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THE COURT: Good afternoon.

And I'll start by asking the government to call the case.

MR. WISE: Thank you, Your Honor. Leo Wise for the United States. And the case is United States of America versus Victor Rivera, criminal number 20-127-CCB.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And defense counsel?

MR. MERCER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Steve
Mercer, counsel for Mr. Victor Rivera, who is present with me in my office.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And, Mr. Rivera, you can see and hear me; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I -- Yes, I do.
THE COURT: All right. And someone needs to be on mute when they're typing. Or something like that.

Okay. Let me start with the preliminary that -- I guess two things. I'm not sure if we have taken care of a due process order in this case. Probably not. And then there is the consent issue. So let me start with both of those.

First of all, we're proceeding by video conference. This is permitted under the Cares Act because of the current Corona Virus pandemic, so long as the defendant consents. And
so long as the Court makes a finding, which I'm prepared to do, that the proceeding to be held today cannot be further delayed without serious harm to the interests of justice. This matter has been pending for some time.

Mr. Rivera has reached an agreement with the government. He's prepared to move forward. That's in his interest as well as the public interest. And it would not be possible for public health safety reasons to do this in person in the courtroom for some substantial period of time, so $I$ do believe the requirements of the Cares Act are satisfied.

But, Mr. Mercer, would you agree with that?

MR. MERCER: Yes, Your Honor. And after consulting with Mr. Rivera, he does wish to proceed.

THE COURT: All right.

Is that correct, Mr. Rivera, you do consent to proceed by video conference today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
The other matter, as counsel are probably aware, there's a recent change to Rule 5 of the criminal rules, which a -- requires me or any judge at the first time that both the government and defense are present in a court proceeding, requires me to advise the government of its obligations under Brady, both orally and in writing.

So as required by Rule 5, the United States is
ordered to produce all exculpatory evidence to the defendant pursuant to Brady versus Maryland and its progeny. Not doing so in a timely manner may result in sanctions, including exclusion of evidence, adverse jury instructions, dismissal of charges, contempt proceedings, vacating a conviction, or disciplinary action against the prosecution.

To be clear, this is not a new obligation. It's something I'm sure the government is well aware of. But for the record, Mr. Wise, has the government complied with its Brady obligations to date in this case?

MR. WISE: We have, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
All right. Then we'll move forward. We are here for sentencing for Mr. Rivera. He's pled guilty to a charge of making a false statement to federal agent. As counsel know, I need to start with the presentence report and the calculation of the advisory guideline range in this case. So let me just start with the presentence report itself.

Mr. Wise, from the point of view of the government, any additions, corrections or modifications?

MR. WISE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Mercer, I know you have read the presentence report. For the record, has your client had the chance to review it and discuss it with you?

MR. MERCER: Yes, he has, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. And do you have any
additions, corrections or modifications?
MR. MERCER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
I've indicated the offense in the case, false statement to the FBI. The advisory guideline range, which is of course just one factor $I$ have to consider, starts at a 6. There is an increase of two for abuse of a position of trust, but a decrease of two for timely acceptance of responsibility. So that's an offense level of 6. Mr. Rivera's Criminal History Category is a I. So I believe the advisory guideline range would be from zero to six months.

Are we in agreement that that is the -- the guideline range, Mr. Wise?

MR. WISE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And, Mr. Mercer?

MR. MERCER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Now, of course, as I said, the guideline range is just one factor. I should mention that in addition to reviewing the presentence report, I have received sentencing memos from both sides, which I've reviewed, of course. Thank you. So I'm generally aware of everyone's position in this case. But of course, I'm happy to hear specifically what anyone would like to say in regard to
the sentence recommendation in this case.
And I'll start with the government, Mr. Wise.
MR. WISE: Thank you, Your Honor.
Victor Rivera almost got away. When FBI agents approached him in November of 2019, the statute of limitations had long since run on the drug crime he participated in almost ten years earlier. And all Victor Rivera had to do was tell them the truth, or, because this was a purely voluntary interview, just tell them he didn't want to talk. But Victor Rivera chose -- and it was his choice -- to do neither. And instead, he lied to the FBI agent that conducted that interview over and over again, as that remarkable transcript -- because the incident was recorded -- makes clear.

I count about 18 separate lies in the course of that interview that went from the general to the specific. Not a single exculpatory no, not a passing reference, not a question that could have been misunderstood. He was asked again and again and again whether he knew anything about drugs being taken from that search scene or them being sold, whether he participated in that.

And it really did. It went from the broadest of terms down to all the facts that were known at that point, about whether the drugs had been in a backpack and whether they had been sold to a source. And again and again and again
he said no. And that's why he's before the court today.
The unusual feature of this case is that, as I indicated in our -- in our filing, typically, it's the government that argues the Sentencing Guidelines generally capture the factors that $3553(a)$ talk about, and therefore a guidelines sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to meet the ends of sentencing. And usually, it's defense counsel that argues they don't.

Here it's the inverse. Here we have a guideline range of zero to six months for a crime that is far more serious than that, because what Mr. Rivera lied about matters. And what he lied about was his involvement in the sale of three kilograms of cocaine, which is really a significant quantity of cocaine. It's the largest single incidence of a drug theft we uncovered in this investigation.

The closest second is the two kilograms of cocaine that Your Honor heard about at the trial in this case, that Wayne Jenkins and Donald Stepp -- that Wayne Jenkins stole at a search site and then Donald Stepp sold on his behalf. This -- this is -- this is a third larger than that, and Mr. Rivera played a critical role.

The facts, as we understand them, is that this was an opportunistic theft and sale; that these drugs found their way into a van that he and -- and two others were in, and that when faced with the choice about what to do with them, instead
of turning them in, which might have harmed the case or been embarrassing or been a black eye for them professionally, they decided to sell them. And they decided to sell them to Mr. Rivera's confidential source.

So he wasn't a peripheral participant. He wasn't someone that just went along for the ride. He was someone who had a means to dispose of the drugs and to essentially take them from one drug dealer and transfer them to another back out onto the streets. And Mr. Rivera only accepted responsibility for that conduct.

And in the motion filed by defense counsel, his acceptance is obviously stressed, but -- but he only accepted responsibility when he was caught. You know, he didn't come forward back in 2009 when they found the drugs. That's what should have happened. We know that. Far worse, they actually decided to sell them and split the profits.

He didn't come forward on March the 1st of 2017, when the members of the Gun Trace Task Force were arrested. The FBI actually set up a tip line that was included in the public communications around that -- those arrests out of the hope that police officers like Mr. Rivera would come forward, whether anonymously or with immunity or other protections, and reveal wrongdoing that had gone on.

And I have to say the results of that are so disappointing, because that effort, that outreach effort
didn't produce a single case. And instead, it was the dogged persistence and determination of the FBI and the U.S. Attorney's Office that has resulted in these -- we're now at 14 charges after the original seven, 14 convictions after the original seven.

And more specifically, among those follow-on investigations, when Sergeant Gladstone was prosecuted and indicted publicly in May of 2019, and Mr. Rivera knew that he had been involved in this incident with him, he didn't come forward then either.

And it was only when he was approached in November of 2019, and in what $I$ can only guess was a view that he could avoid adverse employment consequences or some other adverse consequence, he agreed to this voluntary interview and then lied in response to every question he was asked about this incident.

So that's -- those are the facts. And he's admitted to those in his plea agreement. It was only when brought to that -- brought to the point where he was confronted with what he did, that he accepted responsibility for it.

Now, as his counsel points out, he has provided -in their filing, he has provided information to the Gun Trace Task Force Commission that was set up by the Maryland General Assembly and to the internal investigation that's being conducted by the Baltimore Police Department.

I suggested to the counsel for the GTTF Commission and to the lawyer leading the internal investigation, that both of those entities reach out to Mr. Rivera's counsel to inquire whether he would be willing to talk to them. And -and he did, and he deserves some credit for that.

But I have to say that -- that he and the other officers like him created the conditions that necessitated these extraordinary and expensive efforts. And so it's sort of like, you know, an arsonist that helps the fire department put out a fire they set. And it's not clear that anything will come of this. That's the other thing, of course. There's -- there's recommendations, but as has unfortunately been seen in other police departments and in other contexts, whether legislation or internal changes follow is an open question.

So while having been caught -- I think it is
laudable that he did, in fact, provide information -- I think that it's appropriate to value that in a way that $I$ think the recommendation we've made does. And I want to be clear about that. The 24 months we are recommending takes into account that he -- that he did that, and I would have recommended a higher sentence if he had not.

In terms of another item in the memo- -- in the defense memorandum, the first $I$ learned of the $\$ 20,000$ payment he made was in that sentencing memorandum. And I would say
that many victims of crimes go without restitution, as Your Honor knows, particularly in financial fraud cases. Restitution is often -- is ordered, mandatorily offered or ordered, but frequently, there are little or no -- there's little or no compensation for victims. I would have welcomed the opportunity to discuss whether there were avenues to restitute victims of crime.

But putting that aside, I will say that I -- I do have very real equity concerns about crediting payments to an unaffiliated third party to reduce this defendant's sentence. And what -- what that does is it enables defendants of means, which he obviously has enough means do that, to reduce a term of incarceration, but defendants who lack such financial means cannot. And that -- that raises, as I said, significant equity concerns from a -- in the context of our criminal justice system.

In terms of unwanted sentencing disparities, as I mentioned, 14 officers have been convicted in this investigation and not a single one has received probation as this defendant requests. If he had been charged with the drug offense that these charges would have captured had he been discovered earlier, he would have faced a five-year mandatory minimum sentence. The nearest defendant in terms of conduct, as I pointed out in my -- in my memorandum, was Carmine Vignola, who also committed -- it wasn't lying to law
enforcement, it was a perjury offense from testifying in front of the grand jury, and he received an 18 -month sentence.

I think in light of the fact that drugs were involved and the quantities that were involved here, that the 24 months we have recommended is appropriate. I had made a recommendation that was longer than 18 months in the case of Vignola, and I think the recommendation I'm making here is -is consistent with that.

For all those reasons, Your Honor, we believe 24 months of incarceration is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to meet the goals of sentencing.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Let me give you a chance to address one question, Mr. Wise. You've alluded to it in regard to the guidelines and that the guidelines are lower, as it happens in terms of a false statement to a federal agent, than $I$ believe they were in Mr. Vignola's case, which involved the lying under oath to a grand jury seeking an indictment.

Just abstractly, between those two offenses, do you see any reason to weigh them differently? Obviously, the guidelines do. And this is separate from your argument about what did the lie concern, but there might be some who would say that the grand jury offense is a degree more serious than the federal agent.

MR. WISE: So I'm -- I'm a little -- I'm puzzled by
the difference, because $I$ think that in practice, the way federal investigations are conducted, is individuals are interviewed by the FBI and then put in front of the grand jury. But the value of the information is equal -- I would equalize the two.

We almost never put someone in the grand jury that we haven't interviewed first. That's precisely why we then decide to put them in front of the grand jury and how investigations actually advance.

I think in many respects, the FBI interviews are more important, because we only put a fraction of witnesses that we interview in the grand jury. Then often it's -- if a witness is recalcitrant or we're concerned that they might -you know, it raises -- we try to lock them in. We're afraid that they might change their testimony later.

So putting aside the subject matter, I think -- I think, from my experience, lying to the FBI while we're redesigning guidelines should be just as serious for those practical reasons.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wise.

Mr. Mercer.

MR. MERCER: Thank you, Your Honor. I agree with the government in this respect, that there is a code of silence, $a$ blue code of silence. And it is that blue code of silence that enables a culture of corruption. And it's a very
powerful code, as Mr. Rivera's actions show.
But my comments to the Court now are directed at, I hope, impressing upon the Court that Mr. Rivera's a changed man, and that the actions he is taking to break that code of silence, which are not of insignificant risk to him, should be recognized. And that that is the primary factor we rely upon in asking the Court to impose a guidelines sentence.

Just briefly, before $I$ begin my other comments, I just want to respond to the notion of the contribution to the nonprofit. We did not link that to any aspect of plea bargaining or plea negotiation. That was purely an altruistic move by Mr. Rivera, with I think a genuine aim of restorative justice. I mean, he had -- has been living with this guilt on his conscience for a very long time. And it was completely irreconcilable with who he believes he is. And this was really an act of giving back in some way. He was not trying to earn anything through that.

We do bring it to the Court's attention. I, as his counsel, bring it to the Court's attention, because I think it is part of the context. But our focus, primarily, is on the code of silence and Mr. Rivera's actions to address that, because if -- if there is hope moving forward, it is going to have to involve breaking down that blue wall of silence.

Now, I am requesting a guidelines sentence and that any period of imprisonment be served through home detention.

Alternatively, I'm asking that the Court defer Mr. Rivera's voluntary surrender date until the pandemic is under control in BOP, and he has been vaccinated for COVID-19.

I provided the necessary medical records to the Court under seal. If there's any questions, I'll be happy to address that, but $I$ don't think $I$ need to speak to that further as we're all well aware of the circumstances in BOP.

Now, the -- today the Court must fashion a reasonable sentence that balances the history and characteristics of Mr. Rivera with the nature and circumstances of the offense and the need for general deterrence.

We recognize that the Court will assess the false statement enhanced by the fact that Mr. Rivera was a sworn police officer and that there was abuse of trust.

We also recognize, too, that the Court will likely consider the subject matter of the false statement. That is reasonable.

The government asked for 24 months as the just punishment necessary to deter such future misconduct and to promote respect for the law. Here we part ways with the government to be sure a sentence of imprisonment may work to promote respect for the law. However, the opposite is true if the law is viewed merely as a means to dispense a punishment without taking into full account the circumstances involved in
sentencing.
Now, of course in this case, the relevant circumstances include Mr. Rivera's history and characteristics, his acceptance of responsibility for his conduct, and his strong desire to make amends for his offense. And we maintain that when those factors are balanced against the factors identified by the government, there is a clear message for the Court to send through Mr. Rivera's sentence, albeit not what the government requests.

Before I tell Mr. Rivera's story and explain why a sentence within the guidelines is sufficient but not greater than necessary, I want to emphasize these points. First, Mr. Rivera fully accepts responsibility for violating his fundamental duty to serve the community. To that end, he offers a genuine apology to the citizens of Baltimore, his family, his fellow officers, the Court, and the government.

Second, Mr. Rivera recognizes that he was motivated by personal gain and a desperate, misguided desire to shield his family and fellow officers from his own failures.

Third, in an effort to make amends, Mr. Rivera has voluntarily submitted to in-depth interviews by counsel for Maryland's Commission to Restore Trust in Policing and counsel heading up the Baltimore City Police Department's investigation and root-cause analysis of corruption.

Now I want to spend some time and tell you a little
more about Mr. Rivera's story and his background and characteristics. He's 49 years old. He was born in the Bronx and raised in Suffolk County, Long Island. His parents are Victor Rivera and Candida Rivera. His father's from Puerto Rico. He has two sisters and a brother. It's a very close-knit family. His parents and one of his sisters live in York, Pennsylvania. He's in constant contact with them, daily contact. He visits his family regularly on the weekend.

His father has early stage dementia, sadly. And he regularly visits them to help with their care. He's also in touch with his other family members, his sister in New York, as well as his brother who lives in this area.

Mr. Rivera was married for 16 years. He has two adult children, a son and daughter, who he maintains strong ties with, and also an adult stepson and two stepdaughters. He currently lives with his fiancée.

That's sort of the -- the hard data. And I know that was in the PSI and the Court has reviewed that. But I want the Court to know that when Mr. Rivera graduated from high school, there were two jobs acceptable to his mother, police officer or priest. He dreamt of becoming a police officer. And to make that dream a reality, he applied for a position from Baltimore City Police Department in 1994.

Your Honor, he was 22 years old. He applied, and he went through several rounds of employment testing. The last
test was a physical test. He was worried about his poor eyesight disqualifying him. And -- and it did. And to this day, he remembers how distraught he was on the long ride home from New York -- to New York.

He was able to get corrective surgery, and he was accepted to the department. He entered the police academy on a $\$ 24,500-a-y e a r$ salary, or about $\$ 12.50$ an hour. The academy should have prepared him for the unique challenges that confront our police officers every day in the community.

As the Commission to Restore Trust recognizes, ethics training should be an essential part of an officer's training. It was not. There was no training on corruption at the academy, no training about the different ways that an officer can be tested on the streets. When he graduated from the academy, he felt as though he was given a toolbox without the tools. His words.

As a patrol officer in the Eastern District, he had to learn from more senior officers how to conduct surveillance on drug corners, make vehicle stops, conduct searches. When he saw how things actually worked, he began to realize, this is what it's like. He was never trained what about to expect. He wondered, frankly, even at that young age, what he had gotten himself into.

He was barely taught the basics and then thrown out there. All that he really knew was to look to officers who
had years of experience on him. And it was around 1999, when the broken windows policing policy resulted in an emphasis on the numbers rather than integrity in policing and created a perception of policing in a war zone instead of a community. With a focus on interdicting drugs, Mr. Rivera was tested in ways he never imagined and was never prepared for by the academy or continuing professional training.

While still in his 20s, as a young man, he encountered corruption by his senior officer who was part of the good ole boys network. This occurred in a culture of silence where being accepted as a good cop by a more senior officer was the motivating factor. Mr. Rivera very much wanted to be the good cop. And, frankly, in many ways, he really was.

Still, his integrity was again tested in the 2009 incident that is the subject of his false statement. That event was too much for Mr. Rivera. Although he never again would engage in such conduct, his life had already started to spiral down. His marriage was failing. His drinking became a daily ritual. There was little to instill a sense of pride in his work.

He hit bottom in 2012 when he was charged with DUI and suspended from the force. He struggled back from that low point in his life and recommitted himself to policing and his family. And he did so with respect and he did honor his family.

Still, when federal agents, as the government points out, came to speak with him many years later, he lied. He followed and fell in line with the blue code of silence. And for this, he has profound remorse, because he now knows just how corrupting silence is within the department.

Mr. Rivera's insight about the corrupting effect of silence motivated him to take action. His actions shift the balance of sentencing factors. Why? Because integrity is the backbone of effective policing. A central factor that breeds a culture of ineffective and corrupt policing is the blue code of silence. If you don't talk about it, it never happened.

This code of silence enables corruption. And how does BCPD create a culture of compliance? The Department of Justice, the Commission to Restore Public Trust, the department itself seeked that answer. They discussed measures. Very smart and able members of the commission and -- and counsels have discussed about increased accountability, ethics training, rewarding high ethics, messaging and model behaviors, reform of internal affairs.

But here's the insight that we offer and that $I$ offer from my work with Mr. Rivera: A central factor to each of these measures is combating a culture of silence. And to that end, this is an opportunity to acknowledge the pervasive, corrosive effect of silence that is the root cause of the problems we see in policing. It's an opportunity for the

Court to send a message that speaking out and breaking that code of silence is essential.

Mr. Rivera is the one officer who fully cooperated with the commission and BCPD's root-cause investigation. In doing so, he has broken the blue code of silence. To be sure, he lived by that code of silence, but he has now broken from the chains of that code of silence, and it is not at insignificant risk.

That fact shifts the balance of sentencing factors and outweighs the factors cited by the government. A reasonable sentence is a sentence within the guidelines. Alternatively, a period of home detention would be sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to accomplish the goals of sentencing.

As I said at the beginning, I asked the Court to see Mr. Rivera as a changed person, a person who has come to realize, through the crucible of a career police officer's life on the streets, that his moral compass is central to his character, not what his senior officers thought of him. He is a person who knows now that there are consequences to every action and that silence does not make bad events disappear. That it is your ethics that allow you to overcome the challenges of life and a profession to serve the public. He does live these core values now, and he seeks to instill them within his family and their -- his former colleagues.

And I'll close on $a$-- on a personal note for
Mr. Rivera. And Mr. Rivera still is, I think, in many ways -it's hard for him to speak about some of the things that he close -- holds closest to his heart. But I know his relationship with his father is particularly close. I know his father has dementia. I know that Mr. Rivera goes to care for him. I'm very concerned that if Mr. Rivera is separated for the period of time that the government's asked for in terms of imprisonment, that by the time he leaves, his father will not recognize him.

Now, Mr. Rivera knows that he bears responsibility for his actions and that his actions have consequences, as I've just said. And that would be a heart-breaking consequence. But, on balance, given Mr. Rivera's actions and his courage to really step forward and to break the blue code of silence, and because that is a central enabling feature of corruption in policing, not only in this community but across all communities, $I$ ask the Court to impose a sentence that is within the guidelines, because it is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to accomplish the goals of sentencing. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mercer. MR. WISE: Your Honor, may $I$-- may $I$ just respond to one or two points?

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Wise.

MR. WISE: Your Honor, I -- Mr. Rivera didn't break the code of silence. Four police officers testified in the Gun Trace Task Force trial. They're the ones that really blew open what's -- what's followed and resulted in -- we're now at 14 convictions. So I think it is vastly overstating what he has done, to act like he was the first one to come forward.

Secondly, he wasn't silent. He affirmatively lied. Silence would have been telling the FBI agents, I don't want to talk to you. He tried to throw them off by lying to them about his involvement in this event.

And the last thing I would say, Your Honor, is police officers shouldn't need to be trained not to steal three kilograms of cocaine. And I've heard this argument before that it's a failure of training. I would buy that if this were a civil rights case and the question was in a -- in a sticky spot, you know, when they went into a building, did that -- did that constitute exigent circumstances, or did they engage in police tactics that you might argue were in some -in some -- I've heard police officers sometimes talk about gray zone, which I don't think exists.

But if this were a case like that where you could say, oh, he wasn't given -- whatever the analogy was -- the tools in the toolbox, a police officer doesn't need to be trained not to steal drugs from people and sell them. And I think this is so far beyond anything that you could point to a
failure in training for. I just think it's -- it's -- it almost takes my breath away.

There is undoubtedly a culture of corruption that needs to be combated. But it's not the fault of the institution that Mr. Rivera didn't understand he shouldn't do this.

MR. MERCER: And, Your Honor, briefly, if I could counter-respond. That was certainly not our point and not our argument, that without training, one would not know that that is corrupt behavior. I was putting in context Mr. Rivera's story and how it started and the long slippery slope that culminated in -- in that event.

So I appreciate the government's desire to respond to that, but $I$ think, you know, making these bald statements about, you know, don't -- he's trying to blame training really misses the point that Mr. Rivera has made a commitment to speaking to. And, frankly, if given the opportunity, I'm sure he would go even further than he has with his detailed debriefings, which have been very candid and very personal, with those investigating this -- this long-standing, systemic problem in our policing.

THE COURT: Thank you. And thank you both.
I agree, Mr. Mercer, I did not take your comments about training to suggest that you have to be trained about not stealing drugs. I appreciate that you are not the only
one that thinks that there have been training failures in the past in the police department. And learning on the job is not always the best way to learn.

That's a little bit different from the points that you were making, I think -- or that Mr. Wise thought you were making. And I also appreciate that -- I did not take your comments to mean that Mr. Rivera was the one that had come forward or taken major responsibility for breaking this open in any way, but only in regard to his willingness to speak with the Commission and the city investigators.

Let me ask you, before $I$ turn to your client, Mr. Mercer, regarding conditions -- whatever the sentence may be, regarding conditions, there are various mandatory and standard conditions that are recommended in the presentence report, as well as a special condition of any mental health counseling that the probation officer might recommend. Do you have any additions or objections or anything else you'd want to request or remark on behalf of your client?

MR. MERCER: I should have remarked, Your Honor, that Mr. Rivera has already begun counseling. And that's been -- part of his journey has been to engage in mental health counseling. So he embraces that. There's no issue whatsoever with that at all.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Rivera, if there's anything you'd like to say,
you certainly have the right to do that. You don't have to. I won't hold it against you. If you don't, your counsel has spoken. But if there's anything you'd like to say, you do have the right to do that. And we just need to figure out a way to make sure you're close enough to the microphone.

MR. MERCER: You can take your mask off and I'll put my mask on.

THE DEFENDANT: I just basically -- what $I$ want to say is start off with the deepest apologies to you, to the Courts.

THE COURT: And I'm sorry to interrupt, but just a minute.

Can the court reporter hear, or do we need a little bit more volume?
(Discussion off record.)

THE COURT: Sorry.

THE DEFENDANT: I just wanted to say deepest
apologies to you, to the government, to the investigating officers, detectives, my attorney, also extended to the BPD and the citizens of Baltimore, but most importantly, to my family who's been there with love and support. I know I hurt a lot of people, but $I$ stand before you a changed man.

I'm -- God willing, I want to continue to break down the wall of silence and challenge and speak, you know, to recruits in the academy and plant a seed and share my story
with them and be transparent.

So that's kind of pretty much what I'm -- I'm wanting to do. I do -- I'm not running away from this. I -I'm taking this as my -- my responsibility to do what I have to do, which is do the right thing. And I felt like I have been doing the right thing. And most definitely, there should be more that I do, and I think it's -- I need to do. So -for me and for my family, and just go to make amends for all of this and to kind of start my second half of life, so to speak.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
Rivera.

Okay. Anything else that anybody has not had a chance to say that they would like to?

All right. So I appreciate counsel on both sides and what you've said and what Mr. Rivera has said and the letters that I've received. I've taken all of this into account. It's -- I'll just comment that it's a sad aspect of this. One of the things that Mr. Mercer reflected on was how much this career, at least initially, meant to his client, his dream of becoming an officer. And this is not the first time I have heard that from people that, unfortunately, have been in front of me for sentencing for these serious offenses. And it's just unfortunate to see how those dreams kind of went
down the wrong road and people found themselves involved in very, very serious offenses that clearly they should not have been.

But it's a difficult situation for everyone. This is a very serious offense. Mr. Rivera not only lied, of course, to the federal agents, repeatedly, as the government has correctly pointed out, in 2019 , when he didn't have to, he didn't have to offer anything. But he did. And what he lied about, while -- had happened, of course, many years in the past, was an extremely serious offense, what he was concealing was a significant betrayal of trust.

Sending a very large quantity of drugs back into the community for sale, knowing as I'm sure he did from his work as an officer, the tragedy and destruction that those drugs can bring, he nonetheless participated in it and profited from it. And later, unfortunately, why he's here, is because he did lie about that to a federal agent investigating these very serious matters. I have to take that into account. I have to take into account deterrence and the importance of general deterrence of sending a message.

And I understand Mr. Mercer's point. There are two ways of looking at this. Someone who has been willing to talk and come forward should get some credit for that. But at the same time, it's extremely important to send a message that, not just silence, but criminal behavior and/or refusing to
talk about it and come in and explain and speak truthfully and, for that matter, report it if another -- if an officer sees another officer doing something that they know is a crime, it ought to be part of the culture that they don't tolerate it. That it's unacceptable. And that's part of the message that has to come today, that this culture of corruption, code of silence, whatever it may be called, is unacceptable.

I have to compare sentences that $I$ have given to similarly situated people in this case. Counsel have referred to Mr. Vignola. I did find that 18 months was sufficient for Mr. Vignola who lied to the grand jury. What he lied about had to do with planting a gun at the request of another officer to justify certain police action. I'm not sure there's a -- it's an easy distinction to make between selling drugs and lying about it or planting evidence and lying about it. They're both extremely serious things. And it does matter what the untruthful statement related to.

On the other hand, I certainly -- as Mr. Mercer said, I certainly have to consider Mr. Rivera as an individual. I do believe that he has, recently, at least, more fully accepted responsibility than some of the other -many of the other officers involved in this in this way, which is the willingness to talk to the state commission and the independent investigator, and perhaps in some way contribute
to some changes and improvement down the road. And I agree that his willingness to do this indicates some change. He has publicly acknowledged that that's what he's doing, that he's cooperating with these interviews and providing -- providing information in some effort to make recompense.

The contribution to the particular charity involved, I understand Mr. Wise's point, and I agree to the extent that I don't think you should give one person credit for a financial action that another person was simply unable to do. On the other hand, it is certainly true there are -- there are people who have appeared in front of me who had the means to make restitution or make some sort of giving back, restoration of what they had gained, and have done nothing about it. So I think it is something that can fit into the entire picture of the history and circumstances of Mr. Rivera.

And I also do appreciate that he has certain health issues that would affect his service of a sentence.

So I am trying the best $I$ can to balance all those things. I do believe -- and Mr. Mercer, the combination of the seriousness of the offense and the need for general deterrence do not permit me to impose a probationary sentence. That would not be reasonable under all the 3553(a) factors that I have to consider.

I think that -- as I found with Mr. Vignola, I think that the 24 months is more than is necessary in light of all
the factors that I've identified for Mr. Rivera. Where I come out, in the exercise of the best judgment $I$ can, is that it is going to be a sentence of 14 months in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for Mr. Rivera. That is going to be followed by a period of two years of supervised release. Special conditions, in addition to all the mandatory and standard, including the mental health counseling and treatment that he says he's already started on, which is, I'm sure, a good idea.

Mr. Rivera's financial circumstances, in light of the contribution and in light of other matters, simply looking at his financial circumstances, I don't think a fine is warranted here, but there is a required $\$ 100$ special assessment that $I$ am imposing.

Now, I agree with Mr. Mercer that requiring Mr. Rivera to report to the Bureau of Prisons at this particular time would not be reasonable thing to do in light of the COVID situation and his specific health conditions, so I am willing to defer his voluntary surrender date. I don't know if you have a specific date in mind, Mr. Mercer, or if we might check in at a certain point. Obviously, it cannot be forever postponed, but this would not be a good time.

MR. MERCER: Perhaps we could check back with the Court, say, within 30 days. I would just like to get a sense of when BOP is going to have vaccines available or when Mr.

Rivera can be vaccinated, because I'm -- I'm expecting, just given the state of affairs, that it's probably not going to be until the summertime before the BOP facilities, assuming they get vaccines, are returning to some semblance of normal operations.

THE COURT: Possibly, Mr. Rivera will be able to get the vaccine earlier than that. But yes, checking in in 30 days.

Mr. Wise, do you want to comment on that?
MR. WISE: I think checking in in 30 days would be -- would be fine, Your Honor. We're getting information that the BOP is vaccinating inmates. We actually received an email today that we can inquire about whether specific inmates have been vaccinated. So it is happening. I don't -- don't confess to know the plan specifically or how it's being rolled out and in what facilities, but -- but I would certainly think checking in in 30 days would be acceptable.

THE COURT: All right. Well, what $I$ can do is we'll reflect in the Judgment and Commitment order that he's being permitted to voluntary surrender, and we'll put some language about the date to be set. And I'll speak with counsel. We can set up a conference call in about 30 days to discuss that further.

Is there anything else, anything I've left out, any legal objection to that sentence, anything from the probation
officer or others?

MR. WISE: Not from the United States, Your Honor.

Thank you.

MR. MERCER: Not from the defense. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you all.
Mr. Rivera, in light of the sentence and the plea agreement, I'm not sure there's anything you have a right to or would want to appeal from, but if you were going to be noting any appeal, that would have to be within 14 days. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all.

MR. WISE: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. MERCER: Thank you, Your Honor.
(The proceedings were concluded.)
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