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 * January 2, 2024

8:58 a.m.

LUKE MARSHALL WENKE, * STAT

*

Defendant. *

STATUS CONFERENCE

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

V.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN L. SINATRA, JR.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: MICHAEL DiGIACOMO,

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
By MICHAEL DIGIACOMO, ESQ.,

Assistant United States Attorney,

Federal Centre, 138 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14202,

Appearing for the United States.

For the Defendant: FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE

By FRANK PASSAFIUME, ESQ.,

Assistant Federal Public Defender,

300 Pearl Street,

Suite 200,

Buffalo, New York 14202.

The Courtroom Deputy: KIRSTIE L. HENRY

USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 1/2/25

```
1
     The Court Reporter:
                                 BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR,
                                 Notary Public,
                                 Robert H. Jackson Courthouse,
 2
                                 2 Niagara Square,
 3
                                 Buffalo, New York 14202,
                                 Bonnie Weber@nywd.uscourts.gov.
 4
 5
 6
             Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
                     transcript produced by computer.
 7
 8
 9
                   (Proceedings commenced at 8:58 a.m.)
10
11
12
              THE CLERK: All rise.
              The United States District Court for the Western
13
    District of New York is now in session, The Honorable John
14
15
    Sinatra presiding.
16
              THE COURT: Please be seated.
17
              THE CLERK: United States versus Luke Marshall Wenke,
18
    Case Number 22-CR-35. This is the date for a status conference.
19
              Counsel, please state your appearances.
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Michael DiGiacomo for the United
20
2.1
    States, Your Honor.
22
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Frank Passafiume for Mr. Wenke.
23
              THE COURT: Good morning, Counsel.
24
             Good morning, Mr. Wenke.
25
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Good morning, Judge.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

this.

```
THE COURT: We're here today for a status conference.
At the last status conference, I had asked Probation to
follow-up with BOP regarding what treatment options might be
available.
         And I encouraged the lawyers to keep working on their
efforts to find a psychiatrist or a psychologist willing to
<mark>evaluate</mark> Mr. Wenke.
         So let's have an update from the Government first.
         MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, if I may, Mr. Passafiume and I
have -- you may recall that, when we were here back in late
December, we had reached out to a Dr. Antonius who was -- first
said he was available, then indicated he wasn't available and
provided the name of several individuals who he felt -- within
his practice group -- could facilitate what the Court was
looking for.
         We have -- Mr. Passafiume and I have reached out to a
Dr. Corey Leidenfrost, who's a research assistant professor with
the Department of Psychiatry at the UB school.
         He also has some qualifications where he's --
according to his CV, he's a forensic psychologist at Erie County
Forensic Mental Health Services.
         And he's got some other -- according to his CV --
```

Mr. Passafiume and I are attempting to speak with him

qualities that could make him someone that could potentially do

```
USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 1/2/25
```

whether it's today or this week.

Based on some e-mail communications we had late at the end of the year with him, he had indicated that he feels it would take about ten to 20 hours to conduct an evaluation.

That's dependent upon the fact -- how much information, obviously, he needs. I mean, obviously, he wants Court documentation. He wants medical records, things of that nature. So he's put it in as a ballpark.

The one aspect of -- because he's in private practice -- comes to who would pay this. The range of between ten and 20 hours -- his hourly rate is \$250.

So we're looking at the low end of \$2,500 to a high end of \$5,000, so that's where we are.

We haven't had -- he's aware, because we put it in the e-mail, the exact quote from the statute is the type of evaluation the Court is seeking.

He has indicated he thinks -- he feels as if he can do it. We haven't talked to him to explain all the intricacies, and that's what we're hoping to accomplish either today or early week. And so that's the status of where we are.

Mr. Passafiume and I did have an opportunity to speak with Probation this morning. And it's my understanding that they have -- well, they can report as to the BOP status, as to whether or not they're in a position to undertake the evaluation.

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

point?

```
The BOP is, to take the evaluation that, also, the
Court is seeking. And then it's just a matter of, I guess,
which avenue we pursue.
         If I could add one other thing, Judge, just, with
Mr. Leidenfrost -- I apologize for interrupting.
         Obviously, Judge, everybody's -- I don't know -- and
with respect to budgets -- I mean, the Court's well aware that
there's budgetary issues right now, with there being no Federal
budget in place.
         So, obviously, spending of this nature, I would have
to check to see if the office can even contribute anything or
whether it would fall strictly on the Public Defender's Office
if they wish to go with the private route.
         So I wanted to put that out there, Judge, for full
transparency.
         THE COURT: Mr. Passafiume, any thoughts?
         MR. PASSAFIUME: I agree with all that. That's all
correct, yeah.
         THE COURT: Okay. What about the idea of if your
office had to pay? Do you have any comments on that at this
```

MR. PASSAFIUME: No. In the past, again, when there

So, hopefully, we can do that again this time, but --

haven't been these issues, we've split it. We split the bill if

we agree on an expert, and that's been the case.

```
USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 1/2/25
```

THE COURT: Let's hold open that possibility. 1 2 MR. PASSAFIUME: Sure. THE COURT: Mr. Zenger, Mr. Taberski, do one of you 3 want to give me an update on the probation front? 4 5 PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: Yes, Your Honor, we have been in contact with a number of representatives from the BOP 6 7 who have indicated that, whether it be through the different 8 statutes -- 4244 or 4271 -- sorry -- 4247, there actually is not a waitlist to get involved in that evaluation practice. Either 9 10 not a waitlist or a very short waitlist. 11 The defense did bring to my attention that there's 12 concerns about some kind of transitioning timeline. We've also been in contact with the Marshals and they 13 have indicated that the defendant would need a minimum of around 14 15 four months remaining or longer in his sentence to be able to transition to the BOP, but no further complications that I'm 16 aware of. 17 THE COURT: All right. There's, kind of, a lot all 18 packed into one thought there, but two different thoughts. 19 20 One is that there is no -- what I'm hearing from you 21 is that there is no waitlist, it sounds like. 22 Or, certainly, no meaningful waitlist to get a 4244 23 evaluation, which I know is Mr. Passafiume's concern, correct? 24 PROBATION OFFICER ZENGER: That's correct, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: What else do we need to do here today

USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 1/2/25

```
1
    other than pick a date to come back?
 2
             Mr. Passafiume? Mr. DiGiacomo?
             MR. PASSAFIUME: That's it.
 3
 4
             MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, I guess what it would boil down
    to is what -- we haven't talked to Mr. -- Dr. Leidenfrost.
 5
              I mean, based on the papers and what he's
 6
7
    communicated, he indicates that he should be able to handle it.
 8
    It really boils down to we need to, I think, make a very short
 9
    turnaround, in the sense -- so we know which avenue we need to
10
    pursue.
11
             A, is Dr. Leidenfrost someone that, one, we can
    utilize here. And if not, then it sounds like we're -- we may
12
    not have any choice, but to go the BOP route.
13
14
             If the Court wishes to go the BOP route right now,
15
    then I guess that would be the -- that would solve all the
    issues, and then we would just start from there.
16
17
             So I guess, not to throw the ball back into the
18
    Court's hands, but -- or put it back into your court, Judge,
    it's just -- how does -- how does the Court wish to proceed,
19
20
    knowing the uncertainty as to whether or not Dr. Leidenfrost
                                                                  can
2.1
    do this?
22
             And if the Court wants us to further pursue this, then
23
    I think a short turnaround would be the most appropriate thing
24
    to do here. And then report back and then determine what the
25
    next thing is.
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
USA v Luke Marshall Wenke - Proceedings - 1/2/25
            Because, obviously, it's no benefit to -- to Mr. Wenke
1
2
   that, through no fault of his own or anybody in this
```

And so we really need to get this to some form of finality, so Mr. Wenke can be sentenced.

said they couldn't do what they said that they could do.

THE COURT: All right. So how about a couple weeks, return. Is that about right? Or sooner?

Courtroom -- that various agencies have said they could and then

MR. DiGIACOMO: Judge, I would say, if the Court wants to put it out two weeks, but if I could throw this caveat in there -- if Mr. Passafiume and I learn something or -- perhaps we can e-mail the Court, if Dr. Leidenfrost can't do it, and ask for a sooner evaluation or a status date, We could do that if the Court can sneak us in at some point.

THE COURT: Sure. We're here anytime. So if, in fact, you'd like me to put it on for next week, I can do that, too.

> MR. PASSAFIUME: Thank you.

THE COURT: Next week? Does that make sense? Or should we go out to the 16th or 17th?

MR. PASSAFIUME: Want to do two weeks and then --

MR. DiGIACOMO: Two weeks, Judge.

THE COURT: Two weeks. And then I can --

MR. DiGIACOMO: And then we can come back if we need to get here sooner.

```
THE COURT: -- accelerate it if we need to.
1
 2
             All right. So two weeks from now and we'll accelerate
 3
    it if we need to. 16th is Tuesday. Or the 17th.
             Ms. Henry, thoughts?
 4
 5
             THE CLERK: How about the 16th at 9:30?
 6
             MR. DiGIACOMO: That's good for the Government. Thank
7
    you.
 8
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Thank you.
 9
             THE COURT: All right. And if there's nothing else,
    folks, we'll see you then. And if you'd like to get in earlier,
10
11
    please reach out to us and I'll accommodate that as well.
12
             Thanks, everybody. Take care.
13
             MR. PASSAFIUME: Thank you, Judge.
14
15
                   (Proceedings concluded at 9:07 a.m.)
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. __May 27, 2025 s/ Bonnie S. Weber____ Signature Date BONNIE S. WEBER, RPR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of New York