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

June 21, 2023

1:04 p.m.

LUKE MARSHALL WENKE, * VIOLATION HEARING

*

Defendant. *

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

V.

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

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: TRINI E. ROSS,

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

Assistant United States Attorney,

Federal Centre,

138 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14202,

Appearing for the United States.

For the Defendant: FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE

By ALEXANDER J. ANZALONE, ESQ.,

FONDA KUBIAK, ESQ.,

Assistant Federal Public Defenders,

300 Pearl Street,

Suite 200,

Buffalo, New York 14202.

The Courtroom Deputy: KIRSTIE L. HENRY

```
1
     The Court Reporter:
                                 BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR,
                                 Notary Public,
 2
                                 Robert H. Jackson Courthouse,
                                 2 Niagara Square,
 3
                                 Buffalo, New York 14202,
                                 Bonnie Weber@nywd.uscourts.gov.
 4
 5
             Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
                     transcript produced by computer.
 6
 7
                   (Proceedings commenced at 1:04 p.m.)
 8
 9
             THE CLERK: All rise.
10
             The United States District Court for the Western
11
12
    District of New York is now in session. The Honorable John
13
    Sinatra presiding.
14
             THE COURT: Please be seated.
             THE CLERK: Court calls United States versus
15
    Luke Marshal Wenke, Case Number 22-CR-35. This is a date set
16
17
    for a violation hearing.
18
             Counsel, please state your appearances for the record.
19
             MR. RUDROFF: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
20
    David Rudroff and Charles Kruly on behalf of the Government.
2.1
             MR. ANZALONE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
    Alexander Anzalone and Fonda Kubiak from the Federal Defenders
22
23
    Office. We're here on behalf of Mr. Wenke, who is seated to our
24
    left in custody.
25
             THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon, Counsel. And good
```

```
1
    afternoon, Mr. Wenke.
 2
             THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
             MR. ANZALONE: Good afternoon.
 3
             THE COURT: Okay. Anything we need to do regarding
 4
    this revocation hearing before we get started with witnesses
 5
 6
    from the Government?
 7
             MR. RUDROFF: Nothing from the Government, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone?
 8
 9
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, I would just ask the
    nontestifying witnesses to be excluded.
10
11
             I know the Government usually asks for an exception
12
    for their case agent. This is a VOSR hearing. I don't think
13
    that's necessary here.
             THE COURT: Hang on a second. It's only the
14
15
    testifying -- people who would follow on that you would be
    concerned about for a sequestration, isn't it?
16
             So it would be the second and third or fourth
17
18
    witnesses, not somebody who is just sitting here observing.
19
             MR. ANZALONE: I'd agree.
20
             THE COURT: If that's what you meant by that?
21
             MR. ANZALONE: If I wasn't clear, then that's what I
22
    meant.
23
             THE COURT: Mr. Rudroff --
24
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, I don't have an objection.
25
    I intend to call Probation Officer Zenger first and then --
```

```
1
    yeah, so then Special Agent Krystie Brown from the FBI second.
 2
             THE COURT: Just those two witnesses?
 3
             MR. RUDROFF: The only two witnesses, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. So your second witness should be
 4
 5
    remaining in the hallway until we need her.
 6
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.
 7
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 8
             All right. So, Mr. Rudroff --
 9
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor. Does the Court prefer
    a brief opening remark or just get right into it?
10
             THE COURT: I don't think I need it. I think I'm
11
12
    familiar with what's going on and what the allegations are.
             MR. RUDROFF: Understood, Your Honor. The Government
13
    calls Probation Officer Matt Zenger.
14
15
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone, do you need to say
    something?
16
17
             MR. ANZALONE: I do not.
             THE COURT: Okay.
18
19
             Mr. Zenger, come on up. Please stay standing. Raise
20
    your right hand for the oath.
21
22
                             MATTHEW ZENGER,
23
    witness on behalf of the GOVERNMENT, having first been duly
24
     sworn, testified as follows:
25
```

```
1
             THE WITNESS: I do.
 2
             THE CLERK: Thank you.
 3
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone, does your client need to be
 4
    reminded of what his rights are under Rule 32? I assume he know
 5
    them through you and Ms. Kubiak.
             MR. ANZALONE: He does. We've gone through them and,
 6
7
    as you can see, many of those rights are being exercised today.
 8
             THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure that I
 9
    don't need to read the litany to him.
             Okay, Mr. Rudroff, your witness.
10
11
             MR. RUDROFF:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
12
                    DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. RUDROFF:
13
14
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
15
         Good afternoon, Officer Zenger. Can you please state and
16
    spell your name for the record?
17
18
         Matthew Zenger, M-A-T-T-H-E-W, Z-E-N-G-E-R.
    Α.
19
         And where are you currently employed?
    Q.
20
    Α.
         U.S. Probation.
2.1
         How long have you been a U.S. probation officer?
22
         Since January of 2018.
23
         Can you just briefly describe your duties as a U.S.
24
    probation officer as it results -- relates to people on
25
    supervised release?
```

```
Matthew Zenger - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23
```

- 1 A. Currently my duties include supervising offenders in the
- 2 community to ensure that they follow the conditions that were
- 3 imposed by the Court.
- 4 Q. And are you familiar with a person named Luke Wenke?
- 5 A. I am.
- 6 Q. How are you familiar with Mr. Wenke?
- 7 A. Mr. Wenke is one of the individuals that I supervise.
- 8 Q. Do you see him in the courtroom today?
- 9 A. I do.
- 10 Q. Can you please identify him for the record?
- 11 A. He is the individual sitting with the two defense
- 12 attorneys.
- 13 Q. How long have you supervised Mr. Wenke?
- 14 A. Since approximately the end of March of this year.
- 15 Q. of 2023?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Are you familiar with whether this is Mr. Wenke's first
- 18 | time of supervised release Federally?
- 19 A. It is.
- 20 Q. Okay.
- MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, would the Court prefer that
- 22 I approach the witness with an exhibit or simply put it on the
- 23 ELMO?
- 24 THE COURT: Do you have any problems, Mr. Anzalone,
- 25 just using the ELMO?

Matthew Zenger - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23

```
1
             MR. ANZALONE: No.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Rudroff.
 3
             MR. ANZALONE: Well, provided I can see what's on the
    ELMO.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: We will all have that need, right.
             MR. ANZALONE:
                            Thank you.
 6
7
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
    Q. Officer Zenger --
 8
 9
                            One moment, I'm still not getting it
             MR. ANZALONE:
10
    here.
11
             THE COURT:
                         Stand by, Mr. Anzalone.
12
             MR. ANZALONE: Thank you.
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
13
         Officer Zenger, I've put on the ELMO what I've marked for
14
15
    identification as Government Exhibit 1. And for record
    purposes, this was provided to the defense before today's
16
17
    hearing.
18
         Do you recognize Government Exhibit 1, Officer Zenger?
19
         I do.
    Α.
20
         What is Government Exhibit 1?
    Q.
2.1
         This is the judgment in a criminal case, which essentially
22
    outlines the conditions that were imposed by the Court, or the
23
    entire sentence imposed by the Court at the time of sentencing.
24
         And have you reviewed that entire exhibit?
25
         I did.
    Α.
```

```
1
    0.
         And is that a true and accurate copy of the judgment of
 2
    conviction in 22-CR-35?
 3
    Α.
         Yes, it appears so.
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, I offer Government Exhibit 1
 4
    into evidence.
 5
 6
              THE COURT: Any objection?
 7
             MR. ANZALONE: No objection.
              THE COURT: Government Exhibit 1 is admitted.
 8
 9
    The following was received in Evidence:
10
     GOVT. EXH. 1
11
12
13
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
14
15
         Officer Zenger, did you review this document with the
16
    defendant?
         I did.
17
    Α.
18
         Approximately when was that?
         I believe we covered it -- we reviewed the document
19
20
    together over the phone a few days prior to his release.
2.1
         And then he reported to the office in person the first
22
    business day following his release, at which time we reviewed it
23
    together in person again.
24
    Q. Can you tell the Court what your standard practice is
25
    reviewing judgments of convictions of supervisees?
```

```
MR. ANZALONE: Objection. Relevance.
```

THE COURT: I'll allow it. And I'm assuming he's going to get to what his recollection is here as to this defendant, right?

MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Yes. So we review every condition from the mandatory conditions to the standard conditions to the special conditions, each line item with the defendant.

BY MR. RUDROFF:

- 11 Q. And is that what you, in fact, did with Mr. Wenke with
- 12 respect to Government Exhibit 1?
- 13 A. Yes.

1

5

6

7

8

9

- 14 Q. Turning to page four of Government Exhibit 1. What are we
- 15 | looking at on page four, Officer Zenger?
- 16 A. So page four lists the standard conditions of supervision.
- 17 So those are the conditions that every person on supervised
- 18 release has to follow.
- 19 Q. Okay. And you reviewed these conditions with Mr. Wenke
- 20 when you began supervising him?
- 21 A. I did.
- 22 Q. Looking at the bottom of page four, can you read that block
- 23 underneath U.S. Probation office use only?
- $24 \mid A$. Upon a finding of a violation of probation or supervised
- 25 | release, I understand that this Court may: One, revoke

1 supervision.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Two, extend the terms of supervision; or three, modify the conditions of probation or supervised release.

A U.S. probation officer has instructed me on the conditions specified by the Court and has provided me with a written copy of this judgment containing these conditions.

For further information regarding these conditions, see overview of probation and supervised release conditions available at www.UScourts.gov.

- 10 Q. And do you recognize those signatures underneath that
- 11 portion you just read?
- 12 A. I do.
- 13 Q. Whose signatures are those?
- 14 A. It is the defendant's signature, next to the defendant's
- 15 signature. And then my own signature next to U.S. probation
- 16 officer.
- 17 Q. And did you watch the defendant sign this form?
- 18 A. I did.
- 19 Q. Turning to page five of Government Exhibit 1, what are we
- 20 looking at on page five?
- 21 A. These are the special conditions of supervision. So these
- 22 are the conditions that the Court is intending to meet the
- 23 offender's specific needs.
- So they may or may not even be conditions that fall into
- 25 this area, but these are the conditions that the Court felt was

- 1 relevant for the defendant.
- 2 Q. And can you just read into the record the very last special
- 3 conditions on page five?
- 4 A. "The defendant shall not have any contact directly or
- 5 indirectly, including through social media, telephone, text,
- 6 mail or e-mail with the victim, RG, his family members or his
- 7 | current or prior places of employment."
- 8 Q. And did you review all of the special conditions of
- 9 | supervision with the defendant in this case?
- 10 A. I did.
- 11 Q. Did you review the special conditions of supervision with
- 12 the defendant before he signed on page four --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. -- that we just looked at?
- 15 Did you give the defendant an opportunity to ask questions
- 16 about the conditions of his supervision?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Do you recall if he asked any questions?
- 19 A. I do not recall if he had any questions.
- 20 Q. If he had asked any questions, would you have answered them
- 21 for him?
- 22 A. Absolutely.
- 23 Q. Did you make sure that the defendant understood all of the
- 24 | conditions before he signed?
- 25 A. It seemed as though he did.

```
1
             MR. ANZALONE: Objection. Speculative.
 2
             THE COURT: Overruled. And the observation's
 3
    occurring to me now, since we're reading the special condition
    at the bottom of page five, that that my assumption is we're
 4
    going to use initials, Mr. Rudroff, as opposed to full names?
 5
 6
             Or, actually, the more I say that out loud, the more I
7
    realize it's probably going to become a moot point once we look
 8
    at some of these exhibits, right?
 9
             MR. RUDROFF:
                            That's correct, Your Honor. I think the
    intention was to do that, but some of these exhibits have full
10
11
    names and I don't really think there is a way around it.
12
             THE COURT: Okay.
13
             Mr. Anzalone, do you see it the same way?
14
             MR. ANZALONE: I do, yes.
15
             THE COURT: Okay. All right.
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
16
17
         So I suppose to ask that a different way -- excuse me.
                                                                 Did
18
    the defendant say or do anything to suggest that he did not
    understand the conditions --
19
20
    Α.
         No.
2.1
         -- of his release?
22
         Officer Zenger, putting on the ELMO what I've marked as
23
    Government Exhibit 2.
24
         Do you recognize that?
25
         I do.
    Α.
```

```
1 Q. What is Government Exhibit 2?
```

- 2 A. It is a petition for offender under supervision.
- 3 Q. Is that the petition for offender under supervision that
- 4 | you submitted to the Court in this case?
- 5 A. It is.
- 6 Q. Is it a true and complete copy of the petition that you
- 7 | submitted in this case?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Can you very briefly explain why you submitted the petition
- 10 for offender under supervision in this case?
- 11 A. Shortly prior to filing the petition I received -- I was
- 12 notified by the Government and the FBI that the defendant had
- 13 sent an e-mail to an individual --
- 14 MR. ANZALONE: Objection. Hearsay.
- 15 THE COURT: It's not for a hearsay purpose at this
- 16 point, so I will overrule it.
- 17 | THE WITNESS: -- to an individual that shares office
- 18 | space with the victim of the original case.
- 19 BY MR. RUDROFF:
- 20 Q. And is that e-mail set forth on pages two, three and four
- 21 of the petition?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And is it set forth verbatim?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Thank you.

```
1
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, I have nothing further for
 2
    Mr. Zenger.
 3
             THE COURT: Are you going to move in Exhibit 2 or are
    you not doing that, Mr. Rudroff?
 4
 5
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor, I do offer that into
 6
    evidence. I suppose that's an important part I overlooked.
 7
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone?
             MR. ANZALONE: No objection.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: All right. Government 2 is admitted.
10
11
    The following was received in Evidence:
     GOVT. EXH. 2
12
13
             THE COURT: And are you done with your direct?
14
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone?
16
17
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes, Your Honor, if I could have one
18
    moment, please?
19
             THE COURT: Sure.
20
             MR. ANZALONE: Thank you.
2.1
22
                    CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ANZALONE:
23
    BY MR. ANZALONE:
24
25
    Q. Officer Zenger, good afternoon.
```

- 1 A. Good afternoon.
- 2 Q. Couple quick questions. When you reviewed the conditions
- 3 | with Mr. Wenke, that was after he was released from his
- 4 sentence, correct?
- 5 A. We actually reviewed the conditions twice, I believe. Once
- 6 over the phone.
- 7 Q. You reviewed them once with him over the phone?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And that was just a few days before he was released; is
- 10 | that right?
- 11 A. Yes. Correct.
- 12 Q. And then you reviewed them a second time with him in person
- 13 | after he was released?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 Q. At that point, the judgment is final at that point,
- 16 | correct?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. You asked him if he understood the conditions, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. But he doesn't have an opportunity to go back and ask the
- 21 | judge to change the conditions; is that right?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- MR. ANZALONE: I have nothing further.
- 25 **THE COURT:** Any redirect, Mr. Rudroff?

```
1
             MR. RUDROFF: No redirect, Your Honor.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Zenger, you may step down.
 3
              (The Witness was Excused.)
 4
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, the Government calls Special
 5
    Agent Krystie Brown from the FBI.
 6
             THE COURT: Come on up, Ms. Brown, and remaining
7
    standing when you get up to the witness stand, please.
 8
 9
                              KRYSTIE BROWN,
    witness on behalf of the GOVERNMENT, having first been duly
10
11
     sworn, testified as follows:
12
13
             THE WITNESS: I do.
14
             THE CLERK:
                          Thank you.
15
             THE COURT: Please be seated.
16
             THE CLERK: Can you please say your name and spell it
    for the record?
17
18
             THE WITNESS: Krystie Brown, K-R-Y-S-T-I-E, B-R-O-W-N.
             THE COURT: Mr. Rudroff.
19
20
             MR. RUDROFF: Thank you, Your Honor.
2.1
             DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. RUDROFF:
22
23
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
24
25
         Special Agent Brown, where are you employed?
```

```
1 A. I'm employed with the FBI.
```

- 2 Q. What's your position with the FBI?
- 3 A. I'm a special agent.
- 4 Q. How long have you held that position?
- 5 A. Since 2017.
- 6 Q. Are you assigned to any particular squad or group with the
- 7 FBI?
- 8 A. Yes. I work on the joint terrorism task force, working
- 9 counterterrorism.
- 10 Q. And what very generally are your duties with the -- if I
- 11 | say JTTF, you understand that to mean Joint Terrorism Task
- 12 Force?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 | Q. Can you please tell the Court what your duties are very
- 15 | generally for JTTF?
- 16 A. Yes. I investigate Federal statutes and violations of
- 17 Federal law.
- 18 Q. Special Agent Brown, are you familiar with a person named
- 19 Luke Wenke?
- 20 A. Yes, I am.
- 21 Q. How are you familiar with Luke Wenke?
- 22 A. Luke Wenke was the subject of an investigation involving a
- 23 | criminal defense attorney located in Minneapolis.
- 24 Q. Do you know when that investigation occurred?
- 25 A. It began at the end of 2020.

- 1 Q. Do you know if that investigation ultimately developed into
- 2 a prosecution and conviction of Luke Wenke?
- 3 A. Yes, it did.
- 4 Q. Do you know if Luke Wenke was incarcerated as a result of
- 5 that prosecution?
- 6 MR. ANZALONE: Objection. Relevance.
- 7 THE COURT: I'll allow it. Overruled.
- 8 You can answer.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Yes, he was.
- 10 BY MR. RUDROFF:
- 11 Q. Did you receive information that Mr. Wenke was approaching
- 12 his release date in March of 2023?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Do you know when, or if and when he was ultimately released
- 15 from prison?
- 16 A. Yes. He was released at the end of March 2023.
- 17 | Q. Did -- or are you aware, did the FBI continue to monitor
- 18 Mr. Wenke after his release from prison?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Can you tell the Court what that monitoring involved?
- 21 \mid A. Yes. It just monitored publicly available information.
- 22 Q. Did that include the defendant's social media?
- 23 MR. ANZALONE: Objection. Leading.
- 24 THE COURT: Why don't you rephrase that, Mr. Rudroff.
- 25 Sustained.

```
1
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
 2
         Did the FBI review or monitor Mr. Wenke's social media
 3
    accounts?
 4
             MR. ANZALONE: Same objection.
             THE COURT: It's overruled.
 5
             Go ahead, you can answer.
 6
 7
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
 8
 9
         Did the FBI gather any non publicly available information
10
    as a part of that continued monitoring?
11
         No.
    Α.
12
         What was the purpose of continuing to monitor Mr. Wenke
    after his release?
13
         We wanted to make sure that he wasn't -- he didn't continue
14
15
    to be a threat to public safety.
             MR. ANZALONE: Object to that characterization.
16
17
             THE WITNESS: And also --
18
             THE COURT: Overruled.
19
             You can continue, Ms. Brown.
20
             THE WITNESS: We also wanted to monitor and confirm
2.1
    that the victim in the case was being protected. And that's it.
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
22
23
         So were you monitoring Mr. Wenke to see whether he was
24
    contacting the victim in the case, RG?
25
         Yes.
    Α.
```

```
Krystie Brown - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23
```

```
1 Q. Why was that?
```

- 2 A. Because the history of the case was that the victim was
- 3 | harassed through social media, along with other electronic
- 4 means.
- 5 Q. Did RG eventually reach out to law enforcement regarding
- 6 Luke Wenke after his release from prison?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 MR. RUDROFF: If we can display the ELMO one more
- 9 time.
- 10 THE COURT: Is this 3 for identification, Mr. Rudroff?
- 11 MR. RUDROFF: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 13 BY MR. RUDROFF:
- 14 Q. Special Agent Brown, I've put on the ELMO what I've marked
- 15 as Government Exhibit 3 for identification.
- 16 Do you recognize that?
- 17 | A. Yes, I do.
- 18 O. What is Government Exhibit 3?
- 19 A. This is an e-mail sent by [Victim 1] to law enforcement.
- 20 Q. And can you just read into the record what that e-mail
- 21 states from Mr.
- 22 A. "Drew, David and Jason, good morning, guys. Well, here we
- 23 go again. Below is an e-mail and a picture attached from
- 24 Luke Wenke to attorney Andy B
- 25 Luke e-mailed it to Andy over the weekend. Luke obviously

```
Krystie Brown - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23
knows he cannot communicate with me, but this seems to be
third-party contact in that he knows Andy and I share the same
office space and are close.
     Not sure what, if anything, you want to do about it.
Thanks for your consideration.
    And if we go below --
         MR. RUDROFF:
                       Judge, I apologize, but I have a second
Government Exhibit 3. It's the exact same document and the
version that I put on the ELMO is the version that I marked up
for my own notes. Is that okay if we swap in a clean copy?
         THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Anzalone?
         MR. ANZALONE: No.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. RUDROFF: I can show it.
```

14

MR. ANZALONE: Thank you.

THE COURT: No issues.

MR. RUDROFF: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. RUDROFF:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

- 19 So the e-mail from Mr. [V1] stated below, when we go down,
- 20 what are we looking at here at the bottom of that first page?
- 2.1 This is an e-mail from Andy B
- 22 And what's the subject line? Q.
- 23 Forwarded: George Floyd is dead and that's a good thing.
- 24 So we'll flip to page two of Government Exhibit 3. What
- 25 are we looking at here?

```
1
         This is an e-mail sent from Luke Marshal Wenke at Proton.ME
   Α.
2
   to Andy B
3
        Are you familiar with Proton.ME?
   Q.
4
   Α.
        Yes.
5
        What is that?
        It's an e-mail service, an e-mail server that uses
6
7
   end-to-end encryption.
8
        Do you know if Proton servers are located within the United
   States?
```

- 10 A. They are not.
- 11 Q. Have you seen Proton used as an e-mail server in your
- 12 | custody issues in the past?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. What is your understanding of why a person would use Proton as opposed to a more conventional e-mail server?
- 16 MR. ANZALONE: Objection. Relevance.
- 17 **THE COURT:** Overruled.
- You can answer.
- 19 **THE WITNESS:** It's good to use Proton e-mail because 20 the servers are not located in the U.S., they can't be
- 21 subpoenaed and it's better for confidentiality.
- 22 BY MR. RUDROFF:
- 23 Q. So you stated that this e-mail was to Andy B
- 24 | correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. When was that e-mail sent, according to the header?
- 2 A. Saturday May 13, 2023, at 10:23 a.m.
- 3 Q. And I won't ask you to read the entire e-mail into the
- 4 record, because it is lengthy, but have you read the entire
- 5 e-mail that we're discussing?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Can you just very generally summarize the content of the
- 8 e-mail?
- 9 A. The content of the e-mail focuses on Benjamin Ryan
- 10 and **[V1]**
- 11 Q. Who is Benjamin Ryan ?
- 12 A. Benjamin Ryan was a subject of an FBI investigation
- 13 who was arrested towards the end of 2020.
- 14 Q. Do you know his relationship, if any, to the defendant?
- 15 \mid A. My understanding is they had a romantic relationship.
- 16 Q. Do you know if there is any association between Mr. [Ryan]
- 17 and Mr. [V1]
- 18 A. Yes. was the criminal defense attorney
- 19 representing Benjamin Ryan
- 20 Q. Do you know if he was Mr. [Ryan] 's only defense attorney?
- 21 A. He was not.
- 22 Q. Who else represented Mr. in that matter?
- 23 A. Andy B
- 24 Q. So again, without reading the entire e-mail into the
- 25 record, there is just a few high points that I would like you to

```
Krystie Brown - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23
 1
    illustrate for the Court, if you could.
 2
         Read it out loud?
         No. No. I'm sorry. Don't start reading. I'll tell you
 3
    Q.
 4
    where. Can you start or just read the sentence where I'm
 5
    indicating with my finger?
 6
         It's the first full paragraph, the sentence starts with:
7
    never.
 8
             MR. ANZALONE: Objection. This is not evidence.
 9
             THE COURT: That was my next comment.
10
             MR. RUDROFF: That's correct, Your Honor.
11
             THE COURT: So are you moving it into evidence?
12
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, based on Special Agent
13
    Brown's comments earlier regarding authentication, I do move it
    into evidence at this point.
14
15
             THE COURT: Any objections?
             MR. ANZALONE: I object. I don't think it's been
16
17
    properly authenticated.
18
             THE COURT: What's your authentication argument,
    Mr. Rudroff?
19
20
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, Ms. Brown testified that
21
    this is a true and correct copy of the e-mail that she received
22
    from -- or that law enforcement received from Mr. B
```

THE COURT: Well, I think, Mr. Rudroff, you probably need a couple of links in the foundation. I see your name is up

23

24

25

March of 2023.

there. You are not testifying now, though.

But you might need to lay the foundation on how it came from you or Jason Bedrol or Elizabeth Duo or Andrew Winter over to the witness.

5 MR. RUDROFF: No, I think that I can prove that up, 6 Your Honor.

BY MR. RUDROFF:

1

2

3

4

- 8 Q. Special Agent Brown, how did you come to be aware of this 9 e-mail chain that was sent to myself, Mr. Winter and Mr. Bedrol?
- 10 A. Sure. I'm a co-case agent on Luke Wenke's case through the
- 11 Federal Bureau of Investigation. And this was reported to us
- 12 through the U.S. Attorneys Office.
- 13 Q. Did you ultimately interview Mr. B about this?
- 14 A. Yes, I did.
- 15 | Q. What, if anything, did he state about this e-mail?
- 16 | A. He said the e-mail made him anxious and concerned.
- 17 Q. Let's back up a little bit. Did he state whether or not he
- 18 | actually received it?
- 19 A. Yes. He did confirm that he received this e-mail.
- 20 Q. And what did he say he had did with the e-mail after he
- 21 received it?
- 22 A. He forwarded it to
- MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, based on that, I would move this Government Exhibit 3 into evidence.
- 25 **THE COURT:** Mr. Anzalone?

Krystie Brown - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23 I'm sorry, can I have one moment 1 MR. ANZALONE: 2 please, Your Honor? 3 THE COURT: Yes. 4 MR. ANZALONE: Thank you. Your Honor, I still would object on authentication grounds. Our position is that the bulk 5 6 of this exhibit has still not been authenticated. 7 THE COURT: I would overrule that. I think the foundation is there and the rest is for cross-examination. 8 9 So please proceed. Exhibit 3 is admitted. 10 The following was received in Evidence: GOVT. EXH. 3 11 12 BY MR. RUDROFF: 13 Thank you, Your Honor. So back to what we were discussing 14 before, Special Agent Brown, we'll zoom in a little bit. 15 16 Can you please read that sentence that starts with: I never -- I'm indicating with my finger? It's the first large 17 18 paragraph? "I never got arrested my entire life until age 29, when I 19 20 made the mistake of having a heart for your client, Benjamin 2.1 He acted like he was stranded out there." Ryan 22 You can stop there. I'm sorry. Just that one sentence. 23 Going to the next paragraph, the first sentence starts with:

24

25

Over a year went on --

Can you read just that sentence?

```
1
          "Over a year went on and your comrade
    Α.
                                                   [V1]
                                                            continued
 2
    to make fake recon profiles, speaking to me very impersonally
    when he could have just spoken to me directly."
 3
 4
         Two paragraphs down, the last sentence -- we don't need to
    0.
    read the full sentence, but starting with the word, "this" --
 5
    where I'm indicating with my finger?
 6
 7
         Can you read just that portion of that sentence?
         "This is what your wonderful colleague did to me."
 8
    Α.
 9
         Turning to the next page of that exhibit, the paragraph
    Q.
10
    that begins with: Thank you.
11
         Can you read that second sentence that starts with:
                                                                Thank
12
    you for -- ?
         "Thank you for the felony, but I would like it gone now."
13
         And then lastly the third paragraph from the bottom, where
14
15
    I'm indicating the sentence begins with: Also, your client --
    can you please read that sentence?
16
17
         "Also, your client lied about my grandfather's hunting
18
    rifle."
         As an investigator did you attach any significance to these
19
20
    references we just read?
2.1
    Α.
         Yes.
22
         What significance do they have?
    Q.
23
         They demonstrate Mr. Wenke's knowledge that Andy B
                            and worked as a co-counsel with
24
    represented Ryan
25
       [V1]
```

```
1 Q. And who signed that e-mail at the bottom?
```

- A. Luke Wenke.
- 3 MR. ANZALONE: I'm going to object to that.
- 4 THE COURT: What's the basis for the objection,
- 5 Mr. Anzalone?

- 6 MR. ANZALONE: It's speculation as to who signed it.
- 7 | There are words on the paper, I guess, but that's my objection.
- 8 THE COURT: Okay. I'll let the answer stand. The 9 document says what it says. His name is at the bottom and you
- 10 can argue to me why I should disregard that.
- 11 BY MR. RUDROFF:
- 12 Q. Special Agent Brown, is there any other indication that
- 13 | this letter actually came from Mr. Wenke? This e-mail, excuse
- 14 me, actually came from Mr. Wenke?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. What is that?
- 17 A. It has the same writing style and mentions a lot of the
- 18 | same material in the past. There is also a picture attached to
- 19 it.
- 20 Q. The last page of Government's Exhibit 3, is that the
- 21 attachment that you were referring to?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 \mid Q. Do you recognize the people in that paragraph?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Who are they?

```
Krystie Brown - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23
```

- 1 A. Luke Wenke, his mother and who I understand to be a local
- 2 politician.
- 3 Q. Now, you mentioned earlier that you had investigated
- 4 Mr. Wenke, his underlying case; is that correct?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Based on your investigation in the underlying case, did you
- 7 | have any reason to believe that Mr. Wenke was familiar with
- 8 Mr. B
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. What basis is that?
- 11 A. Mr. Wenke e-mailed [V1] an e-mail previously. I
- 12 believe it was December 2020, where he mentioned B in the
- 13 e-mail several times.
- 14 Q. I've put on the ELMO what I have marked for identification
- 15 as Government's Exhibit 4.
- 16 Do you recognize that?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. What is that e-mail -- or excuse me -- what is Government's
- 19 Exhibit 4?
- 20 A. This is a true and accurate representation of an e-mail
- 21 Luke Wenke sent to V1
- 22 Q. So you jumped the gun. Is that a true, accurate and
- 23 | complete copy of the e-mail that you referenced?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And how did the FBI obtain these e-mails?

```
THE COURT: This e-mail, Exhibit 4?
 1
 2
             MR. RUDROFF: This e-mail.
 3
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
         Excuse me. This e-mail, Government Exhibit 4?
 4
    0.
 5
         This was given to the FBI by
                                          [V1]
 6
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, based on that, I move to
7
    admit Government's Exhibit 4 into evidence.
 8
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, can I have a moment,
 9
    please?
             THE COURT: Yes.
10
11
             MR. ANZALONE: Thank you. No objection.
12
             THE COURT: Okay. Government Exhibit 4 is admitted.
13
     The following was received in Evidence:
14
     GOVT. EXH. 4
15
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
16
17
         In looking at the header of that e-mail, who does
    Government Exhibit 4 report to be from?
18
         Luke Wenke -- from the e-mail address, LukeWenke@Yahoo.com.
19
20
         And if you could just read that last line of the first
    Q.
2.1
    paragraph of Government Exhibit 4?
22
         "I am aware you and the B are close with the judge."
23
         And the last paragraph -- or last sentence, excuse me, of
24
    the second to last paragraph of the e-mail?
25
    Α.
         "You and the B
                               are shockingly good at what you do,
```

```
Krystie Brown - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23
```

- 1 and I have learned a lot these past few months, being someone
- 2 | who only has traffic ticket cases behind my belt."
- 3 Q. And based on the header of Government Exhibit 4, when was
- 4 that e-mail sent?
- 5 A. Wednesday December 16, 2020, at 7:48 p.m.
- 6 Q. And you mentioned earlier that you interviewed Mr. B
- 7 | as part of your investigation in this case; is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Based on that interview, are you familiar with where
- 10 Mr. B practices law?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Where is that?
- 13 A. His law firm is located in the same office as [V1] in
- 14 Minneapolis.
- 15 | Q. I'm showing you on the ELMO what I have marked as
- 16 Government Exhibit 5.
- 17 Are you familiar with Government Exhibit 5?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. What is Government Exhibit 5?
- 20 A. This is information from B Criminal Defense website.
- 21 Q. When you say B Criminal Defense, what is that?
- 22 A. This is the law firm that's owned by B
- 23 Q. And is Government Exhibit 5 a true and accurate copy of
- 24 | that portion of the website that you mentioned?
- 25 A. Yes, it is.

```
Krystie Brown - Rudroff/Direct - 6/21/23
```

```
1
         When did you last visit that website as part of this
    Q.
 2
    investigation?
 3
    Α.
         Today.
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, I move Government Exhibit 5
 4
 5
    into evidence.
 6
             THE COURT: Ms. Brown, you said this law firm was
7
    owned by B
                                    , is that who you are talking
                       Andv
    about?
 8
 9
             THE WITNESS:
                           Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: Okay. Any objection, Mr. Anzalone?
10
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes, Your Honor. I'm objecting on
11
12
    relevance grounds.
             There has been no showing that Mr. Wenke has used this
13
    website, was aware of this website, his access and this
14
15
    information, it's completely irrelevant to this proceeding.
             THE COURT: What's the relevance proffer, Mr. Rudroff?
16
17
             MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, it is publicly facing
18
    information that shows that the address for Mr. B
    criminal defense practice is at the same address, including the
19
                                   's practice.
20
    same suite number as
                            [V1]
2.1
             Again, it is publicly available information. When you
22
    Google Mr. B
                 , it's the first thing that comes up.
23
    whether or not it is -- I would say whether or not Mr. Wenke
24
    actually visited this website, whether there is proof of that
25
    goes to the weight that the Court should give it, not its
```

```
1
    admissibility.
              However, when it is one of the first results on
 2
 3
    Google, I believe the Court should admit it as relevant to
 4
    Mr. Wenke's knowledge here or what he should have known.
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. I'll admit it. The Government
    Exhibit 5 is admitted.
 6
7
    The following was received in Evidence:
 8
     GOVT. EXH. 5
 9
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
10
11
    Q. So looking at Government Exhibit 5, Special Agent Brown,
12
                                              's criminal defense
    can you read the address for Mr. B
    practice?
13
         333 South Seventh Street, Number 3020.
14
15
         Now, I've put Government Exhibit 6 for identification on
    the ELMO as well.
16
17
         Do you recognize that, Special Agent Brown?
18
         Yes.
    Α.
    Q.
         And what is that?
19
                                             's law firm website.
20
         This is information from
                                      [V1]
    Α.
2.1
         And is this a true and accurate representation of the
    Ο.
    information on that website?
22
23
    Α.
         Yes.
24
    Q.
         When is the last time you viewed that website?
25
    Α.
         Today.
```

```
MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, I move Government Exhibit 6
 1
 2
    into evidence.
 3
             MR. ANZALONE: Same objection. I'm objecting based on
    relevance for the reasons previously stated.
 4
 5
             THE COURT:
                          Okay. Overruled. Exhibit 6 is admitted.
     The following was received in Evidence:
 6
 7
     GOVT. EXH. 6
 8
 9
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
         Special Agent Brown, can you please read the address for
10
11
              's law firm?
       [V1]
12
         333 South Seventh Street, Suite 3020.
         Now, going back to your interview with Mr. B
13
                                                             , did you
    ask Mr. B
14
                    about his law firm, the physical layout?
15
         Yes.
    Α.
16
         And what did he tell you?
17
                             have separate law firms, but they share
         Him and
                     [V1]
18
    the same office space.
         Did he give you a description of how that space is laid
19
    Q.
20
    out?
2.1
    Α.
         Yes.
22
         What did he say?
    Q.
23
             MR. ANZALONE: Objection. Relevance. Really the same
24
    grounds as before, we just have no tie to Mr. Wenke having any
25
    knowledge whatsoever of this information. It's irrelevant.
```

```
THE COURT: Does he, Mr. Anzalone, need to under the
 1
 2
    condition that we're talking about here?
 3
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes. Does he -- I want to make sure I
 4
    understand the Court's question.
 5
             THE COURT: Does your client need to have knowledge of
    the shared office space situation --
 6
 7
             MR. ANZALONE: Our position --
 8
             THE COURT: -- or does he just need to have knowledge
 9
    that the condition is being violated?
             MR. ANZALONE: In -- I would -- in order to know that
10
11
    condition is being violated, Your Honor, he needs to know that
12
    they share an office space.
             He needs to know that. Otherwise, he wouldn't be
13
    committing a knowing violation of supervised release.
14
15
             THE COURT: Okay. Save that for your argument to me,
    then, Mr. Anzalone. I'll admit Exhibit 6. And the question is
16
    allowed.
17
18
             MR. ANZALONE: Understood.
19
             THE COURT: Yep.
20
             So go ahead. You want to ask that again?
2.1
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.
    BY MR. RUDROFF:
22
23
         I believe the question was what did Mr. B
                                                          tell you
24
    about the physical layout of his office space?
25
    A. Because they share the same office space, they share the
```

```
1
    same reception, conference room, copier, refrigerator.
 2
         Did he state the layout of their physical offices?
 3
         Yes, he did.
    Α.
         And what did he tell you?
 4
         He said that the three -- inside the office are three
 5
 6
    smaller offices. If you look at the wall, there is three doors.
7
                                              's is located directly
    His is located in the middle.
                                       [V1]
    next to his.
 8
 9
             MR. RUDROFF: No further questions, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone, give me just a second before
10
11
    I invite you up.
12
              MR. ANZALONE: Yes, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Anzalone, cross-examination.
14
             MR. ANZALONE: Thank you, Your Honor.
15
                    CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ANZALONE:
16
17
    BY MR. ANZALONE:
18
         Special Agent, good afternoon.
19
    Q.
20
    Α.
         Good afternoon.
21
                     has his own law firm, correct?
    Q.
22
         Yes, sir.
23
         It's the
                     [V1]
                             , Attorneys and Counselors at Law; is
24
    that right?
25
         Yes.
    Α.
```

Krystie Brown - Anzalone/Cross - 6/21/23

```
1
                            has multiple employees at that law firm?
    Q.
         Okay.
 2
          I'm not aware of his employee -- how many employees he has.
 3
         Well, you know Andy B
                                      is not one of his employees,
    Q.
    right?
 4
         That's correct.
 5
    Α.
 6
         Andy B
                       does not work at
                                             [V1]
                                                    's law firm, to be
7
    clear?
          That's my understanding.
 8
    Α.
 9
         And, in fact, Andy B
                                     has his own law firm, right?
    Q.
10
    Α.
          Yes.
11
         And Andy B
                           's law firm is called the B
                                                              Law Firm;
    0.
12
    is that right?
13
    Α.
         Yes.
                                     Law Firm has multiple lawyers?
14
         Do you know if the B
15
         I believe so.
    Α.
16
    Q.
                    [V1]
                             is not one of those lawyers at the
         Okay.
17
             Law Firm, correct?
18
          I don't believe so.
    Α.
19
         Just to be clear,
                                        and Andy B
                                                          do not work
    Q.
                                [V1]
20
    at the same law firm; is that right?
2.1
         No, they don't.
    Α.
22
          Special Agent, you talked us through Government's Exhibit 5
23
    and 6. Those were screenshots from those respective websites.
24
         Do you remember doing that?
25
         Yes.
    Α.
```

- 1 Q. There is no evidence that Mr. Wenke accessed those
- 2 | websites, correct?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. And you also gave us some information about the shared
- 5 space between Mr. [V1] and Mr. B , right?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. That information did not come from Mr. Wenke, correct?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. That information actually came from Mr. B
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. There is no evidence that Mr. Wenke knew about their shared
- 12 office space; is that right?
- 13 A. I can't speak to what Mr. Wenke knows or does not know.
- 14 | Q. Did you come in -- you have investigated this now, this
- 15 | violation, correct?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 | Q. Okay. Throughout the course of your investigation, did you
- 18 come across any evidence that Mr. Wenke had knowledge of the
- 19 | shared office space?
- 20 A. I don't believe so.
- 21 Q. Special Agent, you indicated that you spoke with Andy
- 22 B yesterday?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 \ Q. And he told you during that conversation that he had never
- 25 spoken with Mr. Wenke before he received the e-mail in question;

- 1 is that right?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. Okay. And, actually, he said he's never even been in
- 4 | contact with Mr. Wenke before he received that e-mail; is that
- 5 right?
- 6 A. That's right.
- 7 Q. And in the e-mail, the sender actually describes
- 8 Mr. [V1] as a, quote, stranger I've never met; is that right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Special Agent, Andy B represented Mr. [Ryan] on his
- 11 Federal case, correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And he was, I think you told us, one of two attorneys
- 14 | handling that case?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Handling that case for Mr.
- 17 A. That's right.
- 18 Q. And that was the material support for terrorism charge?
- 19 A. I don't recall what the exact charge was.
- 20 Q. Pretty serious case, right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Not unusual for two separate lawyers to come together on a
- 23 big serious case?
- 24 A. No, that's not unusual.
- 25 Q. And it was publicly available information who was

- Krystie Brown Anzalone/Cross 6/21/23 40 representing Mr. [Ryan], correct? 1 2 Yes. Α. 3 Probably -- withdrawn. It's publicly available on the Q. Court docket, right? 4 5 Yes. Α. 6 And it's also publicly available in news reports, right? 7 Yes. Α. You also know from your investigation that Mr. Wenke was 8 9 was representing Mr. [Ryan]; is that aware that Mr. B right? 10 11 That's correct. 12 And you know that because of what we've already gone 13 through today in the e-mail that Mr. B received, the sender described Mr. [Ryan] as "your client"; is that right? 14 15 Yes. Α. And that was one of the things that led you to conclude 16 17 that Mr. Wenke was aware that Mr. B was representing 18 in the past? Mr. [Rvan] 19 Yes. Α.
- 20 Q. And the prosecutor also showed you, I believe it was
- 21 Government Exhibit 4, which was an old e-mail sent by Mr. Wenke.
- Do you remember that?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. And in that e-mail, Mr. Wenke also indicated that he knew
- 25 that Mr. B was involved in representing Mr. [Ryan]; is

```
1
    that right?
 2
         Yes.
    Α.
 3
         So bottom line is Mr. Wenke knew Mr. B
                                                        was working on
    Q.
 4
                case?
    the
         [Ryan]
 5
         Yes.
    Α.
 6
         He knew he was one of his lawyers?
7
         Yes.
    Α.
 8
              MR. ANZALONE: Can I have a moment, Your Honor,
 9
    please?
              THE COURT: You may.
10
11
              MR. ANZALONE: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honor.
12
    Just a couple more questions, please.
    BY MR. ANZALONE:
13
         You indicated that in the e-mail, the sender refers to
14
                              's comrade, your comrade; is that
15
                as Mr. B
       [V1]
    right?
16
17
    Α.
         Yes.
         He doesn't at any point refer to Mr. V1
18
    coworker; is that right?
19
20
    Α.
         I would have to read it to refresh my memory.
2.1
    Q.
         Okay.
22
              MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, can I approach with a copy
23
    of Government's Exhibit 3?
24
              THE COURT: You may.
25
              MR. ANZALONE:
                             Thank you.
```

```
Krystie Brown - Anzalone/Cross - 6/21/23
```

```
1
              THE WITNESS:
                            Thank you.
    BY MR. ANZALONE:
 2
 3
         Special Agent Brown, just look up when your memory is
 4
    refreshed, please. Okay.
 5
         Memory refreshed?
         Yes, sir.
 6
7
         Okay. He never refers to them as coworkers in that e-mail,
    does he?
 8
         That's correct.
    Α.
10
         Doesn't refer to them as partners in the e-mail?
11
         That's correct.
12
         Does not refer to them as associates in that e-mail?
13
    Α.
         No.
         Okay. In that e-mail that you just reviewed, there is no
14
    Q.
15
    physical address listed on that; is that right?
16
         No, there isn't.
    Α.
17
         Certainly no reference to a suite number?
18
    Α.
         No.
19
             MR. ANZALONE: I have nothing further.
20
              THE COURT: Mr. Rudroff, any redirect?
2.1
             MR. RUDROFF: No redirect, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: No?
23
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Brown, you may step down.
25
    Thank you.
```

```
Thank you, Your Honor.
 1
             THE WITNESS:
 2
             (The Witness was Excused)
 3
             THE COURT: Mr. Rudroff.
 4
             MR. RUDROFF: No further witnesses, Your Honor.
                                                               The
 5
    Government rests.
 6
 7
                             GOVERNMENT RESTS
 8
 9
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone?
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes, Your Honor, I do have a motion to
10
11
    close of the Government's proof. I'll make that now and I would
12
    like to have a discussion with my client if that motion was
    denied.
13
14
             THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
15
             MR. ANZALONE: Sorry, that wasn't very clear. I have
    a motion.
16
17
             THE COURT: Yep. Go ahead, make it.
18
             MR. ANZALONE: Okay. I'm moving to dismiss the
    petition, Your Honor.
19
20
             It's our position that the Government has not put
2.1
    forth sufficient proof to establish that this was a knowing
    violation of the conditions of Mr. Wenke's release.
22
23
             The Government has certainly proven that Mr.
                                                                  and
24
    Mr. B
                work in the same building, perhaps even the same
25
    suite.
```

```
They have not shown that Mr. Wenke had any awareness
 1
 2
    whatsoever that they work in the same building or the same
 3
    suite.
             The allegations that Mr. Wenke sent an e-mail to an
 4
 5
    e-mail address to someone he knew represented an individual
 6
    along with Mr.
                        , that is not the condition that he's
 7
    alleged to have violated.
             He was never prohibited from sending any communication
 8
 9
    with someone who has worked as co-counsel with Mr.
                                                               on a
    criminal case.
10
11
             He's prohibited from having e-mail communication with
              , his family members, or his place of employment.
12
       [V1]
13
             Our position is that the Government has not come close
14
    to showing that he knowingly communicated with Mr. [V1]
                                                              's place
15
    of employment.
             And, in fact, communicated with an individual who, to
16
    the proof before Your Honor, simply worked at another law firm,
17
                                            V11 was involved in, so
18
    who was involved in one case that Mr.
19
    I'm moving to dismiss it based on that.
20
             THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Anzalone, thank you.
2.1
             Mr. Rudroff?
22
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor. Importantly, on a
23
    violation of supervised release, it is a preponderance of the
    evidence standard.
24
25
             Now, the Court heard testimony that Mr.
                                                             and
```

Krystie Brown - Anzalone/Cross - 6/21/23

```
1
                worked closely together, that they share office
    Mr. B
 2
    space, they share office amenities, their conference room, their
    reception, their kitchenette, et cetera.
 3
             You've also heard evidence that the defendant was well
 4
 5
    aware of the close relationship of Mr.
                                                  and Mr. B
                                            [V1]
 6
    through that e-mail that he sent to Mr. B
                                                    , as well as his
7
    past e-mails to Mr.
                               in 2020.
             The condition is whether or not Mr. Wenke knowingly
 8
    communicated with Mr. [V1] 's place of employment.
 9
             We submit that is satisfied by a knowing communication
10
11
    to a person in what is effectively the same law firm.
12
             I recognize that they are two legally distinct
13
    entities, that there is a
                                          law firm and a B
                                                                  law
14
    firm.
15
             But functionally they are in the same suite, which is
    available on publicly facing information, a simple Google
16
    search.
17
18
             They are sharing office space. They are sharing
    office amenities. They are working together on cases. And
19
20
    there is, I believe, sufficient proof in front of Your Honor to
2.1
    establish that the defendant knew that.
22
             So, Your Honor, as far as a motion to dismiss for
23
    legal insufficiency, we believe that that should be denied.
             There is sufficient evidence for the Court to conclude
24
25
    by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Wenke communicated
```

```
with Mr. [V1] 's place of employment when he reached out to the
 1
 2
    attorney in the office next door to him, with whom he shared a
    suite and numerous office amenities.
 3
             THE COURT: Mr. Rudroff, does there need to be enough
 4
 5
    for me to make an inference that Mr. Wenke communicated with
              's place of employment when he sent the e-mail to
 6
7
    somebody who shares office space with them?
             In other words, does the defendant need to know -- is
 8
 9
    there enough evidence for me to infer that the defendant knew
    that they actually shared the same office?
10
11
             MR. RUDROFF:
                           I would say, Your Honor, based on the --
12
    what I believe is the intimate knowledge of Mr.
                                                           and
13
    Mr. B
               , evidenced from the e-mail to them, he refers to
    them as your client, your colleague -- excuse me.
14
15
             I believe he does refer to him as your colleague. We
    didn't have the agent read this, but it's in the fourth large
16
17
    paragraph of the e-mail: "This is what your wonderful colleague
18
    did to me."
             So your client, your colleague, your comrade, combined
19
20
    with what's publicly available information showing that they
2.1
    share the same suite, I do believe there is enough for Your
22
    Honor to infer that he knew he was reaching out to his place of
23
    employment.
24
             MR. ANZALONE: Can I be heard? Thank you.
25
             Your Honor, there is a far cry between your comrade
```

```
1
    and your colleague and, quote, effectively the same law firm.
 2
    They are not effectively the same law firm.
             There is proof before Your Honor that they are two
 3
 4
    entirely separate law firms and there is absolutely not one iota
 5
    of proof that Mr. Wenke has knowledge of the information that
 6
    the Government is relying on.
 7
             Shared refrigerator? There is no proof Mr. Wenke
    knows that they are, quote, effectively the same law firm.
 8
                                                                  I
 9
    would argue that they hold themselves out very separately.
              THE COURT: All right. I'm going to take a few
10
11
    minutes, maybe until ten minutes after 2 and then I'll come back
12
    out here.
13
             MR. RUDROFF:
                            Thank you.
14
             MR. ANZALONE: Thank you.
15
          (Recess at 2:03 p.m., until 2:15 p.m.)
16
17
18
             THE CLERK: All rise.
19
             THE COURT: Please be seated.
20
             The way I read the -- I think there is two different
2.1
    parts of the condition that we're talking about here.
```

And, I mean, we can take the relevant words and create two different requirements. One is that Mr. Wenke shall not have any direct contact with the victim, , or his place of employment. That's one requirement.

22

23

24

2.1

```
Another requirement is that the defendant shall not have any indirect contact with the victim, . And so that's where we are.
```

Is this an indirect contact with ____, Mr. Anzalone?

MR. ANZALONE: Absolutely not, Your Honor. There are ways to have indirect contact with someone and it's very simple.

I'm sorry, it's not very simple, but it's very straightforward. If I call someone and say I need you to give this person a message, that is in direct contact.

I have read this e-mail over and over and over again. There is at no point does Mr. Wenke give a directive, give an implied directive, indicate that he wants to get a message to [V1]

This is an e-mail addressed to, intended for and directed at Andy B

Simply by mentioning someone's name -- first of all, I mean, you can't have a valid condition that restricts someone in the common parlance to keep someone's name out of your mouth.

You can't have that.

And simply invoking someone's name in a written communication is not indirect contact.

THE COURT: Can I infer, based on the content of the e-mail, that Mr. Wenke intended one lawyer to convey the message over to the other lawyer?

MR. ANZALONE: I would -- I would argue that based on

```
1
    this e-mail, you cannot do that.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay.
             Mr. Rudroff, anything in response to what I just
 3
    heard?
 4
 5
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor. I believe given the
    facts of this case, as they have come out at the hearing and
 6
7
    looking at the actual e-mail that was sent and knowing
    Mr. Wenke's knowledge of the closeness between Mr. B
 8
                                                                 and
 9
         [V1] , as evidenced by the language in his e-mail, it was
    Mr.
    certainly foreseeable, if not intended, that when I send an
10
11
    e-mail with harsh or threatening or vitriolic language about
12
    somebody I know to be close to the recipient, that I intend for
    that information to make it back to the recipient.
13
              It kind of reminds me in, for example, the wire fraud
14
15
    context of the -- you know, sends or caused to be submitted.
16
             You don't have to, as the Court noted, directly
17
    contact Mr.
                        Mr. Wenke didn't have to directly contact
                [V1] ·
18
    Mr.
              I would argue that it is enough for Mr. Wenke to have
19
20
    reached out to a person he knows to be close to Mr.
                                                                with
    the content of the e-mail, knowing that it would make it to
2.1
22
    Mr. [V1] .
23
             And that's evidenced by Mr. B
                                                 's reaction, which
    was to turnaround and forward the e-mail to Mr.
24
                                                            almost
25
    immediately.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
And it's evidenced by Mr. V11 's e-mail forwarding
that to the myself and to the FBI in Minneapolis, where he says,
this is a third-party contact, he obviously knows we're very
close.
         So, Your Honor, I do believe that that's a logical
inference, that this was, in fact, an indirect contact with
         THE COURT: Go ahead.
         MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, the Government keeps
referring to this plainly close relationship. They use the word
close multiple, multiple times. This self-evident close
relationship between
                       [V1]
                              and Andy B
         I don't know where that's coming from. From the word
comrade? From the word colleague?
         They are imputing the knowledge that they have after
their investigation, onto Mr. Wenke, when he does not have
access to anywhere near the same amount of information and the
same type of information that they have.
         THE COURT: I have enough of a concern on the indirect
contact prong, and I may need some case law on this to fully
resolve it, but enough of a concern to deny your motion at the
time, Mr. Anzalone, so please proceed with your case, if you
have one.
         MR. ANZALONE: Thank you. If I can have one moment,
please?
         THE COURT:
                     Sure.
```

```
Krystie Brown - Anzalone/Cross - 6/21/23
```

```
1
              (Discussion off the record.)
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, I do have one witness and
 2
 3
    he should be pretty brief, so I'm going to call investigator Ron
    Ransford at this time.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Okay. And that's a witness that is not
 6
    somebody that was in the courtroom before, so we didn't have a
7
    sequestration problem, did we?
 8
             MR. ANZALONE: All correct, yes.
 9
             THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
10
             Please remain standing, sir.
11
12
                           RONALD C. RANSFORD,
    witness on behalf of the DEFENDANT, having first been duly
13
14
     sworn, testified as follows:
15
             THE WITNESS: I do.
16
17
             THE CLERK:
                          Thank you.
18
                         Please be seated.
             THE COURT:
19
             THE CLERK: Can you please state your name and spell
20
    it for the record.
21
             THE WITNESS: Ronald, C for Charles, Ransford,
22
    R-A-N-S-F-O-R-D.
23
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone.
24
25
             DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ANZALONE:
```

```
1
 2
    BY MR. ANZALONE:
 3
         Investigator Ransford, good afternoon.
         Good afternoon.
 4
 5
         You just told us your name. Can you tell us what you do
    for a living?
 6
               I'm an investigator for the Federal Public Defenders
 7
         Yes.
    Office here in Buffalo.
 8
         And what's your general role in your job as an
    investigator?
10
11
         I assist the attorneys in investigations.
12
         Did you assist in this investigation?
13
    Α.
         Yes, I did.
14
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, may I approach, please?
15
              THE COURT: You may.
             MR. ANZALONE: I'm approaching with a copy of what's
16
17
    been marked for identification purposes as Defendant's Exhibit
18
    Α.
19
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
20
    BY MR. ANZALONE:
2.1
         Investigator Ransford, do you recognize Defendant's Exhibit
    Q.
22
    A?
23
    Α.
         Yes, I do.
24
    Q.
         What do you recognize it to be?
25
    Α.
         This is a copy from the website from the
                                                      [V1]
```

```
1
    Attorneys and Counsels at Law, which I accessed in my
 2
    investigation.
 3
         Okay. And is it your understanding that's publicly
    Q.
    accessible information?
 4
 5
         Yes, it is.
 6
         And when you accessed that public information, is what you
7
    see in front of you a fair and accurate representation of what
    was produced from that website?
 8
 9
    A.
        Yes, it is.
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, I'd offer Defendant's
10
11
    Exhibit A into evidence.
12
             THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Rudroff?
             MR. RUDROFF: No objection, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: Okay. Defendant's Exhibit A is admitted.
14
15
     The following was received in Evidence:
16
     DEFT.
            EXH. A
17
18
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, may I approach again,
19
    please?
20
             THE COURT: You may.
2.1
    BY MR. ANZALONE:
22
         Investigator Ransford, I just handed you what's marked for
23
    identification purposes as Defendant's Exhibit B.
24
         Do you recognize that?
25
    Α.
        Yes, I do.
```

```
Q. And what do you recognize it to be?
```

- 2 A. It appears to be a copy from the website from the B
- 3 | Law Firm in Minnesota.
- 4 Q. When you accessed that -- when you accessed that website,
- 5 | did it appear to be publicly accessible?
- 6 A. Yes, it is.
- 7 Q. And do you recognize what's in front of you as a fair and
- 8 accurate representation of what was produced when you accessed
- 9 that publicly accessible websites?
- 10 A. Yes.

- 11 Q. Excuse me, website?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 MR. ANZALONE: I'm going to offer Defendant's Exhibit
- 14 | B into evidence.
- 15 **THE COURT:** Any objection, Mr. Rudroff?
- MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
- 17 THE COURT: Defendant's B is admitted, B as in boy.
- 18 The following was received in Evidence:
- 19 DEFT. EXH. B

- 21 MR. ANZALONE: Thank you, Your Honor. I have no
- 22 further questions.
- 23 **THE COURT:** Mr. Rudroff, any cross-examination?
- 24 MR. RUDROFF: Your Honor, we don't have any
- 25 cross-examination.

```
1
             THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ransford, thank you. You may
 2
    step down.
             THE WITNESS:
 3
                            Thank you.
             (The Witness was Excused)
 4
 5
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, if I could have one second,
 6
    please?
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Sure.
             MR. ANZALONE: I have no further witnesses. Thank
 8
 9
    you.
10
11
                             DEFENDANT RESTS
12
             THE COURT: Any rebuttal case, Mr. Rudroff?
13
14
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: I can -- and I can and may ask you to
    comment right now and talk to me about what you think the
16
17
    evidence shows or doesn't show, but I guess I feel like going
18
    back to the condition itself and talk about where -- where I am
19
    and where I might be hung you up.
20
             Again, I'm going to go through the condition again.
2.1
    There's two ways to read it, two different kinds of conditions.
22
             It may be more. There is multiple ways, but at least
23
    the two that are relevant here is the defendant shall not have
24
    direct contact with
                         or his current or former place of
25
    employment, current or prior place of employment. That's the
```

```
direct contact piece.
```

2.1

And I'm somewhat skeptical that there is enough there, but I'm willing to be convinced. We'll see.

The indirect piece is the defendant shall not have any indirect contact with the victim . Hard stop. It doesn't matter. That's one of the multiple ways.

And there, I guess I've got the flipside concern and I'm a little bit skeptical of Mr. Anzalone's argument there.

And we may be in a situation where I need to send you out and do some research and return to me on why the indirect piece isn't met, because there is no evidence of intent or knowledge, mens rea, and the flip side would be the opposite.

But then we've got to get some research on -- each of you would brief each issue, I think.

But the other part is is this an indirect contact situation and what's the case law look liking there?

I don't know the answer to that as I sit here. I didn't do that research before I came out here, so I think it would be unfair to have me shoot from the hip on that issue.

So with that preface, Mr. Rudroff, do you feel like you need to make a closing statement?

MR. RUDROFF: Your --

THE COURT: I'm certainly willing to entertain it and we can do it in writing as well.

MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor, I believe at this point,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

17

18

21

```
USA v L. Wenke - Proceedings - 6/21/23
```

```
given the Court's concerns, I acknowledge I do not now off the
    top of my head the case law and indirect contact, what would
    qualify.
             So if the Court is open to it, I would suggest or
    request closing statements by writing, where we could brief that
    issue for the Court.
             THE COURT: That sounds like a good plan for me.
             Mr. Anzalone --
             MR. ANZALONE: I'm outnumbered, but, yes, I agree.
                                                                 I
    think that's a good plan.
             I would ask to be heard on Mr. Wenke's custody status
    while we brief that, but I have no objection to doing that in
13
    writing.
             THE COURT: Well, I think that I've got the same
15
    concerns that I had yesterday.
             What I would rather do more than anything is to get
16
    you to hurry up and get the case law to me. Maybe you can do
    that by the end of the day tomorrow, and then we can have you
    all back here on Friday.
19
20
             That way, you know, in the event that this is not
    proven, then the defendant's detention doesn't prolong longer
22
    than necessary.
23
             So can we have you get us the best case law you can
24
    find by tomorrow?
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
THE COURT: And have you back here on Friday?
 1
 2
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Read the case law and, you know, if you've
 3
 4
    got three or four, five cases, just cite them and save yourself
 5
    the pages on trying to tell me what they say.
              I can read them and, you know, keep your arguments
 6
7
    short, because I'll read the cases.
 8
             And if you need to give me a high level view, I can
 9
    understand what each side's views are, but same thing with your
    closing argument, if you will keep it crisp.
10
11
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.
12
             THE COURT: Anything, Mr. Rudroff?
             MR. RUDROFF: Nothing from the Government, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone, I didn't let you make a
14
15
    robust record on your client's detention, but nothing has
    changed from yesterday, so I still have those overriding
16
    concerns about public safety.
17
18
             So if you need to say something that you haven't
19
    already said, now is the time.
20
             MR. ANZALONE: Very briefly. Just our position is
21
    that with the strength of the evidence or lack thereof, it
22
    requires further briefing.
23
             Mr. Wenke has every additional incentive to come back
24
    to Court and answer for this alleged violation. That's why I'm
25
    asking for his release.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. ANZALONE: That's our position that that's the changed circumstances.

THE COURT: Okay. And that request is denied. I'm going to keep him detained and we'll revisit where we are on Friday. We just need to pick a time.

MR. ANZALONE: Is the Court available at any point in the afternoon on Friday?

THE COURT: How is Friday at 1:30, everybody?

MR. ANZALONE: Thank you. Yes.

MR. RUDROFF: Works for the Government.

THE COURT: Friday at 1:30. Get your briefs to me by the end of the day, filing day tomorrow. The sooner the better.

MR. ANZALONE: Is the end -- I'm sorry. Is that 5:00 o'clock or midnight?

16 THE COURT: I mean, if you -- the sooner the better.

17 If you get them to me, the more time I will spend with them.

But if they are at the end of the CM/ECF filing deadline at midnight, I will read them first thing Friday morning.

MR. ANZALONE: Thank you.

THE COURT: But if you have got your case law and you know you got it, send it in early.

MR. RUDROFF: Understood. Thank you.

MR. ANZALONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

```
USA v L. Wenke - Proceedings - 6/21/23
```

```
THE COURT: All right. Very good. See you Friday.
 1
              MS. KUBIAK: Thank you, Judge.
 2
 3
                    (Proceedings concluded at 2:31 p.m.)
                                 * * *
 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. July 31, 2023 s/ Bonnie S. Weber Signature Date BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of New York

Witness	By (Type)	Page
MATTHEW ZENGER		
	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY	5
	MR. RUDROFF: CROSS-EXAMINATION BY	14
	MR. ANZALONE:	
KRYSTIE BROWN	DIDEOU EVANTNAUTON DV	1 (
	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. RUDROFF:	16
	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY	36
RONALD C. RANSFORD	MR. ANZALONE:	
ROMALD C. KAMSFORD	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY	51
	MR. ANZALONE:	J –

1		INDEX TO EXHIBITS		
2	Exhibit	Description	Page ID	Page Received
3	GOVT. EXH. 1			8
4	GOVT. EXH. 2 GOVT. EXH. 3			14 26
5	GOVT. EXH. 4 GOVT. EXH. 5			30 33
6	GOVT. EXH. 6			34
7	DEFT. EXH. A DEFT. EXH. B			53 54
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

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

June 23, 2023 1:32 p.m.

LUKE MARSHALL WENKE, * CONTINUATION OF

VIOLATION HEARING

*

Defendant.

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

V.

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

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: TRINI E. ROSS,

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

Assistant United States Attorney,

Federal Centre,

138 Delaware Avenue,

Buffalo, New York 14202,

Appearing for the United States.

For the Defendant: FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE

By ALEXANDER J. ANZALONE, ESQ.,

FONDA KUBIAK, ESQ.,

Assistant Federal Public Defender,

300 Pearl Street,

Suite 200,

Buffalo, New York 14202.

The Courtroom Deputy: KIRSTIE L. HENRY

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

```
THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
 1
 2
             THE COURT: We're here today for the conclusion of the
 3
    violation proceeding that began on Wednesday of this week,
    June 21.
 4
 5
             I've studied the parties' submissions from yesterday
    and conducted my own additional research, along with that of my
 6
 7
    team.
 8
             Anything that we need to cover before I keep going,
 9
    Mr. Rudroff?
             MR. RUDROFF: No, Your Honor.
10
11
             THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone?
12
             MR. ANZALONE: Your Honor, I'll rest on my
13
    submissions. Unless, of course, the Court has questions. I can
14
    answer questions.
15
             THE COURT: Okay. Rule 32.1(b) of the Rules of
    Criminal Procedure governs the revocation of supervised release.
16
17
             And unlike a criminal trial, where the burden of proof
18
    is beyond a reasonable doubt, here the Government bears a
19
    lighter burden to prove a violation of supervised release by
20
    preponderance of the evidence.
2.1
             Having considered the hearing testimony, the
22
    documentary evidence, and the parties' submissions, I find that
23
    the Government has sustained its burden of proving that
24
    Mr. Wenke has violated the supervised release condition as the
25
    petition charged.
```

```
In particular, I find that the witnesses presented by
 1
    the Government were credible, as was defendant's witness.
 2
 3
             Notably, Probation Officer Zenger testified as to
    reviewing the conditions with Mr. Wenke on more than one
 4
    occasion, and that Mr. Wenke understood those conditions.
 5
             Special Agent Brown testified to the beginning of the
 6
7
    investigation into Mr. Wenke and being contacted about the
    May 21, 2023, e-mail that is the subject of this proceeding.
 8
 9
             Special Agent Brown also testified to the similarities
10
    between the previous communications from Mr. Wenke to
11
    and the e-mail sent to Andy B
                                        as for the e-mail that
12
    Mr. Wenke sent on May 13, 2023, to Andy B
                                               , as well as Andy
13
             That e-mail references
                                        [V1]
                           collectively over 18 times in a rant
14
            and
                   [V1]
15
    about how they both supposedly wronged him and how things must
    be resolved to Wenke's liking.
16
17
             For instance, there is reference to: "Your client,
18
    Benjamin
                    , your comrade,
                                               , your colleague",
19
    referring to
20
             Three occasions where they were called out,
                                                             [V1]
21
                     as Nazi lawyers. "You all" referring to both
    and Andy B
22
    lawyers.
23
              "Your criminal defense industry", referring to both,
24
    in my judgment. "Your state's Nazi chief lawyer,
25
    "that stranger", referring to
                                      [V1]
                                             , in my judgment;
```

```
1
    "Minnesota defense lawyers", referring to the defendant's felony
 2
    three times.
              "You guys or guys", referring to both lawyers, three
 3
    times. And "you people", referring to both lawyers twice.
 4
             And by "both lawyers" I'm referring, obviously, to
 5
 6
          and B
7
             The contents and circumstances of this e-mail easily
    lead me to infer that Mr. Wenke was intentionally indirectly
 8
 9
    contacting
                          , and additionally intended to contact Andy
                  [V1]
10
            in a way that was reasonably foreseeable to result in
11
    contact with
                    [V1]
12
             The inference of indirect contact with
                                                                 is
                                                        [V1]
    bolstered by defendant's knowledge that he cannot have contact
13
14
    directly with Mr.
15
             And that
                                  and Andy B
                                                   had worked
    together previously on a criminal case involving Mr.
16
17
             And that is relevant there as Government's Exhibit 4,
18
    the December 16, 2020, e-mail from Mr. Wenke to
19
    mentioning you and the B
                                    on two occasions.
20
             The fact that
                             [V1]
                                       and Andy B
                                                        share office
2.1
    space and the defendant's likely knowledge of that fact, given
22
    the history of the case.
23
             And noteworthy there are Exhibits 3, 5 and 6 does add
24
    something to the weight of this inference, albeit that part is
25
    not necessary to my finding.
```

[V1] 1 The indirect contact that I find here with 2 is shown by a preponderance of the evidence. 3 Indirect is something done through someone else or through something else, and Mr. Wenke's e-mail here was an 4 5 indirect contact with [V1] The case law is noteworthy as well. I've studied 6 7 Johnson, I've studied a few of these other cases. Johnson is 446 F.3d 227 from the Second Circuit, 2006. 8 9 Also noteworthy is Burroughs, United States versus Burroughs, 613 F.3d 233 from the D.C. Circuit. 10 11 Among other things, the Court noted that the 12 restriction on indirect contact was clearly meant to reach contact by means of a computer, phone, other device or a 13 third-party intermediary. 14 15 Also, relevant is United States versus Latigo, 2023 Westlaw 2446903, that's from the Fifth Circuit, where the 16 17 defendant's creation of public websites constituted an indirect 18 communication with the victim, in violation of a condition prohibiting any form of unauthorized direct or indirect contact. 19 Moreover, the condition at issue in this case was not 20 2.1 drafted in isolation, nor should it be interpreted in isolation. 22 The power of the Court to impose special conditions is 23 circumscribed by the requirement that the restrictions 24 reasonably relate to the nature and circumstances of the

offense, history and characteristics of the defendant and the

```
1
    need for the sentence imposed.
 2
             The condition must be considered in light of the crime
 3
    for which Mr. Wenke was charged and convicted here, a pattern of
    disturbing communications constituting cyberstalking.
 4
             Based on the evidence, I find that the Government has
 5
    proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Wenke sent
 6
7
    the e-mail to Andy B
                              , and thereby violated the condition
    that he not have any contact directly or indirectly through
 8
    social media, telephone, text, mail or e-mail with the victim,
 9
      , his family or his current or prior places of employment.
10
11
              I therefore find Charge One sustained and that
12
    Mr. Wenke has violated this supervised release condition.
             Next, we need to schedule sentencing, a report from
13
    Mr. Zenger and briefing from the parties.
14
15
             Should we start with Mr. Zenger on a schedule?
             Mr. Anzalone, do you want to be heard before we get
16
    that process discussed?
17
18
             MR. ANZALONE: I'm just going to ask for an expedited
    sentencing date, to the extent it can be accommodated.
19
20
             THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Zenger, how much time do you
21
    need for a report?
22
             MR. ZENGER: Your Honor, we can have a report prepared
23
    within two weeks, so anytime. We can get it in a week before
24
    sentencing.
25
             THE COURT: July 7 for the report from probation.
```

```
Mr. Anzalone, how much time do you need from the time
 1
 2
    that you see that?
 3
             MR. ANZALONE: I could file by Wednesday the 12th, if
    that's reasonable.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Okay.
             Mr. Rudroff, can you match that schedule, Wednesday
 6
7
    the 12th of July?
             MR. RUDROFF: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: All right. Wednesday the 12th of July.
    Is the idea that we would get to sentencing by the 14th? Is
10
11
    that what you are, Mr. Anzalone, looking for?
12
             MR. ANZALONE: Please.
             THE COURT: If we can fit it into our schedule. Let's
13
14
    take a look, Ms. Henry.
15
             Any submissions, Mr. Anzalone, not just briefs, right?
    Whatever you are going to submit July 12th.
16
17
             MR. ANZALONE: Understood.
18
             THE COURT: Okay. And sentencing, if we can do it on
    Friday the 14th.
19
20
             THE CLERK: How about 11:00 o'clock?
2.1
             MR. ANZALONE: Yes. Thank you.
22
             MR. RUDROFF: That works for the Government, Your
23
    Honor.
             THE COURT: Friday July 14, 11:00 a.m. for sentencing.
24
             Okay. Is there anything else, Mr. Rudroff?
25
```

```
USA v L. Wenke - Proceedings - 6/23/23
```

```
MR. RUDROFF: Nothing from the Government, Your Honor.
1
              THE COURT: Mr. Anzalone?
2
 3
             MR. ANZALONE: No. Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wenke will remain remanded
 4
5
    pending sentencing. Thank you very much.
 6
7
                   (Proceedings concluded at 1:42 p.m.)
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. __July 28, 2023 s/ Bonnie S. Weber Signature Date BONNIE S. WEBER Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of New York