1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF OREGON
3	THE HON. MUSTAFA T. KASUBHAI, JUDGE PRESIDING
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
7	Government, )
8	v. ) No. 6:18-mj-00236-MK-1
9	TODD MICHAEL GIFFEN,
10	Defendant. )
11	)
12	
13	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
14	EUGENE, OREGON
15	WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2018
16	PAGES 1 - 24
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Kristi L. Anderson
23	Official Federal Reporter United States Courthouse
24	405 East Eighth Avenue Eugene, Oregon 97401
25	(541) 431-4112 Kristi_Anderson@ord.uscourts.gov

```
1
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
 2
 3
     FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
 4
     Joseph Huynh
     United States Attorney's Office
 5
     405 E. 8th Ave
     Suite 2400
 6
     Eugene, OR 97401
     541-465-6771
 7
     Fax: 541-465-6917
     Email: joseph.huynh@usdoj.gov
 8
     FOR THE DEFENDANT:
 9
     Todd E. Bofferding
     P.O. Box 539
10
     Hood River, OR 97031
     541-490-9012
11
     Email: tbofferding@gorge.net
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2018
3	THE CLERK: Magistrate Case No. 18-236, United
4	States of America versus Todd Michael Giffen for preliminary
5	examination and detention hearing.
6	THE COURT: Good afternoon, counsel. And if you
7	would be kind enough to introduce yourself.
8	MR. BOFFERDING: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My
9	name is Todd Bofferding. I am a member of the CJA panel of
10	the Portland division. I have been asked to represent
11	Mr. Giffen in this case. I believe he does not have funds
12	to hire his own counsel and he is indigent and I do request
13	to be appointed on this matter.
14	THE COURT: So appointed.
15	MR. BOFFERDING: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	If I may have just a moment.
17	THE COURT: Of course.
18	(Counsel conferred with the defendant.)
19	THE COURT: And I do want to make sure just that
20	we are all apprised of the posture of the case.
21	If I am not mistaken, did he appear in Chicago?
22	MR. HUYNH: He was arrested in Chicago and
23	appeared for a removal proceeding and was removed.
24	He then subsequently appeared a couple weeks later
25	in Portland. I believe that was last week where he had an

14:18:58

initial appearance, and then it was set for a status here for the preliminary examination and detention hearing.

I can -- I have spoken to defense counsel, so I can give the court a little bit more information because we inquired how we were going to proceed today.

There is a threshold issue, Your Honor, that may impact how we proceed. The government is requesting a competency evaluation of Mr. Giffen.

That does overlap also with our request for detention based on risk of flight and danger to the community.

If the court so deems a competency evaluation is appropriate, then I don't believe a preliminary hearing should happen today, as the defendant won't be able to assist in his own defense and won't -- possibly won't appreciate the proceedings as well.

And thus, it may make some sense to stay this matter and continue it pursuant to Rule 5.1(d) given the extraordinary circumstances and the interest of justice so we can have that hearing when he can appreciate and assist at the appropriate time after the competency matter is resolved.

That was our discussions. I am happy to give the basis for our request, Your Honor, if you'd like.

THE COURT: Please go ahead.

14:20:10

2

3 4

5

7

6

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

MR. HUYNH: We learned about the communications between Mr. Giffen and Congressman DeFazio back in July of this year. At that time we were concerned about nature of the communication, the threats to the staff, but we were also very concerned more about the mental issues that may be -- from the defendant that may be causing those statements.

We proceeded to send a target letter to the defendant in the hopes of getting him counsel to help, hopefully, stop those communications and get him some assistance. He did get counsel, Craig Weinerman of the federal defenders office. We spoke with him throughout. Unfortunately, Mr. Giffen continued to send those communications, and, thus, the government had to file charges again him.

The concerns the government have continue to exist, which is given nature of his correspondence, which escalated in the nature of threats which also included some unusual discussions about various conspiracy theories, we are concerned that that reflects upon his mental state.

Additionally, I did speak with Congressman DeFazio's office this morning, and they wanted to relate to the court that Mr. Giffen's threats were taken seriously and had implications to them. They had to take extra security measures, including hiring security at events as well as at

14:21:34

the office. This is during a time of an election, so there's even more concern over their staff and volunteers and also required law enforcement to be present and potentially respond as well. So there were significant consequences to the community resources also. They wanted me to relay that to the court.

Additionally, the government is concerned about the proceedings in Chicago. I believe the court has seen the minute orders of what occurred there. Both his comments about conspiracies as well as his comments to the court are very concerning to us.

And that also, I do believe, reflects both on danger to the community as well as to himself as well as his need for a competency evaluation.

Additionally, Your Honor, his prior criminal history does include assaults. It does also include a guilty by reason of insanity. We also understand his prior medical condition has included a paranoid schizophrenia diagnosis, and he has been hospitalized numerous times.

Given all of this, we believe that there is a question of whether or not he is competent at this time to assist with his own defense as well as to understand the proceedings.

I also understand he's filed numerous civil cases in court that also suggest that he may not understand how

14:22:51

the legal system works. He's filed against individuals as well as cities and counties. Most of those cases have been dismissed.

But under the circumstances, we think it's prudent to continue the preliminary hearing until after his competency matter is resolved, he get the competency evaluation.

We suggest a setout of at least 90 days since it's 45 days in custody. And I believe the marshals need some time to transport him both there and back. So 90 days at a minimum would be appropriate.

And then if deemed competent, we can then set it for a preliminary hearing if that's what the defendant wants. That way he can in fact appreciate that proceeding and assist in his defense and give meaning to that proceeding.

And I believe that's called for under Rule 5.1(d) that if he does not agree to this, the court can find under the extraordinary circumstances and in the interest of justice that it be warranted.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. That what would be warranted?

MR. HUYNH: That this delay of the preliminary hearing be warranted as well as any exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act to indict him.

14:24:03 THE COURT: Counsel. 2 MR. BOFFERDING: In response to a couple of 3 things, one is my client informs me and from what I have 4 been able to read on the pretrial services report that Mr. Giffen has never been convicted of any charge except for 5 6 unauthorized use of a weapon, and that was guilty by 7 insanity back in 2003, I believe. 8 Two is that Mr. Giffen does want to stand by his 9 due process rights for a preliminary hearing today, and we 10 request the matter of detention be set aside so I can 11 develop more of a plan. There are a few doctors, one particular in New 12 13 York, that I have been trying to get ahold of last night and today. My client informs me that's a critical person for me 14 15 to contact. So I am still trying to do that as far as his 16 release issues go. 17 And --THE COURT: And these are medical doctors? 18 19 Doctors --MR. BOFFERDING: Psychiatric based. 2.0 THE COURT: Doesn't that raise some initial 21 22 question, then, of exploring this notion of competency a 23 little further, then, today as well? 24 MR. BOFFERDING: That has merit. 25 THE COURT: All right.

14:25:26 1 2 3 4 court at this time. 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 institution. 15 If I may just have a moment. 16 17 MR. BOFFERDING: 18 19 20 21 position. 2.2 THE COURT: 23 24

25

MR. BOFFERDING: However, I do want to make it clear that I have known Mr. Giffen for about two and a half hours now. So I am really not in a position to make a representation as to the competency as an officer of the But what I can say is that if the court does grant the motion, I think probably the proper place for an evaluation or competency motion -- evaluation would be an FMC so that they would be able to judge not only competency but also insanity at the time of the offense; that if the court does order that, the competency evaluation, I would suggest that that also be done at the same time to avoid my client being shuffled around from institution to (Counsel conferred with the defendant.) Okay. My client informs me that Mr. Farber, Dr. Farber has opined to him, my client, as far as his level of competency, which makes it more necessary that I contact Mr. Farber to be able to go forward from our On the issue of competency? MR. BOFFERDING: Competency and detention. THE COURT: So before I -- and I know you wanted

to bifurcate the issues of the preliminary examination and

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOFFERDING: Detention.

THE COURT: -- the detention hearing. But if I have a concern about competency, then a preliminary examination itself is also not appropriate to proceed.

MR. BOFFERDING: That would be correct legally.

THE COURT: Would it be correct in any other way or incorrect in any other way other than legally?

MR. BOFFERDING: From the wishes of my client, you never know. But I am here to advocate strongly for my client, and that's my job today and that's what I am doing.

THE COURT: I appreciate that you are doing that.

(Counsel conferred with the defendant.)

THE COURT: If your client is asking to proceed with the preliminary examination today and a question has been raised with respect to competency, the only way that I -- and I think there is at least some very compelling information in the reports that I have that suggest competency is a question, one of the ways that I am aware of exploring whether to proceed and determine if competency is sufficient here is to engage in some dialogue with the defendant. My concern about doing that right now is what might be said on the record. And so I am in a bit of a pickle here.

Do you have any suggestions, either counsel, about

14:28:23

how that can be resolved?

MR. HUYNH: The recommendation from the government is that the court not engage in that. I think his issues are a little bit more complicated than this as reflected by his actions and words throughout this case.

I do respect and appreciate his desire to have a preliminary examination. He would still continue to have that right after competency is determined in this case. I also do -- have heard of this doctor. My understanding is that the defendant may have been trying to go see this doctor in New York at the time he was being arrested in Chicago, and they have a personal relationship.

I do know if he is being evaluated by the Bureau of Prisons, we can provide the information of the doctor so that the physician or psychiatrist that evaluates him can consult with that doctor and get his appropriate files, if necessary and appropriate.

THE COURT: And counsel also suggests that if I do order the competency evaluation that it might be prudent to also order an evaluation, a psychological evaluation with respect to the defendant's capacity.

MR. HUYNH: And we have no objection to that, although that often doesn't occur because the initial stage is a competency determination, and then, based on that, there might be a restoration process.

14:29:48

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

12 13

11

15

16

14

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

So while it may be requested, it doesn't always happen at that time. But we have no objection to it being requested.

THE COURT: Would the order need to be modified to include both?

MR. HUYNH: We can do so. I have such language in other orders. I can provide a new order to the court.

THE COURT: Anything else, counsel, that you want me to be aware of?

MR. BOFFERDING: Just that my client really wants the court to know that if his doctor in New York could somehow testify or provide a letter or an evaluation or something to me to assist the court or to assist FMC, I definitely will comply with my client's request to do that.

I am just not sure right now, because I haven't personally spoken to the man, how soon that information can be brought to my attention.

MR. HUYNH: It typically requires about three weeks for the individual to be transported by the marshals to the location. At that point the physician there reaches out to the parties to get any information that could assist them. And I think at that point that can be provided timely by defense counsel.

So we'll make sure to relay the fact that he has another physician too, that evaluating psychiatrist, to

comply with defense counsel -- the defendant's concern. 14:31:08 1 THE COURT: Counsel, is there something else that 2 3 I needed to be apprised of? 4 MR. BOFFERDING: I am sorry, Your Honor. 5 get the last colloquy. 6 MR. HUYNH: In sum, that once the physician 7 reaches out to the parties for additional information, we can provide that, whatever you get from the New York doctor. 8 9 MR. BOFFERDING: Okay. All right. And one thing that my client was telling me was that, again, that 10 11 Dr. Farber was willing and ready to testify on the phone today at 1:30, which is, you know -- but that's -- that's 12 13 what I understand. 14 THE COURT: All right. 15 MR. BOFFERDING: But once again, that's the only 16 thing I could really offer. 17 Mr. Giffen would really like to talk to the court. I just want it on the record it's against my advice. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Giffen, I would strongly recommend 19 20 that you follow your attorney's counsel on this. It isn't a good idea for you to make statements on the record that 21 22 could be used as evidence against you in future hearings. 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am aware of that, and I would like to speak anyway because this attorney, 24 25 unfortunately, he was just appointed yesterday, and I have

14:32:19

not been allowed to speak to him. And I have been prepping all week long for Dr. Seth Farber to be here. He told my grandparents, who are in the audience now, that he would be here at this time.

Unfortunately, the attorney was appointed so late in the game, you know, he should have been appointed Monday or Friday. They had all week to do it. So he was not able to prepare for this release hearing or this motion at all that has been filed by the prosecutor's office.

So what -- Dr. Seth Farber is prepared to testify and he's written reports, and I have actually been in court before where Dr. Seth Farber testified to Donna Mills in New York City that I am not mentally ill, I am not a danger to myself or others and have no need for psychiatric treatment.

So the judge ruled I had no need for treatment, was not a danger to myself or others and all that. And you can actually Google Todd Giffen, New York Court of Appeals, and you will find an order that says there was no reason for Todd to have been held in a hospital last year.

Dr. Seth Farber is prepared to testified that I am a victim of a government mind control program, and we have substantial formerly classified documents on this program and numerous witnesses, including William Binney of the NSA. I have e-mails from him on a civil case right now. William Binney is vetting all my information that is legitimate it

14:33:38 in an e-mail. He is say, Todd Giffen, wow, this is the 1 stuff that convinces juries. 2 3 And Curt Levey of the NSA says, Todd Giffen, we are so lucky we have you. Thank God. Because I am out 4 there working with the NSA whistleblowers on government 5 6 crime and stuff like that. 7 Seth Farber will testify that I have PTSD and brain damage from a military mind control program. 8 9 are programs that are extensively discussed in the government's own documents on my civil case, which is filed 10 11 at 6:18-cv-01846-MC. And you will be able to find actual CIA and NSA 12 13 and DI documents that discuss a program where they experimented even on citizens here in Eugene, Oregon between 14 1976 and 1978 pumping radiation into citizens' homes without 15 16 their knowledge or consent. And this was in The 17 Register-Guard. We have copies of the original Register-Guard, which were obtained from Google because they 18 have The Register-Guard archives. 19 2.0 THE COURT: Mr. Giffen, I --21 THE DEFENDANT: 22 everything I needed --23

24

25

Seth Farber is just going to say THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. Hold on. THE DEFENDANT: -- that I don't need to go three weeks at some place halfway across the country and that I am 14:34:55

also scheduled to be getting medical care in Portland, an MRI, hydrotherapy, and massage, and so I should not be held in custody and all this stuff. We will be able to clarify this with Seth and my witnesses here.

THE COURT: I want to respect both your time and I need to respect mine as well in that I want to be able to give you the opportunity to present all relevant evidence at whatever future proceedings that we may have, but today isn't the day.

It sounds to me from what you have just described that there may be a volume of evidence that would need to be at your command in order to be able to present what you think might be important. And you need to work with your attorneys on figuring out the best way to deal with those claims.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And hold on, Mr. Giffen. This isn't the time right now for you to continue speaking.

Given what I have heard in both the report as well as from the proceedings in Chicago, I do have a concern about your ability, your competency to be able to assist in your defense and assist with any other legal proceedings.

It's clear to me that you have a very broad command of quite a few facts that you have just described and I think quite a bit more. But it also suggests to me

14:36:14

that it goes beyond the scope of the charges that we are specifically dealing with today.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, if you remember, my charges are just complaints to the congressman that he helped authorize this program --

THE COURT: Mr. Giffen, you are talking about things that I really do not want you to speak about only because those statements can be used against you in future proceedings on these charges.

It's important for me that the process safeguards your rights as well as provides an opportunity for the government to carry its burden of proof.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I agree with all that, but let my attorney -- just give him a chance to work with me and my doctor, and I have a list here of over 30 experts and my actual physicians who are going to say that I don't need a competency hearing. And once my attorney gets to working with these people, everything is fine.

So the prosecutors have filed this motion not knowing who I am. They have never worked with me. They don't know anything about -- they are ignoring volumes of evidence on my website. All my doctors' evaluations are publicly posted there, deliberately withheld from their affidavits and complaint. So my attorney needs to be familiar with that.

14:37:24

2.2

And if he says, okay, I worked with him and he's crazy, he's having problems, then let there be a competency hearing come up later. That's all I am requesting because this is a delay and stall tactic. And my friend, William Binney, NSA whistleblower, has a hundred million dollar lawsuit against the FBI and NSA for filing malicious prosecutions against them as well, knowing they were innocent and a victim and not leaking classified information. They filed a complaint that they were leaking classified information even though they knew they weren't doing so. And, of course, the charges fell apart and they now have a hundred million dollar lawsuit, right?

So I don't need to be -- I think my lawyer needs to have time to assess this because the prosecutors have a history of misconduct, including bringing false charges against people they victimize, like the NSA whistleblowers.

There's an article --

THE COURT: Mr. Giffen, I have given you a great deal of leeway in addressing the court, and that leeway has extended beyond the normal parameters of appropriate conversation here today.

Based on the conversations that I have been engaged in with you and what I have heard from counsel and what was communicated to me by way of affidavit from the magistrate judge in Chicago, it is -- it raises enough of a

14:38:41 question for this court --1 2 THE DEFENDANT: I was very angry at that judge because he told me to my face I cannot look up PACER to 3 4 review your case. I would need my wife here. I am too old 5 and frail. And he disregarded the fact that I told my 6 attorney there, Elizabeth -- Kimberly something, I said, can 7 you call Seth Farber and have him here for my hearing because I am completely capable of walking back to Oregon 9 and going to the court myself. She refused to talk to me 10 all weekend. Showed up and said, okay, I recommend you 11 don't ask --THE COURT: Mr. Giffen. 12 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. So that's what that was about, and I apologize for that. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Giffen, not another interruption. 15 16 I have given you quite a few opportunities for you to test 17 my patience, and I am not going to accept another one. If 18 you interrupt me again, then I will have you removed from 19 the courtroom. 20 Based on what I have heard, I am going to order 21 the competency evaluation. And --2.2 THE DEFENDANT: And here's another reason I 23 object --So Mr. Giffen --24 THE COURT: 25 THE DEFENDANT: Your doctors are all DI agents. Ι

14:39:40 have my own doctors. Seven psychiatrists that can do this. 1 2 THE COURT: You will now need to be removed from 3 the courtroom. 4 MR. BOFFERDING: I will be in touch. (Defendant removed from courtroom.) 5 6 THE COURT: The government will submit an order 7 providing for both the competency evaluation and a 8 psychological examination, evaluation. 9 MR. HUYNH: For the defense of the defendant, yes, we have that. 10 11 MR. BOFFERDING: For the defense of insanity at the time of the offense. 12 13 THE COURT: Yes. Status hearing at all at this point, or are we 14 15 needing to wait until after the examination is completed? 16 MR. HUYNH: I believe you still have to set a 17 status hearing so that we can keep this on track. What do you think? Four months? Three months? 18 19 Our experience has been four months is a safe bet so we don't have to come back in because of transport, 20 priorities of evaluation. So four months. 21 2.2 MR. BOFFERDING: Yeah. In my experience, it's going to take probably, oh, about a month and a half, two 23 24 months for the marshals to transport him to wherever he is

going, Springfield or Butner or wherever, and then, you

25

```
14:40:52
              know, he's there for 45 days and then turnaround time.
          1
                        Yeah, I think about four months is probably about
          2
          3
              right.
          4
                        MR. HUYNH:
                                     Set it for four months, and if there's
              a request for more time from the physician, we can go ahead
          5
          6
              and inform the court.
          7
                        THE COURT: And do I need to make findings
          8
              regarding extraordinary circumstances?
          9
                        MR. HUYNH: Yes, and the interest of justice to
         10
              delay the preliminary hearing.
         11
                         THE COURT: I do find that given these particulars
              circumstances, there are extraordinary circumstances that
         12
         13
              exist and in the interest of justice for an extended amount
         14
              of time to set this status conference out to four months and
         15
              get a date for that.
         16
                        And then in the meantime, if you can get that
         17
              order --
         18
                        MR. HUYNH:
                                    Yes.
         19
                                    -- prepared, I will go ahead and sign
                        THE COURT:
         20
              that.
                        MR. HUYNH: And just to be clear, that's to delay
         21
         22
              both the preliminary hearing as well as the presentment of
         23
              the case to the grand jury. So that's also a delay in the
         24
              speedy.
         25
                        THE COURT: Thank you for the clarification.
```

```
14:41:45
              with respect to both of those.
          1
          2
                        THE CLERK: Status conference is set for
          3
              March 27th, 2019, at 1:30 p.m., before Judge Kasubhai.
          4
                        MR. BOFFERDING: Actually, I will be in Sunriver
          5
              grading bar exams that week.
          6
                        THE CLERK: Are you available March 20th?
          7
                        MR. BOFFERDING: Let me see. What day is
          8
              March 20th?
          9
                        THE CLERK: It's a Wednesday.
         10
                        MR. BOFFERDING: It's a Wednesday. That will
         11
              work.
                        THE CLERK: Status conference is set for
         12
         13
              March 20th, 2019, at 1:30 p.m. before Judge Kasubhai.
         14
                        THE COURT: Counsel, we all know that the
         15
              examination completion is done well before Wednesday. You
         16
              can make it back in time.
         17
                        MR. BOFFERDING: Thank you, Your Honor.
                        THE CLERK: His appearance for the status
         18
         19
              conference?
         20
                        THE COURT: Say that again.
                        THE CLERK: The client's appearance for the status
         21
              conference?
         2.2
         23
                        MR. BOFFERDING: I think he is not in a position
              to waive it.
         24
         25
                        THE COURT: It would be seem to me as well.
                                                                      Also,
```

14:42:40 given that he isn't present right now, I am not inclined to do anything but require that he appear. If there is any other communications that the two of you might have that suggests otherwise, you can let us know so we can advise the Marshals Service that he may not be need to be transported for the status hearing. MR. BOFFERDING: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. HUYNH: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. This court is adjourned. THE CLERK: (The proceedings were concluded this 5th day of December, 2018.) 

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and 14:43:04 correct transcript of the oral proceedings had in the above-entitled matter, to the best of my skill and ability, dated this 11th day of April, 2019. /s/Kristi L. Anderson Kristi L. Anderson, Certified Realtime Reporter