1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	X
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	v. 03 CR 484 (TPG)
5	ALBERT SANTORO,
6	Defendant.
7	x 5.0 m N.1.
8	New York, N.Y. May 11, 2006
9	12:10 p.m.
10	Before:
11	HON. THOMAS P. GRIESA,
12	District Judge
13	
14	APPEARANCES
15	DAVID N. KELLEY United States Attorney for the
15	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York
15 16	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys
15 16 17	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys  LITMAN, ASCHE & GIORELLA, LLP
15 16 17	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys
15 16 17	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys  LITMAN, ASCHE & GIORELLA, LLP Attorneys for Defendant
15 16 17 18	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York  MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys  LITMAN, ASCHE & GIORELLA, LLP Attorneys for Defendant BY: JACK LITMAN TODD TERRY  LAW OFFICES OF STANLEY N. LUPKIN
15 16 17 18 19	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York  MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys  LITMAN, ASCHE & GIORELLA, LLP Attorneys for Defendant  BY: JACK LITMAN TODD TERRY
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York  MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys  LITMAN, ASCHE & GIORELLA, LLP Attorneys for Defendant BY: JACK LITMAN TODD TERRY  LAW OFFICES OF STANLEY N. LUPKIN Attorneys for Defendant
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York  MARCIA R. ISAACSON STEVEN D. FELDMAN Assistant United States Attorneys  LITMAN, ASCHE & GIORELLA, LLP Attorneys for Defendant BY: JACK LITMAN TODD TERRY  LAW OFFICES OF STANLEY N. LUPKIN Attorneys for Defendant

 about anything that was told to me in the ex parte conference I just had, but is it possible to simply say who was the person who went to that residence, or is that something that there's some reason not to disclose?

MR. LUPKIN: I believe, your Honor, that before either of the two ex parte conferences, I was asked that question by the Court early on and I responded that it was Mr. Rambam.

THE COURT: I think you did. I think you did.

I think that in view of that, and I had not recalled that, I don't quite see -- well, let me take -- I won't complete that sentence. The defense attorneys and Mr. Lupkin raise a point, which I think is, has to be considered, and that is if there's a Grand Jury investigation now of Mr. -- I better just write that. Is it R-a-m--

MR. LUPKIN: R-a-m-b-a-m.

THE COURT: R-a-m-b-a-m, as in Mary?

MR. LUPKIN: M as in Mary. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Both M's. If there's a Grand Jury investigation of Mr. Rambam, and if a subpoena is carried out now calling for the production of substantial, a substantial amount of documents, then it could very well cause Mr. Rambam to withdraw from the case or conceivably cause Pallorium to resign from the case.

Now, there has been a very extensive investigation by Pallorium, lots of interviews with a lot of people. It's not

finished, according to what I'm informed. I wish to do what I can to allow the defense to continue that investigation. I don't know whether Mr. Rambam acted improperly in talking to Ms. Wong or not. I have an affirmation of an FBI agent that said that this person did. Mr. Rambam is not named in the affirmation, but we know now that it's Mr. Rambam.

But the point is, apparently, that Mr. Rambam has conducted many, many interviews, as I am informed, over an extensive period of time, and I'm not apprised of any other instance where he was acting as is alleged here, and if I can assume, as I believe I can, that he has acted lawfully in the investigation with this possible exception, he should be allowed to continue and encouraged to continue in that investigation.

Now, the government has come up with this accusation of misconduct and that could in and of itself be a discouraging factor to Mr. Rambam, but at least I don't want to add to the problem. And consequently, I am inclined to rule that the subpoena should not be given effect now, and that we should have the trial. We'll probably learn a lot more at the trial about matters which relate to what went on with Ms. Wong, as well as many other incidents.

Now, I want to get to the issues that concern me as a trial judge. Without making a finding, I want to state to everybody here, and that includes defense counsel and

Mr. Lupkin representing Pallorium, you must understand that you are under a very clear direction, all of you, to use every possible effort you can to avoid any activity which would involve a misrepresentation of the nature of, and identity and so forth of the investigator and any discussions which could possibly constitute a threat or harassment or anything that would deter the appearance of a witness here in court, that must be totally avoided. Any issues about that that need to be specifically dealt with can be brought up now or at any time beginning now. Although I am at home most of the time during June and July, I can certainly entertain an application for some remedy.

As far as the investigation, I don't know how to say anything except that legitimate investigation, legitimate inquiries will go forward and if there's anything that I as the Court can do to foster that, I will do.

The defense has actually made a motion to dismiss this case because of the service of this subpoena, and in the ex parte discussion, the defense attorneys expressed the idea that they should be able to put on evidence about FBI misconduct and about activities engaged in by Mr. Meyers. The suggestion was that this service of the subpoena should trigger a rather far-ranging hearing about misconduct leading to this indictment. I will not entertain such a hearing, I will not hold such a hearing, I will not hear such evidence, and that

motion is denied.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Santoro should or should not be convicted will be determined by the evidence at the trial, and this Judge will not hear evidence in advance of the trial. So that's the ruling. Thank you very much.

The case will come to trial. The issue about

MR. FELDMAN: Your Honor, I'm sorry, could we ask to clarify, then? One, we don't have a trial date in this case. Mr. Beale has told us that your calendar is filled through December, although your Honor last time indicated you wanted to go to trial in August. So is it your Honor's ruling that the Grand Jury subpoena will be returnable --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I want to talk about the trial date. I think that I probably left court so fast that afternoon when we were having testimony, maybe my intentions sort of didn't get expressed, but I thought I was trying to head for an August trial date, and didn't I express that on the record?

MR. FELDMAN: You did, your Honor, but your schedule right now I'm told is completely booked.

THE COURT: I think we have to adjust the schedule.

Listen, this case has priority over anything on my calendar. I talked about a trial in August. I talked about it to Mr. Santoro when he was on the stand, and he and I had a pretty good discussion. So let's revisit the subject of the