1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
45	Plaintiff, Criminal Action No. 15-mj-01104-DLC
6 7	V. November 13, 2015 DAVID KENNETH DRUMM, 10:06 a.m.
8	Defendant.
9	
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF DETENTION HEARING/STATUS CONFERENCE
12	BEFORE MAGISTRATE JUDGE DONALD L. CABELL
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14	JOHN J. MOAKLEY U.S. COURTHOUSE
15	1 COURTHOUSE WAY
16	BOSTON, MA 02210
17	
18	
19	
20	DEBRA M. JOYCE, FCRR
21	Official Court Reporter John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse
22	1 Courthouse Way, Room 5204 Boston, MA 02210
23	joycedebra@gmail.com
24	
25	

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
     FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
     AMY H. BURKART, ESQ.
     United States Attorney's Office MA
     Suite 9200
 4
     1 Courthouse Way
 5
     Boston, MA 02210
     617-748-3100
 6
     FOR THE DEFENDANT:
 7
     EDWARD E. McNALLY, ESQ.
 8
     DANIEL J. FETTERMAN, ESQ.
     Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman LLP
 9
     1633 Broadway
     New York, NY 10019
     212-506-1708
10
11
     TRACY A. MINER, ESQ.
     Demeo LLP
     200 State Street
12
     Boston, MA 02109
13
     617-263-2600
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1

PROCEEDINGS

(The following proceedings were held in open court before the Honorable Donald L. Cabell, United States

Magistrate Judge, United States District Court, District of

Massachusetts, at the John J. Moakley United States Courthouse,

Courthouse Way, Boston, Massachusetts, on November 13, 2015.

The defendant, David Kenneth Drumm, is present with counsel. The Assistant U.S. Attorney is present.)

THE CLERK: The case of <u>United States v. David Kenneth</u>

<u>Drumm</u>, criminal action number 15-mj-01104 will now be heard

before this Court. Would counsel please identify themselves

for the record?

MS. BURKART: Good morning, your Honor. Amy Harman Burkart for the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. McNALLY: Good morning, your Honor. Edward McNally, David Fetterman, and Tracy Miner for David Drumm.

THE COURT: Good morning to you all.

And good morning, Mr. Drumm.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We're here today for a couple matters relating to the extradition request. The first is, in no particular order, there is a motion for release that was filed by Mr. Drumm on November 10th, and in connection with that, a fair number of papers, roughly 125 pages or so, and the

10:06 10

11 12

7

8

9

13 14

15

16

17

19

21

18

10:06 20

22

24

government has filed a response to that, which I received yesterday. Are those -- and I've gotten all the submissions, I believe, that were provided, both in unredacted and redacted form. Is there anything beyond that with respect to the motion for bail that I should have in front of me? I have that and the government's opposition. Is there anything else or does that --

10:08 20

10:07 10

MS. BURKART: Your Honor, I received a letter this morning, which I provided to the Court via e-mail, which I also provided to Ms. Russo just now from the Irish government to the Office of International Affairs.

THE COURT: I have a copy of that, too. I have not read that letter yet, but I have a copy of that up here, too.

MS. BURKART: I can refer to it in court, your Honor. It was in response to some filings that were received yesterday by our office. We spoke with the Irish authorities yesterday afternoon with some questions, and then they sent a letter this morning addressing those questions.

THE COURT: So we'll address that in due course.

Then the other issue that I really do want to address today is to start thinking about the actual hearing in this matter, and I would like to set a date today. Obviously, we need to talk through some things, but I want to make sure that we are all on the same page as to what that hearing might look like and whether there are any necessary things that need to

take place between today and the hearing. I want to make sure that we identify those and allow those to take place, and if you don't mind, I think I'd like to do that before we address the issue of bail.

10:09 10

10:09 20

So, first, let me ask the government, when do you believe the government would be ready to hold the actual extradition hearing in this case? And as part of that, I want to make sure, whether you agree with me or not, as I understand it, the inquiry at that hearing is fairly narrow. One, we need to determine whether there's a valid treaty between the countries; two, whether the crime charged or the crimes charged are covered by the treaty; and then, third, whether there's probable cause to believe that Mr. Drumm committed the crimes as alleged therein. If you have a different understanding, you can let me know.

MS. BURKART: No, your Honor. I would agree that that would be the scope of the inquiry. As a result because it's rather narrow -- though Mr. Drumm has argued that he would need a great deal of time to analyze a number of records, I believe that's unnecessary in this case --

THE COURT: I'll hear from them on that. When do you think you'd be ready to do it?

MS. BURKART: I could to it in a few weeks, your Honor or I have a pretty lengthy trial in front of Judge Casper that begins on January 4th that I expect will go about three or four

weeks, so that would be an impediment for the January time frame and the late December time frame due to the holidays, but I could do it in a few weeks or I could do it after the trial in front of Judge Casper.

THE COURT: Which is to say you could do it roughly early to mid-December.

MS. BURKART: Yes, your Honor. I was thinking sort of -- yes, early to mid-December. The earlier, the better in December for me, just due to --

THE COURT: Around the second week of December or so.

MS. BURKART: That would be about right, your Honor,

yes, absolutely. Or I could do it after the trial in February,

and I have a very open schedule in February and March.

THE COURT: And presently, do you intend to rely just on the record as we have it, that is, those documents submitted by the Irish government in support of the extradition request and any other papers that accompanied that?

MS. BURKART: I did have some questions, your Honor, after reviewing the record, so I posed those to the Office of International Affairs, to the Irish government, and requested some additional clarification on some of the points. So I've asked for a supplemental affidavit on those points. I expect it would be forthcoming relatively soon. There were some narrow points that I needed some additional clarification on, so I would expect that would be relatively soon.

10:10 10

10:11 20

THE COURT: All right.

10:12 10

10:12 20

So let me hear from the defense on this.

MR. McNALLY: Thank you, your Honor, Edward McNally.

The defendant, David Drumm, has a very different view of the complexities of this case. He's charged in 33 separate crimes, the most recent conduct involved ended seven years ago. His Irish counsel is present in court today, Mr. Michael Steins, and he has said in his affidavit that there may be many millions and millions of pages of documents that relate to this case.

THE COURT: I can't tell you how much it concerned me to see an allusion to that in the papers. I don't want to stop you, but let me ask you right there. You're familiar with extradition proceedings, they're not trials, they're not a trial on the merits, that would take place in Ireland. It's really, in many respects, more akin to a probable cause hearing. Generally speaking, the representations and the allegations that are contained in the papers are accepted as true for the sake of argument. Why, then, would we need to worry about millions of pages of other documents that might be material and relevant to a trial on the merits but not necessarily germane to the narrow scope of inquiry that I just summarized a few minutes ago?

MR. McNALLY: Judge, let me try and be efficient in some ways. You have a sealed document that we're referring to

as the BOP situation. Never in my experience have I had as much difficulty in communicating with a client as has been true in this case. It's certainly despite what I view as the best efforts of the United States. Assistant U.S. Attorney Amy Burkart has tried to assist at every turn, graciously and professionally, but the challenges have been extraordinary.

We have not had an opportunity to discuss most of these issues yet with our client. He is the greatest resource available to us about some of the questions that the Court is asking. We have not had an opportunity to have fulsome or even preliminary conversations with him on many of these subjects.

So, for all these reasons, it appears at this moment that unless there is a remarkable change in the coming days or weeks, we may have great challenges in preparing for this hearing. And we're happy to address that in the right time and place, but the Assistant U.S. Attorney suggested that one window might be February and March, and I think that would be a date we should look for.

THE COURT: Okay.

So there's a couple of things in there, and maybe we're kind of moving from one to the other, and this is a fluid conversation, but I was more concerned with the statement that you raised suggesting somewhere, somehow you would need time, first, to go through all of those other documents in order to prepare for this hearing. I'm not sure I'm persuaded that

10:13 10

10:14 20

that's necessary, but it is helpful to have this conversation so we can figure out timing.

If both sides agree on an ideal time to hold the hearing, and that is not, say, in December, but rather in January or February, I can try to accommodate that.

So have you actually conferred in terms of trying to arrive at an ideal time to have the hearing?

MR. McNALLY: We have not had an opportunity for that. Your Honor, quite honestly, I have not had an opportunity to consult with my client on some of this, which is the threshold question.

THE COURT: Well -- okay.

10:15 20

10:15 10

Well, then, that kind of collapses back to the government.

The government is prepared to go ahead, and the default is, okay, let's go ahead, unless you tell me you can't.

Now, I know you need to talk with your client about that, but I want to as soon as possible, I mean, I want to come up with a firm date, and I don't want it to turn on, first, considering several hundred thousand pages of documents, because then we're going to have the tail wagging the dog.

MR. McNALLY: If I may respectfully suggest this, your Honor -- we take your point. We'd be happy and delighted and will confer both with our client and with the government, and, if possible, in good faith we'll come up with an agreed-upon

1 date or set of dates we could suggest. 2 THE COURT: Or time period. 3 MR. McNALLY: Fair enough. THE COURT: And then, as part of that, I mean, I'm not 4 5 going to put you on the spot now, but I do want -- I want all of us to consider what that hearing is going to look like. 7 really don't want it to be one where we've got volumes and volumes and volumes of documents that might be -- again, might be admissible and germane in Ireland, but, as I see it, don't 10:16 10 really go to any of the issues raised here. 11 So we don't have to resolve that today, but I just want you to understand that if you're going to try to introduce 12 13 evidence outside of the record as we have it, and I understand 14 the statute contemplates there may be some additional evidence 15 introduced, and the government has talked about introducing other evidence, I'd like to get notice ahead of time of what it 16 is so we can all explore whether it should properly be 17 considered at the extradition hearing, okay? 18 19 MR. McNALLY: Understood. 10:17 20 THE COURT: How soon can you confer and jointly 21 propose something? 22 MS. BURKART: Other than school vacation week, your

Honor, I have no conflicts in February, so it would just be a matter of Mr. McNally conferring with his client and his colleagues.

23

24

THE COURT: All right.

10:18 20

10:17 10

So I'm going to ask you both to talk outside of the court, and, if you can, within a week submit something to us. You can do it informally, if you can submit something to Ms. Russo and then we can use that to set a formal date and then we'll issue that as a notice of the hearing.

MR. McNALLY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

All right.

With respect to the bail issue. For the most part, I have read everything. I've read the legal papers, I've read -- I mean, both sides, for various reasons, have attached a copy of the appellate brief or pertinent papers in the bankruptcy proceeding, I've looked at that, and I have gone through, quickly, but I've gone through all of the letters that were submitted on Mr. Drumm's behalf. So I will hear you, Mr. McNally, on the issue of release.

MR. McNALLY: Thank you, your Honor.

On behalf of David, his wife, Lorraine, who's here in court, his family and friends, clergy and employers, we thank the Court for this opportunity to be heard on David's behalf.

David is grateful to be standing before this Court, and he's grateful to be standing in this country. He's personally grateful for the fundamental decency and professionalism and the dispassionate approach that the United

States Attorney's Office has taken, and he's grateful, most of all, that he stands here before the Court actually and truly presumed to be innocent.

1

2

5

7

10:19 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

10:20 20

Your Honor, seven years ago, in December of 2008, as the worldwide financial crisis struck home with its full fury, David Drumm resigned his position as CEO of the Anglo Irish Bank in Dublin, Ireland. And David stands before you today because only now, only now has the government of Ireland gotten around to seeking to extradite him based on a number of alleged offenses from that time. To be clear, David has not been accused of any violent crimes, he has not been accused of stealing any money, he is not accused of personally profiting from any of these alleged actions. Instead, the Irish government has implicated him in a number of actions that were taken collectively with the advice and ratification of the Irish government and the advice of counsel during the peak of the global financial meltdown. In essence, he has been implicated in the actions that he, among many others, took in furtherance of the Angelo Irish Bank's interest and the general interest of the Irish economy.

Several of his putative co-defendants have already been through trial in Ireland. The court withheld from the jury the evidence showing that the men had the advice of counsel and that they had acted at the behest of government regulators, who were also trying to save the banks and the

economy, because, unbelievable as it may seem, neither the advice of counsel nor government authorization are defenses in Irish law. But after the men were convicted, the judge took a very different view at the sentencing. He found that the Irish regulators, quote, gave a green light to the transactions in question and held that, and again I quote, it would be most unjust for this court to imprison these two gentlemen when it seems to me that a state agency has led them into error and illegality. And the court sentenced them to community service with zero jail time.

David Drumm is a father and a husband who first moved to Boston 17 years ago in 1998, and who has been gainfully employed in the U.S. these past seven years. He has long been an officer in a respected asset management company, a job on which he and his family depend for their livelihood.

Like his family and his neighbors and his friends, three of whom are in court today, having pledged the Massachusetts homes they live in, confident that David is not going anywhere, his employers are here as well. They have stood with him throughout his last month in jail and have held his job open for David.

In the American experience, it's common, once the indictments come and the man is actually arrested, for the company to run for the hills. They terminate that same day, gone. But that didn't happen here. It's remarkable and rare

10:21 10

10:21 20

for an American company.

In extradition cases like this, as the Court knows well, there is no Speedy Trial Act. In complex international financial cases, such as this, with documents and where the most recent evidence is already seven years old, the experience in U.S. jurisprudence is that multiple steps and multiple stages and multiple courts of the extradition process could easily consume two or four years, if not more.

And so today, in Boston, we are charged with considering whether it is necessary under the law to continue to confine David Drumm, although presumed innocent and although convicted of no crime, to an unrelentingly harsh prison experience for two to four years in a case on which the judge in Ireland gave the convicted counterparts not one day in jail.

And David is here today to tell you that this would be a severe and punishing and unjust and entirely unnecessary result, particularly when there are many effective alternatives available, and it would be a result that is supported by neither the law nor the facts of this case. So we'd like to get two things out of the way at the outset.

First of all, the one issue that it seems clear both the government and David Drumm are in agreement on is that David represents absolutely no danger to the community. He has no criminal history, he's never been arrested or charged with any other crime, and even the offenses for which Ireland seeks

10:23 20

him are a hundred percent entirely non-violent in nature.

10:25 20

10:24 10

Which brings us to risk of flight. The vast majority of the government's brief is directed squarely and really solely at risk of flight. And although we certainly acknowledge that there is a presumption against bail in extradition cases, and we do so in a case where the applicable law and the undisputed facts of this case provide an overwhelming rebuttal to any such presumption.

The government attempts to make much in its brief of an unrelated bankruptcy case that has been in the courts now for five years and which remains both in dispute and on appeal. But when David Drumm went to the government earlier this week to propose the imposition on himself of a strict set of bail conditions, he did not in any way ask either the government or the Court to simply take him at his word. In fact, the evidence available for this Court to make its findings today as to risk of flight does not depend on any of David Drumm's words at all. It need only rely on his deeds, his conduct, his actions in living and working and worshipping openly in Wellesley these past many years, in raising his children, earning a living, maintaining his family, all the while knowing for seven years that this day almost surely would come.

When David learned through the media last winter that the Irish government might come looking for him, now ten months ago, he did not go underground, he did not flee to a country

without an extradition treaty. Instead, he instructed his counsel, here at this table, to contact this office, the United States Attorney's Office, and to let them know that Ireland might be seeking him, where he lived and where he could be found, and offered to surrender to the United States at the time and place of the government's choosing.

And the evidence on which this Court can base its findings as to risk of flight today is right here in this courtroom. It's in his three business colleagues, none from the company where he works, none related to him by law or marriage or blood or otherwise. Each of these three men is married, most of them have children, and all of them are here to tell you, your Honor, that they are so certain that David is not going anywhere, that they are prepared to pledge and risk the Massachusetts homes that their families live in.

More than a dozen letters have been submitted to the Court, including by the three men who are here who have pledged their home, and if the Court or the government would like to see additional guarantors on the hook, as these letters make clear, there are others who are willing to do so who are here at the courthouse today.

The evidence that there's no risk of flight is in his employers, also here in court today, and here to tell that you they are standing with David Drumm, and frankly, that David is dependent on them to hold and maintain and keep one of the few

10:26 10

10:26 20

such jobs available to a man who came with so much talent but also with the kind of baggage that made few employers willing to take the risk.

10:27 10

10:28 20

And most of all, the evidence here in this courtroom is in the person of Mrs. Lorraine Drumm, David's wife of nearly 25 years, and their two daughters, also here today. Both girls are Massachusetts raised and educated, both are still in school. All four of them make their home together in Wellesley, and the only home that the family has.

Add to this that David and his employer have offered to the government that he will work from home, 24/7 home confinement, monitored electronically and at David's own expense, that his wife, both daughters, and David will surrender all of their passports to the government, they've got nowhere else to go.

And it's clear on the evidence that this is not a man who is going to risk his job, forfeit his home, forfeit the homes of his closest and bravest and most stalwart of friends, and destroy the future of the three women most central to his life on earth.

Your Honor, this is not a man who is fighting or fearing or fleeing the legal process of the United States. He is embracing it, glad of it, and eager to engage in the hard work ahead that will be incumbent on many of us here in this room in this difficult and challenging case.

He did not run away last winter when he heard he was a wanted man, and he is not running away today. In fact, David was running towards this country for the same reason that other people have for many decades and more. He came to a land where he would be presumed innocent, where he would not be judged on rumor or innuendo or on his politics, a land where both the people and the law offer a new life, a fair shake, and a second chance, and a place where even strangers, like David, are offered the fullest protections of our Constitution and the law. And those protections say, America's courts say that when special circumstances, like those seen here, are present, it is entirely appropriate for the court to release the accused on bail and to impose strict security to make that bail real.

10:29 10

10:30 20

Your Honor, when you look at the two briefs before you today side by side, perhaps one of the primary takeaways is that the government and David Drumm are by and large in very heated agreement on the law and on the standards to apply here. It's a two-part test, risk of flight, and special circumstances. There is nothing novel here. More than a century ago, the Supreme Court made clear that we have a duty here, each of us, in our roles to address the questions of special circumstances. We have not yet heard from the government on this question. And as to special circumstances, it's not even clear from the government's brief whether or not there is all that much daylight even between our positions on

the facts.

10:31 10

10:31 20

David Drumm's claims of special circumstances rest on a list of seven factual claims that are supported by evidence, and citation and are listed in the last seven pages of Mr. Drumm's brief. We provided that list and an informal copy of the entire brief to the government on Monday evening in an effort to see if we could resolve any disputes before filing and bringing this to -- the dispute before this Court.

The government brief does not challenge any of those seven statements of fact, and we would invite the government today, if they are so inclined, to let the Court know which, if any, of these seven facts they challenge, and, if so, on what basis.

So here are the basic fact statements, they're labelled A through G on the last seven pages of our brief.

Ireland has a constitutional presumption favoring bail and regularly grants bail for the very offenses which David is charged.

Ireland regularly grants bail to American citizens for whom the United States is seeking extradition.

Third, the Irish government delayed charging and seeking extradition by seven years.

Fourth, the issues here are complicated and will require many weeks, if not months, if not years, in process and due process in the U.S. court system.

Fifth, David's wife and their two daughters are dependent on him for their livelihood.

10:32 10

10:33 20

Sixth, the BOP situation, the subject of the sealed declaration we referenced earlier that's been provided to the government and this Court.

And last, that, particularly given the BOP situation and given the many pages of documents and years of complex evidence known to and understood by Mr. Drumm and him alone, it will be very challenging, if not impossible, for David to adequately work with his counsel to prepare an effective defense while in jail potentially here for the next several years.

These are the facts on which David's claims of special circumstances are based, and no contrary evidence has been presented and none of these factual statements had even been challenged in the government's brief.

I said earlier that there was not much daylight between the parties' views on the rule of law. In its brief, the government concedes that bail considerations are made, and I quote, based on a confluence of factors, as opposed to any single consideration, and that such findings are very case specific within the discretion of this Court. The government further concedes that even with respect to certain individual factors that have been found not to constitute special circumstances on their own in certain specific cases, the

reality is that in exceptional cases, these very same factors has been deemed by the court to be special circumstances. And we agree with both points of the government's brief.

10:34 10

10:34 20

As our own brief makes clear, this is exactly the kind of case that is before the Court today. This is an unusual case and a combination of special circumstances in which the sum of the parts is greater than the sum of the whole, and that's exactly what the courts have asked us to look to in assessing whether special circumstances are present. And on these time-proven standards, this is precisely such a case. The special circumstances here are each significant on their own, but when they are taken together, they overwhelmingly justify and support the conclusion that David Drumm should be granted bail in this case.

I'd like to conclude where we began, with the sole focus of the government's brief, risk of flight. Home detention and electronic monitoring are no longer novel. They are time-proven mechanism that enable those, particularly those protected by the presumption of innocence, to participate in these often lengthy legal proceedings and processes while still maintaining and taking responsibility for their fundamental obligations to their families, their employers, their communities, and themselves. This is not an either/or situation. The legitimate interests of both the government and the accused can be regularly accommodated by the Court in any

orders issued out of today's proceedings, both can be firmly protected, and it's not a heavy lift, it does not need to break any new ground.

1

2

5

7

10:35 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

10:36 20

We understand that the United States Attorney's Office was obliged to oppose bail here, as they are in every extradition case. On this question, their hands are tied by the Department of Justice, and we don't begrudge them that. There is a memo that says AUSAs who appear on these matters, must oppose bail, no discretion, zero. It's a rare thing in the practice of the U.S. Attorney's Office, no discretion, no ability to assess the law and the facts and offer its own independent judgment. But this Court has discretion, that's what the Supreme Court said more than a century ago. The court said that America's magistrate judges and their fellow courts do have the discretion, especially here, where the executive branch, by its own edict, has abdicated and stripped discretion from the hands of its own prosecutors. And this is a case on special circumstances, a case that cries out for the exercise of that independent discretion because, as we said, the sum of the parts is greater than the sum of the whole.

I'd like to conclude on Mr. Drumm's behalf with the words of Supreme Court Associate Justice David Souter in his remarks in the United States Senate during confirmation hearings. He said, "The first lesson, simple as it is, is that whatever court we're in, whatever we're doing, at the end of

our task, some human being is going to be affected. Some human life is going to be changed by what we do. And so we had better use every power of our minds and our hearts and our beings to get those rulings right."

Your Honor, that human being is David Drumm, and those human lives are gathered behind him in this courtroom. And when our arguments are concluded this morning, Mr. Drumm has asked that he be given an opportunity to be heard by the Court, and we understand that the government has no objection to that request.

Judge, the government doesn't need this man in solitary confinement in order to lock him down or to expend potentially years of taxpayer resources in order to protect diplomatic or other legitimate interests. We can lock this man down on bail, we can lock him down tight using all the tools that the law and David Drumm himself have offered, and he and we will be back here before you each and every time you direct, each and every time the government requests, month after month, and, if need be, year after year.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Can I ask you a question for my edification? You alluded to two individuals in Ireland who have already been tried and convicted, and you talked about their disposition. What were their positions in comparison to Mr. Drumm's? Were they subordinates, peers, superiors? And

10:37 10

10:38 20

```
1
         were they charged with the same offenses that he is charged
         with, both the type of conduct alleged, as well as the
     2
     3
         quantity, in Mr. Drumm's case, 33 offenses? Were those
         individuals charged with that many offenses, if you know?
     5
                  MR. McNALLY: I don't know. I know that some of the
     6
         charges overlap, your Honor.
     7
                  THE COURT:
                               Okay.
     8
                  And do you know what their positions were relative to
         Mr. Drumm?
10:38 10
                  MR. McNALLY: I don't know their titles, sir.
    11
                  THE COURT: Okay.
                  All right.
    12
    13
                  Thank you.
    14
                  MR. McNALLY: Thank you.
    15
                   THE COURT: Do you want to have Mr. Drumm address the
         Court now before the government? Because I think, in fairness,
    16
         they may want to respond to anything he may have to say.
    17
                  MR. McNALLY: Sure.
    18
    19
                  THE COURT: Okay.
                  MR. McNALLY: David, come on over.
10:39 20
    21
                   THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor.
    22
                   I'm very grateful for this opportunity to very briefly
    23
         address the Court.
    24
                   I want to give you a sense of my -- and Attorney
    25
         McNally has dealt with it to an extent -- myself and my
```

family's history here in the United States.

We first came out to the Boston area around the summer or the early summer of 1998. I had been asked by the bank that I worked for, Anglo Irish Bank, to set up a new office for them. The bank then was primarily based in Ireland and in the UK, so it was a big deal to come over and open an American office, and, of course, Boston was chosen after some research on the basis of its Irish heritage and an Irish domiciled bank might be well received in the area.

So our second daughter was actually born that year, Abby, Sarah was about three years old when we moved over.

Suffice it to say, we loved living in Boston back then. We ended up living out in Sudbury. We had a fantastic neighborhood, we made fantastic friends. Our children got into very good like formation schools, and we just loved being here. It was a wonderful time in our lives, perhaps maybe the happiest times in our lives, the five years we were here.

I was asked to come back to Ireland in 2003 to take up a more senior position within the bank, and we went back, after much debate within the family, we went back to Ireland I think in was June of that year.

As Attorney McNally said, in December of 2008, I lost my job in the bank, and to be frank, it was instinctive in us to think about going back to Massachusetts. We -- in the 17 years that had passed since we first came out here, 15 of them

10:40 10

10:40 20

we've owned a home here. We have had our heart here for the longest time. We came back because we felt it was good for the family, good for two girls in terms of their education and the lifestyle here, and we felt that I would have much better prospects of getting a good job here, which -- all of which turned out to be the case.

10:42 20

10:41 10

I did not flee Ireland, and I reject the notion that I fled Ireland. Nobody was charging me with anything back then. I was free to come and go. We wanted to come back as a family, and, you know, after a lot of work getting visas and everything else, I think I was six or seven months out of the bank at that stage, we eventually packed up and came back here.

That was the year 2009. In that year, I went back twice, having moved the family back out here. I went back twice to meet with my former employer because I had outstanding loans and I needed to sit down and talk to them about how I was going to deal with those loans. So that was in the latter part of the year, I think October and November of that year. So I really do strongly reject the notion that somehow, you know, we ran away from Ireland. We did not.

Your Honor, the last six years or so have been very difficult for me. As you can imagine, they have been very difficult for my family. We have had what I can only describe as unprecedented media attention, sometimes quite intrusive, into the family, looking through the windows, knocking at the

door. My children are not the better of that, I know they're not. All of us have suffered in some way from it, but I feel for them because of the prevalence of social media and the whisper campaigns and so on, that's been a big issue for them. But all that served to do at the end of the day was glue the family closer together.

10:43 20

10:43 10

Both of our families are in Ireland, I'm from a very big family, I've got seven siblings, my mother is alive.

Lorraine has her parents in Ireland, she's got three siblings.

I think between the two families there are 25 grandchildren.

So it's a big sacrifice to be an emigrant. You leave that behind. Through the wonders of Skype, you can talk to them as much as you want, but it's not the same as being there. Again, that's probably glued the four us together in a unit in the most extraordinary way and, frankly, that's what's kept me sane and going in the last number of difficult years.

In relation to the extradition, Attorney McNally already alluded to it, that we knew about this. It was all over the Irish papers for a couple years, journalists calling for it, never mind mentioning that it might happen. Even political figures, when things heated up in my case, you know, screaming from the rafters to get him home. So we kind of knew it was inevitable, that this was going to come. Then, when the press announced quite specifically about it in January of this year, they were able to mention the number of charges, they

were able to mention sources in the government of Ireland, we knew that was real, and that's why we approached the U.S. authorities, to say, Look, I'm here, I live in Wellesley, I'll come in, I'll surrender, you can arrest me, whatever it takes, but this may come, and this is where you're going to find me.

10:45 20

10:44 10

So, again, I didn't run then, I'm not running now. I have no intention of going anywhere. I'm happy to work through all of the issues that I have with all of my heart and soul. The concept or even the theory that I would somehow take off and run away from my family right now is just an anathema to me because it's the very center of my world. The three women, as Mr. Mr. McNally said, are in my life. I believe all of my actions to date support that position. Were I to flee now, I would be abandoning my wife of 24 years, I'd be abandoning my children, potentially derailing their education, pulling out financial support from them, never mind the damage that it would due to me personally. That's something that I just could not take. So I say to you I would not even contemplate that.

I am -- despite all that negativity, I am one very fortunate man in that the support I have from family here, my wife and kids, and the support I have from the family in Ireland is phenomenal. I also have phenomenal friends that I've known since I came to Massachusetts, and they put their heart and soul behind me here today by offering to support the bail application with their private homes and their own

reputations because they know, they know me well, they know me for a long time, and they know that I am not going anywhere.

I'm not going to do anything that would damage my family, that would break up my family. So I'm fortunate to have that support.

Your Honor, I'm asking the Court to let me out on bail on whatever conditions, restrictions, no matter how severe they have to be, so that I can be with my family, first of all, so that I can work and support my family, and that I can get through in an effective way this whole legal quagmire that I'm in which just cannot -- I've had 33 days in jail to think about it, there is no way on earth I can do that from a jail cell, it's too complex a matter, hence, I'm beseeching the Court.

Your Honor, that's all I have to say. I thank you very much for the opportunity again.

THE COURT: Thank you.

10:45 10

10:46 20

All right, Ms. Burkart.

MS. BURKART: Thank you, your Honor.

There's a strong presumption against bail in a detention hearing on an extradition. Mr. McNally is correct, we do not disagree in our briefs about the governing law here, it's very clear, but what strikes me about both his argument and Mr. Drumm's statements is that they both seem to think that the regular rules don't apply to him and don't apply to this case.

1 The process is in place very specifically, treaties 2 govern it, they're very well defined, what steps need to be 3 There's a request from one government to another government through the State Department, the Office of 5 International Affairs reviews the request, it comes eventually to the district. When we arrive here at this moment, there is 7 a great deal of guidance about what happens. We're not supposed to argue the merits of the case, we're not supposed to talk about how the treaty should work or how Mr. Drumm feels 10:47 10 the rules would be better serving him. It's about determining 11 whether the person is a flight risk under very clear burdens 12 and then determining whether the conditions of the treaty have 13 been met.

Here today we're determining both the flight risk and the special circumstances. It's a clear test, two parts.

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

10:47 20

Mr. McNally mentioned several times that I was not disputing the special circumstances. I am. I mentioned that in my brief. I was receiving filings and various things in this case right up through yesterday afternoon, and, as I said in my reply, I am arguing both flight risk, that he has not met the very strong presumption to show this Court that he is not a flight risk, I'm also arguing that each of the special circumstances that he has suggested are an inappropriate basis to release him. Mr. Drumm fails on both prongs.

And in making his arguments, he, again, I think very

clearly demonstrates that he believes that the rules that apply to this court, that apply to extradition proceedings, should not apply to him.

10:49 20

10:48 10

I believe there are primarily six rules -- six reasons why Mr. Drumm has not demonstrated that he is not a flight risk, he's failed to meet the burden.

One, the circumstances under which he came to the United States in 2009. Mr. Drumm makes pains here and there are pains made in the letters and in the memorandum to suggest that this is very natural progression, it was, essentially, a homecoming for him. That may have been true in one way, but in other way he is leaving a country that he, his wife, and his two children are citizens of on the heels of a very difficult situation. He's remained here for six years, not visiting any of the extended family he mentioned, specifically to avoid the government of Ireland's inquiries. That's essential to considering whether he's a flight risk. He has in many ways become a fugitive from the laws of Ireland by living here for these six years, despite how open he has been in doing so.

Two, he is not cooperating with the authorities in Ireland. Again, in the memorandum there's a suggestion that Mr. Drumm has made efforts to be cooperative by responding to written requests and agreeing to appear by video testimony. First of all, that was an entirely separate inquiry from the criminal investigation, that related to an Irish parliamentary

inquiry. But the very fact that Mr. Drumm is saying that while he will not be interviewed here or in Ireland but he's willing to do video testimony speaks to this fact, that he thinks some kind of special rules should to apply to him.

Third, Mr. Drumm clearly has significant assets and the means to flee. Throughout the record, throughout what's happened here over the last few weeks, there are a number of examples of Mr. Drumm's ingenuity with marshaling resources when it serves his purposes.

He came to the United States in 2009, according to the bankruptcy court proceedings, and not disputed in his own filings in that proceeding, owing over \$11 million. Yet, he managed to buy a house, which appears to have been about a \$2 million house, based on the bankruptcy filings that he's filed, talking about the amount of the down payment, the amount of the payments that were made there, moved to Wellesley, which is a very wealthy suburb outside of Boston, and he and his family maintained a very wealthy lifestyle while they were living there, despite the fact upon arrival he owed a great deal of money to his former employer.

He tries to downplay this lifestyle through the filings, but it comes through very clearly. He describes his Wellesley home as a four bedroom home. Again, a \$2 million home in Wellesley is a significant asset. There's nothing wrong with having a lovely home in Wellesley, but it's relevant

10:50 10

10:50 20

to the bail proceeding considering what assets Mr. Drumm has and what means he may have to depart the United States.

10:51 10

10:52 20

Similarly, in the memorandum, he describes his daughters attending a local Catholic school. Again, I believe this is disingenuous. The school that his daughters attend and have attended is a Catholic school that is nearby to Wellesley, but it's one of the most expensive schools in this country. The publicly available information on their website about the tuition shows that it's over \$44,000 a year. The private college that his other daughter is at with room and board is over \$60,000 a year.

There are at least eight lawyers working on this case for Mr. Drumm both in Boston, in New York and in Ireland.

These are only the ones that I'm directly aware of.

I'm not suggesting there's anything wrong with having the best representation money can buy, sending your children to great schools, living in a lovely town, but it's very relevant for this proceeding. As uncomfortable as it is in some ways to bring these kind of things up, it's relevant because Mr. Drumm has put his family front and center of this discussion.

He has the ability to marshal assets when he finds it appropriate for himself to do so, and he tried to discharge his debts in bankruptcy and failed to do so in January of this year, yet, he continues to maintain this lifestyle. This strongly suggests that if he were to use -- attempt to use

those assets to flee this jurisdiction, he could do so.

10:53 10

10:53 20

Fourth, white collar criminals certainly do flee, especially those that aren't citizens. Mr. Drumm has made mention in both his memorandum and his lawyer has done so in court today about him calling our office in January and saying he'd be willing to surrender and suggesting that that makes him not a flight risk. Your Honor, of course we can't negotiate a surrender of someone who we have an arrest warrant for that we're going to seek to detain. It's the policy of the office, it's not a -- it's not a personal slight to Mr. Drumm. When we have arrest warrants, we seek to arrest people. If they prove they're not a flight risk, we seek to release them.

Mr. Drumm wasn't negotiating a plea to an information, he was being arrested. Repeatedly counsel has suggested there's something improper about arresting him on a Saturday, despite the fact that I've spoken with him openly about the difficulties of surveilling someone who is living in a different -- excuse me, working in a different state. And yet, they then agreed, asked, requested that Mr. Drumm stay in jail for three weeks, seeking two requests for extensions. There's clearly nothing improper about us arresting him when we did, and he continued to bring it up after they've continually requested extensions suggests, again, there's some kind of perception that Mr. Drumm should have some kind of special rules that apply to him. But we arrest white-collar criminals,

just like we arrest criminals who commit other types of crimes because that's the policy of the office. Admittedly, that wasn't always the policy of the office. There have been times where we did not do so. But I'm personally aware of at least six instances in the white-collar world where we have had defendants attempt to flee within the last year or so or have done so successfully, and it's perhaps not surprising. about three hours south of the Canadian border. options for people who have assets, there are options for people who have means. It's not so unimaginable that somebody would make the decision to flee the jurisdiction because it's happened before, particularly someone in Mr. Drumm's situation. His ability to stay in the country is at issue. He came here under an investor visa, but that has been called into question by the bankruptcy court. There are other questions raised by the bankruptcy court about potential perjury charges, and that certainly complicates Mr. Drumm's situation and his ability to stay in this country. That has got to be part of the calculus that he is considering when he decides whether to stay here and submit himself to the rules of the court.

1

2

5

7

10:54 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

10:55 20

Fifth, Mr. Drumm's arguments about the strong ties that he has here in the community that keep him from leaving when examined closely do not support his claim. He had strong ties in Ireland, too. He just described the very large extended family that he and his wife had there, and yet, twice

he picked up and moved and came to the United States. He's certainly capable of doing it. Family ties and ties of friendship can be broken by a move. They can also be maintained through e-mail, through other means. The fact that Mr. Drumm has affection for people that live here in the United States and they have it for him, though genuine, is not a reason why he shouldn't be -- it's inconceivable that he would leave.

10:56 20

10:56 10

The fact that he's got friends who are nice enough to put up their homes for him is a credit to Mr. Drumm, but it also is the type of thing that puts the government in a very difficult position. If someone flees and betrays their friendships, they have then become a victim, but the government is put in the position of having to enforce the obligation to take that person's home and put them and their family onto the street. It does not provide comfort, frankly, that they're willing to do that.

The Drumm home has been repeatedly brought up as an example of something that should secure his presence, but that itself is subject to the creditors we've just spoken about. An entire section of the bankruptcy court proceeding was about how the home was purchased by the Drumms in a structured way so as to try to shield it from the creditors only in Mrs. Drumm's name, the first time in their marriage they ever bought an asset like that only in Mrs. Drumm's name.

Your Honor, I don't doubt the sincerity of the many letters that have been put before your Honor. They're from friends, from family, many of them are very heartfelt, and those are difficult, because we see those a lot in this courthouse. We see them often in sentencing. But there's nothing inconsistent with somebody being a wonderful father and a terrific husband and a good co-worker and a good friend but also having committed a crime, and that's what Mr. Drumm is charged with being, not with not being a good co-worker, but with having committed a crime.

So the letters are no doubt very persuasive for showing that Mr. Drumm has got good friends and family, but they're not persuasive in proving that he is not a flight risk, because, again, those are the kind of ties that can be broken and their genuineness does not ultimately end up being persuasive on the question of flight.

Finally, I think one of the most powerful examples of why he can't be trusted by this Court is that he was not found to be trustworthy by another judge in this district very recently. I have quoted that opinion, I have attached it, I find it very compelling. I know that it is on appeal. I don't think that the fact that Mr. Drumm disagrees with the decision means that it is not persuasive. There was a six-day trial in which Mr. Drumm and Mrs. Drumm both testified, and at the conclusion of that trial, I think the court's words are very

10:57 10

10:58 20

powerful here: Finding Drumm not remotely credible and his conduct both knowing and fraudulent, I conclude that the plaintiffs have established cause to deny him a discharge many times over. Drumm's statements to this court were replete with knowing false statements, failures to disclose, efforts to misdirect, and outright lies. It was a judge in this district in January of 2015, this year.

10:59 10

10:59 20

Ultimately, the question of bail and flight risk comes down to trust and respect, trust for the rules of the court, not the rules as Mr. Drumm, his attorneys would like them to be, and respect for the rule of law.

Mr. Drumm has demonstrated already in the District of Massachusetts that he cannot be trusted. For this reason, I think Mr. Drumm is -- has not met his burden of demonstrating that he is not a flight risk.

The second prong of the test is special circumstances.

Again, I vehemently oppose the special circumstances. The fact that they were not fully briefed in the filings relates to the timing of the filings and the challenges of the week and has nothing to do with the government's position on them. As I said in the filings, I plan to address them in court today, so I will address each of them in turn.

One, he claims that there is no diplomatic need for him to be held. This is incorrect. The government of Ireland has correctly followed the process to seek his extradition.

They obtained their arrest warrant, they followed each of the steps. Now, pursuant to the treaty, it's our turn to follow the steps that have already been outlined through the procedures and the law that are controlling here, and we are at that step.

11:00 10

11:01 20

As a result, the political insinuations that have been made in the brief have no place here. Under the rule of non-inquiry, it is not the Court's place to determine whether there is something suspicious regarding the timing of the elections in Ireland. I will note, however, that the extradition was sought, the process was begun about two years ago, so the elections were well far off. So that argument is both misplaced and irrelevant.

Mr. Drumm has tried several times to make merit-based arguments, again, they have no place at a bail hearing. But he also attempts to assert various defenses, and they have no place here at all. That will be something for him to fully, no doubt very well represented, argue in Ireland where he is being put to trial. He's not being put to trial here in the United States, as much as he might like to have the trial here.

Worth noting, your Honor, in terms of the interest of the Irish government in having Mr. Drumm extradited under the treaty is the letter that I received today. Having received the memo and having some questions, I posed them through the Office of International Affairs and received some

clarifications. One of them speaks to the point that your Honor raised just now asking about the colleagues that were on trial.

11:02 10

11:02 20

The last paragraph of the letter quotes the judge who sentenced Mr. Fitzpatrick, who I believe was the chairman of the board of Anglo Irish Bank, you asked about his position; Mr. McAteer, and Mr. Whelan. Mr. McNally quoted that judge's finding and claiming that -- or in correctly stating, no doubt, that the judge had said something to the effect of there had been a green light provided for some of these charges. But these gentlemen were found guilty of having breached the law, and the judge said, another quote from the judge which is provided in the letter is, I've also come to the conclusion that David Drumm was the instigator and author of this scheme in question and is -- that the lending -- excuse me -- that is, the lending to the ten individuals, and it seems to me that both of the defendants in this case, referring to Mr. McAteer and Mr. Whelan, played their part in execution of the scheme.

So these were the two men that were sentenced to community service, your Honor. They were both subordinates to Mr. Drumm at the Anglo Irish Bank, and the judge, having found or having at least stated that Mr. Drumm was the instigator and author of the scheme in question, is no doubt relevant to the judge's determination of what the appropriate sentence was in that case.

Again, I think it's very demonstrative of their interest in this case that they sent this information so quickly. And I think that the letter gives another interesting insight into how Mr. Drumm is situated against his other co-defendants. They were, in fact, all released, but it states in the letter that all of them were in country at the time the arrests were sought, and -- with the exception of one, Mr. Fitzpatrick, the chairman of the board, who was actually vacationing in the United States, but having heard of the arrests of the others, got on the next available flight to Ireland and was arrested early in the morning in Dublin that next day. I think that is very telling in terms of the relationship between Mr. Drumm and his co-defendants and the argument that because they were released on bail that that would be persuasive for him. It is not a special circumstance under the full vetting of the facts.

1

2

5

7

11:03 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

11:04 20

Also noted in this letter is the fact that repeatedly the Irish authorities attempted to interview Mr. Drumm, and he refused to be interviewed by them.

Another special circumstance put forward by Mr. Drumm is that there was substantial delay by Ireland in moving forward, but, again, Mr. Drumm was the cause of that delay. Having not agreed to being interviewed, he created the delay, and the record in the case shows the various steps that were followed, the different times they tried to interview him, the

progression they made with colleagues. It appears the Irish authorities have been vigorously pursuing this case for a number of years, it has worked its way through the process, and now it comes in a timely fashion before your Honor.

11:04 10

11:05 20

This is entirely different than the <u>Castaneda-Castillo</u> case, which was cited by defendants. That was a case here in the office about five years ago. The defendant in that case had committed a crime approximately 25 years before, and he was in jail for five years while waiting for that process to go through. The Mexican government waited three years, the United States government waited two years before having the extradition properly brought before the court. Judge Dein found that that was a lengthy delay and that the five-year delay on a 25-year-old charge was compelling. It was also very important to the judge in that case that the defendant was indisputably not a primary player in the crime that was alleged. He was a player sort of on the fringe of what had occurred, and the judge found that persuasive. That is the exact opposite of the situation here.

Sort of the next response, your Honor, collapses a number of different things that are put forward as special circumstances but broken out into a couple of different points but I think fundamentally come down to the argument that there's such an extraordinary amount of information and documents in this case that delay is warranted because it's

going to take, according to Mr. McNally's estimate just now, two to four years before this case is properly heard.

1

2

3

4

5

7

11:06 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

11:07 20

That is directly in contrast to the case law. case law limits the scope, as your Honor reminded us this morning, of what happens at the preliminary hearing. And the courts have consistently found that the normal passage of time inherent in the litigation process, the complexity of the pending litigation, is not a special circumstance. Here we have a limited role. We're finding whether there's probable cause on these 33 charges. Fundamentally they're charges that Mr. Drumm engaged in actions to make the financial health of the bank look stronger than it was. No doubt that's not the most straightforward crime, but it's also not the most complex thing we deal with either. We regularly deal with white-collar crimes in this district. It's not that unusual in the scheme of things that there would be a crime alleging transactions at a bank. A hundred million pages of documents are no doubt going to be relevant, although I question whether many of them are repetitive bank documents, but it's of no matter, because they are not relevant here. That is for the Irish authorities to determine, and that's something that Mr. Drumm and his defense can mount vigorously when he returns.

Reading the memorandum, it jumped out at me that he talked about needing to spend a great deal of time analyzing the record, retaining accountants and experts to review and

analyze the evidence. I don't understand what the need for that would be, given the scope of the hearing.

11:08 20

11:07 10

Basically what Mr. Drumm has said here is that he's going to cause a delay by mounting a defense, which is inappropriate in this context, and then he's going to claim that because there's going to be a delay, he is entitled to the special circumstance of being released. That cannot be the way special circumstances work. You cannot make your own special circumstance by delay. And facing extradition on complex charges certainly is not outside the purview of the type of thing that is normally considered by courts handling extradition.

What's been referred to as the BOP situation by counsel has been resolved. I think it's an example of the system working. The fact that Mr. Drumm wants a different system is not relevant here. Making discovery available to counsel when they're in jail is something that we deal with regularly, and it's something that we'll be dealing with in Mr. Drumm's case. He has had full access to counsel.

Finally, your Honor, what's put forth as the last special circumstance is, I think, in many ways the most egregious. Mr. Drumm cites the dependency of his family. I, again, note that Mr. Drumm is the one who has put his family front and center in this case, and his attorneys cite to a case from 1952 to talk about the importance of a defendant

supporting his wife and children. Many cases that are more recent say that that is not a special circumstance in an extradition hearing. And it is, sadly, common in this courthouse that people appear before your Honor and the other judges in this building who have families. That is not a special circumstance, and it is often very sad and it is an unfortunate collateral consequence of the criminal justice system that loved ones are hurt. But here, your Honor, I think it's not even a close call. Mr. Drumm's wife is an able woman, and his children are 20 and 17 years old. His wife's letter talks about sacrifices that, frankly, are not the kind of sacrifices that are compelling in a criminal context. Not being able to do a study abroad program is not the type of compelling special circumstance here, and I think it shows a lack of understanding of the severity of what's happening here and how the rules are going to be applied.

Mrs. Drumm talks about being homeless, penniless, and unable to travel, but knowing that this was coming for seven years, they have sent their children to the most expensive schools in the country and continue to maintain this lifestyle. Again, there's nothing wrong with providing for your family and trying to give them the best life that you can, but it's very relevant to a proceeding in determining whether Mr. Drumm is a flight risk, and it is, when he has pointed out the dependency of his family as a special circumstance, relevant to note that

11:09 10

11

1

2

7

12 13

14

15

16

1718

19

11:09 20

21

22

24

1 what he wants to do is stay in the United States with his family, living the same lifestyle he has somehow managed to 2 3 maintain for all of these years since they came here, despite all that has happened without responding to the charges against 5 him in Ireland. Enough. The special circumstances have to be extraordinary in 7 order to meet the burden. None of the factors put forward by Mr. Drumm are extraordinary. They're the kind of things faced by all defendants facing extradition. The rule is that he 11:10 10 should be held unless he is both not a flight risk and he 11 demonstrates special circumstances. He does not want to abide 12 by those rules, but those are the rules that bind him. He 13 should not be released. Fairness requires that he be held. 14 Thank you, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. McNally, briefly, is there anything you want to 16 17 say in response? 18 MR. McNALLY: Yes, I think Mr. Fetterman will respond, 19 your Honor. 11:11 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 Mr. Fetterman. 22 MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you, your Honor. 23 I would like to start, your Honor, by addressing 24 something Ms. Burkart said. 25 It's completely not the case that we are not -- that

we are trying to avoid application of the rules. In fact, as your Honor has seen in our briefing, we are relying on case law and the application of the law to the compelling facts in this case, and I believe that Mr. McNally comprehensively addressed the risk of flight. We completely reject the government's view that given Mr. Drumm's actions that he poses any risk of flight. And I'll rely on Mr. McNally's argument, unless the Court has a question specifically about the risk of flight issues.

11:12 10

11:12 20

And I'd like to turn to the special circumstances.

Because the government is relying almost entirely on the strong presumption that they say applies, but the issue that the Court should address is that, as we've said in our papers, your Honor, the presumption is based on a diplomatic necessity, that is, that somehow the government of the United States would be embarrassed because the government of Ireland has, as

Ms. Burkart said, followed the rules and asked that Mr. Drumm be returned. But as we've set forth in our papers, I think it's extremely important here, and we cited the cases that discuss this, there is no diplomatic necessity here for two reasons: One, the government of Ireland, the country of Ireland has a constitutional presumption in favor of bail and regularly bails, grants bail for people accused of the crimes that Mr. Drumm is accused of.

And secondly, and I think really even more

importantly, your Honor, that when the tables are turned and American citizens who are facing extradition by the U.S., to be returned from Ireland to the U.S., the country of Ireland regularly grants bail for those American citizens. And we've given the Court ample authority for that, both in the form of the affidavit from Mr. Steins and also from a highly well-regarded professor in Ireland.

11:14 20

11:14 10

THE COURT: Are you arguing, then, that if you show that a country requesting extradition is one that presumptively defaults toward releasing somebody on bail, then the issue for me basically becomes just one of flight risk without the need to show special circumstances?

MR. FETTERMAN: No, your Honor. I think it's clear we have to show there's no risk of flight and special circumstances. But I think in evaluating the special circumstances, the question of whether there's a strong presumption that you can just defer to and that the government can hide behind is present I think gets nullified, and then you can look whether there are other special circumstances present. And here there are compelling additional special circumstances, and the first and most important one is the delay. It's been seven years, your Honor. And while I know Ms. Burkart commented on the <u>Castillo</u> case, in the <u>Chapman</u> case that we've cited, a court found that special circumstances existed where Mexico waited three years before bringing extradition.

THE COURT: Okay.

11:15 10

11:16 20

I'm not trying to cut you off, but I think the salient statement she made was that the delay was caused in this case by Mr. Drumm, so not so much the length of time, but the reason for the delay.

MR. FETTERMAN: Your Honor, that makes no sense. She's saying Mr. Drumm, who was living openly and notoriously in the United States, in fact, made his presence known and agreed to cooperate with a government inquiry by providing written testimony and agreeing to a videotaped testimony but would not sit down with criminal investigators, would not sit down with the FBI or the Irish equivalent while he's in the United States and has a Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination, that somehow he's the cause of Ireland's delay, that is a circular argument.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure that implicates the Fifth Amendment because it relates to a crime possibly committed in Ireland, doesn't necessarily expose him to criminal liability here, but I understand your point, he shouldn't be required to sit down and make incriminating statements against himself.

MR. FETTERMAN: And he was being advised by counsel and the like.

So the notion that the government, the U.S. government is going to vitiate -- the issue of delay in cases in this

circuit weighs heavily in favor of bail. So our argument, your Honor, is there are two special circumstances going directly to diplomatic necessity that effectively vitiate the presumption, and then you have strong factors weighing heavily in favor of bail, the first one being delay; and the second one, your Honor, being that his family is solely and wholly dependent on him. You know, Ms. Burkart sounded a little callus when she said, Well, sometimes bad things happen to, you know, people who get caught up in the criminal justice system. But here, this family has no other means of support, and that's another factor that weighs in favor of bail.

11:17 10

11:17 20

And then I think it is just not appropriate to completely dismiss the complexity of this case. As Mr. McNally said, these cases, by the time they go through the appeals and the like, often involve lengthy periods of time. This is a complex case, and while it may be that the argument and the issue that we're going to be trying when we next meet for the hearing is probable cause, the government still has the burden of proving probable cause, and we, as Mr. Drumm's counsel, have the obligation to investigate the facts and see what arguments are or not present to vitiate probable cause. So we expect this is going to take a very long time.

The BOP situation which Ms. Burkart referenced has been -- made it extremely difficult for us to even communicate with our client, as we've referenced, and there's every reason

to expect, your Honor, that if Mr. Drumm stays in, that the BOP situation will occur again. It happened more than once already, and we have every expectation that it will occur again, and we have no idea how many times that will happen. So as both Mr. Drumm and Mr. McNally said, we cannot effectively represent our client under those circumstances.

And the most important thing I would direct your Honor to in summing up is that the question is not do you pick apart each single special circumstance, as Ms. Burkart attempted to do, but you look at the totality of the circumstances, and where you have a country that waited seven years to seek charges and extradition, that itself has a constitutional presumption in favor of bail, regularly bails defendants in the requesting country for the crimes that are being charged, also regularly grants bail to American citizens when the United States government makes the request for extradition. And you have the other compelling special circumstances that exist in this case, your Honor. We submit that this is not even a close call, but that it's an overwhelming case in favor of the Court releasing Mr. Drumm on the conditions that will assure his appearance.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Fetterman.

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. BURKART: Your Honor, may I be heard?

THE COURT: The last voice, if you want it.

11:19 20

11:18 10

1 MS. BURKART: May I be heard very briefly on two 2 points? 3 THE COURT: Briefly. MS. BURKART: One, on the point I was accused of 4 5 making no sense on, I will be very clear. I not saying that Mr. Drumm was under the obligation to speak with Irish criminal 7 investigators. I was saying his leaving the country and his refusal to speak with the investigators after repeated requests to do so, both here and in Ireland, is something that led to 11:20 10 the delay. The proceedings went forward against the other 11 people that Mr. Drumm worked with, but are on a different track 12 as to Mr. Drumm because he moved here and then failed to speak 13 with the investigators. So it is unfair for Mr. Drumm to then 14 point to that delay and say that that is a special 15 circumstance. That was my point there, to the extent that was not clear before. 16 Second, I took great pains not to be callus in 17 18 discussing Mr. Drumm's family situation. He is the one that 19 brought it before this Court, it is relevant for the 11:20 20 proceeding, and what I said was that it is an unfortunate 21 reality that people have children who appear in criminal 22 proceedings. 23 Thank you. 24 THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. Thank you both. This is helpful.

Obviously there's a lot to digest, and, as I noted at the outset, some of the materials I've only received within the last 24 to 36 hours, so we'll take this under advisement.

11:22 20

11:21 10

But let me end by underscoring what we talked about earlier, which is, if you could confer and come up with a date for a hearing in February, that would be helpful, and if you can get that to us within one week, we will then issue a notice with the official date.

I understand there's -- there are a lot of reasons that have been offered arguing both ways that would affect timing, but I am persuaded that we do need to set a schedule for this and start to generate some momentum. So, as strongly as I can, please pick a date in February, and let's treat that date as a firm date once it's set and that whatever we need to do to get ready by then, we'll make ourselves as available as we need to. In some instances, if we have to have a conference on short notice, we can do it by telephone rather than counsel appearing in person, but I have every intention of us at least conducting the extradition hearing in February. All the more so, if counsel are correct and that the process writ large is going to take longer than that, we need to start this.

So -- is there anything else that we need to address today?

MS. BURKART: Nothing from the government, your Honor.

MR. McNALLY: Nothing from Mr. Drumm, your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Thank you. We'll be in recess, and
2	Mr. Drumm will be remanded for the time being to the custody of
3	the marshals.
4	THE CLERK: All rise.
5	(Court adjourned at 11:22 p.m.)
6	
7	CERTIFICATION
8	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
9	of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter to
10	the best of my skill and ability.
11	
12	
13	
14	/s/Debra M. Joyce November 14, 2015 Debra M. Joyce, FCRR Date
15	Official Court Reporter
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	