

# Appendix A

23-129-cr(L) 12/23/2024  
*United States v. Iotova*

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

### SUMMARY ORDER

**RULINGS BY SUMMARY ORDER DO NOT HAVE PRECEDENTIAL EFFECT. CITATION TO A SUMMARY ORDER FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2007, IS PERMITTED AND IS GOVERNED BY FEDERAL RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 32.1 AND THIS COURT'S LOCAL RULE 32.1.1. WHEN CITING A SUMMARY ORDER IN A DOCUMENT FILED WITH THIS COURT, A PARTY MUST CITE EITHER THE FEDERAL APPENDIX OR AN ELECTRONIC DATABASE (WITH THE NOTATION "SUMMARY ORDER"). A PARTY CITING A SUMMARY ORDER MUST SERVE A COPY OF IT ON ANY PARTY NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL.**

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of December, two thousand twenty-four.

Present:

ROBERT D. SACK,  
WILLIAM J. NARDINI,  
EUNICE C. LEE,  
*Circuit Judges.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Appellee,*

v. 23-129-cr, 23-6148-cr,  
23-6149-cr

ANTOANETA IOTOVA, ISSAK  
ALMALEH, a/k/a Issak Izrael,

*Defendants-Appellants.*

For Appellee: MATTHEW J. KING (Rebecca T. Dell, Nathan Rehn,  
on the brief) Assistant United States Attorneys, for  
Damian Williams, United States Attorney for the  
Southern District of New York, New York, NY.

For Defendant-Appellant Antoaneta  
Iotova:

ELIZABETH M. JOHNSON, Law Offices of Elizabeth  
M. Johnson, New York, NY.

For Defendant-Appellant Issak  
Almaleh:

Marsha R. Taubenhause, Esq., New York, NY.

Appeals from judgments of conviction of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Edgardo Ramos, *District Judge*).

**UPON DUE CONSIDERATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** that the judgments of the district court are **AFFIRMED**.

Defendants-Appellants Antoaneta Iotova and Issak Almaleh (the “defendants”) appeal from judgments of conviction entered on January 31, 2023, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Edgardo Ramos, *District Judge*), following a jury trial. A superseding indictment filed on December 6, 2021, charged the defendants with four counts: conspiracy to commit mail fraud and wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1349 (Count One); mail fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 2 (Count Two); wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 2 (Count Three); and making false statements to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”), in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1007 and 2 (Count Four). The government alleged that the defendants engaged in a multi-year scheme in which they falsely claimed to work on behalf of a bank, created fake deeds to fraudulently transfer the ownership of dozens of properties in Florida and New York to entities that they controlled, and purported to rent those properties to people who were later forced to leave the properties when the true owners realized what had happened. Both defendants argued that they lacked the state of mind to defraud because they had a sincere belief in their right to rent the properties.

A jury trial began on March 3, 2022, and ended on March 17, 2022, when the jury found both defendants guilty on all four counts. On January 20, 2023, the district court sentenced each

defendant principally to time served and three years of supervised release. The defendants now appeal their convictions, arguing that the district court made several erroneous evidentiary rulings—both of admission and exclusion—that deprived the defendants of a fair trial. We assume the parties’ familiarity with the case.

We review a district court’s evidentiary rulings for abuse of discretion and will reverse “only where the decision to admit or exclude evidence was manifestly erroneous.” *United States v. Litvak*, 889 F.3d 56, 67 (2d Cir. 2018).<sup>1</sup> Even if a decision was “manifestly erroneous,” however, we will affirm the decision so long as the error was harmless. *Id.*; see also *United States v. Dhinsa*, 243 F.3d 635, 649–50 (2d Cir. 2001).

### **I. Alleged Errors of Admission**

The defendants contend that the district court abused its discretion by admitting several categories of evidence offered by the government. As set forth below, we discern no error warranting reversal.

#### **A. Admission of Tenants’ Testimony That They Had Been “Scammed”**

The defendants argue that the district court erroneously admitted the testimony of several tenant witnesses that they had been “scammed.” Tenant F’lesson Wood testified that he had rented a house in Florida from the defendants based on an online listing, but that he lived in the house only for a few weeks because it “turns out that that house was a scam.” Iotova App’x 226. He testified that the police forced his family to leave the house, and that he then texted Iotova to ask for his money back. In one message, he told Iotova that the house was “a scam.” *Id.* at 244. Additionally, tenant Julie Rivera testified that, after she learned that the apartment she had rented

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, when quoting cases, all internal quotation marks, alteration marks, emphases, footnotes, and citations are omitted.

from Iotova was going to be demolished, she told her daughter that she had been “scammed” and that she needed her daughter’s help to confront the defendants. *Id.* at 363. Rivera stated that she and her daughter then arranged to meet the defendants at another property that the defendants had listed for rent; once there, she demanded her money back and called the police. The defendants argue that the tenant witnesses’ testimony that they had been “scammed” was inadmissible for two reasons: first, the statements were “more prejudicial than probative” under Rule 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence; second, the statements constituted improper lay opinion testimony under Rule 701 because they expressed the witnesses’ opinions on “exactly the issue to be decided by the jury.” Iotova Br. 30. We find neither argument to be persuasive.

Rule 403 provides that a court may exclude relevant evidence “if its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of . . . unfair prejudice.” Evidence is unfairly prejudicial within the meaning of Rule 403 “only when it tends to have some adverse effect upon a defendant beyond tending to prove the fact or issue that justified its admission into evidence.” *United States v. Kadir*, 718 F.3d 115, 122 (2d Cir. 2013). We “accord great deference to the district court’s assessment of the relevancy and unfair prejudice of proffered evidence.” *United States v. Morgan*, 786 F.3d 227, 229 (2d Cir. 2015). Accordingly, when evaluating a district court’s decision to admit evidence under Rule 403, we “generally maximize its probative value and minimize its prejudicial effect.” *United States v. Coppola*, 671 F.3d 220, 245 (2d Cir. 2012).

Applying these principles, we conclude that the testimony of Woods and Rivera was not barred under Rule 403. Woods’s statement that he believed that the “house was a scam” explained why he had contacted Iotova to demand his money back. His additional testimony that he had told Iotova that the house “was a scam” was relevant because it showed that she had been put on notice that the apartment she had rented out might not in fact have been owned by her, and that the tenant

who had paid her to rent the apartment had been unable to occupy it. *See United States v. Daly*, 842 F.2d 1380, 1388 (2d Cir. 1988) (“Background evidence may be admitted to show, for example, the circumstances surrounding the events or to furnish an explanation of the understanding or intent with which certain acts were performed.”). Similarly, Rivera’s testimony that she had told her daughter that she had been scammed laid a foundation for her subsequent testimony regarding her confrontation with the defendants, which was admissible to demonstrate notice, as described above. The district court did not abuse its discretion by deciding that the probative value of the tenant witnesses’ reference to having been “scammed” was not substantially outweighed by any danger of unfair prejudice.

Further, we conclude that the challenged testimony of Woods and Rivera was fact testimony, rather than lay opinion testimony, and that it was properly admitted. A lay witness may provide relevant fact testimony provided that “the witness has personal knowledge” of the issues. *United States v. Cuti*, 720 F.3d 453, 457 (2d Cir. 2013). Here, the testimony of Woods and Rivera that they had been scammed was proper fact testimony because it described their state of mind concerning their experiences with the defendants. *See United States v. Morton*, 391 F.3d 274, 277 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (“A witness’s testimony about his own state of mind is not opinion testimony.”). That testimony was offered not to prove that they had, in fact, been scammed, but to provide context for the actions that they took because they believed that they had been scammed. For that reason, the testimony was also plainly relevant.

#### **B. Admission of Denise Torres’s Testimony Regarding Her Encounter with the Police**

The defendants also challenge the admission of certain elements of Denise Torres’s testimony regarding her encounter with police officers at the apartment that she and her husband had paid the defendants to rent. Torres testified that as she and her husband were moving into the

apartment, police officers, while “holding . . . guns,” “order[ed] us to come out with our hands above our head . . . and they escorted us out of the apartment and placed us in handcuffs.” Iotova App’x 427. According to Torres, the officers explained that she and her husband were living in the apartment “illegally.” *Id.* at 435. Further, she testified that after the officers released them, she called Iotova and told her that she and her husband had been “held up at gunpoint by police” and that Iotova “wasn’t the owner of the place.” *Id.* at 438. Torres stated that she then asked for her money back, but Iotova “really didn’t have much to say” in response. *Id.* The defendants argue that the district court abused its discretion by admitting two “extraneous and inflammatory details of the police response”—first, that the officers were holding guns when they confronted Torres and her husband, and second, that the officers handcuffed them. Iotova Br. 34.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by permitting those elements of Torres’s testimony. That context was “legally and morally relevant to the conduct constituting the offenses committed” by the defendants. *United States v. Velazquez*, 246 F.3d 204, 211 (2d Cir. 2001). Indeed, the fact that the police approached Torres and her husband at gunpoint and then handcuffed them underscored that the defendants did not own the property in question and that the victims were harmed by the defendants’ fraudulent actions. Torres’s recounting of these facts starkly put Iotova on notice that she did not own the apartment. Further, the fact that Iotova “really didn’t have much to say” in response to Torres’s description of the police response was probative of Iotova’s knowledge that the defendants did not own the property. *See Baxter v. Palmigiano*, 425 U.S. 308, 319 (1976) (“[I]n proper circumstances silence in the face of accusation is a relevant fact . . .”).

**C. Admission of FDIC Examiner’s Testimony that the Defendants’ Application Was “Most Likely Fraudulent”**

Iotova challenges the admission of opinion testimony offered by Ernest Garibaldi, an FDIC

examiner in the New York regional office who reviewed the defendants' application to register Deutsche Bank National Trust Company ("DBNTC"), for which the defendants claimed to work, as an FDIC-insured bank. At trial, Garibaldi testified that the FDIC did not approve the application and returned it to the defendants as incomplete, and he flagged particular problems with the application. When the prosecutor asked Garibaldi why the FDIC did not approve the application, he stated that he and his supervisor assessed that it was "most likely fraudulent." Iotova App'x 829. Iotova's counsel objected to this statement as a "legal conclusion," but the district court overruled the objection. *Id.* On appeal, Iotova argues that this statement was inadmissible as lay opinion testimony under Rule 701 because it was not helpful to the jury, and that it was also inadmissible under Rule 403 because it was "more prejudicial than probative." Iotova Br. 30. Iotova also argues that Garibaldi's reference to his supervisor's opinion was inadmissible as hearsay. *Id.* at 31; Iotova Reply Br. 10.

Even assuming that the district court erred by admitting Garibaldi's statement, we conclude that any error was harmless because Garibaldi went on to testify at length about the deficiencies and abnormalities in the application, which he said raised "many, many red flags" about the veracity of the information contained therein. Iotova App'x 839. For example, he stated that the application was unsigned; had no letterhead; did not provide the biographies of DBNTC's directors and officers; lacked a required certification; and was replete with misspelled words, grammatical errors, and formatting issues. He also testified that after he had returned the application to the defendants as incomplete, they declined to meet with officials from the FDIC's New York office to address the application's deficiencies and instead submitted the same application to a different regional office—actions, he said, that were atypical. Considering Garibaldi's full testimony and other uncontested evidence concerning the defendants' application, we conclude that the district

court's decision to admit the challenged statement, even if erroneous, was "unimportant in relation to everything else the jury considered" on the question of whether the defendants had made false statements to the FDIC. *United States v. Paulino*, 445 F.3d 211, 219 (2d Cir. 2006).

#### **D. Admission of Testimony Regarding "Uncharged Misconduct"**

Iotova also argues that the district court erred by admitting the following four "statements made by out of court declarants of uncharged bad acts by the defendants." Iotova Br. 35. First, Rivera testified that when she visited the apartment that she had ostensibly rented from the defendants, the neighbor who lived next door came into the hallway and said, "Oh, my God, they got you too." Iotova App'x 363. Second, Torres testified that while police officers were removing her and her husband from the apartment that they had ostensibly rented from the defendants, the property manager arrived and informed the officers that Torres and her husband "were just a victim" and "weren't the first people" to fall prey to the defendants' scheme. *Id.* at 436. Third, with respect to the same incident, Torres testified that the property manager warned that "she's had encounters with [Almaleh] and he's aggressive." *Id.* Finally, Jennifer Patterson, another tenant witness, testified that the "true owner" of the house that she had ostensibly rented from the defendants told her that "the key [to the house] was stolen . . . in New York." *Id.* at 507. Iotova contends that the district court should have excluded each of these statements as inadmissible hearsay, or under Rule 403—because, even accepting the non-hearsay purposes that the government proffered in support of their admission, the statements were substantially more prejudicial than probative.

We need not decide whether each statement was properly admitted because we conclude that even if the district court admitted all four statements in error, the errors were harmless. None of the challenged statements went "to the heart of the case against the defendant[s]," and the



government's other evidence was overwhelming. *United States v. Rigas*, 490 F.3d 208, 222 (2d Cir. 2007). In Iotova's opening brief, she effectively concedes facts that constitute substantial evidence of the defendants' guilt even excluding all the evidence that the defendants challenge on appeal. For example, she states: "All of the tenants testified in detail about renting properties from defendants, paying for them in cash, and then within a short period of time learning that they could not stay in the properties. They also testified that they made efforts to contact the persons who had rented them the properties in order to get their money back, but that they did not get refunds." Iotova Br. 30 (citations omitted); *see also id.* at 37 ("Every [tenant] witness . . . also testified that they rented property from the defendants, paid cash up front, and that they were not able to actually live in the properties—they were removed by the police, they were told the property was scheduled for demolition, or told it belonged to someone else."). Moreover, the government introduced evidence showing, among other things, that: the defendants repeatedly used fake names during the scheme, employees of DBNTC stated that the defendants did not work there, the defendants did not claim to work for DBNTC on their tax returns, the defendants' residence contained evidence that they had doctored property deeds, and the defendants declined to meet with the FDIC to address the agency's concerns about their application. Given the totality of the evidence that the defendants do *not* challenge, we conclude with "fair assurance that the jury's judgment was not substantially swayed by" any hypothetical error. *Paulino*, 445 F.3d at 219.

#### **E. Admission of Default Judgments**

Iotova also argues that the district court abused its discretion by admitting complete, unredacted versions of three default judgments issued against the defendants rather than ordering the redaction of certain "highly prejudicial" judicial findings that constituted inadmissible hearsay or, in the alternative, were inadmissible under Rule 403. Iotova Br. 41–44. Each of the default

judgments declared that certain deeds that the defendants had used to transfer property from DBNTC to an entity that they controlled were invalid or fraudulent. The district court admitted the documents subject to this limiting instruction: “These documents are not put before you for the truth of the information in the documents, but rather to the extent that you believe they serve to provide notice to the defendants of the information that is contained therein.” Iotova App’x 681. The district court later reiterated this instruction.

The admission of the default judgments was not an abuse of discretion. The district court admitted the default judgments for the proper non-hearsay purpose of demonstrating that the defendants were put on notice that they did not own certain properties that they purported to own. *See United States v. Dupree*, 706 F.3d 131, 137 (2d Cir. 2013). Moreover, “the law recognizes a strong presumption that juries follow limiting instructions,” *United States v. Snype*, 441 F.3d 119, 129 (2d Cir. 2006), and we see no basis to conclude that the jury failed to abide by the district court’s twice-issued instruction here. And even if the district court had erred in admitting the default judgments, any error would have been harmless because there was ample other evidence that the defendants had notice that they were not the rightful owners of the properties, as discussed in Section I.A *supra*.

## **II. Alleged Errors of Exclusion**

The defendants also challenge the district court’s exclusion of three categories of proffered defense evidence. For the reasons set forth below, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion:

### **A. Exclusion of Defense Evidence Regarding Failure of Service**

First, Iotova argues that the district court erroneously excluded sworn affidavits of service showing that other parties had unsuccessfully attempted to serve certain documents on the

defendants at the outset of the proceedings that led to the default judgments. The defendants offered those documents to rebut the government’s argument that they had received the default judgments and were therefore on notice that they did not own the properties in question. But again, even if these affidavits were relevant and not hearsay, any error in their exclusion was harmless because of the other evidence that the defendants had sufficient notice that they were not the rightful owners of the properties.

**B. Preclusion of Defense Questioning Regarding the 2007–08 Financial Crisis**

Second, Almaleh argues that the district court erroneously prohibited the defendants from questioning government witnesses about “the role that banks and mortgage companies played in the [2007–08] mortgage/foreclosure crisis.” Almaleh Br. 94–95. At trial, the defense asked government witness Mila Schwartzreich, the general counsel for the Broward County Property Appraiser’s Office, about the “many problems with foreclosures and . . . mortgages after the foreclosure crisis” and about settlements in litigation between states and several large financial institutions, among other related questions. Iotova App’x 730–31. The district court sustained the government’s objection to this line of questioning for two reasons—first, Schwartzreich was not “aware of these issues beyond . . . [what] any person in this courtroom would be aware of,” and second, the questions constituted “nitpicking victim blaming” by suggesting that the purported misconduct of DBNTC, or other financial institutions, was relevant to the defendants’ actions. *Id.* at 736. The district court did not abuse its discretion by excluding this line of questioning under Rules 401 and 403 because it was plainly beyond the scope of the witness’s knowledge, had no bearing on the charged conduct, and created a substantial risk of confusing the issues.

### C. Preclusion of Defense Evidence of Defendants' Emails and Legal Complaints

Finally, Almaleh argues that the district court abused its discretion by excluding “a number of the defendants’ emails sent to government officials, as well as legal complaints they filed, complaining that others were attempting to steal real estate from them and seeking to legally establish their ownership of the disputed properties.” Almaleh Br. 98. The district court excluded these documents as inadmissible hearsay. Almaleh contends that the district court erred because the documents were being offered “for a non-hearsay purpose: to show that the defendants[] did not have the specific intent to defraud.” *Id.* He further contends that the proffered evidence showed that “he genuinely believed” that “the [disputed] properties had actually been stolen from” him, and that that belief “was longstanding and was not something he had recently invented in order to rebut the government’s charges.” *Id.* at 98–99.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by excluding the proffered emails and court filings. Even if these documents were not offered for their truth, it would have been well within the district court’s discretion to conclude that any incremental probative value from the non-hearsay purpose of the documents was substantially outweighed by their risk of confusing and misleading the jury because the documents alleged wide-ranging misconduct, harassment, and terrorism by government officials and others. *See United States v. Reyes*, 18 F.3d 65, 70 (2d Cir. 1994).


Moreover, even if the district court erred by excluding that evidence, the error was harmless. Considering the overwhelming evidence of the defendants’ fraudulent intent, we are confident that the exclusion of the proffered emails and court filings did not substantially sway the jury’s judgment. *See Paulino*, 445 F.3d at 219.

\* \* \*

We have considered the defendants' remaining arguments and find them to be unpersuasive. Accordingly, we **AFFIRM** the judgments of the district court.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

The image shows a handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe". The signature is written over a circular official seal. The seal contains the text "UNITED STATES" at the top, "SECOND CIRCUIT" in the center, and "COURT OF APPEALS" at the bottom, with small stars on either side of the central text.

**Appendix B**

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Southern District of New York

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ISSAK ALMALEH

## JUDGMENT IN A CRIMINAL CASE

Case Number: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)

USM Number: 15569-104

Richard Harris Rosenberg

Defendant's Attorney

**THE DEFENDANT:**

- ☐ pleaded guilty to count(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ pleaded nolo contendere to count(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
which was accepted by the court.
- ☒ was found guilty on count(s) 1 - 4 of the S1 Indictment  
after a plea of not guilty.

The defendant is adjudicated guilty of these offenses:

<u>Title &amp; Section</u>	<u>Nature of Offense</u>	<u>Offense Ended</u>	<u>Count</u>
18 USC 1349	Conspiracy to Commit Mail Fraud and Wire Fraud	1/25/2017	1
18 USC 1341 and 2	Mail Fraud	1/25/2017	2
18 USC 1343 and 2	Mail Fraud	1/25/2017	3

The defendant is sentenced as provided in pages 2 through 8 of this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984.

- ☐ The defendant has been found not guilty on count(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Count(s) underlying counts ☐ is ☒ are dismissed on the motion of the United States.

It is ordered that the defendant must notify the United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of name, residence, or mailing address until all fines, restitution, costs, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid. If ordered to pay restitution, the defendant must notify the court and United States attorney of material changes in economic circumstances.

1/20/2023

Date of Imposition of Judgment

Signature of Judge

Edgardo Ramos, U.S.D.J.

Name and Title of Judge

Date

January 31, 2023

DEFENDANT: ISSAK ALMALEH

CASE NUMBER: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)

**ADDITIONAL COUNTS OF CONVICTION**

<u>Title &amp; Section</u>	<u>Nature of Offense</u>	<u>Offense Ended</u>	<u>Count</u>
18 USC 1007 and 2	False Statements to the FDIC	1/25/2017	4

DEFENDANT: ISSAK ALMALEH  
CASE NUMBER: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)**IMPRISONMENT**

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of:  
Time Served.

☐ The court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:

☐ The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.

☐ The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district:

☐ at \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ a.m. ☐ p.m. on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ as notified by the United States Marshal.

☐ The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons:

☐ before 2 p.m. on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ as notified by the United States Marshal.

☐ as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office.

**RETURN**

I have executed this judgment as follows:

Defendant delivered on \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

at \_\_\_\_\_, with a certified copy of this judgment.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

By \_\_\_\_\_

DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL



DEFENDANT: ISSAK ALMALEH  
CASE NUMBER: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)

### SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, you will be on supervised release for a term of:

3 years.

### MANDATORY CONDITIONS

1. You must not commit another federal, state or local crime.
2. You must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance.
3. You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. You must submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter, as determined by the court.
  - ☒ The above drug testing condition is suspended, based on the court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse. *(check if applicable)*
4. ☒ You must make restitution in accordance with 18 U.S.C. §§ 3663 and 3663A or any other statute authorizing a sentence of restitution. *(check if applicable)*
5. ☒ You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. *(check if applicable)*
6. ☐ You must comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (34 U.S.C. § 20901, *et seq.*) as directed by the probation officer, the Bureau of Prisons, or any state sex offender registration agency in the location where you reside, work, are a student, or were convicted of a qualifying offense. *(check if applicable)*
7. ☐ You must participate in an approved program for domestic violence. *(check if applicable)*

You must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court as well as with any other conditions on the attached page.

DEFENDANT: ISSAK ALMALEH  
CASE NUMBER: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)

### STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

As part of your supervised release, you must comply with the following standard conditions of supervision. These conditions are imposed because they establish the basic expectations for your behavior while on supervision and identify the minimum tools needed by probation officers to keep informed, report to the court about, and bring about improvements in your conduct and condition.

1. You must report to the probation office in the federal judicial district where you are authorized to reside within 72 hours of your release from imprisonment, unless the probation officer instructs you to report to a different probation office or within a different time frame.
2. After initially reporting to the probation office, you will receive instructions from the court or the probation officer about how and when you must report to the probation officer, and you must report to the probation officer as instructed.
3. You must not knowingly leave the federal judicial district where you are authorized to reside without first getting permission from the court or the probation officer.
4. You must answer truthfully the questions asked by your probation officer.
5. You must live at a place approved by the probation officer. If you plan to change where you live or anything about your living arrangements (such as the people you live with), you must notify the probation officer at least 10 days before the change. If notifying the probation officer in advance is not possible due to unanticipated circumstances, you must notify the probation officer within 72 hours of becoming aware of a change or expected change.
6. You must allow the probation officer to visit you at any time at your home or elsewhere, and you must permit the probation officer to take any items prohibited by the conditions of your supervision that he or she observes in plain view.
7. You must work full time (at least 30 hours per week) at a lawful type of employment, unless the probation officer excuses you from doing so. If you do not have full-time employment you must try to find full-time employment, unless the probation officer excuses you from doing so. If you plan to change where you work or anything about your work (such as your position or your job responsibilities), you must notify the probation officer at least 10 days before the change. If notifying the probation officer at least 10 days in advance is not possible due to unanticipated circumstances, you must notify the probation officer within 72 hours of becoming aware of a change or expected change.
8. You must not communicate or interact with someone you know is engaged in criminal activity. If you know someone has been convicted of a felony, you must not knowingly communicate or interact with that person without first getting the permission of the probation officer.
9. If you are arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer, you must notify the probation officer within 72 hours.
10. You must not own, possess, or have access to a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or dangerous weapon (i.e., anything that was designed, or was modified for, the specific purpose of causing bodily injury or death to another person such as nunchakus or tasers).
11. You must not act or make any agreement with a law enforcement agency to act as a confidential human source or informant without first getting the permission of the court.
12. You must follow the instructions of the probation officer related to the conditions of supervision.

### U.S. Probation Office Use Only

A U.S. probation officer has instructed me on the conditions specified by the court and has provided me with a written copy of this judgment containing these conditions. For further information regarding these conditions, see *Overview of Probation and Supervised Release Conditions*, available at: [www.uscourts.gov](http://www.uscourts.gov).

Defendant's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

DEFENDANT: ISSAK ALMALEH  
CASE NUMBER: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)

### **SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION**

You shall submit your person, and any property, residence, vehicle, papers, computer, other electronic communication, data storage devices, cloud storage or media, and effects to a search by any United States Probation Officer, and if needed, with the assistance of any law enforcement. The search is to be conducted when there is reasonable suspicion concerning violation of a condition of supervision or unlawful conduct by the person being supervised. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release. You shall warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. Any search shall be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

You must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information.

You must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are in compliance with the installment payment schedule.

It is recommended that you be supervised by the district of residence.

DEFENDANT: ISSAK ALMALEH  
CASE NUMBER: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)

### CRIMINAL MONETARY PENALTIES

The defendant must pay the total criminal monetary penalties under the schedule of payments on Sheet 6.

	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Restitution</u>	<u>Fine</u>	<u>AVAA Assessment*</u>	<u>JVTA Assessment**</u>
<b>TOTALS</b>	\$ 400.00	\$ 24,639.47	\$	\$	\$

☐ The determination of restitution is deferred until                     . An Amended Judgment in a Criminal Case (AO 245C) will be entered after such determination.

☐ The defendant must make restitution (including community restitution) to the following payees in the amount listed below.

If the defendant makes a partial payment, each payee shall receive an approximately proportioned payment, unless specified otherwise in the priority order or percentage payment column below. However, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3664(i), all nonfederal victims must be paid before the United States is paid.

<u>Name of Payee</u>	<u>Total Loss***</u>	<u>Restitution Ordered</u>	<u>Priority or Percentage</u>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

<b>TOTALS</b>	\$	<u>0.00</u>	\$	<u>0.00</u>
---------------	----	-------------	----	-------------

☐ Restitution amount ordered pursuant to plea agreement \$                     

☐ The defendant must pay interest on restitution and a fine of more than \$2,500, unless the restitution or fine is paid in full before the fifteenth day after the date of the judgment, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3612(f). All of the payment options on Sheet 6 may be subject to penalties for delinquency and default, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3612(g).

☐ The court determined that the defendant does not have the ability to pay interest and it is ordered that:

☐ the interest requirement is waived for the ☐ fine ☐ restitution.

☐ the interest requirement for the ☐ fine ☐ restitution is modified as follows:

\* Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-299.

\*\* Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-22.

\*\*\* Findings for the total amount of losses are required under Chapters 109A, 110, 110A, and 113A of Title 18 for offenses committed on or after September 13, 1994, but before April 23, 1996.

DEFENDANT: ISSAK ALMALEH  
 CASE NUMBER: 1:17-cr-25-1 (ER)

### SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Having assessed the defendant's ability to pay, payment of the total criminal monetary penalties is due as follows:

- A ☒ Lump sum payment of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ due immediately, balance due  
     ☐ not later than \_\_\_\_\_, or  
     ☒ in accordance with ☐ C, ☐ D, ☐ E, or ☒ F below; or
- B ☐ Payment to begin immediately (may be combined with ☐ C, ☐ D, or ☐ F below); or
- C ☐ Payment in equal \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly) installments of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ over a period of \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., months or years), to commence \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after the date of this judgment; or
- D ☐ Payment in equal \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly) installments of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ over a period of \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., months or years), to commence \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after release from imprisonment to a term of supervision; or
- E ☐ Payment during the term of supervised release will commence within \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after release from imprisonment. The court will set the payment plan based on an assessment of the defendant's ability to pay at that time; or
- F ☒ Special instructions regarding the payment of criminal monetary penalties:

Unless the court has expressly ordered otherwise, if this judgment imposes imprisonment, payment of criminal monetary penalties is due during the period of imprisonment. All criminal monetary penalties, except those payments made through the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Inmate Financial Responsibility Program, are made to the clerk of the court.

The defendant shall receive credit for all payments previously made toward any criminal monetary penalties imposed.

☐ Joint and Several

Case Number Defendant and Co-Defendant Names (including defendant number)	Total Amount	Joint and Several Amount	Corresponding Payee, if appropriate
---	--------------	-----------------------------	--

- ☐ The defendant shall pay the cost of prosecution.
- ☐ The defendant shall pay the following court cost(s):
- ☐ The defendant shall forfeit the defendant's interest in the following property to the United States:

Payments shall be applied in the following order: (1) assessment, (2) restitution principal, (3) restitution interest, (4) AVAA assessment, (5) fine principal, (6) fine interest, (7) community restitution, (8) JVT assessment, (9) penalties, and (10) costs, including cost of prosecution and court costs.

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**