## Transcript Of Proceedings

USA v Giffen

March 20th, 2019



CC REPORTING AND VIDEOCONFERENCING
172 East 8th Ave
Eugene, OR 97401
541-485-0111
www.ccreporting.com

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF OREGON

EUGENE DIVISION

HON. MUSTAFA T. KASUBHAI, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

COURTROOM NO. 3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

) Case No.
)6:18-mj-00236-MK

TODD MICHAEL GIFFEN,

Defendant.
)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2019

## APPEARANCES:

For the Government: Mr. Joseph Huynh

U.S. Attorney's Office

405 E. 8th Avenue, Suite 2400

Eugene, OR 97401

541/465-6771

joseph.huynh@usdoj.gov

For the Defendant: Mr. Todd E. Bofferding

P.O. Box 539

Hood River, OR 97031

541/490-9012

tbofferding@gorge.net

Reported by: Jan R. Duiven

CSR, FCRR, CRC

```
1
            WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2019; 2:22 P.M.
 2
                            -000-
 3
 4
                    COURTROOM DEPUTY: Magistrate case
 5
     No. 18-236, United States of America versus Todd
     Michael Giffen for status conference.
 6
 7
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Good afternoon,
 8
    your Honor.
 9
                    THE COURT: Good afternoon.
10
                    MR. HUYNH: Yes, your Honor.
                                                   I've
11
     talked to defense counsel. The defendant is not
12
    present --
13
                    THE COURT: Oh, he's not here today?
14
                    MR. HUYNH: -- today because of a --
     just a delay in transferring him. His competency
15
16
    evaluation was completed quite --
17
                    THE COURT: I did see a report
18
     indicating that --
19
                    MR. HUYNH: Correct.
20
                    THE COURT: -- he was not found fit
21
    to proceed.
22
                    MR. HUYNH: That's the
23
     recommendation of the medical examiner. I
24
     informed defense counsel of this last week, that
25
    he wasn't going to make it today, to see if he
```

```
wanted to continue the matter. He was going to
1
2
    appear which could be as early as next week
    according to the marshals. However, I believe
3
4
    defense counsel still wants to go have the status
5
    conference to lay out some matters on the record,
    so I'll defer to defense counsel.
6
7
                    THE COURT: Mr. Bofferding.
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Yes, please, your
8
            Todd Bofferding for Mr. Giffen. In the
9
    Honor.
10
    last couple days I received a plethora of phone
    calls from Mr. Giffen, and from other people
11
12
    across the country, people from New York, people
    from Texas.
13
14
                    THE COURT: Associated with
15
    Mr. Giffen?
16
                    MR. BOFFERDING: I'm sorry?
17
                    THE COURT: The plethora of calls
18
    other than from Mr. Giffen were --
19
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Were from --
20
                    THE COURT: -- associated --
21
                    MR. BOFFERDING: -- other people,
22
    associates of Mr. Giffen, residing in New York and
23
    Texas, Nevada, and elsewhere.
24
                    THE COURT: What's a plethora?
25
                    MR. BOFFERDING: A lot. A whole
```

```
lot. An amazing amount.
 1
                    THE COURT: Well, I knew that, but
 2
     what's a number?
 3
                    MR. BOFFERDING: At least 15.
 4
 5
                    THE COURT:
                                Okay.
                    MR. BOFFERDING: At least 15.
 6
 7
     want to be able to put something on the record
    even though Mr. Giffen is not adjudged to be
 8
    competent at this time, he still asked me to put
9
10
    something on the record, as does a lot of other
11
     people who have been calling me.
12
                    I want to be able to say that by the
13
     marshals not transporting Mr. Giffen to court
14
     today is a direct violation of fundamental
15
     fairness, violates due process in that it causes a
16
     delay in justice.
17
                    There is also an Eighth Amendment
18
     violation for cruel and unusual punishment by
19
     forcing Mr. Giffen to stay at the federal medical
20
     center in SeaTac longer than he needs to.
21
     evaluation process was completed early this month.
22
    The argument is that the marshals had plenty of
23
     opportunity to get him here. From what I
24
     understand is the bus needs to be filled or
25
     substantially filled in SeaTac for the marshals to
```

```
1
     transport people down.
 2
                    THE COURT: And you understand that
     from what source?
 3
                    MR. BOFFERDING: I understand that
 4
 5
     from my prior discussions with the marshals on
     cases like this. When they're transporting people
 6
 7
     around the country, they -- they have a habit.
     They just don't send one person down. They wait
 8
     till there's more people to move for financial
 9
10
     reasons.
                    I understand that from an
11
12
     administrative standpoint; however, waiting for a
13
    bus to be filled does not create an exception to
14
     due process.
15
                    Mr. Giffen is requesting to be
16
    released, whether it be on conditions or
17
    otherwise, or in the alternative, to have his case
18
    dismissed for violation of due process. That's
19
    the argument that I have and that's all I have at
20
    this time on this issue.
21
                    THE COURT: Mr. Huynh.
22
                    MR. HUYNH: Yes, your Honor.
                                                   This
23
     issue of delays in transport -- in fact, any
24
     transport of these defendants for either
25
     competency proceedings or restoration of
```

```
1
     competency proceedings --
                    THE COURT: And if I understand,
 2
     though, Mr. Giffen was going to be transported
 3
 4
    here for this status conference.
                    MR. HUYNH: Correct.
 5
                    THE COURT: So it's not a delay
 6
 7
     associated of him getting to a bed or a facility.
                    MR. HUYNH:
                               No. But it's still a
 8
    delay associated with his current status of being
 9
10
    somewhat in the process of determining competency.
11
     So it's still part and parcel with the whole
    procedure of him going to give an evaluation and
12
    then coming back to have a hearing and then
13
14
    proceeding from there.
15
                    The due process clause, we've argued
    before the Court, is not invoked in these cases.
16
17
     It's invoked in cases where there's no legitimate
18
    reason to -- to justify what they would argue is
19
    unreasonable incarceration, but we haven't. We
20
    haven't with the competency proceedings.
21
                    The speedy trial clock specifically
22
    enunciates these types of delays that -- while the
23
     competency determination still outstanding is
24
    excludable. In this case, factually, we actually
25
    have a pretty expeditious evaluation. You have
```

```
1
    him on December 5th being ordered by this Court
    for a competency. He was sent to SeaTac on
2
    January 10th. An evaluation was done in 35 days
3
    under the 45 days requirement of Court order.
4
                    The Court got its order on -- the
5
    opinion from the -- the medical examiner on
6
7
    March 11th. There was no request for an extension
    or anything like that, which is, again, quite
8
    rare. So this was done very quickly, his
9
10
    examination.
11
                    The only issue is that the
12
    transport, again, has to be done effectively.
    was -- he likely would be here tomorrow or the day
13
14
    after up in Portland. Getting him down to Eugene
15
    is additional delay. As I indicated to defense
16
    counsel, he could be here next Wednesday for this
17
    matter. And, thus, I don't believe there's any
18
    reason to claim that there's been undue delay in
19
    this case or any delay that would justify a due
20
    process claim for dismissal.
21
                    THE COURT: All right. Help me
22
    understand.
                The reason for him not being
23
    transported for today's date was?
24
                    MR. HUYNH: I didn't get the
25
    details. I asked of the marshals, but my
```

```
1
    understanding was that there was just a logistical
            It could be what Mr. Bofferding indicated.
2
    issue.
    I don't know that. But I do know that sometimes
3
    they have to coordinate transports of multiple
4
5
    individuals.
                   I can't say that's right or wrong in
    this case.
6
7
                    THE COURT:
                               And at what point were
    both of you made aware that there was going to be
8
    this delayed transporting of Mr. Giffen?
9
10
                    MR. HUYNH: Last week. I believe it
    was about middle of last week the marshals
11
12
    indicated that to me, and I informed that --
    Mr. Bofferding of that immediately to see how he
13
14
    wanted to proceed.
15
                    I also included him in the email
16
    chain loop to see if he had any questions of the
17
    marshals as well. And I asked of the marshals
18
    when could he -- when is the earliest he could
19
    arrive so we could inform the Court and try to set
20
    this orally.
21
                    THE COURT: And, Mr. Bofferding, you
22
    wanted to maintain this status conference to make
23
    these issues -- make these -- make these issues on
24
    the record --
25
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Correct.
```

```
1
                    THE COURT: -- for the Court to
 2
     consider.
                    Okay. All right. It always seems
 3
 4
     like I'm the last one to hear about the delays.
     So how is it that we can make sure that I'm
 5
     advised of this in advance of the hearing? And it
 6
 7
    might be that you don't want to, I guess, burden
     the Court with these things, but at the same time,
 8
     I think given that Mr. Giffen's circumstances are
 9
10
    unique, and with respect to competency issues, I
11
    think it raises probably more -- more questions
12
    that don't have to be otherwise raised.
13
                    Maybe we're working even more
14
     preemptively or proactively in scheduling --
15
     scheduling these status conferences when you have
16
    someone as well versed as Mr. Giffen being able to
17
    communicate his concerns.
18
                    MR. HUYNH: Well, again, I think we
19
     would have informed the Court had we sought to
20
     continue this matter as to why we weren't
21
     continuing it. So I think that was where we were
22
     trying to go with this, which is to inform the
23
     Court there was delay, and then continue the
24
     status conference for a time when he would be
25
    here.
```

```
1
                    But, otherwise, you know, it was a
     decision to inform the Court at this hearing
 2
    rather than prior to that.
 3
 4
                    THE COURT: All right.
                    MR. HUYNH: Based on defense
 5
     counsel's request to have the hearing. Outside of
 6
 7
     that, I mean, if the Court would like, we could
     try to confirm in advance status conferences with
 8
     folks in transport if they're going to be here,
 9
10
    but that's typically not what we do because of all
11
     the numbers of transports. So if we hear
12
    otherwise, we inform defense counsel and we see
13
    how they want to proceed.
14
                    THE COURT: All right. So you're
15
    asking me to dismiss the case, Mr. Bofferding?
16
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Yes. Or in the
17
    alternative, release on conditions.
18
                    THE COURT: All right.
19
                    MR. HUYNH: And just a reminder, on
20
    the release issue, this is a defendant who was
21
    charged with making threats to a public figure.
22
    Who, during his own removal proceedings, insulted
23
    and threatened the magistrate judge in Chicago and
24
    then proceeded to come here and also had some
25
    issues in this court as well.
```

```
1
                    THE COURT: And is it your
2
    contention that a one-week delay in his status
    conference would be that violation of due process?
3
                                     Well, it's going to
4
                    MR. BOFFERDING:
5
    have to be more than one week. I'm a member of
    the Board of Bar Examiners. They're sending us to
6
7
    Sunriver Friday to begin grading bar exams.
8
                    THE COURT: You know, that's a
    difficult one for me to feel sympathetic over,
9
10
    Mr. Bofferding.
11
                    MR. BOFFERDING: I understand.
12
    understand. There's board meetings and other
13
    things entailed. That's my schedule. And if the
14
    marshals would have brought him here, we would be
15
    on schedule.
16
                    THE COURT:
                                All right.
17
                    MR. BOFFERDING: So my schedule
18
    should not be the reason for violation of due
19
    process. It's because it all started he wasn't
20
    transported per court order of a case setting
21
    where my client never waived personal appearance.
22
                    THE COURT:
                               All right. But you're
23
    available the following week?
24
                    MR. BOFFERDING:
                                     I am.
25
                    THE COURT: All right.
```

```
1
                    MR. BOFFERDING: I am. And what
 2
    we're --
 3
                    MR. HUYNH: Actually, the discussion
 4
    was --
 5
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Go ahead.
                    MR. HUYNH: -- based on his
 6
 7
     schedule, we talked about April 9th, I believe,
 8
     Tuesday, April 9th, as a possibility because
    that's going to likely have to be a contested
 9
10
    competency hearing. I'm going to have to get
11
    either by PTC or personal appearance the
12
    physician. I've been told that we're still going
13
    to have to put on evidence next.
14
                    THE COURT: How long do you
    anticipate that hearing to take?
15
                    MR. HUYNH: On the Government's
16
17
     side, it would take no more than about 15 to
18
     20 minutes to go over the evaluation. I've done
19
    this before here. However, the defendant has a
20
    right to ask questions. The defendant has a right
21
    to also speak on his own behalf at these
22
    proceedings, and I can't say on that how long that
23
    would take.
24
                    THE COURT: How long do you
25
    anticipate your side of the case?
```

```
1
                    MR. BOFFERDING: It depends how long
    Mr. Giffen desires to speak on his behalf. He has
2
    a right to testify. I have a right to control
3
4
    everything else.
5
                    And what I expect to happen is that
    I -- my professional responsibility requires, I
6
7
    believe, and my duty to the Court as well, is that
8
    I will not present a case that opposes competency,
    but my client will in his statement.
9
10
                    THE COURT: All right.
11
                    MR. BOFFERDING: So I can't tell you
12
    how long it will be. Potentially a half hour.
                    THE COURT: Okay. So 15 minutes,
13
    30 minutes, 45 minutes. I calculate that to be
14
15
    about two hours.
16
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Correct.
                                               Yeah.
17
                    THE COURT: So we could take this up
18
    after the regular 1:30 docket that following --
19
    that Wednesday. Is that April 10th, Jackie?
20
                    COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes.
21
                    THE COURT: Yes.
                                      We'll keep it on
22
    the 10th of April and take it up at the end of the
23
    docket.
24
                    MR. HUYNH: Yes, your Honor.
25
                    MR. BOFFERDING: And would that be
```

```
1
    set as a contested competency hearing as opposed
2
    to a mere status conference?
                    MR. HUYNH: I would argue that we
3
    should just have the hearing, your Honor. There's
4
5
    no need to have conference to then set the
    contested hearing. Let's just have the hearing if
6
7
    they want it.
8
                    MR. BOFFERDING: I agree.
                    THE COURT: As do I.
9
10
                    MR. BOFFERDING:
                                     Good.
11
                    THE COURT: So let's make sure that
12
    everyone comes ready to present evidence on the
13
    competency hearing.
14
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Yes, your Honor.
15
                    COURTROOM DEPUTY: Competency
16
    hearing is set for April 10th, 2019, at 1:30 p.m.,
17
    before Judge Kasubhai.
18
                    THE COURT: And perhaps to clarify,
19
    then, for the record that even though I recognize
20
    that Mr. Giffen had not been transported for
21
    today's status conference, today, if he had
22
    appeared -- if he had appeared, we would have had
23
    to reset a contested competency hearing out to,
24
    more likely than not, that April 10th date.
25
                    So in terms of whatever concerns
```

```
1
    that I might have had with respect to some
 2
    prejudice on Mr. Giffen, it is resolved by being
 3
    able to set the competency -- contested competency
 4
    hearing as early as it would have otherwise been
 5
    set had Mr. Giffen been transported today.
 6
    However, I clearly recognize that he otherwise has
 7
    a right to appear in person for all of these
8
    proceedings.
9
                    MR. BOFFERDING: Very well, your
10
    Honor.
11
                    THE COURT:
                                 Thank you.
12
                    MR. HUYNH:
                                 Thank you, your Honor.
13
           (The proceedings recessed at 2:35 p.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
                    CERTIFICATE
 3
 4
 5
 6
     STATE OF OREGON
 7
    County of Lane
8
9
                 I, JAN R. DUIVEN, Certified Shorthand
    Reporter for the State of Oregon, in and for the
10
11
    County of Lane, do hereby certify that the
    foregoing pages 1 of 15, comprise a complete,
12
    true, and correct transcript, to the best of my
13
14
    ability, of the proceedings held in the
15
    above-entitled matter on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20,
16
    2019.
17
18
                 Dated at Eugene, Oregon, this 27th day
19
    of March, 2019.
2.0
21
22
23
                 JAN R. DUIVEN, CSR, FCRR, CRC
24
                 Certified Shorthand Reporter
25
```