## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA HON. LAWRENCE J. O'NEILL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

1:16-cr-069 LJ0-SK0

Plaintiff,

SENTENCE

VS.

DARRELL MAXEY,

Defendant.

Fresno, California

Monday, September 24, 2018

## REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## **APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:**

For the Government: KIMBERLY SANCHEZ

Assistant U.S. Attorney

2500 Tulare Street, Rm. 4401 Fresno, California 93721

For the Defendant: DAYS LAW FIRM

2300 Tulare Street, Suite 240

Fresno, CA 93721 BY: MARC DAYS

REPORTED BY: PEGGY J. CRAWFORD, RDR, CRR, Official Reporter

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

```
1
     Monday, September 24, 2018
                                            Fresno, California
     9:42 a.m.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: Darrell Maxey number 10 on calendar.
 4
              MR. DAYS: Good morning, your Honor. Marc Days with
 5
     Darrell Maxey, who is present, in court. He is in custody.
 6
              MS. SANCHEZ: Kim Sanchez representing the United
 7
     States.
 8
              THE COURT: Sir, your name, please.
 9
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Darrell Maxev.
10
              THE COURT: Mr. Maxey, have you had a chance to
11
     review the Presentence Report with your counsel?
12
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, sir.
13
              THE COURT: Do you have any questions that remain?
14
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              No. sir.
              THE COURT: The Court has received and reviewed the
15
16
     Presentence Report, the 11(c) agreement, defendant's
17
     objections to the fine, the defendant's letter requesting the
18
     drug program, the defendant's sentencing memorandum, and the
19
     government's response to the objection concerning the fine.
20
              The Court notes the offense level to be 30. History
21
     Category is III. Guideline range is 121 to 151.
22
              The recommendation is on Counts 1, 2, and 3, 48
23
     months, 48 months, and 40, to run consecutively, for a total
24
     of 136.
```

The Court has considered the 3553(a) factors.

Mr. Days, do you wish to be heard further?

MR. DAYS: Yes, your Honor. It is not my intention to go over the sentencing memo that I filed. I think I have laid out what our position is. I just want to make a couple of remarks.

The first one is, your Honor, whenever I get a case, one of the things -- and we get to the point of sentencing, one of the things I consider is how did we get to this point.

And I believe that my sentencing memo describes how we got to this point; in particular, paragraph 103 of the PSR, the first sentence.

I didn't put that specifically in the sentencing memorandum, but I do cite to it, and I hope the Court can just take a moment to look at the first sentence.

THE COURT: Where are you looking?

MR. DAYS: The first sentence of paragraph 103 of the PSR.

THE COURT: Hang on one second. I'm there, yes.

MR. DAYS: I think this case is an absolute tragedy.

And I understand that Mr. Maxey is going to be punished.

I don't think anything that these young men -- and my client was 20 years old when he was arrested. And it is, as a father, disturbing to me that these men, these young men, this man in particular, this young man, was shown that this is okay.

Through his entire life, there is nothing good about it, there is nothing right about it. I don't think any young man has a real chance in this environment. These values.

THE COURT: Does he have a greater chance in prison?

I mean what do we do? Do we just ignore what he has done?

MR. DAYS: No.

THE COURT: I mean these people that he is doing this to need protection from him. So while I understand exactly what you are saying concerning how did we get here, I get it, I understand what you are saying. But what do we do about it?

MR. DAYS: So that's the question. This -- I know that the Court has been on the bench for, as the Court said today, 29 years.

I have full confidence in the experience that you have, and the number of defendants that you have seen go through your court, that you will impose a sentence that is reasonable and no harsher than is necessary.

The recommendation by Probation is 11 years and four months. And that's also the recommendation of the People.

The ultimate question I think in front of the Court is, is that what is necessary? Is that number what is necessary?

I don't think it is. I don't think a 20-year-old being sentenced to 11 years and four months, that's what it takes. Not with this upbringing, not with these values.

THE COURT: So what do we have, no matter what I give him, what do we have when we get out?

MR. DAYS: Well, what we have is a wonderful federal supervision system. That's what we have.

THE COURT: Oh, but that doesn't work when you have nothing to work with. And you know, I can't -- you can't have this argument both ways, you know.

If he is where he is now because of the background, when he gets out, he is not only going to have the background that you are describing, but he is going to have a prison background too.

So what exactly are we going to have when he is done and he gets out on federal supervision?

MR. DAYS: Well, one thing is, as noted by the probation report, it is the first time I have seen this in a probation report, although the Court, there may be other times it's been in the report, but one of the things pointed out is the development of the brain. I do think that's something to consider.

What we will have is we will have a more mature individual. I mean that's generally what happens, right? The older we get, the more mature we get.

Here, we have got the probation report talking about literature in which there is more of an emotional response that young men have opposed to a more intellectual, reasoned

response. And that's based on the development of the brain.

So to answer the Court's question, I think that when Mr. Maxey eventually gets out of custody, what we will be dealing with on supervision is a person that is going to be more mature. Also a person that will receive some hopeful rehabilitation and some punishment. The question is how much.

Given the fact that he will be on supervision, I think the Court can -- and we all know the Court can have a grip on somebody for quite a period of time if they don't straighten up.

What I see is -- and it does break my heart, because I see a young man here who has been nothing but respectful to me throughout the entire time that I have represented him, and not that that's anything unusual, but I see a young man that has a potential. He is not dumb. He is smart. He is charismatic. He has a great personality.

But how can that flourish? How can that flourish when you have been raised by this? It can't. It is stifling.

I mean paragraph 103, the first sentence, that is -- I mean a child that sees this and thinks that this is acceptable is going to be headed for trouble. And I don't think 11 years and four months is what has to happen here for a 20-year-old, raised like this.

I -- there is nothing acceptable about what Mr. Maxey has pled guilty to. It is troubling. I am not here to

minimize it at all.

What I'm here to say is this is a 20-year-old young man, raised like this, who, it is not surprising to anybody that we are right here right now.

But there is a brighter day. I'm asking the Court to consider what is absolutely -- what do we have to do to try to get this young man on the right track? And I don't think 11 years and four months is what we have to do.

THE COURT: Do you wish to be heard?

THE DEFENDANT: Me?

THE COURT: You.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: First of all, I want to apologize to the victims, to their family, and my family. I just want to say I understand I made a lot of bad choices at a young age, but that's still no excuse for my actions. I'm here to take responsibility as a man.

Everything else I got to say came with the letter.

THE COURT: Does the government wish to be heard?

MS. SANCHEZ: Your Honor, the government requests the Court impose a sentence of 136 months. The government recognizes the arguments defense has made in this case.

I would note that in the plea agreement, the defendant acknowledges that 136 months is within the range of

reasonable sentences that could be imposed in this case.

I recognize that there is a balancing that the Court has to look at, a balancing that does include the defendant's background and history, the fact that he was brought up in the environment that defense has set forth and that appears in, at least in part, in the plea agreement.

There are several factors that, while the defendant is young and he was raised in an environment that didn't teach him necessarily better character or better choices, it seems to me that almost anyone would know that certain of the choices that the defendant made were wrong.

And even in this case, I believe that's evidenced by the fact that much of what the defendant and his coconspirators did was not -- or contained an element that was an effort to avoid being detected by law enforcement.

The human trafficking activity that the defendant engaged in, the conversations that were intercepted between this defendant and several of the female victims who were prostituting for him and making a substantial amount of money doing so, were quite disturbing.

The level of the threat of violence and the discussions of assaults that occurred, that was disturbing. And I don't think any person could think that that was okay and that wasn't a problem.

The conversations the defendant engaged in with his

coconspirators, the actions they took in searching for rival gang members to protect their turf, to retaliate, to gather guns, to engage in retaliatory shootings, those conversations and the actions they took, I don't believe that anybody can think, at 20 years old, that that's okay, even if that's the environment in which they were raised.

And I think that the sentence the Court imposes, I think 136 months is reasonable and takes into account punishment and rehabilitation and retribution, the factors that are required to be considered for sentencing.

The defendant made several admissions in his plea agreement, admitting to giving his codefendant, Kiandre Johnson, contact information for another coconspirator who could supply a firearm. And admitting to gathering coconspirators for a meeting in early April of 2016, at which the defendant and his coconspirators discussed retaliation, admitting sending prostitutes in and outside of California.

I think that 136-month sentence accounts for those choices, the charges the defendant pleaded to, the admissions the defendant made.

And the government requests that the Court follow Probation's recommendation and the government's request for 136 months.

THE COURT: I understand the background issue, but the part that is most disturbing to me is that you or anybody

else could think it is all right to treat another human being the way you treated human beings.

(The Defendant nodded his head in the affirmative.)

THE COURT: These women are human beings. And they are a lot more than physical parts that are up for sale. These people that you manipulated have a right to have a relationship that probably, in most instances, has now been taken away from them, because they will not know the difference between a physical act and an emotional commitment that goes along with the physical acts. They will not be able to separate their past from their future. This is life-altering. It is without question.

I wish you could sit here in my position over the years, and watch as we select juries, and have -- in sex cases especially, and one of the unpleasantries of selecting those jurors is to have to ask the question: Has anything of this nature occurred in your lifetime?

And the numbers of people, both men and women, who have been abused physically, sexually, who, decades later cannot hold their emotions intact as they explain that they couldn't possibly sit on such a case because of what this would bring back to them.

Now, I know you weren't thinking of that, the future of all of these women. But I'm telling you, this sort of thing is life-altering. And once you've manipulated these

folks, it is forever. It is not just: It is over now. We got the money. The act is done, it is over.

It is not over, anymore than when I sentence you, that it is over. It is not over.

Also, the violence that the prosecutor is talking about is real. I mean you are acting as though, when you are negotiating these things and being a part of their occurring, that you are dealing with marbles or something, not with real people. People who die because of what you are planning and plotting.

The prosecutor is correct. I don't care whether you are 20 or 12, you know the difference between right and wrong.

And you knew this was wrong.

I don't think that you or your counsel, either one, is telling me that this isn't a big deal. That's not what I'm hearing.

But the sentence can't be just about you. The sentence has to be about victims. It has to be about deterrence. It has to be making a statement about punishment, and about this would be foolish for others to get involved in it.

Do you understand what I'm saying to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Days?

MR. DAYS: I would like to respond very briefly to

the point made by the government about knowing right or wrong.

This is not black and white. It is complex.

THE COURT: It always is.

MR. DAYS: And I cannot agree necessarily with the statement that, whether you are a 12-year-old, 12 or 20, you should know the difference between right or wrong.

And the reason I say that is because our country has a history, well-documented history, of people not knowing the difference between right and wrong, based on how they have been raised, and the pain that they have caused to other people because they don't look like them. They may not have the same sexual orientation. We have a history of raising people that grow up, inflict pain on people, and many people in the community may think that's acceptable.

And I'm talking about, for example, racism. The history of our country, where people have been killed, brutalized, and it's been accepted for countless years.

THE COURT: Not by decent people.

MR. DAYS: Well, some people would consider those folks decent. It is all -- so my point is simply this: That how you are raised is not of some small moment. It is not insignificant. Children are highly impressionable. And I don't believe Mr. Maxey was raised in a way to have that empathy, to be able to put himself in somebody's shoes and understand the pain that he was causing.

THE COURT: I may agree with that part, but I don't agree that your client didn't know that this was wrong.

Are you saying that your client believes that what he did, at the time he did it, he didn't know that it was wrong?

MR. DAYS: I am not saying that. What I'm saying is that I don't believe that emotionally, he was able to fully understand that the depth of the pain that he was causing.

THE COURT: Oh, you are talking about consequences. That's exactly what I was referring to when I said, "I doubt very much that at the time you were doing this, that you thought about, knew about, or even considered the fact that what you were doing to these women was forever."

I get that part, but I still think he knew that what he was doing was wrong.

MR. DAYS: And I'm not here to suggest that that's not the case, your Honor.

My argument is simply that it is 11 years and four months; is that number a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary? I think that -- I mean he hasn't done -- the biggest sentence he has done before this was how many days?

> THE DEFENDANT: 151.

MR. DAYS: 151 days.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

No, your Honor. MR. DAYS:

THE COURT: Anything else, Ms. Sanchez?

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23 24

MS. SANCHEZ: I would submit with respect to the sentencing, and I would ask that the Court make the preliminary order of forfeiture final.

And we would submit on Mr. Baker's filing regarding the special assessment.

THE COURT: Any objection to that?

MR. DAYS: I'm sorry?

MS. SANCHEZ: We asked that the preliminary order of forfeiture be made final, and we submit on Mr. Baker's response to your objection on the special assessment.

MR. DAYS: No objection, your Honor. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: All right. With regard to the objection on the special assessment, the objection is overruled. The Court does agree that the position that the defendant's anticipated future earnings, especially at such a young age now, for his lifetime is appropriate to assess.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that you are committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, to be imprisoned for a term of 48 months on Count 1, 48 months on Count 2, and 24 months on Count 3, to be served consecutively, for a total of 120.

You shall pay a special assessment of \$300, and the assessment of \$5,000, as required by the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, under 18 United States Code 3014, payment to begin immediately.

The preliminary order of forfeiture filed in August of this year is made final and shall be incorporated into the judgment.

Upon release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of 36 months on Counts 1, 2, and 3, to be served concurrently, for a total of 36.

Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, you shall report in person to Probation in the District where you are released.

While on release, you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime; shall not illegally possess controlled substances; shall cooperate in the collection of DNA, as directed by Probation; shall comply with the standard conditions recommended by the Sentencing Commission and adopted by the Court; shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance; shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two thereafter, not to exceed four per month.

The Court is going to order the nine special conditions, which I can read or incorporate by reference.

MR. DAYS: Incorporation is fine.

MS. SANCHEZ: Incorporation is fine.

THE COURT: Done and ordered.

Are you requesting geographically?

MR. DAYS: Yes, your Honor. Herlong, Terminal

1 Island, or Lompoc. 2 THE COURT: The Court will make those recommendations 3 in that order as requested as they accord with security 4 classification and space availability. 5 The Court is going to recommend the 500-hour Bureau 6 of Prisons Substance Abuse Treatment Program. 7 I believe that he pled to a superseding information. 8 Was he named in the original indictment? 9 MS. SANCHEZ: He was, your Honor. The government 10 moves to dismiss the counts naming this defendant, just as to 11 this defendant. 12 THE COURT: Granted. Appellate rights have been 13 waived. 14 Anything else? 15 MR. DAYS: No, your Honor, thank you. 16 THE COURT: That's the order. 17 PROBATION OFFICER: Ross Micheli from the Probation 18 Office. 19 THE COURT: Yes? PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor imposed a sentence of 20 21 120 months? 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 PROBATION OFFICER: That is technically a 24 below-guideline sentence. I was just wondering if the Court

25

could state its reasons.

THE COURT: The specific reason for that -- two, actually -- and they are exactly what was argued by defense counsel, and that is, one, the age. He was at a specifically young age when this occurred. And secondly, with regard to the upbringing, it was abysmal. It was disgraceful. It was, frankly, almost beyond comprehension. He just didn't get it, and that's not an excuse, but it is an understanding of what happened. Those are the reasons. (The proceedings were concluded at 10:08 a.m.) I, PEGGY J. CRAWFORD, Official Reporter, do hereby certify the foregoing transcript as true and correct. Dated: 22nd of April, 2020 /s/ Peggy J. Crawford PEGGY J. CRAWFORD, RDR-CRR