VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE COUNTY OF

ARLINGTON

+ + + + +

:

IN THE MATTER OF:

:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA: CR-17000434-00

: CR-17000435-00

VS. : CR-17000436-00

: CR-17000699-753-00

ADIAM BERHANE

:

DEFENDANT.

Tuesday,
May 1, 2018

Arlington, Virginia

The hearing re motion to continue, motion to compel, motion to appoint accountant, and motion to appoint computer expert commenced at 9:44 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM T. NEWMAN, JR., JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA:

MARGARET L. EASTMAN, ESQ.
Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney
LISA B. TINGLE, ESQ.
Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney
1425 N. Courthouse Road
Suite 5200
Arlington, VA 22201
(703) 228-4410

ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT BERHANE:

BRADLEY HAYWOOD, ESQ.
Chief Public Defender
RACHEL COLLINS, ESQ.
SUSANNAH C. LOUMIET, ESQ.
JAMES ROBINSON, ESQ.
Assistant Public Defender
Office of the Public Defender
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Suite 201
Arlington, VA 22201
(703) 875-1111

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	9:44 a.m.
3	THE CLERK: Adiam Berhane.
4	MR. ROBINSON: Good morning, Your
5	Honor.
6	THE COURT: Good morning. Good
7	morning.
8	MR. ROBINSON: James Robinson,
9	Susannah Loumiet, Brad Haywood and Rachel Collins
10	on behalf of Adiam Berhane.
11	THE COURT: All right.
12	MR. ROBINSON: May it please the
13	court, Judge?
14	THE COURT: Yes, you may have a seat.
15	MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	This comes before the court on several motions
17	filed by the defense on behalf of Mr. Berhane.
18	I'm asking the court at this time to
19	take up the motion for a forensic expert, a
20	motion for appointment of a digital forensic
21	expert, and then Ms. Loumiet will argue the
22	motion for appointment of a forensic accountant,

and we'll move on from there, Judge, if that's okay with the court.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, we are asking for a forensic expert to be appointed in this case. I have consulted with Lars Daniels and Larry Daniels. They run a firm, Envista, that does this kind of work.

As Your Honor is likely aware, the evidence in this case consists of a huge amount of digital data -- much of it pulled from devices with some connection to the defendant or the codefendant, or both.

And essentially, Judge, we are at the point where the volume of data alone, the assistance of a digital forensic expert just to help catalog and categorize this data to where we can access it in a way that's efficient for trial.

Right now, we kind of have everything sort of poured into a big bucket, and a digital forensic expert can help organize this data,

provide links to the data, and get it organized so it's actually useful for us in a way that -- without --

I don't have the technical expertise to manipulate the files in this way, Judge, but that alone, I think, would be a sufficient task for the court to appoint an expert just so we can actually have command over all of this data.

But in addition to that, Judge, you know, there are methods that the police use to get this data off of the devices and I'd like -- I'm not capable. I don't have the technical expertise to determine whether or not those methods are prone to defect or any other mistakes.

I haven't been really provided any information about those specific methodologies,

Judge, but if I had, I could tell the court that

I wouldn't know the difference between a

description of a method that works and the

description of a method that would not

necessarily produce accurate data.

So that is another factor for which I believe it's necessary to have a forensic expert, Judge. All of this data, the reliability of this data, I'd like an expert to be able to consult with.

And, you know, at a later time, Judge, we might ask for testimony if that's appropriate, but at this point, we're seeking funds to have an expert help us review and catalog this data into a method that's usable and also help review the methods and the manners in which this data was gathered to make sure that they are, in fact, reliable, and look for any potential avenues there where - well, essentially, Judge, just to help us get an idea for the weight of these methods and whether they should be coming into evidence or not.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. EASTMAN: Judge, may I respond to all of the motions at the end?

THE COURT: No, I'd like to just deal with these individually.

MS. EASTMAN: I don't have a particular position with respect to the appointment of a forensic expert, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay, all right, the court will grant your motion for appointment of an expert.

MR. ROBINSON: We will, once I've gotten some additional information from the expert as far as the funds, I'll ask for another hearing, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. LOUMIET: Good morning, Your
Honor, Susanna Loumiet on behalf of Adiam
Berhane. This is the motion for an appointment
of a forensic accountant. Your Honor, under the
case law, I believe the case law establishes that
we are entitled to a forensic accountant in this
case because of the nature of the allegations.

It really -- we can -- it is -- it would be -- it's a basic tool for us to present an adequate defense because this case is going to be based on following where the funds went, how

they were channeled into the business account, if they were channeled into the business account, and it involves multiple transactions.

We are not equipped ourselves to do an independent investigation of that, nor are we equipped to explain that to the jury should it get to that point.

We would need an expert to testify, an expert who is educated in accounting principles and who can explain to a jury what has been found. So, Your Honor, we are asking for a forensic accountant in this case.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. EASTMAN: Can I ask who the accountant is, please?

MR. ROBINSON: Sorry, I have been consulting several accountants, Judge. We haven't been able -- I've spoken to one. He felt that the volume would interfere too much with his other matters, so I've been referred to several others.

Again, Judge, we would ask if this

motion is granted, for a status so we have time 1 2 to finish our consultations and get a figure before the court before we ask for the funds to 3 4 be dispersed. 5 MS. EASTMAN: I'd ask the court to hold your ruling in abeyance until somebody is 6 7 identified. 8 THE COURT: All right, let me see, I 9 will tentatively grant your motion, but pending, you know, verification as to who and what and, 10 11 you know, approximate cost and so forth. 12 Yes, Your Honor. MR. ROBINSON: 13 MS. LOUMIET: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. 15 MR. HAYWOOD: Good morning, Your 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: Good morning. 18 MR. HAYWOOD: Your Honor, we filed a 19 motion, as the court's aware, for discovery, production of discovery, mainly hard copies of 20 21 the discovery that's been provided for our

I understand this is an issue of some

review.

significance, both to my office and to the Commonwealth. I haven't received a response to the pleading.

I do realize that we filed this a few days ago, but in light of the issues that we are confronting, I do think that it's important for me to have notice of the Commonwealth's position so that I can be prepared to argue this in light of whatever their position is.

I'll just be honest with you. That's never been articulated to me. Although I've had conversations with the Commonwealth, including Ms. Stamos, it's not been articulated to me why my request can't be granted in limited circumstances such as these, and I'd like to know that before I'm here presenting a legal argument to the court even if it was just, it was just put off, the hearing was just put off for a few days, and perhaps the Commonwealth could provide me something to give us a sense of where they're going with this. That would be extremely helpful.

We're entitled to notice just as they 1 2 are, and I think at this point, they have a 12page or a 14-page pleading from me that's 3 detailed and researched with a statement of facts 4 5 and our position and our request, and I really don't know where they're coming from on this. 6 7 So just in terms of parity, I would 8 ask the court to declare a responsive pleading 9 and consider hearing this on a different day. THE COURT: Does the Commonwealth have 10 11 12 MS. EASTMAN: Are you finished? Yes, ma'am. 13 MR. HAYWOOD: 14 MS. EASTMAN: I'm sorry. I just didn't want to interrupt if you weren't. 15 16 this case was indicted in April of last year. 17 Mr. Ellis, who was originally retained counsel in 18 this case, withdrew from representation, and this 19 court appointed the Public Defender's Office in 20 June of 2017. 21 The original trial date that was set 22 in this case was October 23, 2017. On the

defendant's motion, the trial date was continued to January 9. Part of the reason, and I didn't disagree, you know, certainly was that there was a compelling amount of information in this case to investigate.

On January 4, there was a motion, a bill of particulars, argued in front of Judge DiMatteo requesting more information from the Commonwealth in an, in fact, more responsive information from the Commonwealth regarding the charges at hand.

And during that motion and in my response of pleading that I filed in that case, I pointed out several things, and I would like to point them out again.

In the summer of 2017 when this case was -- first of all, the preliminary hearing in this case was March of 2017, and at that time, Mr. Ellis and Mr. Bugg, who represented the codefendant, were asking lots of questions about the case.

In response to that, I invited counsel

for the defendants to come to my office, which they did, and I sat down in my office and I prepared an extensive PowerPoint presentation for them describing the evidence that we had recovered in the case.

We showed them pictures, circles and arrows, an explanation of how our pieces of evidence fit together, what we believed was occurring in this particular case, and that two-hour presentation was done in the presence of Mr. Bugg and Mr. Ellis at the time.

You got a taste of a little bit of that presentation during the sentencing of the co-defendant in this case when I gave Your Honor a one-hour presentation. I think it took one hour, and I apologize for that, but about a one-hour presentation of how this case evolved and what the evidence in the case was.

Double that information was provided at least to counsel during that first meeting.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Ellis, after a plea disposition case, sort of fell to the wayside.

The Public Defender's Office was appointed in June of 2017, and shortly thereafter, I invited the Public Defender's Office to my office where I repeated the performance, sat them down in our conference room in our office and for two hours went through the whole litany of evidence, what we believed was occurring, and again, went out of our way to explain the case to counsel for the defendant.

Based on the motion for the bill of particulars after explaining these very same facts to Judge DiMatteo, that in combination with some of the information I did respond to for the bill of particulars, Judge DiMatteo denied the bill of particulars, but she also granted the motion to continue. Again, there's an extensive volume of information involved in this case, and we picked a trial date of May 21.

So at this point in time, Judge, we've had three trial dates, several continuances, and these dates were selected each time by counsel for the defendant.

Each time these cases were continued, the Commonwealth subpoenaed scores, and I'm talking scores of witnesses, to appear from all over the country and locally, including multiple agencies, the Attorney General's office, the FBI, the Arlington Police, et cetera, to appear on the chosen trial dates.

Now, I may not be reading the true filing information in my Access as well as I should, and so I apologize, but I did not see any subpoenas from the defense -- subpoenas duces tecum, subpoenas for witnesses, or any such thing.

I will tell the court that there are so many search warrants, it's hard to count them, that we issued from our office and the police department, including scores and scores of subpoenas duces tecum for financial information that began when we were in the General District Court, and that continued up until the last several months when we issued additional subpoenas duces tecum for additional financial

information.

So we have been diligently prosecuting this case, Judge, for -- since a year-and-a-half now this case has been pending in the Arlington court system.

Notwithstanding the failure to subpoena anything themselves, as far as I can tell, and in addition to all of the PowerPoint presentations -- and I might point out I think the public defender was here during the sentencing argument in the last case when I went yet through another hour-long presentation of the evidence with you -- we have been unable to discern much progress on the part of the Public Defender's Office in this case in terms of getting this case ready for trial.

I will point out that we have discovery logs in our office which indicate when you want to come in and look at a file or to look at evidence in a case. Counsel needs to sign in before they remove the file and sign out when they leave, and so I took a look at those from

June of 2017 through the last couple of days of April.

In 2017, 16 hours in 2017 was spent in our office examining the discovery provided in the Adiam Berhane case. In 2018, 26 hours was listed in our logs, and that's being generous because on several of these occasions, multiple files for unrelated co-defendants were also pulled out at the same time.

So to give them full credit, 26 or so hours, that means 42 hours since they've been appointed, have been spent on discovery in this case, which amounts to about 4.2 hours a month between two attorneys for the Public Defender's Office committed to doing discovery in this case.

Now, I appreciate that there's a lot of information. Ms. Tingle and I are faced with the same volume of information that the Public Defender's Office is faced with. We agree there's a lot of information here. There's no doubt, Judge, that this is a gargantuan task by either side of this equation.

I guess my position in this case is		
going to be a little surprising to the court, but		
let me just say this, that in the pleadings on		
page three of the motion to continue filed by Mr.		
Haywood, he has indicated that the		
MR. HAYWOOD: Your Honor, just a		
correction, I didn't draft or file the motion to		
continue.		
MS. EASTMAN: Your motion is		
MR. ROBINSON: The discovery motion,		
not the motion to continue.		
MS. EASTMAN: The discovery, oh,		
excuse me, the discovery motion, my apologies.		
Mr. Haywood represents that the		
defense has, and I quote, "barely made a dent in		
the discovery materials provided by the		
Commonwealth and has done anything but		
demonstrate that it is capably navigating		
discovery in the case."		
discovery in the case." I couldn't agree with him more. I		
-		

discovery in this case, and I believe that they've been given an ample amount of time and resources to do so.

I understand the position Mr. Haywood takes in this case as somehow the agreement reached by the Public Defender's Office and the Commonwealth as in respect to the discovery in this case was some type of - I almost --

I don't want to put these words in his mouth because I don't believe he intended this, but it strikes me as almost about bait and switch, that, you know, they signed this open file discovery, which we have afforded in this case, and somehow they were overwhelmed and they would not perhaps have signed this agreement had they known the volume of information.

I take issue with that, Judge, but what is concerning to the Commonwealth, frankly, is the lack of effective investigation in this case, the failure to file any subpoenas for their own financial information, the failure to detect and identify and request of the court for experts

in this case prior to three weeks before trial, which of course would occasion a continuance, the utter failure to present any of these issues to the court in a timely way that could be resolved without requiring a continuance.

But having said that, Judge, I want to preserve, if we get a conviction in this case, I would like to preserve it, and I believe that these representations in this discovery request are making a compelling case for ineffective assistance of counsel, and that is very disturbing to me, and I believe by saying to this court that, "We haven't done our job," they are prejudicing any success that the prosecution might have in this case on appeal.

And I regretfully stand here and say to this court that I think you have to continue this case based on the representations made in these pleadings, and that pains me greatly because no benefit is going to come to the Commonwealth as a result of this continuance other than upsetting quite a lot of people in

this case, but having said that, I think there's a compelling argument in this case that to date, there has been ineffective assistance of counsel.

And with that in mind, and the fact that we've been going on for almost a year now since the Public Defender's Office has been appointed, and we are no further along in this investigation of the case by the defense, we are respectfully asking you to remove them and appoint somebody else.

MR. HAYWOOD: Your Honor, if I may, I might have to bite my tongue a bit. I'm not accustomed to low blows of that nature in a criminal courtroom.

In responding to the Commonwealth's last request, I would note that -- I would ask of the Commonwealth how many hours they've spent in a room outside of their office taking words that have already been typed by another human being, and then typing them on their own keyboard, how many hours on this case, how many hours on any other case, how many hours in their lives they've

done that.

My attorneys have been doing that for 42 hours. That's just the 42 hours that both of them have been there, and usually they'll go there together, so you can probably add another 23 hours to that, 25, who knows? 60 some, maybe 70 some hours of attorney time have been spent keyboarding. That's what's been going on here.

What the Commonwealth did when the Commonwealth needed to make copies, because they did, I'm sure they have more than one copy, they asked somebody to click "print" on a computer.

They asked an administrative aide to take a stack of papers and put them through a copier. That's what they did.

In a case like this, having done serious cases before, very frequently you can litigate a whole case before you go to trial in less than 100 hours. That's a lot, and a courtappointed attorney wouldn't even get paid on those hours.

So to suggest that this is any,

there's any amount of dilatory conduct by my office is plainly offensive. These people are incredibly hardworking. I've watched it.

It is perhaps, having personal experience sitting in those rooms manually transcribing discovery, I don't know that there's any more demeaning a task that I've done as a defense attorney.

We're going to be ready for this case, but the fact of the matter is we haven't had the time yet. If our task is, if our duty is, our obligation as attorneys is to have all the material that's been provided to us that has been deemed material by the Commonwealth, that's been deemed important to this case, if our duty is to have all of this, we've got to copy all of it and we're going to copy all of it.

The fact of the matter is I think if there was any error that was made by my staff here, it was not asking for a longer extension of time because the first continuance should have probably asked for two years because that's

exactly how much time it's going to take anyone to manually transcribe the absolutely overwhelming quantity of discovery that's present that the Commonwealth has provided to us and for some reason won't just give it to us in the form that anybody else would expect in any kind of case in the world.

Why is it that we can't get copies of spreadsheets for example? Are spreadsheets going to land in the hands of somebody who is going to harm somebody else as their common justification goes? Why can't we get copies of photographs, pages of text with photographs? Is there even a way for us to manually copy those things down?

The reason that we aren't ready now is because of the Commonwealth's discovery policies, and that's the reason they have put this motion on because it's absolutely absurd to expect anyone in our position to be ready for a case of this nature with these minimal accommodations without any reason that's been given to us as to why that is the case.

It doesn't happen anywhere else. It doesn't happen anywhere else. That's all I did in private practice was large family matters.

In jurisdictions where there are completely closed file discovery in large cases, they give you stacks of paper because they're concerned about the fairness of the process.

They're actually concerned about defense counsel being ready for court. They're concerned about protecting their record, as Ms. Eastman mentioned, and you get it because that's the way this is supposed to work.

In Federal Court, and I cited many cases like this, in Federal Court, that's exactly what you get. In Federal Court where you have large financial fraud schemes, you have stacks of financial documents, what they do -- because it's considered unreasonable, it's unreasonable to have those sitting in someone else's office.

It's unreasonable not to have the defendant have a copy of those.

They give them copies because that's

what you need to be prepared. That's really all I have to say. I mean, I guess I concur in their request for a continuance. I strongly, strongly object to their request to have my office removed from this case.

We can adequately provide incredibly competent representation. I'm very confident of that. I think that, frankly, the discovery matter might be something I would like to understand a little bit more about the Commonwealth's position.

This is something that needs to be more fully briefed. The court needs to be more fully briefed on it, and we need to have an opportunity to really hash out why it is they elected this, what I view as an arbitrary procedure.

So along those lines, we would ask -we would agree with the -- well, obviously we
made the motion for a continuance, so we'd ask
for a continuance, and we'd also ask, again, as I
mentioned before, to delay the proceedings on the

motion for discovery. Thank you.

THE COURT: Well, I'll say a couple of things. I am not going to, first of all, remove the Public Defender's Office because I think that, first of all, we're almost starting from scratch again with them, and the length of time that may be to get any other attorneys up to speed would occasion a delay of an even greater amount of time than I think that we could, than what the court is willing to do.

I agree with Ms. Eastman in the fact that if the court didn't grant one, it would be akin to -- I'm just saying right now -- ineffective assistance because of the volume and so forth, and it wouldn't - so the court has to in this case, as much as it pains it to have to, continue it again because it has been at this point continued.

Perhaps at the time that this date was requested, it was not done -- it should have been a longer delay. The court will -- I will not comment about the discovery process. I will

agree with whatever is filed and at another time listen to whatever arguments may be made about it.

Obviously there is a very voluminous amount of material here. I think that it did not bode well when -- I think that the -- your office could have done a little -- filed some of these motions earlier. I mean, I think there is a delay here because -- and these motions should have been filed earlier.

But without further comment, the court will grant a continuance in this matter, and I think that this next one has to be hard and fast. The new date, whatever it is, must be one that everybody agrees is a legitimate date because the court will be very loathe to consider any further continuance beyond this -- very loathe to do that. I just think that, so whatever we agree, a date that's agreed upon, must be hard and in stone.

MS. EASTMAN: Can the Public Defender's
Office make a representation as to how much time

they're actually going to need to be ready? 1 2 MR. HAYWOOD: Is it possible to set this for status maybe Thursday or next week so we 3 I think that's something 4 can consult about that? 5 that requires a little more discussion. 6 think, honestly, if I was to ask right now, I'd 7 ask for 18 months, but I don't think the court 8 would be open to that. 9 THE COURT: Nope, nope, that's beyond This case is -- I mean, I appreciate 10 the pale. 11 the volume and everything else, but it's over a 12 year, year-and-a-half old now. It's not going to -- 18 months at the time when it was set 13 14 initially, that might have been reasonable, but 15 not now, not now. All right, we can set it for Is Thursday -- next Thursday good? 16 status. 17 MS. TINGLE: Your Honor, if I may, 18 we're going to need to consult with, I want to 19 say somewhere in the ballpark of 60 witnesses to 20 be able to set dates. 21 MS. EASTMAN: More than that.

More than that?

MS. TINGLE:

	MS. EASTMAN: 85.			
2	MS. TINGLE: 85, I think, is what we're			
3	up to now, so, I mean, trying to get all of those			
4	folks by dates is going to be tricky to do in a			
5	week.			
6	THE COURT: All right, well, starting			
7	next week, I move to the criminal docket, so any			
8	day would probably how much what would be			
9	reasonable for the Commonwealth?			
10	MS. TINGLE: Judge, we have a trial			
11	date of May 21 already, which is only three weeks			
12	away, so I don't know whether it makes sense to			
13	just keep that date.			
14	THE COURT: Why don't we just keep that			
15	date as the status date at this point, and we'll			
16	go from there?			
17	MS. EASTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.			
18	THE COURT: All right.			
19	MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Judge.			
20	(WHEREUPON, AT 10:14 A.M., THE			
21	PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MANNER WERE			
22	CONCLUDED)			

a.m 1:17 3:2 30:20 abeyance 9:6 **able** 6:4 8:18 29:20 ABOVE-ENTITLED 30:21 absolutely 24:2.18 **absurd** 24:18 access 4:18 15:9 accommodations 24:20 account 8:1.2 accountant 1:15 3:22 7:15,17 8:12,15 accountants 8:17 accounting 8:9 accurate 5:22 accustomed 21:13 add 22:5 addition 5:9 16:8 additional 7:8 15:21,22 adequate 7:21 adequately 26:6 **Adiam** 1:7 3:3,10 7:13 17:5 administrative 22:13 afforded 19:13 agencies 15:5 ago 10:5 agree 17:19 18:20 26:19 27:11 28:1,18 **agreed** 28:19 agreement 19:5,15 **agrees** 28:15 aide 22:13 akin 27:13 allegations 7:18 amount 4:10 12:4 19:2 23:1 27:9 28:5 **amounts** 17:13 **ample** 19:2 anybody 24:6 apologies 18:13 apologize 13:16 15:10 appeal 20:15 appear 15:3,6 **APPEARANCES** 2:1 appoint 1:15,16 5:7 21:10 **appointed** 4:5 11:19 14:2 17:12 21:7 22:20 appointment 3:20,22 7:3,5,14 appreciate 17:16 29:10 appropriate 6:7 approximate 9:11 **April** 11:16 17:2

argue 3:21 10:8 argued 12:7 argument 10:16 16:11 21:2 arguments 28:2 **Arlington** 1:2,11 2:6,14 15:6 16:4 arrows 13:7 articulated 10:11.13 asked 22:12,13 23:22 asking 3:18 4:5 8:11 12:20 21:9 23:20 assistance 4:16 20:11 21:3 27:14 Assistant 2:5,12 attorney 2:4,5 15:5 22:7 22:20 23:8 attorneys 17:14 22:2 23:12 27:7 avenues 6:13 aware 4:9 9:19

В **B** 2:4 **bait** 19:11 ballpark 29:19 **barely** 18:15 based 7:22 14:10 20:18 **basic** 7:20 **began** 15:19 behalf 2:2,8 3:10,17 7:13 **believe** 6:2 7:16 19:1,10 20:8,12 **believed** 13:8 14:7 benefit 20:20 Berhane 1:7 2:8 3:3,10 3:17 7:14 17:5 beyond 28:17 29:9 big 4:21 **bill** 12:7 14:10,14,15 bit 13:12 21:12 26:10 bite 21:12 **blows** 21:13 **bode** 28:6 Boulevard 2:13 **Brad** 3:9 **BRADLEY** 2:9 **briefed** 26:13,14 bucket 4:21 Bugg 12:19 13:11 **business** 8:1,2

С

C 2:11 capable 5:12 capably 18:18 case 4:6,10 7:16,16,18

7:21 8:12 11:16.18.22 12:4,13,16,18,21 13:5 13:9,14,17,18,22 14:9 14:17 16:3,4,11,15,16 16:20 17:5,13,15 18:1 18:19 19:1,5,8,14,20 20:1,7,10,15,18 21:1 21:2,8,21,22 22:16,18 23:9,15 24:7,19,22 26:5 27:16 29:10 cases 15:1 22:17 25:5 25:14 catalog 4:17 6:9 categorize 4:17 certainly 12:3 cetera 15:6 channeled 8:1,2 charges 12:11 **Chief** 2:10 chosen 15:7 circles 13:6 CIRCUIT 1:1 circumstances 10:15 cited 25:13 Clarendon 2:13 **CLERK** 3:3 click 22:12 closed 25:5 **co-** 4:12 12:19 co-defendant 13:14 co-defendants 17:8 **Collins** 2:10 3:9 combination 14:12 **come** 13:1 16:19 20:20 **comes** 3:16 **coming** 6:16 11:6 command 5:8 commenced 1:16 comment 27:22 28:11 committed 17:15 common 24:11 Commonwealth 1:5 2:2 10:2,12,19 11:10 12:9 12:10 15:2 18:17 19:7 19:18 20:21 21:17 22:9,10 23:14 24:4 30:9 Commonwealth's 2:4,5 10:7 21:15 24:16 26:11 compel 1:15 compelling 12:4 20:10 21:2 competent 26:7 completely 25:5

CONCLUDED 30:22 concur 26:2 conduct 23:1 conference 14:5 confident 26:7 confronting 10:6 connection 4:12 consider 11:9 28:16 considered 25:18 consists 4:10 consult 6:4 29:4,18 consultations 9:2 consulted 4:6 consulting 8:17 **continuance** 20:2,5,21 23:21 26:3,20,21 28:12,17 continuances 14:20 continue 1:14 14:16 18:4,8,11 20:17 27:17 continued 12:1 15:1,20 27:18 conversations 10:12 conviction 20:7 **copier** 22:14 copies 9:20 22:10 24:8 24:12 25:22 copy 22:11 23:16,17 24:14 25:21 correction 18:7 cost 9:11 counsel 11:17 12:22 13:20 14:9,21 16:20 20:11 21:3 25:8 count 15:15 country 15:4 COUNTY 1:1 couple 17:1 27:2 course 20:2 court 1:1 3:6,11,13,14 3:16,18 4:2,3 5:7,18 6:18,21 7:4,4,11 8:13 9:3,5,8,14,17 10:17 11:8,10,19 15:14,20 16:5 18:2 19:22 20:4 20:13,17 25:9,13,14 25:15 26:13 27:2,10 27:12,15,21 28:11,16 29:7,9 30:6,14,18 court's 9:19 court-22:19 Courthouse 2:5 courtroom 21:14 **CR-17000434-00** 1:5 **CR-17000435-00** 1:6 **CR-17000436-00** 1:6 CR-17000699-753-00

computer 1:16 22:12

concerned 25:7,8,9

concerning 19:18

arbitrary 26:16

1:7

credit 17:10 criminal 21:14 30:7 D Daniels 4:6.7 data 4:11,15,17,22 5:1 5:8,11,22 6:3,4,9,11 date 11:21 12:1 14:18 21:2 27:19 28:14,15 28:19 30:11,13,15,15 dates 14:20,21 15:7 29:20 30:4 day 11:9 30:8 days 10:5,18 17:1 deal 6:21 declare 11:8 deemed 23:14,15 defect 5:14 defendant 1:8 2:8 4:12 4:13 12:20 14:9,22 25:20 defendant's 12:1 defendants 13:1 defender 2:10,12,12 16:10 **Defender's** 11:19 14:1 14:3 16:15 17:14.19 19:6 21:6 27:4 28:21 defense 3:17 7:21 15:11 18:15 21:8 23:8 25:8 delay 26:22 27:8,21 28:9 demeaning 23:7 demonstrate 18:18 denied 14:14 dent 18:15 department 15:17 Deputy 2:4 describing 13:4 description 5:20,21 detailed 11:4 detect 19:21 determine 5:13 devices 4:11 5:11 difference 5:19 different 11:9 digital 3:20 4:11,16,21 dilatory 23:1 diligently 16:2 **DiMatteo** 12:8 14:12,14 disagree 12:3 discern 16:14 discovery 9:19,20,21 16:18 17:4,12,15 18:10,12,13,16,19 19:1,7,13 20:9 23:6

27:1,22 discussion 29:5 dispersed 9:4 disposition 13:22 District 15:19 disturbing 20:12 docket 30:7 documents 25:17 doing 17:15 22:2 Double 13:19 doubt 17:21 draft 18:7 duces 15:11,18,22 duty 23:11,15

Ε earlier 28:8,10 Eastman 2:3 6:19 7:1 8:14 9:5 11:12,14 18:9,12 25:10 27:11 28:21 29:21 30:1,17 educated 8:9 effective 19:19 effectively 18:22 efficient 4:18 either 17:22 elected 26:16 **Ellis** 11:17 12:19 13:11 13:21 else's 25:19 entitled 7:17 11:1 Envista 4:7 equation 17:22 equipped 8:4,6 error 23:19 **ESQ** 2:3,4,9,10,11,11 **essentially** 4:14 6:14 establishes 7:16 et 15:6 everybody 28:15 evidence 4:10 6:17 13:4,8,18 14:7 16:13 16:20 evolved 13:17 exactly 24:1 25:14 examining 17:4 example 24:9 **excuse** 18:13

expect 24:6,18

experience 23:5

7:3,6,9 8:8,9

expertise 5:4,13

explaining 14:11

explanation 13:7

explain 8:6,10 14:9

experts 19:22

expert 1:16 3:19,21 4:5

4:16,22 5:7 6:2,4,9

extensive 13:3 14:16 extremely 10:21 F faced 17:17,19 fact 6:12 12:9 21:4 23:10,18 27:11 factor 6:1 facts 11:4 14:12 failure 16:6 19:20,21 20:3 fairness 25:7 fallen 18:21 family 25:3 far 7:9 16:7 fast 28:13 **FBI** 15:5 Federal 25:13,14,15 fell 13:22 **felt** 8:18 figure 9:2 file 16:19,21 18:7 19:13 19:20 25:5 filed 3:17 9:18 10:4 12:13 18:4 28:1,7,10 **files** 5:5 17:8 **filing** 15:9 financial 15:18,22 19:21 25:16.17 finish 9:2 finished 11:12 **firm** 4:7 first 12:17 13:20 23:21 27:3.5 fit 13:8 **folks** 30:4 following 7:22 forensic 3:19,20,22 4:5 4:16,22 6:2 7:3,15,17 8:12 form 24:5 **forth** 9:11 27:15 **found** 8:11 frankly 19:18 26:8 fraud 25:16 frequently 22:17 front 12:7 full 17:10 fully 26:13,14 **funds** 6:8 7:9,22 9:3

extension 23:20

gargantuan 17:21 gathered 6:12 General 15:19 General's 15:5

further 21:7 28:11,16

generous 17:6 getting 16:16 give 10:20 17:10 24:5 25:6,22 given 19:2 24:21 gotten 7:8 grant 7:5 9:9 27:12 28:12 granted 9:1 10:14 14:15 greater 27:8 greatly 20:19 guess 18:1 26:2

Н hand 12:11 hands 24:10 happen 25:1,2 hard 9:20 15:15 28:13 28:19 hardworking 23:3 harm 24:11 hash 26:15 **Haywood** 2:9 3:9 9:15 9:18 11:13 18:5,6,14 19:4 21:11 29:2 hearing 1:14 7:10 10:18 11:9 12:17 help 4:17,22 6:9,10,15 helpful 10:22 **hold** 9:6 honest 10:10 honestly 29:6 **Honor** 3:5,15 4:4,9 7:13 7:15 8:11 9:12,13,16 9:18 13:14 18:6 21:11 29:17 30:17 **HONORABLE** 1:22 hour 13:10,16,17 hour-long 16:12 hours 14:6 17:3,5,11,11 17:13 21:17,21,21,22 22:3,3,6,7,19,21 huge 4:10 human 21:19

idea 6:15
identified 9:7
identify 19:22
important 10:6 23:15
including 10:12 15:4,17
incredibly 23:3 26:6
independent 8:5
indicated 18:5
indicated 11:16
individually 6:22
ineffective 20:10 21:3

24:3,16 25:5 26:8

27:14 information 5:17 7:8 12:4,8,10 13:19 14:13 14:17 15:9,18 16:1 17:17,18,20 19:16,21 initially 29:14 intended 19:10 interfere 8:19 interrupt 11:15 **investigate** 12:5 18:22 investigation 8:5 19:19 21:8 invited 12:22 14:3 involved 14:17 involves 8:3 issue 9:22 19:17 **issued** 15:16,21 issues 10:5 20:3

James 2:11 3:8 January 12:2,6 job 20:13 JR 1:22 Judge 1:22 3:13 4:1,14 5:5,9,18 6:3,6,14,19 7:3,10 8:17,22 11:15 12:7 14:12,14,19 16:3 17:21 19:17 20:6 30:10,19

June 11:20 14:2 17:1 jurisdictions 25:4 jury 8:6,10 justification 24:11

Κ

keep 30:13,14 keyboard 21:20 keyboarding 22:8 known 19:16 knows 22:6

L

L 2:3
lack 19:19
land 24:10
large 25:3,5,16
Larry 4:7
Lars 4:6
law 7:16,16
leave 16:22
legal 10:16
legitimate 28:15
length 27:6
light 10:5,8
limited 10:14
lines 26:18
links 5:1

LISA 2:4 listed 17:6 listen 28:2 **litany** 14:7 litigate 22:18 little 13:12 18:2 26:10 28:7 29:5 lives 21:22 loathe 28:16,17 locally 15:4 logs 16:18 17:6 longer 23:20 27:21 look 6:13 16:19,19,22 lot 17:16,20 20:22 22:19 lots 12:20 Loumiet 2:11 3:9,21 7:12.13 9:13

М

low 21:13

ma'am 11:13 **making** 20:10 manipulate 5:5 **MANNER** 30:21 manners 6:11 manually 23:5 24:2,14 March 12:18 **MARGARET** 2:3 material 23:13.14 28:5 materials 18:16 matter 1:4 23:10,18 26:9 28:12 matters 8:20 25:3 mean 26:2 28:8 29:10 30:3 means 17:11 meeting 13:20 mentioned 25:11 26:22 method 5:20,21 6:10 methodologies 5:17 methods 5:10,14 6:11 6:16 mind 21:4 minimal 24:20 mistakes 5:15 **month** 17:13 months 15:21 29:7,13 morning 3:4,6,7 7:12 9:15,17 motion 1:14,15,15,16 3:19,20,22 7:5,14 9:1

9:9,19 12:1,6,12

27:1

28:9

14:10,16 18:4,7,9,10

18:11,13 24:17 26:20

motions 3:16 6:20 28:8

mouth 19:10 move 4:1 30:7 multiple 8:3 15:4 17:7

Ν

N 2:5 nature 7:18 21:13 24:20 navigating 18:18 necessarily 5:22 necessary 6:2 need 8:8 26:1,14 29:1 29:18 **needed** 22:10 needs 16:20 26:12,13 never 10:11 new 28:14 **NEWMAN** 1:22 nope 29:9,9 **note** 21:16 notice 10:7 11:1 Notwithstanding 16:6

0

object 26:4 obligation 23:12 obviously 26:19 28:4 occasion 20:2 27:8 occasions 17:7 occurring 13:9 14:8 **October** 11:22 offensive 23:2 office 2:12 10:1 11:19 13:1,2 14:1,4,4,6 15:5 15:16 16:15,18 17:4 17:15,19 19:6 21:6,18 23:2 25:19 26:4 27:4 28:6,22 old 29:12 once 7:7 one-13:16 one-hour 13:15 open 19:12 29:8 opportunity 26:15 organize 4:22 organized 5:1 original 11:21 originally 11:17

<u>P</u>

overwhelmed 19:14

overwhelming 24:3

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 3:1 page 11:3 18:4

pages 24:13 paid 22:20 pains 20:19 27:16

outside 21:18

pale 29:10 **paper** 25:6 **papers** 22:14 parity 11:7 part 12:2 16:14 particular 7:2 13:9 particulars 12:7 14:11 14:14,15 pending 9:9 16:4 people 20:22 23:2 performance 14:5 personal 23:4 photographs 24:12,13 **picked** 14:18 pictures 13:6 **pieces** 13:7 plainly 23:2 plea 13:21 pleading 10:3 11:3,8 12:13 **pleadings** 18:3 20:19 please 3:12 8:15 point 4:15 6:8 8:7 11:2 12:15 14:19 16:9,17 27:18 30:15 **pointed** 12:14 **police** 5:10 15:6,16 policies 24:16 position 7:2 10:7,9 11:5 18:1 19:4 24:19 26:11 possible 29:2 potential 6:13 poured 4:21 **PowerPoint** 13:3 16:8 practice 25:3 prejudicing 20:14 preliminary 12:17 prepared 10:8 13:3 26:1 presence 13:10 present 7:20 20:3 24:3 presentation 13:3,10 13:13,15,17 16:12 presentations 16:9 presenting 10:16 preserve 20:7,8 principles 8:9 print 22:12 **prior** 20:1 private 25:3 **probably** 22:5 23:22 30:8 procedure 26:17 proceedings 26:22 30:21 process 25:7 27:22

produce 5:22

production 9:20

progress 16:14 **prone** 5:14 prosecuting 16:2 prosecution 20:14 protecting 25:10 provide 5:1 10:19 26:6 provided 5:16 9:21 13:19 17:4 18:16 23:13 24:4 **public** 2:10,12,12 11:19 14:1,3 16:10,14 17:14 17:18 19:6 21:6 27:4 28:21 **pulled** 4:11 17:9 put 10:17,18 19:9 22:14 24:17 Q

quantity 24:3 questions 12:20 quite 20:22 **quote** 18:15

R

Rachel 2:10 3:9 reached 19:6 reading 15:8 ready 16:16 23:9 24:15 24:19 25:9 29:1 realize 10:4 reason 12:2 24:5,15,17 24:21 reasonable 29:14 30:9 received 10:2 record 25:10 recovered 13:5 referred 8:20 regarding 12:10 regretfully 20:16 reliability 6:3 reliable 6:13 remove 16:21 21:9 27:3 removed 26:4 repeated 14:4 representation 11:18 26:7 28:22 representations 20:9 20:18 represented 12:19 represents 18:14 request 10:14 11:5 19:22 20:9 21:16 26:3 requested 27:20 requesting 12:8 requires 29:5

resolved 20:4 resources 19:3 respect 7:2 19:7 respectfully 21:9 respond 6:19 14:13 responding 21:15 response 10:2 12:13,22 responsibilities 18:22 responsive 11:8 12:9 result 20:21 retained 11:17 review 6:9,10 9:22 **Road** 2:5 **Robinson** 2:11 3:4,8,8 3:12,15 4:4 7:7 8:16 9:12 18:10 30:19 room 14:5 21:18 rooms 23:5 ruling 9:6

S

run 4:7

sat 13:2 14:5 **saying** 20:12 27:13 **schemes** 25:16 scores 15:2,3,17,17 scratch 27:6 **search** 15:15 **seat** 3:14 seeking 6:8 selected 14:21 sense 10:20 30:12 sentencing 13:13 16:11 serious 22:17 **set** 11:21 29:2,13,15,20 **shortly** 13:21 14:2 showed 13:6 side 17:22 sign 16:20,21 signed 19:12,15 significance 10:1 sitting 23:5 25:19 **somebody** 9:6 21:10 22:12 24:10,11 **sorry** 8:16 11:14 sort 4:21 13:22 specific 5:17 **speed** 27:8 spent 17:3,12 21:17 22:7 spoken 8:18 spreadsheets 24:9,9 stack 22:13 stacks 25:6,16 **staff** 23:19 **Stamos** 10:13 stand 20:16 starting 27:5 30:6

statement 11:4 status 9:1 29:3,16 30:15 stone 28:20 strikes 19:11 **strongly** 26:3,3 subpoena 16:7 subpoenaed 15:2 subpoenas 15:11,11,12 15:18,22 19:20 **success** 20:14 sufficient 5:6 suggest 22:22 **Suite** 2:6,13 **summer** 12:16 supposed 25:12 surprising 18:2 Susanna 7:13 **Susannah** 2:11 3:9 **switch** 19:12 **system** 16:5

T

T 1:22 **takes** 19:5 talking 15:3 task 5:6 17:21 23:7,11 taste 13:12 technical 5:4.12 tecum 15:12.18.22 tell 5:18 15:14 16:8 tentatively 9:9 terms 11:7 16:15 testify 8:8 testimony 6:7 text 24:13 **Thank** 3:15 27:1 30:17 30:19 things 12:14 24:14 27:3 three 14:20 18:4 20:1 30:11 **Thursday** 29:3,16,16 timely 20:4 **Tingle** 2:4 17:17 29:17 29:22 30:2,10 tongue 21:12 tool 7:20 transactions 8:3 transcribe 24:2 transcribing 23:6 trial 4:19 11:21 12:1 14:18,20 15:7 16:16 20:1 22:18 30:10 **tricky** 30:4 **true** 15:8 trying 30:3 Tuesday 1:10

two 14:6 17:14 23:22

two- 13:9 **type** 19:8 **typed** 21:19 typing 21:20

U **unable** 16:13 understand 9:22 19:4 26:10 unreasonable 25:18.18 25:20 unrelated 17:8 upsetting 20:22

usable 6:10 use 5:10 useful 5:2 usually 22:4 utter 20:3

VA 2:6,14 verification 9:10 view 26:16 Virginia 1:1,5,11 2:2 volume 4:15 8:19 14:17 17:18 19:16 27:14 29.11 voluminous 28:4 **VS** 1:6

W

warrants 15:15 watched 23:3 way 4:18 5:2,5 14:8 20:4 24:14 25:11 wayside 13:22 week 29:3 30:5,7 weeks 20:1 30:11 weight 6:15 went 7:22 14:6,8 16:11 weren't 11:15 WILLIAM 1:22 **willing** 27:10 withdrew 11:18 witnesses 15:3,12 29:19 words 19:9 21:18 work 4:8 25:12 works 5:20 world 24:7 wouldn't 5:19 22:20 27:15

X

year 11:16 21:5 29:12 year-and-a-half 16:3

requiring 20:5

researched 11:4

29:12		
years 23:22		
years 25.22		
Z		
0		
1		
10:14 30:20		
100 22:19		
12- 11:2		
14-page 11:3		
1425 2:5		
16 17:3		
18 29:7,13		
2		
201 2:13		
2017 11:20,22 12:16,18		
14:2 17:1,3,3		
2018 1:10 17:5		
21 14:18 30:11		
22201 2:6,14		
228-4410 2:7		
23 11:22 22:6		
2300 2:13		
25 22:6		
26 17:5,10		
3		
4		
4 12:6		
4.2 17:13		
42 17:11 22:3,3		
5		
5200 2:6		
6		
60 22:6 29:19		
7		
70 22:7		
703 2:7,14		
8		
85 30:1,2		
875-1111 2:14		
9		
9 12:2		
9:44 1:17 3:2		
	1	I

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Virginia v Adiam Berhane

Before: The Honorable William T. Newman, Jr., Judge

Date: 05-01-18

Place: Arlington, VA

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &