he's reviewed -- he's capable of giving us a
16 specific answer as to whether 4244 -- whether he needs to, for
17 treatment, be in a **BOP** hospital.

18 If he can give us that opinion, yes or no. Then we
19 don't need any new doctors involved here, from my perspective.

20 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Sure. And I guess -- he's a court
21 expert, if the Court orders him to make that or try to make that
22 finding.

23 But I guess what I'm saying is then --

24 **THE COURT:** I don't know where he came from.
25 **Leidenfrost.**

1 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** He was a joint decision, Your Honor,
2 by both. We wanted to avoid sending Mr. Wenke to BOP.

3 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Yeah.

4 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** And Mr. Passafiume was very -- he
5 pulled from his knowledge and was able to craft an order,
6 whereby the Court paid to have an agreed-upon evaluator here in
7 the Western District undertake that examination, to avoid what
8 happened with Mr. Wenke going to BOP and having to come back.

9 So it was -- although Court paid, it was an
10 agreed-upon -- between the parties.

11 **THE COURT:** All right.

12 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** So, I guess, if we're going back to
13 where we were pre-4241, there's still a -- if Dr. Leidenfrost is
14 able to make that -- give that opinion and says Mr. Wenke is
15 suffering from a mental disease or defect, I --

16 **THE COURT:** Well, he does say that already. He does
17 already say that he's got a mental disease or defect.

18 The next piece of the puzzle is, what do we do about
19 it? That part, his opinion doesn't reach.

20 At least, the written opinion. He might have that
21 opinion in his mind, but not in his written opinion.

22 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Sure. But this all, kind of,
23 disregards, I think, the BOP report.

24 And I think now that the BOP report exists, I think
25 there are grounds to contest that finding, Judge. And

1 whether -- hypothetically, if we do have a hearing and
2 Your Honor requires these two BOP doctors to testify, they might
3 be favorable to the defense and they might say Mr. Wenke does
4 not need care and custody for his mental disease or defect.

5 So I think this BOP report gives, like, a multi verse.
6 It gives an alternate timeline here, because, I think, it is so
7 different from Dr. Leidenfrost's report that it does raise
8 issues on whether Mr. Wenke needs to be in custody, because he's
9 suffering from mental disease or defect.

10 **THE COURT:** Right. I almost feel like we're talking
11 past each other a little bit, though.

12 4244 says that I can, on my own motion, which I've
13 done -- twice -- order a hearing on the present mental condition
14 of the defendant: The Court shall grant the motion, or at any
15 time prior to sentencing shall order such a hearing on its own
16 motion, if the Court is of the opinion that there is reasonable
17 cause to believe that the defendant may presently be suffering
18 from a mental disease or defect, for the treatment of which he
19 is in need of custody for the care or treatment in a suitable
20 facility.

21 So I order the hearing. Sub (b) says: Prior to the
22 hearing, I may order a psychiatric evaluation.

23 What I'm trying to do is avoid another psychiatric
24 evaluation, if we don't need one. We'll have the hearing, and
25 maybe you're -- the new people from Chicago -- and I keep

1 forgetting their names -- but maybe they will convince me that
2 there is no mental disease or defect. I don't know.

3 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** That's right, though. But in the
4 interim, Mr. Wenke stays here. He doesn't get sent off to the
5 BOP.

6 **THE COURT:** Right. Well, that's what I'm trying to --
7 well, I guess what I'm getting at ultimately, guys, is somebody
8 needs to reach out to Leidenfrost and ask the question, to find
9 out whether we've got a sufficient stable of witnesses to have
10 this hearing.

11 And if we do -- if he says: Yes, I think I can make
12 that -- and then you can cross-examine it, or he can
13 cross-examine it, depending on what the opinion is --

14 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Correct.

15 **THE COURT:** -- then we don't need more people visiting
16 with Mr. Wenke.

17 If Leidenfrost can give us a yes or a no, well, then,
18 at least we've got enough evidence that's coming in. Whether --
19 how it looks after cross-examination, I won't know.

20 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** That's right. We were talking past
21 each other. You're right.

22 **THE COURT:** Yeah. So the idea is I'd like not to send
23 him any place else if Leidenfrost tells us he can be that guy.
24 That's all.

25 So maybe we need to set a hearing date and then, in

1 the meantime, give both of you a chance to call **Mr. Leidenfrost**
2 and ask that question.

3 And then you can just report back to me: Hey, I think
4 we're good. He can do it.

5 Or maybe he tells us he needs to meet with Mr. Wenke
6 one more time, which, I think can be accomplished, right? He's
7 local.

8 Mr. Wenke's going to be in one of the local
9 facilities. I assume he is right now, right?

10 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Correct, Judge. I don't see why not,
11 yeah.

12 **THE COURT:** So if he needs to meet with him one more
13 time, that's easy enough to accomplish.

14 **MR. DIGIACOMO:** Judge, I just want to make sure, so
15 that when Mr. Passafiume and I will -- obviously, we've
16 communicated with **Dr. Leidenfrost** in the past -- and I just want
17 to make sure that we're getting to the Court what they want.

18 So we're going to ask -- pursuant to the statute,
19 we're going to ask **Dr. Leidenfrost** -- he already says, as the
20 Court's pointed out, Mr. Wenke's presently suffering from a
21 mental disease or defect.

22 What the Court wants to know, as the statute says, is,
23 is he suffering from a mental disease or defect for the
24 treatment of which he is in need of custody, care or treatment
25 in a suitable facility.

1 Because then, Judge -- then I'm looking at (d), and
2 that's why I want to be careful, to make sure the Court gets
3 what it wants.

4 Because then subsection (d) of 4244 says that -- you
5 know, obviously -- that, if after the hearing -- that the Court
6 finds that the defendant's suffering from a mental disease or
7 defect and that he should, in lieu of being sentenced to a
8 prison, be committed to a suitable facility for care or
9 treatment, the Court can commit the defendant to the custody of
10 the Attorney General.

11 I think I'm just -- I'm trying to be specific, Judge.
12 We need to know from **Dr. Leidenfrost**, does he feel that
13 Mr. Wenke, based upon his finding, needs to be -- needs to get
14 treatment at a suitable facility?

15 **THE COURT:** Yeah. So 4247(c) is addressing the
16 report. And it's (c), subsection (4)(E): "If the examination
17 is ordered under 4244 or 4245, whether the person is suffering
18 from a mental disease or defect, as a result of which he is in
19 need of custody for care or treatment in a suitable facility" --
20 that piece, that second piece is what -- the second half of that
21 sub (E) is what isn't already in **Leidenfrost**.

22 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** Okay. I just want to make sure we --

23 **THE COURT:** So get together. The two of you get
24 together, if you will, please, and ask **Leidenfrost** if he can
25 make that opinion.

1 And if he can, great. Then we've got what we need.

2 And, Mr. Passafiume, you're still entitled to bring somebody
3 else, if you like.

4 But if he can't, for some reason, reach that
5 conclusion on his own, then we've got to get back here again and
6 talk about -- I can't imagine that he can't.

7 I mean, he's -- he's got to the qualifications to do
8 it. Why couldn't he answer one more question, right?

9 Basically, you can bring him here, put him in a chair,
10 and ask him, but I'd rather know whether he's got an opinion,
11 one way or the other, in advance, so we don't waste everybody's
12 time or he can develop one by spending a little more time with
13 Mr. Wenke.

14 All right. So you at least understand what I'm
15 getting at.

16 What about Dr. Rutter? I remember that, but where is
17 that now?

18 Is there a report on the docket somewhere?

19 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Might be on the first -- no, it would
20 be the same -- I don't know, Judge. I don't know if it's on the
21 docket somewhere.

22 **THE COURT:** I remember we talked about it a few times
23 before, but I don't remember seeing that anywhere. So if it's
24 not there, filed somewhere, somebody needs to file it, I think,
25 under seal.

1 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** It might be attached to the
2 sentencing memo on the first violation, but I'll double check
3 and --

4 **THE COURT:** All right. So I think I can give you both
5 until -- when, the end of next week, to give me your report back
6 on what **Leidenfrost** can accomplish?

7 And then just, literally, based on that, I can either
8 set the hearing or have you back in and we can talk about
9 pulling our hair out and having another **psychological**
10 **evaluation**, right?

11 And you don't have any hair left to pull out,
12 Mr. Passafiume, so --

13 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Thanks, Judge.

14 **THE COURT:** Okay. So let's try it that way, which
15 would be the easier way, which means we've got the record,
16 almost, that we need in existence.

17 And so the end of next week, is the -- what's the
18 date? 29?

19 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Correct.

20 **THE COURT:** By Friday the 29th, get me a joint status
21 report on whether this **Dr. Leidenfrost** is the one who can give
22 us that opinion or -- one way or the other, okay?

23 And if he can, then I'm going to give you a tentative
24 hearing date now, that I would then impose or apply, if you're
25 giving me a green light on **Leidenfrost**, all right?

1 So why don't we work together on picking a tentative
2 hearing date -- well, maybe we should wait.

3 Leidenfrost may tell us that he needs another visit
4 with Mr. Wenke, so let's just wait and see.

5 And what I can probably do is have my law clerk -- if
6 there's going to be a hearing set, she can work with both sides
7 to come up with a date that makes sense for everybody -- or a
8 couple days in January, probably, at this point.

9 And I don't think it's going to happen in December,
10 but maybe. If Leidenfrost tells us he's good to go, then we can
11 probably set it up in December.

12 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** Judge, the status report on the 29th,
13 are Mr. Passafiume and I -- is the Court satisfied if we e-mail
14 you? Or do we need to appear on the 29th?

15 **THE COURT:** No, no. File it, though.

16 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** File it?

17 **THE COURT:** A letter, yeah. Put something -- put it
18 on the docket. Some kind of a letter would be fine, on the
19 docket.

20 And that's probably all I need to -- then communicate
21 with you about hearing dates or communicate with you about
22 coming in for a quick status conference.

23 Okay. Rutter is already on the docket; I was having
24 trouble finding it.

25 All right. Well, what else, while we're all together?

1 Mr. DiGiacomo?

2 **MR. DiGIACOMO:** Nothing from the Government, Your Honor,
3 thank you.

4 **THE COURT:** Mr. Passafiume?

5 **MR. PASSAFIUME:** Nothing, Judge.

6 **THE COURT:** Mr. Taberski?

7 **THE PROBATION OFFICER:** Nothing, Your Honor. Thank you.

8 **THE COURT:** All right, everybody.

9 Thank you, take care.

10

11 (Proceedings concluded at 3:03 p.m.)

12

* * *

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

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.

s/ Bonnie S. Weber
Signature

May 27, 2025
Date

BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
Western District of New York