

APPENDIX

1a

APPENDIX A

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

**No. 17-41123
Summary Calendar**

United States Court of
Appeals
Fifth Circuit
FILED
July 9, 2018
Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff – Appellee

versus

MIGUEL CABRERA-RANGEL,
Defendant – Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
No. 5:17-CR-198-1

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and SMITH,
Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Miguel Cabrera-Rangel appeals the sentence imposed for assault on a federal officer by physical contact. He was acquitted of assault on a federal officer by physical contact inflicting bodily injury.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

Cabrera-Rangel contends that the district court ignored the jury's verdict and impermissibly relied on acquitted conduct. He maintains that the assessment of his base offense level and the application of enhancements under U.S.S.G. § 2A2.2(b)(2)(B) and (3)(E) violated the Sixth Amendment because the determinations were premised on actions of which he was acquitted. Cabrera-Rangel concedes that this claim is foreclosed by *United States v. Watts*, 519 U.S. 148, 157 (1997), and that we have held that *Watts* is valid after *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005). He notes, however, that a reevaluation of *Watts* is necessary because it did not address whether consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing violates the Sixth Amendment and that *Watts* otherwise did not account for principles articulated in *Booker* and later Supreme Court decisions.

A panel of this court may not overrule another panel's decision without en banc reconsideration or a superseding contrary Supreme Court decision. *United States v. Lipscomb*, 299 F.3d 303, 313 n.34 (5th Cir. 2002). We have held that *Watts* remains valid following *Booker*, see *United States v. Jackson*, 596 F.3d 236, 243 n.4 (5th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Farias*, 469 F.3d 393, 399 (5th Cir. 2006), and the Court has not held otherwise, see *Cunningham v. California*, 549 U.S. 270, 274–94 (5th Cir. 2007). Cabrera-Rangel thus has not shown that the district court erred when it considered conduct of which he was acquitted. See *Farias*, 469 F.3d at 399 Cabrera-Rangel contends that his sentence is improper because the district court relied on judge-found facts as to his acquitted conduct; Cabrera-Rangel maintains that, if

only the facts encompassed by the verdict were considered, his sentence is unreasonable. He asserts that his sentence violates the Sixth Amendment and should be vacated.

As Cabrera-Rangel concedes, his claim is foreclosed. Regardless of whether Supreme Court precedent has foreclosed as-applied Sixth Amendment challenges to sentences within the statutory maximum that are reasonable only if based on judge-found facts, our precedent forecloses such contentions. *United States v. Hernandez*, 633 F.3d 370, 374 (5th Cir. 2011).

AFFIRMED.

4a

APPENDIX B

[1]

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LAREDO DIVISION

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Case No. 5:17-CR-00198-1 LAREDO, TEXAS FRIDAY OCTOBER 27, 2017 11:35 a.m. to 12:50 p.m.
vs.	
MIGUEL CABRERA-RANGEL	

SENTENCING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DIANA SALDANA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PARTIES: SEE NEXT PAGE

COURTROOM DEPUTY: ZACH DAVIS, U.S.
MARSHAL

RECORDING OPERATOR: BEN MENDOZA

TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE BY:

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC
935 ELDRIDGE ROAD, #144
SUGAR LAND, TEXAS 77478
(281) 277-5325 (office) (281) 277-0946 (fax)
www.judicialtranscribers.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,
transcript produced by transcription service.

[2] APPEARANCES:

FOR THE
GOVERNMENT

U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
Michael Bukiewicz, Esq.
11204 McPherson Road,
Ste. 100A
Laredo, Texas 78045
956-721-4975

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

FEDERAL PUBLIC
DEFENDER'S OFC.
Raul Guerra, Esq.
Sara Martinez, Esq.
1202 Houston Street
Laredo, Texas 78042
956-753-5313

ALSO PRESENT:

Diana Gonzalez
Raul Gonzalez
Official Court
Interpreters
Delia Gonzalez
Case Manager
Daniel Vella
Ruben Chapa
U.S. Probation Office
Zach Davis
U.S. Marshal

[3] LAREDO, TEXAS; FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2017,
11:5 [sic] A.M.

(Official Interpreters utilized for translation.)

THE COURT: Miguel Cabrera-Rangel, 17-0198.

MR. GUERRA: Raul Guerra for Mr. Cabrera-Rangel, Your Honor. And Sara Martinez.

(Defendant sworn.)

THE COURT: You are Miguel Cabrera-Rangel?

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Cabrera, I need to sentence you for assault on a federal officer by physical contact. Did you get a chance to review the report?

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: I don't know what report you're talking about, ma'am.

THE COURT: The one that your lawyer is showing you.

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: Oh, yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. So I need to sentence you. This was a jury trial and I think you're still contesting.

Right, Mr. Guerra?

MR. GUERRA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He's contesting the facts.

MR. GUERRA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Usually I ask was everything correct. But because there was a trial I'm assuming that the underlying facts that you're contesting and

your attorney is confirming that for me, I'm going to go over your life history, sir, your [4] personal background. And then your criminal record and then your family record. All of that, was that correct?

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: So it says here you're 54. You actually had a birthday last week on Monday, and that you're a native and citizen of Mexico.

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: And you actually have a criminal record that puts you at a Category IV. But a lot of other encounters with law enforcement that were not – that you were not given criminal history points for, and they start in 1984. Which really just shows the extent of the time that you've been in the United States and then why you keep on coming back to the United States, because you've been here since about the age of 21.

And lots of different parts of the country. The first ones that we have here in 34 and 35, those are in Florida. One of these is discharge of a firearm in public. And then in 1990 another one in Florida and this is a DUI. And then a resisting arrest without violence in 1993 in Florida. And then a couple of – well, an illegal entry in '96, that was here in Laredo. And then possession of marijuana in Georgia. So all of these encounters that I've just talked to you about, they don't give you criminal history points, but they're all convictions. And so those start in [5] paragraph 34.

So now we've made it to paragraph 39. And then we've got a couple more illegal entry

misdemeanors in page 10, paragraph 40, 41 and 42. The first two don't give you points. The last one on that page does give you a point. That was in 2008. And all of those are here in Laredo, the last one was in McAllen.

Then in 2012 you have a felony re-entry. That's in Victoria. That one gives you two points. And that, I think, is –

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: Excuse me. Excuse me. I have never been through McAllen.

THE COURT: Let me see here. You may – oh, it wasn't McAllen that you crossed through. It looks like you crossed through Pharr, but then they prosecuted you in McAllen. They took you to the court closest to that area, is in McAllen. So it's not crossing through there, but it is – that's where they took you to court. You saw Judge Ormsby. He's a magistrate judge. He's still there. You were – but it says here you crossed the river near Pharr, Texas. And that was in 2008. He gave you time served. He's a very nice man. That was after like two or three misdemeanor illegal entries.

But in any event, after that you had the felony. That one was seven months in custody. I think that's the most [6] at that point that you had been sentenced to, seven months.

Af[t]er that we see you – you get deported through Laredo, but then you're back again in May and you're in Angleton, Texas. And that's a possession of marijuana. That's another two points.

You get deported again or you leave – no, you get deported after the misdemeanor possession of

marijuana and then you're back again. So we have May, June, July, two months later you're back again here in Laredo. And this one you appeared before Judge Garcia and he gave you six months. So that's two points.

And then you get deported again in 2014 through Del Rio. But then you make it back because now you're in Galveston in 2016. And you get prosecuted for a DWI or open alcohol container, it's a misdemeanor. You get two points for that.

You get deported again September the 2nd, 2016. And we end up here in Laredo in this case January 19, 2017. So that was the last deportation, September 2016. October, November, December, January, you were back four months later in this case.

There's a lot of other encounters, so that's where it puts you, at a Category IV. We've got a lot of other encounters with law enforcement where you were either voluntarily returned, deported. Some of these are disturbing. [7] The first one was in 1987. It was assault and battery with intent to kill. It was a felony. It was dismissed. The narrative there says that they were dispatched because of a stabbing. The person had been stabbed in the back. And they then encountered you who had sustained injuries following this physical altercation with the victim. That's in South Carolina.

And then in 1988 you have an aggravated assault felony. The charges were dropped. That is later, that's the following year, but that's also in reference to a stabbing. They say that the operator of

a vehicle identified you and that you had tried to run over this witness. That was dismissed.

And then in '99 we have a possession of alcohol. You get deported. That's in Georgia.

And then we've got a couple of illegal entries here in Laredo. Voluntary returns.

And then in 2001 another incident in Georgia. They deport you to Mexico.

And then in 2003 an apprehension in New Orleans and you get deported.

And then we've got some carrying concealed weapons in the mid-'80s. We don't know the dispositions.

But you look like you have a brother who's a resident alien who's in Galveston. Everybody else, I think, [8] in your family is in Mexico. Actually, you have two brothers. They're both fishermen and they're both in Galveston.

But then your movement back and forth between Laredo and Mexico – or not Laredo, between the United States and Mexico, it's in paragraph 59.

You have a child in Florida. More importantly, you've got seven kids in Mexico. You're married and you've got seven kids in Mexico and they're all citizens of Mexico. The youngest one is seven, the oldest one is 17.

And then it talks here about your two fingers being missing from your left hand because of an automobile accident in 1992.

And it talks a lot about the alcohol consumption that started when you were 16. That you claim you don't have an alcohol problem, but that your criminal record reflects several alcohol-related arrests.

So that's pretty much the extent of your background. That you're a seasonal employee, shrimper, oyster harvester in Galveston and in Port Lavaca. In fact, I think they found you in this case on a boat near Corpus when they encountered you in this case. So that's it.

I'll go over the scoring with you here in a little bit. In fact, I'll probably just let your lawyer do the objections and that's how we'll get into the actual facts. But the way that you're scored right now, you're at a 24/4 [9] which is 77 to 96 months. That's how you're scored.

Would you like to say anything to me before I decide your sentence? And then I'm going to talk to your lawyer about all the objections.

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay, Mr. Guerra, let's see here. Let me get to the scoring. Okay. Okay, I'm here. So we are at an offense level 14.

MR. GUERRA: That's correct. That's where the probation officer scored him, Your Honor. And I have an objection to that. But that is where he was scored.

THE COURT: Okay. So what's the objection to the 14?

MR. GUERRA: Your Honor, he's cross referencing based on the Guidelines. He's using 2A –

let me make sure I get the numbering correct here. He's 2A2.2 which is the aggravated assault. Which is the aggravated assault Guideline calculation. And our objection, Your Honor, is that he is – he was convicted of the impeding, obstructing, assaulting which is 2A2.2 – I'm sorry, 2.4. And that has a base offense level of 10. And so, our objection is that basically to use – using this particular Guideline, Your Honor, calls for the Judge to use the Guideline for each separate, unconvicted offense. And so, that's our objection to that.

He was not convicted of the aggravated assault. [10] That is that particular evidence was presented to the jury and they found beyond a reasonable doubt that he was not guilty of that. And so, our objection is that that is a incorrect base offense to start this discussion on, Your Honor.

May I proceed, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. GUERRA: Okay. So that is one objection, Your Honor.

We have, of course, specific objections to the use of a dangerous weapon which they're including, and the injury, bodily injury, the confession of bodily injury.

But I guess let me begin, Your Honor, if I may, by addressing as I did in my written objection, that we understand that based on current Fifth Circuit case law we're foreclosed in terms of our objection to the use of the acquitted conduct. And, however, we –

THE COURT: And that specifically would be – why don't we just make it clear. That the part that

you're objecting to, the acquitted conduct, I guess, if you will, it's not physical contact, it is the bodily injury.

MR. GUERRA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And what would be the other thing?

MR. GUERRA: Well, it's bodily injury and the use of a weapon.

THE COURT: Use of a weapon. Yeah. [11]

MR. GUERRA: He's including both of them, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah, okay.

MR. GUERRA: So, and so we understand –

THE COURT: And those two would have been – would have been under the Count One?

MR. GUERRA: Count One, Your Honor, which was a not guilty Count.

THE COURT: Except that the Count One was forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate and interfere and engaged in acts involving physical contact and use of a deadly or dangerous weapon or inflicting bodily injury. So, I know that you highlighted this in your objection. The Government chose to proceed with inflicting bodily injury?

MR. BUKIEWICZ: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.

MR. GUERRA: They abandoned the use of a deadly weapon and proceeded with the infliction of bodily injury.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GUERRA: And so that is – that’s another part of our objection. And not just that, but with regard to the inclusion of – there were two different – two different alleged bodily injuries, Your Honor. The information that was presented to the grand jury, which is the broken nose and the lacerations to the face, and there’s the information that was included by Probation which was abandoned by the Government, [12] also, prior to trial, which is the issue of –

THE COURT: Detached retina.

MR. GUERRA: – the detached retina. And we attached a copy of a letter from the ophthalmologist that was provided through discovery by the Government that we believe basically supports our position that that’s one of the reasons why they abandoned it. Because this particular expert, the ophthalmologist in that particular letter is saying, well, you have a pre-existing condition that makes you, you know, places you at high risk for this particular ailment. And he does say, however, it could also be caused by this. But it’s not definitive. And so, we would imagine that that’s why they chose to abandon it prior to trial.

But with regard to the issue having, you know, told the Court as I just did, Your Honor, that we understand that existing Fifth Circuit case law precludes some of these objections that were – or forecloses the objections, I should say. We would like to – we’re still trying to – seeking to preserve for the record, Your Honor, for various reasons. And if the

Court will indulge me I wanted to put some things on the record, Your Honor, because it is very important.

In looking at the case law, my understanding based on looking at the case law and looking at some of the arguments that have been made in some other cases that were pending as recently as, I believe, last year in another [13] Circuit, it seems to be that the prevailing consensus is that the *Watts* case was decided on Fifth Amendment grounds. Specifically, the due process issue, whether or not a sentencing court could use basically just a preponderance standard to make a determination and use that conduct in fashioning the appropriate sentence.

The Fifth Circuit case law seems to include the Sixth Amendment, but at my reading of it and, certainly, reading what some of the commentators that have written about the *Watts* case, they seem to say that the whole Sixth Amendment issue was not even addressed by the Supreme Court, Your Honor.

And so, we're focusing our objection on Sixth Amendment grounds, which is his right to a jury trial, which he did have. And for the specific reason that, as we all know, that an acquittal carries a special weight in the American criminal justice system. And so, this particular right of – Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial, Your Honor, is extremely important. It's a – it is a fundamental guarantee of an individual's liberty.

And so, our position, Your Honor, is that enhancement by acquitted conduct basically eviscerates the jury's ability to protect the citizen from government overreaching. And so, in addition to that it diminishes the democratic nature of the

criminal justice system and [14] undermines public confidence in the judicial system. Because we have a jury that is empaneled, comes in, like we saw. The Government gets to present all its evidence. We get to cross examine their witnesses, present whatever defense we have. And at the end of the day they come back as they did with a split verdict with a not guilty on the most serious charge. He was facing up 20 years on that particular charge. They specifically came back and said not guilty. And the Court's instruction was very specific. It said you must find that he inflicted bodily injury, and they said not guilty on that, Your Honor. And so, we can certainly debate what may or may not have gone through their mind. The fact is that they, after the evidence was presented to them, that is the conclusion that they reached. And they found that he did not inflict bodily injury.

And so, our position is that to turn around now and for the Government to say, well, that's good and well, he exercised his right to a jury trial and the jury found that. But, Judge, you can find that he did inflict bodily injury. And so, we think that that's just turning the whole judicial system on its head, Your Honor. And certainly, again, specifically, which is of concern to us, is that it undermines the public confidence in the judicial system.

Additionally, Your Honor, we have concerns with regard to due process and the standard of proof because, [15] again, recognizing that the Supreme Court has said preponderance of evidence is sufficient for sentencing. We don't dispute that. We know that the Supreme Court has said that. But from a very basic standard, Your Honor, we believe that it is

fundamentally unfair to find someone guilty and imprison him on the same strength of evidence as what applies in a civil case, which is exactly what would happen in this case. Because you have a jury – we had the criminal trial, we had a jury look at the evidence under the much higher scrutiny of beyond a reasonable doubt, and they reached a verdict and they said not guilty. And yet, the Government gets to take a second bite and say, well, forget about that, you know, let's just go with the much lower civil standard of preponderance and that's good enough. And we believe, again, that that's just fundamentally unfair, Your Honor, based on our system of government, basically.

And, you know, I found this quote, Your Honor, from a learned professor. It's from an old law review article. And I think, you know, this is just exactly on point in terms of our position. And his argument is that allowing a sentence enhancement for acquitted conduct is tantamount to permitting the judge to enter, for sentencing purposes, a judgment of guilt, notwithstanding the verdict on the counts of acquittal, an action which is barred as inconsistent with the Sixth Amendment right to trial by jury.

[16] And so, we believe that the use – and specifically, I don't want to – you know, there's two different things. There's always the issue of unadjudicated conduct and adjudicated conduct. And I'm focusing on adjudicated conduct, which is what we're talking about with respect to Count One. He was adjudicated. It was a not guilty verdict. And so, with regard to adjudicated conduct our position, Your Honor, is that the preponderance of evidence standard is fundamentally at odds with our system of

justice because it basically dislodges the jury from its crucial role in our criminal justice system. So, that's the second issue.

The next issue, Your Honor, is with regard to double jeopardy. And he is looking at again basically being punished for an offense that he has been found not guilty. And the Government may come back and say after I'm done, well, but he's not because we're not – I know the case law says if it's – anything that goes beyond the statutory max has to be put before a jury, otherwise the judge cannot consider it.

But it's really semantics, in our opinion, Your Honor, because in essence, and you can see it very clearly in this case, in essence the Government's position is, well, you know what, yeah, he had his day in court, the jury came back not guilty, but the case law is very clear. You know, you can use this conduct even though it is adjudicated conduct and he has been adjudicated not guilty. And although it doesn't [17] increase the statutory max, it's going to increase the Guideline range substantially compared to where he would be otherwise.

And so, at the end of the day he's placed in the same predicament. He's going to be looking at a much higher sentence than he would otherwise. Irrespective of the fact that we're not, you know, touching the statutory maximum, he's still looking at a lot more time because the adjudicated not guilty conduct is going to be included, which is what the Government is proposing.

And so, again, we believe that that is – it is a violation of his Constitutional rights, specifically the double jeopardy, Your Honor, that in doing so we are

again really, really just turning the criminal justice system on its head because the whole system of – or the rule, you know, in our criminal justice system is that these judgments reflect our interest in preserving the finality of judgments to protect individuals from government overreach. And so, I may have stumbled on that.

But the point is again that the whole issue of these trials and having a judgment is to preserve, you know, the individual citizens from government overreach. And this is turning it on its head, Your Honor.

So, to reiterate, if we do this, Your Honor, the use of acquitted conduct is tantamount to a redetermination by the [18] sentencing judge of a jury's final verdict. I mean that's what it amounts to. And again, I'm talking about just adjudicated conduct, not unadjudicated conduct.

Finally, Your Honor, this is another issue that I think is very important because in looking at the case law, of course, it says the court can look at unadjudicated conduct, relevant conduct, whatever, you know, whatever term you want to use to put in the proper context, you know, the nature of the offense that he has been or she has been convicted to form – or fashion, I should say, the appropriate sentence.

However, I think there's a big distinction, Your Honor, between using it to conceptualize the offense of conviction and basically redefining the offense of conviction. And I think that's what we're doing in this particular case. Because by Probation using the aggravated assault Guideline calculation, which is

exactly what they've done, our position is that what they're doing is they're redefining his conduct. Which, again, the jury came back in Count Two it is simple assault. I mean not simple assault, but I mean it's assault, a physical contact. And they're using the cross reference for aggravated assault and they're redefining it for a crime that he was not convicted of. And so, that is another objection that we have.

And we believe that – and this goes back to what I told the Court a little while ago, that the use of a [19] Guideline, a cross reference Guideline we would argue is illegitimate because it is – he's in essence being convicted for a separate offense that – I'm sorry, he's being sentenced for a separate offense that he was never convicted of; in this particular case, aggravated assault. He ends up scoring a lot higher. They're specifically using all the enhancements from that particular provision even though the assault provision which is the 2A2.4 provision has some enhancements in and of itself, Your Honor.

And so, it's not like it does not have – the Government's not – doesn't have the ability to use those particular enhancements in that other section. They're two distinct sections and they each have different enhancements. And so, that is our position that by using this cross reference for aggravated assault they're redefining the offense of conviction as aggravated assault and they're violating my client's Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial, Your Honor. Because, again, as I stated earlier, this whole issue of inclusion of this unadjudicated or adjudicated conduct is a distinction without difference because the end result is that Mr. Cabrera is going to end up

being punished more severely. His punishment range is going to be increased because of the consideration of the acquitted conduct. And again, our position is that that violates his Constitutional rights, Your Honor.

[20] So, we're – I gave specific – a little bit more specific in the written motion with regard to the use of the dangerous weapon, Your Honor. Specifically, again in terms of the – that even applying the preponderance standard, we believe that if the Court – as the Court is bound to do, follow current applicable case law, even using the preponderance standard, Your Honor, we believe that with regard to the use of a weapon enhancement the information, the evidence that was presented to the jury, if the Court sees it also in terms of – we have two different things. We have the agent testifying and saying this is how it happened, this is what was used.

But they also – “they” being the Government – also presented the experts. And they presented the two experts from the FBI laboratory. One being the fingerprint analyst and the other one being the DNA expert. And our position is, Your Honor, that their reports and their testimony further supports our conclusion that even based on the preponderance standard that it's – there's not enough there to find that that was used because one testified there are no fingerprints. Not even the agents, not even Agent Platt's fingerprints were found on the flashlight. And he testified that that had been his flashlight for the last five years. And that is just amazing that you would have no fingerprints on a flashlight that a person – his own fingerprints, let alone the alleged

[21] assailant's. And so, DNA – and the Court, of course, presided over the trial, so I'm kind of just repeating what the Court already knows. But the DNA expert, of course, testified that they found some DNA. It wasn't – it was inclusive as to the agent and it definitely was not my client's, Your Honor. And so they have no idea. They know that it's a male DNA, but they have no idea whose DNA that is. And so, we believe that even applying the preponderance standard is still not sufficient with regard to the use of a deadly weapon for the Court to apply that enhancement, Your Honor.

The issue of the bodily injury, I know that, number one, I've already made a distinction between the retina issue which I believe I've already covered and I can certainly, if the Court wants me to, reiterate some of those points. But I believe I made clear that our position is that, number one, they abandoned that particular alleged injury. And now that it's before the Court again we believe that their experts, the treating physicians, ophthalmologist's letter itself, Your Honor, shows that the one person who would know who is the treating physician. He's an expert of eye – eye expert is saying in writing that you have this pre-existing condition, that that in and of itself can account for it. But, yeah, you know, if something happens to you, that may account, too. So it's – that even by a preponderance standard we believe that [22] that's insufficient, Your Honor, for the Court to find that they've met their burden and that that should be included.

With regard to the bodily injury itself, as the Court may recall, when they presented their expert, or I guess that was testified as an expert. I know it

was a treating physician, the fact witness. But the doctor testified under cross and when Ms. Martinez specifically crossed him on that he admitted that it was very possible that the injuries that the agent sustained could have been a result of – could have resulted when he tackled the person and fell to the ground. And so, their expert's own testimony puts into question whether or not anybody really caused those particular injuries, Your Honor.

And so, again we believe that even applying the current preponderance standard that that would be also insufficient. The Government has not met their burden and it would be insufficient. And that, of course, is all part of the record the Court presided over that the Court heard. I believe even the Court asked the doctor a couple of questions, also, if I'm not mistaken. But we believe that they have failed to meet their burden on that front, also, Your Honor.

So, if I may just ask Ms. Martinez if I haven't forgotten.

(Mr. Guerra consulting with Ms. Martinez.)

MR. GUERRA: With regard to the objections, Your [23] Honor, I think that that is what I wanted to put on the record for the Court to consider.

If I may, with regard to the criminal history, if the Court will allow me to make some comments about that, Your Honor. The criminal history that the Court went over, number one, Your Honor, the – as the Court stated, a lot of those are very, very old. You know, 31, 30 years ago, the first one when he was 21 years old. And so, pursuant to our current Guidelines, Probation has followed the Guidelines

and they don't receive any criminal history points as is allowed by the Guidelines. And so, it is criminal history that is very dated, number one. Number two, if the Court looks at the most recent criminal history, Your Honor, most of that is illegal entry. And most of those are misdemeanors. And I think that reflects why in 2012 when the Court in Victoria sentenced Mr. Cabrera-Rangel, he received only a seven month sentence. And I think it's reflective of the fact that a lot of the – those convictions were not receiving criminal history points in 2012. And really, the most recent arrest he had and convictions were all misdemeanor illegal entries, Your Honor, that were considered by the court.

With regard to the more serious arrests that he had that are also very, very dated from almost 30 years ago, from 1987 and – or, actually, 30 years ago, 1987 and almost 30 years ago from 1988. As the Court correctly stated, those [24] were dismissed, Your Honor. I mean we don't dispute that they sound very serious in terms of you look at the actual charge. But at the end of the day these particular jurisdictions, albeit the South Carolina jurisdiction in paragraph 48 or the Florida jurisdiction in paragraph 49, they made the determination after applying the facts to the law of their jurisdiction to dismiss those charges, Your Honor.

And so, we certainly – you know, we have the limited information that's included in there, but obviously being that as the Court said, and we don't dispute that they're serious charges, what is most important to us is that the charging jurisdictions did not proceed. They dropped those charges.

And so, that leads me to believe that there was either an issue of self defense, as might be an issue alluded to paragraph 48 because it says that the defendant, being my client, also had injuries when he was arrested. And so, there certainly is an issue that that was probably – and again, you know, I don't have that information, so I'm just making some assumptions based on the fact that the charges were dismissed, that that is a probability, Your Honor. That they found that it was an issue of self defense and they dismissed it.

With regard to paragraph 49, the same thing. Again, the charges were dropped in 1989. And so, we don't dispute that they're serious, but for whatever reasons the state [25] jurisdictions decided not to proceed, you know.

And I think that is very important for the Court to consider because otherwise, again, you know, we just had a huge discussion about adjudicated conduct with a finding of not guilty being used to prejudice my client and that particular adjudicated not guilty conduct being used to increase his Guideline sentence. And we certainly want to avoid the fact that an arrest in and of itself that resulted in the dropping of charges or the – you know, the case not proceeding in those particular jurisdictions, for that also to have any kind of undue influence on the Court in terms of affecting also his sentence, Your Honor. Because, again, these jurisdictions made the decision to not proceed on these charges for whatever reason. And, you know, anybody can second guess them, but they're the ones that are charged with making those calls and that's what they did.

And so, we would – The criminal history category, Your Honor, he's got nine criminal history points. But, again, I believe – and let me count them real quick, but I believe it's four of the nine are all illegal – illegal re-entry, either the felony or the misdemeanors, Your Honor. And so, – let's see two, four, five. It's actually five criminal history points out of those nine are illegal re-entry cases, Your Honor. And so, those are issues or factors that we would ask the Court to consider, Your Honor, as it fashions a sentence.

[26] And with regard to his family, the Court mentioned and it's included in the PSR, he's got seven minor kids right now that depend on him, Your Honor. And so, as the Court saw in the PSR, when he was here he was primarily working in the shrimping and fishing industry. And he would come to work, send money to his family, go back, spend time with them, come back again, as the Court says, seasonally to work. And so, we would like for the Court to consider those factors, Your Honor.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you know, your arguments, you know, are well taken, Mr. Guerra. I appreciate the work that you've put into preparing those objections. I've reviewed them. I've reviewed them yet again before I came on the bench. I reviewed them again this morning. I'm reviewing them again right now.

A couple of things. And, Mr. Bukiewicz, I don't know if you – I know you filed a response and I have that and I looked at the cases that you cited, as well. So, I've got all of that.

And I'm looking at the Probation Officer's response. So the Probation Office decided, you know, they come over here, they come to the trial, they witness, they listen to everything, they take all the reports, they put everything together for the Court. So, the Probation Officer decided to start this off at an offense level 14.

[27] And so, if you look at the Probation Officer's response to the objections, the reason that they did that is – let me see, I think it's to Objection No. 1. So, they summarize your objections and your arguments and they indicate the reason why they did what they did. So, if you can look at the – if you look at the assault provision here under 2A2.1 – let me get back to it – 2A2.3, 2A2.3, excuse me. So, you're right, it's a 7 if the offense involved physical contact or if a dangerous weapon, including a firearm, was possessed and it's used with threat, 7. And so, the verdict was on Count Two involving physical contact, so it's a 7. And then it goes to the specific offense characteristics, which you've highlighted, if the victim sustained bodily injury, increase by 2. That's a 9 because they [sic] other one doesn't apply. It has to be a spouse, an intimate partner or a dating partner or an individual under the age of 16. So, it's increased by 2. So that's 9.

There's a cross reference. So, the Probation Office is doing this. If the conduct constituted aggravated assault, apply 2A2.2. So, they end up going then to 2A2.2, which is where I'll go now. So that base offense level is a 14. And if you look at the definition for aggravated assault it means a felonious assault that involved a dangerous weapon with intent to cause bodily injury with that weapon,

serious bodily injury, strangling, suffocating or attempting to strangle or suffocate or an intent to commit another offense – or another felony; [28] excuse me.

And so, the Probation Officer replies to the objections with “the Border Patrol Agent Platt testified that the defendant struck him in the face with his flashlight during this struggle. The defendant denies doing that. The defendant did admit that he was able to gain possession of the agent’s flashlight during the struggle.” And so, because of that testimony the Probation Officer thinks that that is an aggravated assault and that’s why they went to that cross reference and that’s why they start at 14.

So, you’ve made a couple of points with regard to – that there’s not enough under a preponderance standard for the Court to find that there was this aggravated assault. One of them being the DNA, the other being the fingerprints. The lack of the DNA or the lack of the fingerprints.

I presided over the trial. I listened to all of the testimony. I was – quite frankly, I was shocked that the jury did not find the defendant guilty of the first Count – or the second Count, whichever one they acquitted him of.

MR. GUERRA: The first Count, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It was the first Count?

MR. GUERRA: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

The DNA and the fingerprint analysis really did not – I did not think was significant. It was something that the [29] Government decided to do. I don't know why they did that, but they did. The flashlight is not a porous object. There was no testimony as to how long the flashlight stayed out in the field. There was no testimony as to how it was handled when it was picked up. You know, I know that the agent testified that he ran away from the encounter after he was able to free himself from the defendant, and the flashlight was left behind. I don't know when it was found. I don't know how it was found. So this whole notion of there's no DNA and there's no fingerprints, that doesn't really support your contention then that it wasn't used. It doesn't support it at all, in my view.

The defendant – I mean Agent Platt testified that he was hit in the face by his flashlight. I thought that he was very forthcoming, appeared to be honest, truthful, very powerful testimony. He identified his flashlight in the courtroom. But the lack of DNA or fingerprints on the flashlight doesn't support that it wasn't used. Maybe in the eyes of the jury, because you made very compelling arguments and they went along with you on it, they, you know, acquitted him of that conduct. There's no dispute as to that.

But I am still, you know, as my role as the presiding judge over the trial and the sentencing, the law allows me to take into account all of that conduct. And that's why the Probation Office did what they did. I can't – You know, I don't know that it's the Government pushing it. I guess [30] they're responding to your objections, but it's really the Probation Office who evaluated all of the evidence,

sat through the trial and then decided how to score the case.

And so, I do believe that there is sufficient information in here for us to start off at the offense level 14. So that objection is overruled.

The next objection then is if a dangerous weapon was otherwise used, increase by 4. And so the Probation Office indicates what I just stated a little while ago, that Agent Platt testified that he was struck in the face with his flashlight during this struggle. And at some point during the course of all of this the defendant did admit that he was able to gain possession of the flashlight. And I don't think that that was much of a dispute.

And again, you know, I found the agent's testimony to be very credible. And the injuries that were contained or demonstrated in the photographs seem consistent with that type of hit or type of conduct. And so, you know, I think that there is sufficient information in the record to support that enhancement, as well. So that objection is overruled.

And then the last objection then is to this plus 6 for the permanent or life-threatening bodily injury because of the detached retina. So, I understand your argument, you know, about, you know, what the doctor said and that he had this other condition. And I also listened to the testimony, you [31] know, that the doctor, the medical doctor talked about with regard to what type of conduct or what type of things could have caused the injuries to Agent Platt.

You know, I'll note that he's been a Border Patrol agent and – I don't know, I have my notes

here, let me see if I can – 19 years. When he testified, a Border Patrol agent 19 years. And I know one of the points that was made by somebody – maybe it was Mr. Bukiewicz – is he's had this condition and throughout his 19 years as a Border Patrol agent he hasn't suffered a detached retina. And so, I think that that is – that there's sufficient information in the record even if the Government decided to – well, they abandoned the – they abandoned that part of it, they did not abandon the bilateral nasal bone fracture, which was repaired. But the detached retina, because he's on light duty, he remains on light duty to this day because of the vision in the left eye following that surgery. I think that there's sufficient information that if you get hit in the face with a flashlight that that would then be the cause of the detached retina, considering the fact that he had not had any issues with that even with the pre-existing condition.

You know, I don't know why the Government abandoned that. Maybe they thought that would be too confusing to the jury. It doesn't really matter. The facts are the facts the way that they are contained in the report. And I think that [32] that would be sufficient information for me to make that determination.

The other thing that I, you know, note that's part of the report – and if you just bear with me while I go to that section. This individual, this defendant fled. The encounter, the assault, whatever, however you want to call it, ended when Agent Platt was able to free himself from the defendant. And then Agent Platt ran out. I'm going to find that here. He called for help.

During a search of the area, paragraph 10, agents encountered four undocumented aliens. The defendant was not with the group. He had fled. The four aliens, along with Agent Platt, identified the defendant as the assailant, through interviews and by photograph.

The arrest warrant was issued January the 27th. Issued for the defendant. He wasn't found until February the 13th, and that's when he was found in Corpus Christi.

So, we did not hear from the four undocumented aliens. They were deported. You know, I would hope that if we ever have this type of situation again – and, hopefully, we won't – that the Government or even the defense would ask that these individuals be kept as material witnesses. I understand that at this time the defendant had not been found yet. And so, maybe there was uncertainty as to whether or not he was going to be found and when he was going to be found, and we [33] were going to be holding these undocumented aliens, you know, indefinitely. Probably not. But the only way that this person was identified and eventually found is because he was identified with the help of the other people who were part of the group who, according to this, would have identified him as the person who was involved in this assault.

So, I think that with all of this information that there is enough for me to overrule the objections and to find that the report is accurately scored.

So, it's not – you know, the Probation Office is not, you know, just grabbing these items or these levels out of thin air. I mean they're following the

advisory Guidelines. They're following the information and the evidence that was presented during the course of the trial. And the law allows for the Court to examine that and to use acquitted conduct.

And so, you know, I'll tell you, Mr. Cabrera, you know, if there was any doubt in my mind – and I would hope, you know – you haven't been in front of me other than this time that I had the trial. Any doubts I always give to the defendant, you know, because I believe very strongly in our Constitution. I believe very strongly in defendants leaving this Court feeling like, You know what? this was the outcome, but I feel like I was treated fairly and I was – you know, that's the law and I don't agree with the law, but I was treated fairly. And, you know, that's always my intent, my [34] desire to do that.

And I am not going to ignore, you know, the testimony that I heard, everything that's contained in the report. You know, I don't have any doubt of it. And so, I think that it clearly meets the preponderance standard which I'm required to evaluate in determining sentencing issues.

You know you have a right to appeal. You haven't accepted responsibility for this conduct. You're disputing it. You know, I'm sure you're going to appeal the trial. You know, maybe the guilty verdict on that one Count and whatever errors your appellate section or the Public Defender's appellate section can find. And then you would, you know, have the ability to appeal the sentence. And so, the Fifth Circuit will be able to review it. They're going to get a chance to review it. Your lawyer did a beautiful job of

putting everything on the record that he thinks he needs to put on the record. But I think that it's correctly scored.

I highlighted your background really just for you to recognize and for you to see and for you to maybe evaluate and consider these continued returns to our country where you are not welcome here. You have been deported numerous times. You've been prosecuted numerous times.

Some of this conduct, you know – because your attorney is telling me, Well, it's really old and, you know, don't worry about it – and, you know, we have a DUI in 1990 [35] and then we have one July 23, 2016. That conduct is a danger to the community. It is a danger to the community. And those are convictions. Those are convictions. Those are not things that were not charged that somebody decided not to prosecute you on. Those are convictions. And we all know that drinking and driving is a danger. We see it every day in the news. So you're coming over here. You're committing violations of law as early as 1990, as late as 2016.

And so, you know, the point is that the Government has tried numerous times, you know, to prosecute you for these illegal entries and then to send you home. You have a lot of kids. We want you to stay in Mexico with your kids. It's hard to support them, I understand that. You know, and maybe you're able to make more money over here because your brothers are here and they live over here. I think that both of them who live here, they're resident aliens. You are not one.

And so, you know, I hope that this experience has been a bad enough experience for you so that you, you know, decide that it's not worth it for you to come over here anymore. Because this is definitely conduct that is not welcome. It's not welcome here.

So, I'm looking over my notes, if you'd just bear with me.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Yeah. And I think the other thing was – [36] and the Fifth Circuit is going to get chance to review the transcript. They'll get a chance to listen to – or not listen to, but to read all of the testimony that was displayed and that was talked about.

And even this whole notion of, well, you know, maybe he got these injuries from, you know, falling down or I think maybe even hitting a rock. The doctor, you know, who testified said that it would be very rare, that it was really more this trauma, blunt force trauma to the head like an intentional – maybe he didn't use those words, but I know that on cross examination there was questions that were made and he testified that it would be rare the way that, Mr. Guerra, you were asking him the questions. But, you know, it is what it is.

And so, I know that your lawyer, you know, feels very strongly and has very well and eloquently argued on your behalf. And, you know, we need individuals like him and Ms. Martinez and people who, you know, are going to bring these issues up to the Court because the Fifth Circuit will get a chance to review this and review the arguments that he's made. And they'll take it all very seriously also

because, you know, we all want, obviously, to follow the Constitution and to make sure that we're protecting the rights, your rights because you're the one who's in custody. You're the one who is serving this sentence. And so, it's a serious case for you and for everybody else.

[37] I know that we, I guess, we always ask if we have a victim if they want to submit a statement. I don't remember, Mr. Chapa.

MR. CHAPA: One was not received, Your Honor, looking in my –

THE COURT: It was not?

MR. CHAPA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CHAPA: But I did speak to the –

MALE SPEAKER: Agent Platt is present.

THE COURT: I know he is.

MR. CHAPA: I did speak with him, Your Honor, and I – little synopsis on paragraph – let's see – paragraph 17, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I did read it. Okay. Yeah. No, I remember reading it. I just wasn't sure whether or not there was an actual statement. Okay.

Do you want to say anything? Do you want to – does Agent Platt want to talk to me?

MR. BUKIEWICZ: Your Honor, obviously, I don't want to disagree with anything we've already said because it's consistent with our position. I would say that the criminal history score, if anything, is under-represented. I disagree with counsel regarding all of

these arrests. It's not just that he's an unlucky individual, but he's had a lifetime of [38] crime. And I think the Court has already acknowledged that.

Agent Platt is present and he would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Agent Platt sworn.)

AGENT PLATT: Your Honor, I wanted to say it has been very hard. The initial surgery on my retina was done on – well, after the assault I experienced floaters in my eye and flashes in the side of my eye. And I went to the, you know, regular eye doctor. He looked in there, he said you have a torn retina, you need to have emergency surgery. So, the very next day, you know, he set me up with a doctor in Corpus. And the very next day I had the surgery. And since then a cataract had formed, so I had to have another surgery August 1st. And now I have to have another procedure next week because there's scarring in my eye which they say is very simple to take care of, but it's a lot to go through.

I've a letter from my wife, also.

THE COURT: Okay.

AGENT PLATT: And that's all I have to say.

THE COURT: And I guess since I have you up here, Agent Platt, that previous condition that they mention in one of the letters is – I didn't get a chance to look it up to see what it is. Do you understand what that previous condition is?

AGENT PLATT: They call it highly myopic, which is – [39] I have bad eyes.

THE COURT: Okay.

AGENT PLATT: I have to wear contacts.

THE COURT: It's the shape of the retina?

AGENT PLATT: I'm not sure on that.

THE COURT: Okay. I think – okay. Let me read this letter that I'll make part of the record.

Do you want to – I hate to make you stand up here while I'm reading this. Do you want to say anything else?

AGENT PLATT: That's all, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. You can sit down.

(Court reading letter.)

THE COURT: Okay. I've reviewed it. I'll make it part of the record, I guess under seal since I reviewed it. Thank you.

Anything else, Mr. Bukiewicz?

MR. BUKIEWICZ: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Guerra? So, I've overruled your objections, for the record.

MR. GUERRA: Your Honor, just one last thing if I may, in terms of, again, just for purposes of the record. Our position, and I understand the Court has already read – I mean ruled. But for purposes of the record our position is that the correct offense base would have been 10, Your Honor. And even assuming for the sake of argument that the Court would have [40] included the enhancements that are allowed by 2A2.4, which we believe is the correct applicable

Guideline section, there would be a total of five additional levels for enhancement that would be for the physical contact and for bodily injury. That would put Mr. Cabrera-Rangel at a maximum – or at a level, I should say, of 15, Category IV, which would be a range of 30 to 37 months. And that is what we believe, Your Honor, would have been the accurate score, just for purposes of the record, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Which provision?

MR. GUERRA: 2A –

THE COURT: The assault? Because I had him at a 10. I'm just curious how you got to 15.

MR. GUERRA: Well, Your Honor – yes, and I noticed the Court was using 2A2.3 which is assault. But in looking at the commentary in terms of the statutory provisions that apply to that, I don't see 18 U.S.C. 111, Your Honor, so I had followed 2A2.4. And it has –

THE COURT: Oh, okay. Obstructing or impeding?

MR. GUERRA: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GUERRA: And that one does have 111 as the applicable statutory provision.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, thank you for correcting me. So, yes. I see that. And thank you for doing that because I had wanted to do that.

So, it's a 10. I'm looking at now 2A2.4. I've been corrected. If the offense involved physical contact or a dangerous weapon was possessed and its use was threatened, increase by 3. And then if the victim sustained bodily injury, increase by 2. Thank you, Mr. Guerra. And that does then cross reference the aggravated assault, so I see now where you get the 15. I appreciate that.

It's a 15, IV and which would be 30 to 37 months. I see that.

MR. GUERRA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I do believe, Mr. Cabrera, that your correct score is a 24/IV which is 77 to 96 months. And I'm going to leave you there.

The Probation Department has described, and so has the prosecutor, described factors that would warrant a departure, and that's in paragraph 89. And that would consider all of the criminal conduct that you've been involved in on whether or not your criminal history category is under-represented because of your continued involvement in criminal conduct when you've been here in the United States. And, in fact, probably the biggest highlight to that notion would be the 1990 DUI and then the 2016 DUI. Both of them convictions.

[42] And – let me get to that page. And like I said, a deportation in September and you were arrested – or this offense occurred in January. So, I counted the months, September, October, November, December, January, four months later back in the United States again illegally. And then being involved in this aggravated assault with Agent Platt.

So, I think that that's very well-taken information for the Court with regard to the criminal history category. So you're at 77 to 96 months. And the statutory maximum is eight years.

MR. CHAPA: He's right at the statutory max, Your Honor, so –

THE COURT: Yeah, which is the high end.

MR. CHAPA: The highest that he can get. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. That's what I'm looking for. I just want to make sure. Yeah, I see it. Yeah.

So, because of that information that I just highlighted I didn't – well, this score reaches the statutory maximum penalty at a Category IV. So I'm going to leave you here but I'm going to sentence you at the high end to the statutory maximum penalty which is 96 months in custody. It'll be followed by a three-year term of supervised release. I'll impose standard and mandatory conditions of release.

A special condition is going to be that if you get [43] deported, you don't come illegally. And you're going to get deported again, Mr. Cabrera. I'm imposing it as an added deterrent to your returning to the U.S. illegally because you have two brothers who live here and that's strong incentive for you to return to the United States.

I'll impose \$100 special assessment. I'm not going to impose a fine because of your inability to pay a fine.

Mr. Cabrera allocuted, right? He didn't want to say anything?

MR. GUERRA: Yes, the Court did ask him, Your Honor. He said he didn't want to say anything.

THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah. They're just telling me, Mr. Cabrera, that they didn't think that you were able to talk, but I think you indicated to me that you didn't want to say anything. And your attorney is confirming that.

But you have kept your right to appeal. It's a free appeal. You know, talk to your lawyer about it. You have 14 days to appeal. Make sure that you file the notice and that way they can start working on all of the transcripts. And, you know, we'll see what happens.

I do wish you luck. I hope that this situation and this encounter has been negative enough for you so that once you are done with your sentence in this case, and once you get deported again, that you don't come back to this country. You're already 54 years old and you've been coming and going [44] for a significant amount of time. And it's really time for you to just stay in your home country and for you not to come back to the U.S. illegally.

So, again, you have 14 days to appeal. It's a free appeal.

Do you want me to recommend a specific facility?

DEFENDANT CABRERA-RANGEL: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Talk to him and see if he wants to recommend because he has family in Galveston. So, there is a couple of them over there. And then just let the Probation Officer know so that we can include it in the judgment.

MR. GUERRA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GUERRA: And just for purposes of the record, Your Honor, we object to the sentence imposed for the reasons previously stated in terms of our objections, Your Honor. And that it is greater than necessary and that it's also based on a –

THE COURT: Unacquitted conduct.

MR. GUERRA: Unadjudicated – I'm sorry, adjudicated not guilty conduct. And also that the Court's calculation, in our opinion, Your Honor, that was the wrong base offense level and the enhancements.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

All of those objections I've addressed. All of them [45] were overruled, you know. And I've stated, we've talked a good amount of time and I've talked about your record, Mr. Cabrera.

You know, the other thing that I'll say, too, is I've got – you know, I've got to deter you and others from committing this type of conduct. I have to protect the community. I have to promote respect for the laws of this country and avoid sentencing disparities. But really the other three factors that I identified are very significant. And you're not someone who we've never seen before. You're not someone who hasn't been to court. You're not someone who hasn't been deported. You're not someone who doesn't have a criminal record in the United States. And so, with all of that in mind, you know, this is a serious offense, serious encounter, serious background. You know, and there's a need to

deter, promote respect for the laws of this country, protect the community from all of this type of activity. And, you know, so I think it's sufficient and not greater than necessary. Obviously, there's a dispute as to that, you know.

And that's why we have the appellate court because they have where Mr. Guerra thinks you should be and they have where I held you. And so then they have the analysis that I'll say that I think that even if I'm wrong on all these enhancements, I would have sentenced you to the statutory maximum penalty regardless of the offense level because of your background, your record that you have. The conduct. Even the [46] conduct that was adjudicated and where you were found guilty. You know, the Fifth Circuit will get a chance to evaluate all of that and review it and then, you know, decide what they do. So, we'll see.

But I do wish you luck. And I hope – you know, you're a very quiet man. You've been quiet, you know, even before when I met you and before when we did the trial and even today. So, I don't really feel like I know you the way that I like to get to know people when I'm sentencing them. But that's okay. My hope, you know, and prayer is the same for you, that you're able to look back on your life and that you're able to evaluate it and see how you ended up here. And if there are any issues, you know, that you try and address them so that you can live, you know, a healthy and a fruitful life, but that you do it in your home country, not in the United States illegally. But I wish you luck.

So, you talk to your lawyer. I know it's a harsh sentence and I know that it's – you know, that you're taking it in. You've got brothers in Galveston. They're resident aliens. If you would like for them to maybe go see you, there's some facilities over there that are close by. So, talk to him and see whether or not you want me to recommend that because I can put it in the judgment. So, good luck.

Thank you, Mr. Guerra.

MR. GUERRA: Thank you, Your Honor.

May I be excused, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

MR. GUERRA: Thank you.

(Proceeding concluded at 12:50 p.m.)

* * *