UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA LAFAYETTE-OPELOUSAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : DOCKET NO. 04-20075

Plaintiff,

vs. May 26, 2004

GREGORY JAMES CATON,

Defendant. : Lafayette, Louisiana

REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE PLEA HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE TUCKER L. MELANCON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: LARRY J. REGAN

Assistant United States Attorney

800 Lafayette Street, Ste. 2200

Lafayette, LA 70501

FOR THE DEFENDANT: LEWIS O. UNGLESBY

Attorney at Law 246 Napoleon Street Baton Rouge, LA 70802

REPORTED BY:

LARAE BOURQUE, RPR, CRR United States Court Reporter 800 Lafayette Street, Ste. 3103 Lafayette, Louisiana 70501



PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. The next matter that we have is Criminal Docket 04-20075, <u>United States of America vs. Gregory</u>

<u>James Caton</u>. The matter before the Court today is the attempt of the defendant to enter a plea of guilty to Counts 1, 2, and 3 of a Bill of Information.

Are there any -- well, let's go ahead and let the lawyers identify themselves at this time for the record starting with the Assistant United States Attorney representing the government.

MR. REGAN: Your Honor, this is Larry J. Regan representing the U.S. Attorney's Office.

MR. UNGLESBY: Lewis Unglesby on behalf of Greg Caton, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And is the defendant ready to proceed, Mr. Unglesby?

MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Regan, is the government ready to proceed?

MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor. I'm getting the originals in order before I turn them in, but we are ready.

THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Unglesby, if you and your client would please come up to the lectern here.

And, Mr. Unglesby, am I correct that your client intends to enter a guilty plea to Counts 1, 2, and 3 of the Bill

of Information?

MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm sorry. You said, yes, that was correct?

MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Regan, are there any filings to be made in connection with this defendant's guilty plea?

MR. REGAN: Your Honor, I will make them. I had one page out of order. I'm trying to locate that right now, and I'll put it in as soon as I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And, if you would, state for the record what that is that it's going to be when you file it, the totality of the documents.

MR. REGAN: At the time it will be filed, the government intends to file a plea packet with a copy of the Bill of Information; the waiver of indictment executed by the defendant; the elements of the offense; the affidavit understanding of maximum penalty and constitutional rights; a plea agreement; a factual stipulation; an agreement to abandon property pertaining to the guns seized; an agreement to abandon property which deals with products seized; a consent decree of forfeiture and motion and order of forfeiture; and suggested questions for the Court.

THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Unglesby, based on the

representation that Mr. Regan makes that he's just getting the 1 paper in order, are there any objections to those filings? 2 MR. UNGLESBY: No. 3 They will be admitted without objection. THE COURT: 4 All right. Mr. Caton -- am I saying that right, Caton? 5 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes. 6 All right. Mr. Caton, there are a number THE COURT: 7 of questions I'll have to ask you in order to assure myself that 8 you are entering a valid plea. If you do not understand any of 9 the questions or at any time you wish to consult with 10 Mr. Unglesby, please say so as it is essential to a valid plea 11 that you understand each question before you answer it. 12 Do you understand that, sir? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 All right. And, Ms. Jordan, would you THE COURT: 15 please administer the oath to the defendant. 16 Please raise your right hand. THE CLERK: 17 (DEFENDANT SWORN) 18 Mr. Caton, do you understand that having 19 THE COURT: been sworn, your answers to my questions will be subject to the 20 penalties of perjury or of making a false statement if you do not 21 answer truthfully? 22 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. And how old are you, Mr. Caton? THE COURT: 24 Forty-eight. 25 THE DEFENDANT:

1 THE COURT: And how far did you go in school? Four years of college. THE DEFENDANT: 2 And did you get a degree from a college? THE COURT: 3 Associate's degree and an additional THE DEFENDANT: couple of years all together in school. 5 THE COURT: An associate's degree and what? 6 Associate's degree and then a couple of THE DEFENDANT: 7 years after that of additional schooling. 8 So you can read and write the English THE COURT: 9 language? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Have you taken any drugs, medicine, 12 pills of any kind, or drunk any alcoholic beverages in the past 13 24 hours? 14 THE DEFENDANT: No. 15 THE COURT: Have you ever been treated for mental 16 illness or addiction to narcotic drugs of any kind? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: No. Do you understand what is happening here THE COURT: 19 20 today? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Would you please explain to me in your own 22 THE COURT: words what it is that you're here to do today. 23 I'm here to enter pleas to protect my 24 THE DEFENDANT: wife and my employees and others.

Okay. But, now, you need to help me with THE COURT: 1 And you may need to talk to Mr. Unglesby and you may not, 2 but part of my role right now is to make sure that what you're 3 doing is, one, that you understand what you're doing, and, two, it's a voluntary -- that you understand it's voluntary. 5 Now, I really need for you to help me with what you're 6 actually saying, coming up here and saying, Judge, under oath, 7 under penalty of perjury or of making a false statement, this is 8 what I did. 9 You know, that's the role I play right now, and I'm not 10 trying to make it more difficult for you. 11 I understand, Your Honor. Well, there THE DEFENDANT: 12 are accuracy issues in the pleas, but -- I'm sorry. Specifically 1.3 what do you want to know, Your Honor? 14 THE COURT: I want to know -- I'm under the impression 15 that you are pleading guilty to Counts 1, 2, and 3 of the Bill of 16 Information. 17 You're saying that you're pleading guilty. 18 understand that. What are you pleading guilty to, sir? What are 19 you telling me you did wrong under the law? 2.0 Let me read it. 21 THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: You can go ahead and consult with 22 Mr. Unglesby if you'd like. 23 Paula, turn that microphone off, please.

(CONFERRING)

24

1 THE DEFENDANT: Mail fraud involving violations of FDA 2 rules. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. Turn the microphone back 4 on. 5 I'm sorry. Go ahead. 6 Mail fraud involving violations of FDA THE DEFENDANT: 7 rules. 8 THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Unglesby, prior to the start of court today, did you have the opportunity to visit with 9 your client? 10 11 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: And have you had the opportunity prior to 13 today to visit with your client? 14 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: 15 And based on those meetings and your knowledge of the defendant, do you have any doubt as to the 16 17 defendant's competence to enter a plea in this matter here today? 18 MR. UNGLESBY: No. The defendant is very competent, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. Well, the Court is satisfied, 20 21 based on the interaction it's had with the defendant as well as the representation of the defense attorney, that the defendant is 22 competent to enter a plea in this matter at this time. 23 Now, Mr. Caton, have you had ample opportunity to 24

discuss your case with Mr. Unglesby?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I just got the -- this paperwork just about an hour ago, so -- and I've signed it. So I would say I haven't had a lot of time, but I've had enough time to sign the documents.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you because this is very important to me and certainly important to you.

Do you feel like you need more time -- even though you've signed these documents, even though there's not an objection to them being filed, would you like more time to speak with Mr. Unglesby either today or come back here later today or we can come back another day? I want to make sure you have had adequate time to discuss your case with Mr. Unglesby.

THE DEFENDANT: In all candor, Your Honor, I don't think it would affect the outcome.

THE COURT: Okay. And, again, I'm not trying to make this more difficult. I'm just trying to do what I'm supposed to do, the role I play here.

Even though it doesn't -- or it might not affect the outcome, would you like to have more time to talk to Mr. Unglesby?

THE DEFENDANT: Maybe this is the utilitarian part of me speaking, but I don't see the usefulness of it. I think I know what you're getting at, Your Honor, and I'm going to try to tell you this is -- I've taken an oath to speak the truth. So I'm going to tell you as truthfully as I can.

My wife and I prepared for potential problems during the Y2K thing. We bought a lot of food. We bought solar panels. Included in our purchases was a series of guns because we were very fearful as were a number of other people in our community. At the time that we did that, we bought guns from a police officer who had a shop on Kirkman.

We really felt everything we were doing was in accordance with the law. My understanding of the law as it's been told to me is that even if I had got advice from an attorney, even if I had a whole police department saying that this was okay, that the way the current law reads, it has nothing to do with intent. It has to do with possession and only possession such that the possession of two guns would bring ten years.

If this document said I must serve five years in prison because I improperly entered -- emptied a kitty litter box, I would be forced to sign that. I don't really have a choice in the matter.

So when you ask me have I had enough time with my attorney, for me it becomes an issue of relevancy. What's the relevancy? I'm having to sign this because I can't afford for myself and my wife to go to prison and orphan my seven-year-old son because we didn't have knowledge that under any condition no woman in America can own a gun if she's living with a man who's had a prior altercation with the federal law. That is -- for all

intents and purposes, that's the way the law is currently being enforced. Most citizens don't know that. We certainly didn't know that.

But that determines the course that one has to take in the course of doing a plea bargain. Whatever this says, it doesn't matter whether it's truthful or not, I have to sign it.

THE COURT: Well, I want you to understand, I'm doing the best I can. You may feel you have to sign it. You may feel it may do no more -- do you no more good to talk to Mr. Unglesby, but to do the job I'm supposed to do for our society under the oath I took, I don't have to accept the guilty plea.

And I've got to tell you right now, I know you're doing the very best you can right now one human being to another. I see you trying to say, Judge, this is how I feel. This is the way I see it.

I want you to know that's what I'm trying to do, but what you just said, I don't think there's any way in the world today that I can accept your plea.

And I'm not trying to delay this, I certainly don't want that to happen, but, I mean, you've just said a bunch of things here that -- and if you didn't have -- and, again, I don't want to make Mr. Unglesby's head any bigger than some judges say it is. You've got one of the best defense lawyers in this state with you right now. I don't know what he's told you. I don't care to know.

But I don't feel my comfort level here. It's like you're getting railroaded into doing something that you don't think is right.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't understand that, Your Honor.

MR. UNGLESBY: Here's our situation, Judge. The government has agreed to waive charges on the guns. Caton is a convicted felon. The guns, the ammunition, the body armor, all of the things that were found which resulted in his being detained are well-documented.

Now, there's confusion over whether it was his guns or his wife's guns, but in the facts of the case, it's clear to him that he would be convicted if he had a trial.

Now, in addition to that, he was -- what provoked all of this was the position by the FDA that he was in violation of FDA law by selling various products that were labeled as medicine or identified as medicine without FDA approval.

His position has always been these were -- fell under a different act. These were herbs and, you know, outside the mainstream of regular medication and that they were allowed. We were wrong. It's simple. Whether Mr. Caton had a good intention or not, he was wrong. The law is clear that what he did do he can't do.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't necessarily agree with that.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't necessarily agree with that.

2.

THE COURT: Well, I tell you what I'm going to do,
Mr. Unglesby. I think it's the right thing to do. Before we
refix this for another day, I'm going to go ahead and take my
three o'clock matter. I'm going to give you and Mr. Caton until
3:30. We'll come back at 3:30. Now, if you need more time than
that, I'm going to give you more time.

would like to do it that way with Mrs. Caton, I'm going to ask the marshal to make the same arrangement we had before here so Mrs. Caton can be part of it if that's what both of you want. If Mr. Caton says, no, that's not necessary, or you say, Mr. Caton, I suggest we don't do that, that will be y'all's business, but I want the marshal to make available the same jury room back there.

And, again, Mr. Caton, I want you to know this. I'm doing my dead level best to do my job and not make it any harder on you and your wife than it must already be. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we're in recess in this matter. And we'll go ahead -- if we could get Frances in here for the other case, we'll just do this conference call on the record in here.

MR. UNGLESBY: Be here at 3:30?

THE COURT: 3:30 for us, and if Mr. Unglesby says we need more time than that, we'll take all the time we need.

Should I hold on on putting this --1 MR. REGAN: I'm -- let me just say this. Let's do hold THE COURT: 2 off until we see where we're going. 3 Okay, sir. Good enough. MR. REGAN: (RECESS) 5 All right. Mr. Unglesby, have you had THE COURT: 6 ample opportunity to discuss your client's case with --7 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes. THE COURT: And based on your understanding of the 9 meeting that you and your client had, are we ready to proceed or 10 should we continue this to another day? 11 MR. UNGLESBY: No, sir. We're ready to proceed. 12 And, Mr. Caton, is that correct? You've THE COURT: 13 had ample opportunity to discuss this matter with Mr. Unglesby? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: And are you ready to proceed, sir? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 All right. Now, Mr. Unglesby, let me ask THE COURT: 18 you a lawyer question because it's getting to be kind of a 19 procedural thing for us, and maybe the answer is just so easy we 20 should have figured it out without asking you. I called the case 21 as Criminal Docket Number 03-200 --22 THE CLERK: No. 23 THE COURT: Okay. I called the case that was filed 24 That's 04-20075. And that is in the case where the

25

yesterday.

Bill of Information was filed, which I think we're proceeding on today, and the older case was one by indictment.

MR. REGAN: By indictment, and that was 03-20092. And that -- in the plea agreement there is a provision to be dismissed.

THE COURT: You're going to dismiss that after the sentencing in this case.

MR. REGAN: Yes. And I apologize. I probably should have mentioned something to you and it caught you unaware. I'm sorry. That's my fault.

THE COURT: And I wouldn't have known -- and again it doesn't matter to me, but why we wouldn't have done it in the same case.

MR. REGAN: Well, we were going to do it, but it creates problems in the federal government's tracking of these cases, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So it's another bureaucratic thing from the Justice Department.

MR. REGAN: That's exactly right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Another attempt to micromanage what the district judges do by the Justice Department.

Okay. I understand.

All right. I believe where we left off, Mr. Caton, I had asked you, I believe, if you had had ample opportunity to discuss your case with Mr. Unglesby. I just asked you that

before we started, but I'd ask you again if you could tell me if 1 you've had ample opportunity to discuss your case with 2 Mr. Unglesby. 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 THE COURT: And have you been satisfied with 5 Mr. Unglesby's representation of you up until today? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Are you satisfied to have him represent you 8 here today? 9 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Now, Mr. Unglesby, has the defendant been 11 furnished with a copy of the Bill of Information containing the 12 charges he's attempting to plead guilty to here today? 13 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, he has, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: And, Mr. Unglesby, does the defendant waive the reading of the Bill of Information? 16 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, he does, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Now, Mr. Caton, do you understand that you 18 have a constitutional right to be charged by an indictment of a 19 Grand Jury, but you may waive that right and consent to being 20 21 charged by a Bill of Information of the United States Attorney? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 22 23 THE COURT: Do you understand that if you do not waive indictment, the government may present the case to the Grand Jury 24

and request it to indict you?

THE DEFENDANT: 1 Yes. THE COURT: Do you understand that a Grand Jury is 2 composed of at least 16 and not more than 23 persons, and that at 3 least 12 Grand Jury members must find that there's probable cause 4 to believe that you committed the crime with which you are charged before you may be indicted? 6 THE DEFENDANT: 7 Yes. THE COURT: Do you understand that the Grand Jury might or might not indict you? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Do you understand if you waive indictment 11 by the Grand Jury, the case will proceed against you on the 12 United States Attorney's Bill of Information just as though you 13 had been indicted? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 16 THE COURT: Have you discussed the matter of waiving 17 your right to indictment by the Grand Jury with Mr. Unglesby? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Unglesby, do you know of any reason why 19 your client should not waive indictment in this matter? 20 21 MR. UNGLESBY: No, sir, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Caton, do you understand your right to 22 indictment by a Grand Jury? 23 24 THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: Have any threats or promises been made to

1 you to induce you to waive indictment? THE DEFENDANT: 2 No. 3 THE COURT: Do you wish to waive your right to indictment by a Grand Jury? 4 THE DEFENDANT: 5 6 THE COURT: The Court finds that the defendant's waiver of indictment is knowingly and freely given and will accept it. 7 Mr. Caton, do you understand that under the 8 constitution and laws of the United States, you're entitled to a 9 10 trial by a jury on the charges contained in the Bill of Information? 11 THE DEFENDANT: 12 Yes. THE COURT: Do you understand that in order to convict 13 you, all of the 12 jurors would have to agree that you were in 14 fact quilty? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes THE COURT: And, again, Mr. Unglesby, you say that the 17 18 defendant has previously been provided with a copy of the charges in the Bill of Information? 19 20 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, as well as the original indictment, Your Honor. 2.1 22 Now, Mr. Regan, maybe it's just my copy, THE COURT: but it doesn't seem like it's in order. 23 It doesn't have what, sir? 24 MR. REGAN: One minute and I'll tell you if I'm right. 25 THE COURT:

1 (PAUSE) 2 THE COURT: I am right. I've got two second pages it looks like, but let's see if we can get through this thing. 3 MR. REGAN: Your Honor, let me go ahead and 4 double-check. I will give you mine. 5 That's all right. I'm going to go 6 THE COURT: No. 7 with what I've got right now. 8 MR. REGAN: All right, sir. 9 THE COURT: Do you understand, Mr. Caton, that at trial you would have the right to testify if you chose to do so, but 10 you'd also have the right not to be compelled to incriminate 11 12 yourself? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 14 THE COURT: And do you understand that at that trial you would be presumed to be innocent, and the government would 15 have to overcome that presumption and prove you guilty by 16 competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt and you would 17 18 not have to prove that you were innocent? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Do you understand that at the trial and through to any appeal you have the right to the assistance of a 21 lawyer, and if you cannot afford one, the Court will appoint a 22

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

23

24

25

lawyer for you?

THE COURT: And do you understand that in the course of

the trial, the witnesses for the government would have to come to court and testify in your presence, and your lawyer could confront and cross-examine the witnesses for the government, object to evidence offered by the government, and offer evidence on your behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And as I said earlier or asked you earlier, you understand that if you chose to testify, you could, but you couldn't be compelled to testify if you chose not to?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you would have the right to summon, call, and present witnesses on your behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If I accept your guilty plea, do you understand that you will waive your right to a trial and the other rights I've just discussed, there will be no further trial, and I will simply enter a judgment of guilty and sentence you on the basis of your guilty plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In pleading guilty, do you understand that you will also have to waive your right not to incriminate yourself since I'll have to ask you questions about what you did in order to satisfy myself that you're guilty as charged and you will have to admit or acknowledge your guilt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you willing to waive and give up your right to a trial and the other rights I've discussed?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And have you discussed with Mr. Unglesby the charges in the Bill of Information to which you are attempting to plead guilty to here today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Were you able to read it and go over it with him?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You have been charged in Count 1 of the Bill of Information with mail fraud in violation of 18, United States Code, Section 1341 and 2. I am required to explain to you this offense.

The cited statute, among other things, makes it a crime for anyone to use commercial interstate carriers in carrying out a scheme to defraud.

For a jury to find you guilty of this crime, the government would have to prove each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that you knowingly created a scheme to defraud, that is, you knowingly devised a plan whereby you introduced unapproved new drugs into interstate commerce and you were aided and abetted by others in this endeavor; second, that you acted with a specific intent to defraud numerous victims by the introduction of unapproved drugs; and, third, that you

shipped by commercial carrier the unapproved new drugs or caused other persons to ship the unapproved new drugs through interstate commerce for the purpose of carrying out the scheme.

Do you understand the nature of those charges?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And I'm going to ask you this in light of what's been said here earlier because that's my role again. This offense says that you must have knowingly done that and that you had specific intent to defraud. Is that accurate?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, except that I never intended to harm anyone and believed in my products.

THE COURT: Okay. So you said you didn't intend to harm anyone and you believed in your products. And, again, Mr. Caton, I'm really not trying to make this difficult on you or me or Mr. Unglesby or the government.

But what you're saying here to me in essence is, Judge, one, I knew I was creating a scheme to defraud. I knew that.

And, two, I did it with the specific intent to defraud people.

Is that what you did?

MR. UNGLESBY: Well, yes, but not -- we get into these semantics, Judge. Mr. Regan writes this stuff. I can't control what he writes.

THE COURT: Well, those are the elements of the crime that the government would have to prove at trial.

MR. UNGLESBY: Yeah. And we're guilty of those

elements of the crime, but from this perspective. The defrauding was against the government. Mr. Caton put in interstate commerce materials that he advertised as medicine that were not FDA approved and received money in return for shipping those materials.

There are other allegations in civil cases and implicit in these charges is that those materials harm people. What Mr. Caton is trying to say is he never had any intention to harm anyone nor any reason to believe that any of the things that he was selling would harm anyone. It's a distinction without a difference, but it's important to him.

He did do it. He did place it in interstate commerce. He didn't have FDA approval. It's illegal, you know, and that constitutes mail fraud, but he didn't mean to hurt anybody by it.

THE COURT: Well, does he concede that he knowingly created a scheme to defraud?

MR. UNGLESBY: Well, in the definition of scheme to defraud, he had a business that he advertised over the Internet that represented things which he sold to be a certain type of material, which it was not. So, yes.

THE COURT: So that was knowingly?

MR. UNGLESBY: Yeah. He knew that he did not have FDA approval, Your Honor, to advertise anything as a medicine. And he knew that as it was put in the Bill of Information, he did not have FDA approval -- pardon me -- or have the application for FDA

approval on site in his business, which would be required if a person were going to engage in the kind of business that he was in.

MR. REGAN: In addition, Your Honor, on his Internet site for which he sold his goods, he advertised that they were being -- he was operating out of the Caribbean islands.

THE COURT: Okay. But let's say in a trial of the cause, that would be all evidence that the government would introduce to the jury to show that it was a knowing scheme to defraud?

MR. REGAN: Right.

THE COURT: What I need to know from the defendant before I can accept the guilty plea is if that's what he's pleading guilty to. I can't just blink at that even though everybody is trying to get through this as best they can.

MR. REGAN: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I mean that with the greatest respect for the defense lawyer and the government's lawyer here.

MR. REGAN: I understand that and I understand your position, Your Honor, but I just added that to show that it's part of the overall scheme in order to defraud. He claimed that these products were manufactured outside the United States and they were being shipped from outside the United States.

THE COURT: And if I were the trier of fact, I might find him quilty, but he's got to let me know that that's what he

Those

did. I've just got to understand that. 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: So you understand -- you admit to me that 3 you knowingly created a scheme to defraud? 4 As you're now defining defraud, yes. 5 THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: I'm sorry. As I now what? 6 MR. UNGLESBY: He said as he understands the definition 7 8 of defraud, yes. THE DEFENDANT: As you're defining defraud, yes. 9 10 THE COURT: Okav. And that the intent to defraud someone -- the intent. Look, Mr. Caton, I told you how good a 11 lawyer I think you have, and you do. I'm not trying to make this 12 hard, but I cannot let you walk off a cliff if that's not what 13 you're saying you did. 14 THE DEFENDANT: As it's been described to me, yes, I 15 16 was intending to defraud the government. And is it correct that you shipped or had THE COURT: 17 18 somebody ship it by commercial carrier, whatever product you were selling? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I did ship products by commercial 20 21 carrier. THE COURT: All right. And you have been charged in 2.2 Count 2 of the Bill of Information with introduction of 23

unapproved new drugs into interstate commerce in violation of 21,

United States Code, Section 331(d), 335(a), and 333(a)(2).

24

statutes make it a crime for anyone to introduce and deliver for introduction into interstate commerce an unapproved new drug.

In order for the United States to prove you're guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the government must prove the following elements: First, that you introduced or delivered for introduction into interstate commerce unapproved new drugs; second, that you did so with the intent to defraud or mislead; and, third, that you knowingly committed these acts, acts one and two.

Do you understand the nature of the charge against you in Count 2 of the Bill of Information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you agree that in fact all of those things you did, all of the elements, the three elements I just listed, that that's correct, that's what you were trying to do when you did it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, in Count 3 of the Bill of Information you've been charged with criminal forfeiture in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 982(a)(1) and(2)(a).

Do you agree with the forfeiture of your assets as outlined in the plea agreement and the consent decree of the

forfeiture? Do you agree with that, sir?

2.

2.2

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And those are the items that would have been negotiated between Mr. Unglesby on your behalf and the government that you would turn over and forfeit to the government; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, I am convinced now after talking to you, Mr. Caton, that you do understand the nature of the charges. You have under penalty of perjury or of making a false statement said you are in fact guilty of those charges.

Do you know the maximum sentence and fine I might impose on the charge to which you are pleading guilty, the charges which you're attempting to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The maximum possible penalty on Count 1 of the Bill of Information is a term of imprisonment of not more than five years; a fine of not more than \$250,000; three years supervised release; and a one hundred dollar special assessment fee. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And Count 2 of the Bill of Information, the maximum penalty that may be imposed for that is a term of imprisonment of not more than three years; a fine of not more than \$250,000; a term of supervised release of not more than one

year; and a one hundred dollar special assessment fee. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The penalty for Count 3 of the Bill of
Information is the forfeiture of the assets and the one hundred
dollar special assessment fee. That's the items that I asked you
about earlier that Mr. Unglesby and the government lawyer had
negotiated that you were going to turn over to the government.
Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And you understand the special assessment fee is a hundred dollars for each of the three charges. It would be a total of \$300.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And I understand from what was filed in the record, I believe, is a consent decree the government has prepared; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you sign that consent decree along with your lawyer and the government lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in every criminal case in which a defendant may be sentenced to more than one year of imprisonment as in this case, that in addition to any maximum possible penalty, the Court shall order a term of supervised

release to follow the imprisonment for a length of time of up to three years? Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that while on supervised release, you would be required to abide by conditions specified by the Court, and that supervised release might be revoked if you violate any of those conditions?

If supervised release is revoked for any reason, you may be imprisoned for the full term of supervised release without credit for time spent on post-release supervision, and that the combined time spent in prison under a sentence of imprisonment and a subsequent revocation of supervised release might exceed the statutory maximum sentence. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand the offense to which you are pleading guilty is a felony offense? If your plea is accepted, you will be adjudged guilty of that offense, and that such adjudication may deprive you of valuable civil rights such as the right to vote, the right to run for political office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess any kind of firearm.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you, leaned on you, or forced you to plead guilty, or told you that if you do not plead guilty, further charges will be brought against you or that

1 other adverse action will be taken against you?

THE DEFENDANT: May I have a moment with my attorney?

THE COURT: You may. Absolutely. And if you'd like to excuse yourself from the room or if you want to just go over to the side there, you may, too.

(CONFERRING)

MR. UNGLESBY: No, Judge, no one has threatened Mr. Caton or forced him to plead guilty and he can answer for himself on that. However, part of the agreement that's in the documents is that there will be no charges filed against his wife or any of his associates.

THE COURT: That's part of the plea agreement.

MR. UNGLESBY: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. So again the question I would ask you, Mr. Caton, has anyone threatened you, leaned on you, or forced you to plead guilty, or told you if you do not plead guilty, further charges will be brought against you or that other adverse action will be taken against you?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand that plea agreements are permissible and that you and all of the lawyers have a duty to disclose the existence and terms of any such agreement to the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Regan, what is the substance of the

plea agreement that the United States has entered into with Mr. Caton and Mr. Unglesby?

MR. REGAN: Your Honor, the government has entered a plea agreement. It's understood in that plea agreement that he will plead guilty to Counts 1 and 2 and also agree to the forfeiture in Count 3 of the Bill of Information, admit that he's in fact guilty of the offenses charged. He agrees to cooperate with the government and forfeit all interest in the properties listed in the plea agreement and the other documents.

He agrees to identify fully all his assets subject to polygraph examination as subject to the matter of this particular case, abandon -- he agrees to abandon property, firearms, and ammunition, which were the subject of forfeiture in Count 2 of the indictment under Criminal Number 03-20092.

In return, the government -- if the Court finds a factual basis for Mr. Caton's plea, we agree not to prosecute him for any other offenses based on the investigation which occurred during the years stated in the plea agreement.

At the time of sentencing -- at the time of sentencing we will make known to the Court the nature and extent of the defendant's cooperation.

And the government will state for the record here, Your Honor, that the government will be positing some information directly to the Court because of its sensitive nature and the situation in which Mr. Caton cooperated with federal government

agents in a matter unrelated to this, but it was a matter of national security.

2.0

So I would -- I'm going to attempt to by letter probably bring that specifically to your attention. And I won't try to be too cryptic, but there are things I can't go into.

THE COURT: You mean at this time?

MR. REGAN: At this time, Your Honor.

MR. UNGLESBY: And one other thing, Judge, just to clarify -- I'm sorry. Did I interrupt you?

MR. REGAN: No. Go ahead.

MR. UNGLESBY: The language as written has a number of, I think, \$860,000 or something in forfeiture. There is no \$860,000 or \$86,000 or \$86.

There's also language there that says that the government has the right to substitute assets if they can't find the four listed items. Well, three of them are property, hard property. There's not in issue. The fourth one is the dollar figure which Mr. Regan and I both know is illusory. There is no -- there has never been any such money that Mr. Caton has to forfeit.

Part of the agreement is that there will be no property taken from Mrs. Caton such as her home, you know, unless there's some proof that there was some effort to secrete assets in the course of this investigation, which, of course, right now the record is that there has been no effort to secrete any assets

from anybody, secrete any assets from anyone.

So I want to make it clear that while it says that, you know, there's equally an agreement between the government and I that that will not be done in any effort to take away the family home.

MR. REGAN: No. That does not -- counsel is correct, Your Honor. The government has no intention at this moment or anywhere down the road to take the family residence away from Mrs. Caton.

THE COURT: Well, help me. And, again, I'm just trying to understand. The \$860,000 -- why is Mr. Unglesby right? If it's an illusory number, why did you put that in there?

MR. REGAN: Because we have to, Your Honor. In the area of forfeiture law -- and once again regulations that I and AUSA's have to abide by. The problem is we have to stipulate what was involved, proceeds and so on, even if we may never get them back. And, you know, I will in good faith stand here and tell the Court today, no, there's no accounts we can go to to get \$950,000.

And, in addition, Your Honor, so that the Court is not confused or people don't think we're trying to mislead, the Bill of Information and one of the other documents expresses the amount at \$950,000 in cash. The consent and order decree stipulates \$860,000. That's because we gave Mr. Caton an offset for the equity of the three buildings we're seizing and it

1 | brought it down to 860.

THE COURT: How much was it before in the government's view?

MR. REGAN: Pardon me?

THE COURT: How much was it before you gave him the credit for the three buildings?

MR. REGAN: \$950,000. It's down. He had equity which reduced it to \$860,000.

THE COURT: Well, help me. And even though it's not really germane at this point, I'm trying to -- like I say, don't confuse me, and you know how confused I get and how easily I get confused.

Why does the government say he owed this nine hundred and something thousand?

MR. REGAN: Because at one time funds were transferred from his account, Alpha Omega, the company in which he sold the medicine or whatever over the Internet. A total of \$950,000 in four transfers, five transfers --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Numerous transfers.

MR. REGAN: Numerous transfers over the period of time that is mentioned in the Bill of Information that the investigation covered. There were numerous transfers of money from Alpha Omega to another company Mr. Caton and his wife owned, Lumen Foods, totaling \$950,000.

We have the accountant here who's an ex-IRS agent who

was hired by FDA who analyzed the bank records and that was the amount of money that went from the company, which the government considers any funds derived from the sale of these things was ill-gotten because it was as a result of mail fraud. So basically the 950 is what we put in here and it backed off to 860.

1.8

THE COURT: Mr. Unglesby, the next question to you, good lawyer that you are and officer of the court that you are, we have the sentencing hearing. One of the issues as far as the guideline range is going to be the amount of the loss.

You have told me in your view that's an illusory number, but it's in the plea agreement. What happens at the sentencing hearing when the probation officer comes back with the amount of loss -- and let's use Mr. Regan's approach in saying this is the government claim. That's exactly what they do and I think it's Draconian sometimes the way it works, but are we going to have an issue on the amount of loss for the calculation of the guidelines?

MR. UNGLESBY: I don't think so because of two reasons. Number one, it's not -- they use the term "loss." That's the gross sales, Judge. In the five years they were in business, that's the total amount of money transferred over, \$950,000, not \$950,000 in profit by any sense.

Now, second, as I appreciate the guidelines -- and I'm more than willing to admit my ignorance of guidelines sometimes

-- the magic number was a million dollars. As long as we're under a million dollars, it doesn't matter. Whether it was \$500,000, \$475,000, \$860,000, whatever number Larry chose, the critical thing is to be under a million dollars.

As long as we're under a million dollars and our interpretation, he and mine, is correct, which I think it is, then it's okay.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Regan, officer of the court that you are and wearing the white hat that you do, I just went through this with Ms. Finley today on a Social Security case.

And I'm not talking about -- I mean, I'm not sure I understand the breakoff point Mr. Unglesby is talking about because I know in that Social Security case it was under \$70,000. There was a lot less of a guideline range. If you got over 70, then we had another issue.

Is it different in this type of case with wire fraud, mail fraud?

MR. REGAN: No, it shouldn't be, Your Honor. My appreciation of the law is -- well, I may be trying to answer the wrong question. We kept this under a million dollars for a specific purpose, Your Honor. And arguably he's right. I'm not saying that the \$950,000 that went from Alpha Omega into Lumen was net proceeds.

THE COURT: Net profit.

MR. REGAN: Net profit. I'm sorry. Net profit.

THE COURT: But it will be the government's position
that it doesn't matter because it's the total volume amount and
that's what the guidelines call for?

MR. REGAN: Right.

THE COURT: Are we together on that, Mr. Unglesby?

Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. UNGLESBY:

2.2

MR. REGAN: But I would also state, Your Honor, when it comes to restitution in this matter, that there will only be one victim we're talking about that the government would be seeking restitution. And once again it may be illusory because there's no funds to pay for it, but --

THE COURT: Well, what's the requirement in the plea agreement that you recited that he's got to disclose all of his assets? What's that about?

MR. REGAN: Basically to help the government. We've been able to identify from business records, Your Honor, but I'm not saying that in Mr. Caton's case it's the case.

However, unfortunately it has been the government's experience in these type of cases where people have knowingly concealed assets or shifted assets away from them to basically shield those assets from being taken when they plead guilty and they agree for forfeiture.

I'm not accusing Mr. Caton of doing that. I'm just saying if for some reason we find out somewhere down the road

that a lawyer of his or somebody acting in his capacity
transferred some funds somewhere that he didn't disclose, then we
have to address that.

MR. UNGLESBY: There's been a pretty lengthy debriefing from Mr. Caton by agents who are trained to find that, interested in what they had done and had studied up his businesses.

And he's been -- I think it's reflected in the documents, and I'm sure it's reflected by Mr. Regan verbally, that he answered all of their questions and no one's indicated that there's anything but truthfulness in everything he's done.

MR. REGAN: Right.

MR. UNGLESBY: So we don't see it as a problem because he doesn't have anything to be afraid of.

THE COURT: Okay. And, again, the amount of restitution that would come up under the guidelines, again that's not really going to be an issue because whether we think it's the right way to go or not, that's what the guidelines say about the total money that washes through.

MR. REGAN: Right.

MR. UNGLESBY: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. REGAN: And, Your Honor, just to continue because I think Mr. Caton may have hesitated a moment on this. It's part of the plea agreement that we did agree that we would not prosecute his wife if he pled guilty as well as not to prosecute

other members that were involved or involved in the business he 1 2 was in. I'm going to take that as employees whether 3 they're family members or not. 4 MR. REGAN: Yes, sir. We're not going after them. 5 And then the other, Your Honor, is the fines and so on 6 as the Court has instructed him. And basically this is the 7 substance of the entire plea agreement between the defendant, 8 Gregory James Caton, and the U.S. 9 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Unglesby, do you agree that 10 the substance of the plea agreement has been correctly stated? 11 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Caton, is that your understanding of 13 the substance of the plea agreement that you entered into with 14 the United States? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 16 THE COURT: And before you signed that document, the 17 plea agreement, were you able to go over it with Mr. Unglesby? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 19 Was he able to answer any questions you THE COURT: 20 might have had about the terms of the plea agreement? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 2.2 THE COURT: Do you have any questions at all about it 23 right now? 24

THE DEFENDANT:

25

No.

THE COURT: And that plea agreement was filed in the record of this proceeding prior, right, Mr. Regan?

MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor. You asked me to withhold it.

THE COURT: You introduced it and there was no objection. I said it would be in, but you didn't tender it to Ms. Jordan. You may do that at this time.

All of those documents were admitted without objection, right, Mr. Unglesby?

MR. UNGLESBY: Yes.

MR. REGAN: Your Honor, I would ask madam clerk to conform the affidavit of understanding of maximum penalty and constitutional rights with her signature and would ask the Court to affix its signature on the waiver of indictment and the consent decree of forfeiture. And the order will also need to be signed by the Court, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What you just said, there's several orders that she needs to present to me so I can sign so we can go through?

MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor, in the total plea packet right there.

THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Jordan, just make sure I do that before we leave the courtroom here.

Now, Mr. Caton, has anyone made any promises other than those that are contained in the plea agreement that induced you

to plead guilty in this matter, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the United States Sentencing Commission has issued guidelines for judges to follow in determining a criminal case. Have you and Mr. Unglesby talked about how the guidelines might apply in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And have you and Mr. Unglesby discussed the concept under the guidelines of relevant conduct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Regan, let me ask you this, because, again, I don't want to muddy the water, but I'm just trying to make sure I understand and that I understand that Mr. Caton understands.

This relevant conduct, how would that apply in this case? You indicated that by whatever the Bill of Information says, there's nine hundred and some thousand dollars total.

MR. REGAN: Right.

THE COURT: But my question becomes once Mr. Helo or his office gets involved in this and starts looking at the whole universe, is there likely to be other dollars that will be considered relevant conduct in connection with -- that would in fact increase the sentencing guidelines?

MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor.

2.0

THE COURT: All right. And I guess -- again without
trying ever to fence the government in, but it seems to me that's
a judicial admission you just made, that this is it, Judge?

MR. REGAN: Yes, sir.

1.3

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Caton, do you understand that the Court will not be able to determine a guideline sentence in your case until after the presentence report has been completed and you and the government have had the opportunity to challenge the facts reported by the probation officer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that after it has been determined what guideline applies to a case, I have the authority in some circumstances to impose a sentence that is more severe or less severe than the sentence called for by the guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that under some circumstances, you or the government may have the right to appeal any sentence that I impose?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that parole has been abolished, and if you are sentenced to prison, you will not be released on parole?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if the government -that if the government is agreeing not to prosecute other counts
or charges, this conduct might be considered in the presentence
report -- well, let me just back that out.

That's a standard question, Mr. Regan. I suppose that doesn't have anything to do with this case, does it?

MR. REGAN: The gun count?

THE COURT: Number 57 here, that when I ask about if you are agreeing not to prosecute any other charges, the other charges that the government said we aren't going to prosecute, that conduct might be considered in the presentence report and might increase your sentence under the guidelines. I think based on your representation as a judicial admission, there's no other matters -- I don't need to ask that question, do I?

MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor.

And if I may clarify one thing I said a minute ago. We intend to ask for no more money. So, again, the relevant conduct is at that level right now. The caveat is -- and it's in the plea agreement -- is that if we should discover money that has been secreted, then we would have to make that known to probation. I don't think that's going to happen.

THE COURT: Then that would be grounds for the government to say the plea agreement is out.

MR. REGAN: Right. It would. It would.

THE COURT: Okay.

1.3

MR. REGAN: But I don't anticipate we will. I think things will be okay, Your Honor.

and you may have been on the receiving end of this from me before, but, you know -- and I'm not suggesting you did this in this case, but shame on the government if the government ever negotiates anything as far as what the law says or the restitution because I rely on those folks as the arm of the court, not Article II, to tell me that.

MR. REGAN: Right.

THE COURT: But you didn't do that in this case?

MR. REGAN: To negotiate the what, sir?

THE COURT: What the loss was. What you're telling me right now, there's nothing else there. That's what I understand.

MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor. There's only -- and there's only restitution to one person, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Caton, has anyone made any prediction, prophecy, or promise to you as to what your sentence will be?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: No?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, Mr. Regan, in the plea packet there is a written summary of the government's evidence against the defendant. That's what you want me to use as a factual basis

1	for the guilty plea; is that correct?
2	MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Ms. Jordan, may I see the factual basis?
4	(PAUSE)
5	THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Caton, you signed the
6	stipulated factual basis for guilty plea, right?
7	You signed this stipulated factual basis. I mean, I'm
8	looking at the original that's been filed. I see your signature.
9	You did sign that; is that right?
10	THE DEFENDANT: I believe so.
11	THE COURT: Okay. I see your signature, Mr. Unglesby's
12	signature, and Mr. Regan's.
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
14	THE COURT: All right. Now, before you answer before
15	you signed that, were you able to go over it with Mr. Unglesby?
16	And if you'd like to look at it. I'm just going to
17	show you.
18	Ms. Jordan, give this to Mr. Unglesby and let him just
19	make sure Mr. Caton understands the document we're talking about.
20	(PAUSE)
21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I signed it.
22	THE COURT: All right. And before you signed that, you
23	went over it with Mr. Unglesby and he answered any questions you
24	might have had about it?
25	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

Is everything contained in that factual THE COURT: 1 basis true? 2 Yes, yes. THE DEFENDANT: 3 Okay. You started to say something or --THE COURT: 4 THE DEFENDANT: No. 5 I'm sorry? THE COURT: 6 MR. UNGLESBY: You asked him the question different 7 than it's written down, Judge. It threw him off. 8 THE COURT: Okay. I apologize for that. Sometimes I 9 It's probably not a good practice. do that. 1.0 But, Mr. Unglesby, based on the discussions that you 11 had before you and your client signed the stipulated factual 12 basis for guilty plea, do you believe everything based on his 13 representations to be true? 14 MR. UNGLESBY: Yes, it is. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Caton, do you have any disagreement at 16 all with anything contained in that factual statement? 17 THE DEFENDANT: No, except that I never -- I had no 18 intention to harm anyone. I believe in the products. I use the 19 products. My employees use the products. 20 If I could, we're going to take a brief THE COURT: 21 little recess. I'd just like to meet with these two lawyers over 22 23 here. And, Mr. Caton, you can go sit down at the table right 24

there for a moment.

25

Okay?

(RECESS) 1 All right. Mr. Caton, let me just ask you, THE COURT: 2 because I've looked -- one of the great things about this 3 technology, I can go back and look at the monitor and see what 4 you said. Help me with what you said. I think now rereading it 5 I do understand. 6 You said you didn't intend to hurt anybody and that you 7 use the products; is that right? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 9 THE COURT: And that's because in your view the 10 products wouldn't hurt anybody and you weren't trying to 11 physically hurt anybody; is that right? 12 THE DEFENDANT: That is correct. 13 THE COURT: Well, after having read the monitor, that's 14 what I thought. 15 Mr. Unglesby, is there anything else you'd like to ask 16 your client in regard to the question I just asked? 17 No, sir. MR. UNGLESBY: 18 THE COURT: Mr. Regan, anything? 19 MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor. 20 Okay. And so then that statement that you THE COURT: 21 just made and my understanding after reading it, Mr. Caton, I 22 take it you don't have any disagreement with the factual 23 Is that true? statement. 24

Correct.

THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: All right. Since you acknowledge that you're in fact guilty as charged, since you know your right to a trial, what the maximum possible punishment is, and since you are voluntarily pleading guilty, I'll accept your guilty plea and enter a judgment of guilty on your plea.

2.1

2.2

It is the finding of the Court in the case of <u>United</u>

<u>States of America vs. Gregory James Caton</u> that the defendant is fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea, and that his plea of guilty is a knowing and voluntary plea supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense. The plea is therefore accepted and the defendant is now adjudged guilty of that offense.

Now, Mr. Caton, I'm going to order a presentence investigation report on you. Mr. Ron Helo, the gentleman seated in the jury box, will be the United States Probation Officer assigned to your case. I urge you to cooperate with Mr. Helo in furnishing information for that report since the report will be important in my decision as to what your sentence will be.

You'll have the right to have Mr. Unglesby present with you when you give information to Mr. Helo if you wish. You'll also have the opportunity to read the presentence report before sentencing, and you and your lawyer can file any objections to that report based on any incorrect information you think or your lawyer thinks is contained therein, and you and your lawyer will be able to speak at the sentencing hearing.

Do you understand that, sir? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 All right. Now, the defendant -- how long THE COURT: 3 has the defendant been in custody if we've got that for the 4 Do we know? Anybody? 5 record? September 17th of 2003, Your Honor. MR. REGAN: 6 THE COURT: All right. And there was an appearance before one of the magistrate judges, I suppose. 8 Yes, Your Honor. MR. REGAN: 9 And that was -- that was -- the defendant THE COURT: 10 was ordered detained pending trial of the proceedings or whatever 11 happened. 12 What's the government's view on keeping him detained at 13 this time? 14 MR. REGAN: Your Honor, we'd ask for continued 15 detention. 16 THE COURT: Well, it seems to me with what he's pled 17 quilty to -- and I'm just trying to make sure I understand 18 because there was a different standard under the first charges 19 than there might be now. And I would -- under that criteria --2.0 and I don't have it right in front of me, but at the risk of 21 fleeing or danger to other folks or himself. 22 Yes, sir. MR. REGAN: 23 What's the basis for me keeping him? THE COURT: 24

MR. REGAN:

25

We're concerned about flight. He's now a

two-time convicted felon. Of course, it's not like he's looking at a hundred years. I understand that.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask just -- I know we've already gone through that and made it clear that -- or I made it clear and the defendant acknowledged that. I said nobody would know what the sentence would be, can't know until we get the presentence report, but I'm sure at some point there was some discussion, as you guys worked out a plea agreement, what the potential ranges, plural, might be.

What's the government's best view worst case scenario/best case scenario for the defendant under what you perceive the guidelines might be? And I'm going to ask
Mr. Unglesby if he agrees that that's the universe.

MR. REGAN: I think the most, Your Honor, that -- with my limited understanding of sentencing guidelines and looking at it, just a guess, it's 47 months, under five years.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Unglesby, is that pretty much your view? And this is one of those terrible officer of the court questions. Is that pretty much how you see it?

MR. UNGLESBY: Yes. I believe Mr. Regan said he thought that was the maximum and I agree with him.

THE COURT: What would be the low end?

MR. UNGLESBY: I think 41, Judge. The way we look at it is this way. We don't even have to -- I mean, guidelines are easy, but let's just max out at five years for a minute. That's

60. He's served nine. He has -- 85 percent is what he would have to serve under the absolutely most Draconian situation, which I don't believe would apply.

2.1

So you take those two together, the amount of time he's already served and knock off 15 percent if you want to make it 60 for the sake of argument. He's still significantly under five years. And I don't think Mr. Caton has any history of having fled, been difficult to find, or anything of that nature.

The reason he's pleading guilty, besides that he did wrong, is implicit in what he said today. Number one, he wants to save his wife and his employees from any prosecution, from any kind of conspiracy or other charges. He wants to save his house from any kind of forfeiture. And he has a young child that's how old, Greg?

THE DEFENDANT: Seven years old.

MR. UNGLESBY: A seven-year-old son, and he wants to get out of jail in time to help raise him. So the likelihood of Mr. Caton fleeing under normal human criteria is very, very small.

And I'll add in -- and I don't think Mr. Regan will disagree with me -- he doesn't have any money. You know, so he's not a man of means where if he had some sophisticated way to leave, he could. He's got a young child and he's got a wife who he's pleading guilty in order to try to save from a potential conspiracy charge involving these nutritional supplements that

were sold as medicine.

2.

And he's been completely debriefed in great detail and is still always available to be further debriefed as the government sees fit, but he's twice been completely debriefed by the FDA and their investigators as well as FBI agents as to all of his activities, his associations, and his business.

So I think that, you know, today the United States
Government knows far more perhaps about Mr. Caton than they did
on the day they first raided his house.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Regan, let me ask you, is there anything in this defendant's record as far as the government knows that might fit that other criteria that he'd be dangerous to anybody?

MR. REGAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And what was the offense -- I think Mr. Unglesby mentioned it earlier, that he was a previously convicted felon.

MR. REGAN: It was counterfeiting, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And one other question. And I think it's completely appropriate at this time unless you tell me there's some other information you're going to bring to my attention in the way of cooperation. I think it's completely appropriate at this time for me to excuse everybody from the courtroom.

Since he's the one that made the information available

to you, obviously -- and this is a proceeding concerning him.

His lawyer needs to be here. But I would ask everyone else

except the government employees -- and that would be the wife

even and the friend.

Is there anybody that's here -- I see a number of folks with these agencies. Are there any of them that should not be privy to this because you say national security and that really gets my interest, because if it doesn't relate to this case, they don't need to know either.

MR. REGAN: It doesn't relate to this case.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm going to ask all of you guys to please excuse yourselves, too.

And, Ms. Jordan, I'm going to ask you to turn the microphone off so nobody in the building can hear what we're doing.

Now, we've got a lawyer over there with the FDA. You don't have to -- you're a lawyer. You can stay here unless you say let me get out of here.

(COURTROOM CLOSED)

Now, Ms. Jordan, you have turned off the microphones so nobody can hear us. The microphone is off, right, Ms. Jordan?

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. And for the record all of the non-government people that were in the room, including the government's case agent or whatever else on this case -- I want

to know what you're talking about on this national security thing because that may present an issue for me to consider, too, if there's anybody out there wanting to hurt this man.

MR. REGAN: Your Honor, we can -- I can state unequivocally, based upon my conversations with the agent that debriefed him, that unless Mr. Caton were to flee to Russia, he has no problems.

THE COURT: With this other national security issue?

MR. REGAN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And in due course you're going to let me -I don't need to know that. You're representing to me, Judge,
that's not an issue. That shouldn't keep him in jail to protect
him from whoever the bad guys are.

MR. REGAN: Right. Yes, Your Honor.

And just as a matter of record, I mean, if this Court determines that the prerequisites of 18 USC 1341 or 1341 et seq. don't apply here, I'm not going to jump up and down, I mean, if you want to release him.

We just had concerns based upon the fact that when he
-- after having been convicted, knowing he was a convicted felon,
we removed eight or nine weapons from the house and over 10,000
rounds of ammunition and documents and so on.

Mr. Caton is a very bright person, but also Mr. Caton at the time of the millennium honestly believed that the world was going to come crumbling down, and a lot of people did.

THE COURT: A lot of people did.

2.4

MR. REGAN: And so in an effort to protect what he felt would happen and to protect his family, he more or less fortified sections of his house, had a well put in -- or it may have already been there, a fresh water well in the yard. He filled up gasoline -- a 55-gallon drum with gasoline supposedly around his business place to set it off because he felt that when the collapse came, there would be rascals that would be coming to take food and water. That would be the currency.

I mean, it just kind of frightened some folks, okay, I mean, that itself, that many guns and that many weapons. And that was based upon -- at the time that he was arrested, we did retrieve visas showing that he had been to Russia on at least two occasions. Is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Twice.

MR. REGAN: And we felt as though -- we didn't know for sure -- in fact, at the time we seized some of the records, we -- and later I think to find out that it was part of a business venture he was trying to set up. There were moneys which had been disbursed to different places outside the United States, and we felt as though at that time he might indeed be a risk of flight and he might also be a danger, you know. So he was detained at that time. I cannot say -- I cannot give the Court any evidence to show that he's a risk of flight, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I have to assume -- and I may be wrong,

but I have to assume with whatever this actual national security issue is, that the government -- and you correct me if I'm wrong -- would not have allowed him to plead to a Bill of Information with all these weapons and all this other stuff if they had any reason to think that he was a threat to himself or anybody else of this country.

MR. REGAN: You're correct on that, Your Honor. You're correct on that. You know, obviously the event didn't happen, the millennium bug didn't happen, and I think things kind of calmed down, at least in his mind and his wife's mind about things.

Nevertheless, the weapons were there, 10,000 rounds of ammunition, and, you know, that was why those charges came up, but I'm not here telling you that I think --

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. REGAN: -- he's going to run or that he's a danger.

I can't prove that. I can't give you any evidence.

So if the Court decides that he needs to be released on bond -- nor I do not feel that he has any personal threat against him by anything that he has done.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Unglesby, do you want to say something?

MR. UNGLESBY: Only, Judge, again, at the time we didn't know a lot of things that we know now, I mean, "we" being both sides. And I'll say this -- and Mr. Regan can correct me if

I'm wrong.

I think subsequent investigation revealed two relevant facts. None of those guns had ever been loaded, much less fired. They were exactly as they were when they had been bought back in 1999.

Secondly, none of the ammunition had ever been broken open or transport -- you know, anything. It was all just like it was. Secondly, I don't think we knew that at the time that it was bought from a police officer in Lake Charles who knew Mr. Caton had been convicted of a felony.

Had there been a trial, the defense -- and legally I don't know how far I could have gone with it, but the defense was actually the guns were titled in his wife's name. I mean, that's true.

There was some dispute as to whether that makes any difference because he was present, under their theory, at the time they were purchased and played a role in having them purchased and, therefore, as a convicted felon violated the law.

But in terms of your normal felon in possession of a firearm to continue to be a felon or to endanger folks in some fashion or need, you know, want to carry a gun because you're engaged in activity that requires you to be protecting yourself, I think we all pretty much now know that Greg Caton was -- the gun served the same purpose as the 5,000 pounds they found of dried food and beans in his locker at his house as well as the

windmill with the gigantic water cistern that he dug in his backyard right in the middle of a neighborhood. I mean, he just thought that he was -- he was into that issue.

THE COURT: And let me say this. I understand. And had I taken that tact and thought that this was really the end, I would have -- I always thought about that as like, well, if you're one of the few folks that planned for it, everybody else that didn't plan for it is going to be all over your case. So they're going to be coming after you to get the food or the water or whatever else you had. So I always understood that.

Now, again, one other question, though. Is that pretty much what you understand, that all these weapons there had never been used, never been opened, the ammunition and all that stuff?

MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, Mr. Caton had never been convicted or never taken part in any criminal activity of a violent nature.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's get these other folks back in here because I'm going to say some stuff that may concern Mrs. Caton.

(COURTROOM OPENED)

THE COURT: All right. Everybody back in the court from the government's perspective that you want back here so they can hear what I'm going to do so they don't chew on you if I do something they don't like?

MR. REGAN: No. Everybody is here that can be here.

1.0

2.2

The others will be back in time, Your Honor. They probably went to the office. We can start without them. I have everybody here I need.

THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Jordan, just in case
-- because we do have public hearings and we always have the
microphone on. The microphone can go back on now.

Now, I am convinced based on what was said on the record here during the time that I asked those folks to excuse themselves, except the government employees here and the defendant and his attorney, are that, one, Mr. Caton is not a danger to anyone.

And I understand exactly why the magistrate judge at the initial detention hearing with the charges then pending would have taken the position that he did, but that was a different universe ago.

Now, as to the issue of whether or not he's a flight risk, I have to go in a general sense with what Mr. Unglesby said. I mean, life experience would tell me this man is not going anywhere based on what he's done in this case and what he's trying to preserve for his wife and his child. That's what my 58 plus years on the planet would lead me to believe.

However, I have a couple of questions of Mr. Unglesby, and maybe he knows and maybe Mr. Caton knows or maybe Mrs. Caton knows.

Mr. Unglesby, this house that the defendant was

2.2

interested in making sure it didn't get into the long reach of
the government as far as collecting assets as a result of the
plea I just accepted, how much of that -- how much is that house
worth?

1.3

2.0

MR. UNGLESBY: Judge, the house was appraised in the late 90's for \$123,000. It has an \$85,000 mortgage on it. It's had some improvements on it, but I can confirm \$123,000 because that was an appraisal five years ago.

You know, there's nothing -- I've been to the house. There's nothing in the neighborhood or anything to indicate any degradation. So I'd think that that's -- at least it's still worth that.

THE COURT: And the house is in the wife's name or is it in both names?

THE DEFENDANT: It's in my wife's name.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Regan, so we don't get in an issue down the road, the government knows that, that it's in the wife's name right now and that's not an issue in this case?

MR. REGAN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Where is the house,

Mr. Unglesby? You've been to it. Where is it physically located
so I'll understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, the address is 1139 Hodges.

It's about a mile or two from downtown Lake Charles, less than a mile from the federal court building on Broad Street.

THE COURT: And my perception from what you just said, 1 that would be an older section of town? 2 THE DEFENDANT: The Sharpentia (phonetic) district. 3 I'm sorry? THE COURT: Sharpentia. THE DEFENDANT: 5 Spell it for the court reporter. Okay? THE COURT: THE DEFENDANT: Just put the garden district. 7 Okay. And, again, what kind of, Mr. Caton, THE COURT: improvements have y'all made on it since '99? 9 THE DEFENDANT: The bathrooms -- there hadn't been much 10 done to them since 1946 when the home was built. 11 completely redid those. We gutted out the garage and, you know, 12 put in a jacuzzi and closed it in so it's a completely enclosed 13 14 area. Hardwood floors have been added. A lot of interior 15 It's really hard to describe. There's a lot of little 16 things such as tearing up all the tile in the kitchen. We're 17 totally remodeling the kitchen and putting down ceramic tile and 18 ceramic tile in both the upstairs and downstairs bathrooms and 19 completely remodeling those. 2.0 THE COURT: And the mortgage is \$85,000? 21 It's with Gulf Coast Bank in THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 22 Abbeville. 23 THE COURT: And how much was the mortgage for when you 24 first placed it on the property? 25

THE DEFENDANT: It's floating because what we did was we -- for soybean.com, my food company, there was an additional line of credit when inventory was needed.

So it was a floater. It's not like this thing you get and then it's amortized over, let's say, a ten- or a twenty-year period. It floats in accordance with what you borrow. Currently the outstanding principal balance is about \$85,000 if I recall. I'd have to ask my wife. It's about \$85,000 right now.

THE COURT: Okay. As far as you know, you're in good standing with the bank and paying whatever they want every month and there's no issues on that as far as you know?

THE DEFENDANT: I'll speak more broadly than that. My financial reputation on all levels is impeccable. I have R4's all over my credit reports at every conceivable level, whether it be my personal credit reports or the reports of my company or anything filed with the Better Business Bureau. I made my livelihood off my reputation.

THE COURT: Okay. Mrs. Caton, I'd like for you to come up here if you would.

And, Mr. Unglesby, I'm not going to ask her anything about this case, and while you represent Mr. Caton and not her, any reason why she shouldn't be administered the oath to answer some questions?

MR. UNGLESBY: No.

THE COURT: Mrs. Caton, your full name, please.

MRS. CATON: Katherine Caton. 1 THE COURT: And how long have you and Mr. Caton been 2 married? 3 Since '93. MRS. CATON: 4 And you have one child, I believe? THE COURT: 5 MRS. CATON: One child. 6 Where does that child go to school? THE COURT: 7 MRS. CATON: Hamilton Christian. 8 Hamilton Christian. And what grade is he THE COURT: 9 10 in? Second. He just finished the second. MRS. CATON: 11 Today was the last day. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Now, you've heard your husband 13 answer questions that I asked him about the value of the house. 14 Do you have anything to add about what you think the 15 value of the house is, and do you know anything of your own 16 knowledge that he might not? 17 MRS. CATON: Everything he said was correct. 18 THE COURT: And in your neighborhood, are there other 19 houses that are older houses like yours that people are starting 20 to renovate and bring up? 21 MRS. CATON: Correct. 22 THE COURT: And when I hear garden district, I can 23 think of New Orleans. I can think of Alexandria. I can even 24 Those are older neighborhoods that have started think of Monroe. 25

to come back because people are starting to bring them back generally in my experience.

Is that what you're thinking this area in Lake Charles is?

MRS. CATON: Correct.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Regan, I don't want to ask you any more than general information. The garden district in Lake Charles that you referred to or this other area -- and I've forgotten what you called it, but is that generally what's going on in that area to your knowledge?

MR. REGAN: Yes, Your Honor. And I'm not a real estate agent, but I have purchased a home in the last five years or six years. And I think basically the statement that the home is at least worth a hundred and twenty some odd thousand dollars, I would have no hesitation telling the Court right now I think it probably is.

I've been in the home also. It's a two-story home. It is in one of the older districts. Some places have been torn down. Other people, professionals, have come in and they've refurbished. So I think \$123,000 is probably a very good appraisal of what that house could sell for.

THE COURT: Being on the conservative side?

MR. REGAN: On the conservative side, yes, sir. I would think you could get \$123,000.

THE COURT: Mrs. Caton, let me ask you this. One of

the reasons your husband entered into this agreement with the 1 government, according to what he said and I think what 2 Mr. Unglesby said, was to make sure the house was saved. 3 Correct. MRS. CATON: 4 The house is in your name. How long has it THE COURT: 5 been in your name? 6 MRS. CATON: Maybe five or six years. I don't know 7 exactly. 8 Okay. My question to you, ma'am -- and is THE COURT: 9 it right that you owe about \$85,000 on it? 10 MRS. CATON: Correct. 11 And I may have to ask Mr. Caton to help you THE COURT: 12 or maybe you know. This floating mortgage, what's the most you 13 could borrow from the bank against this floating mortgage? 14 Ninety. MRS. CATON: 15 THE COURT: Ninety. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Maybe I can add to that. 17 Come on up, sir. THE COURT: 18 To get the interest that I wanted, I THE DEFENDANT: 19 had to have a low debt to equity ratio. So I didn't ask for 20 anywhere close to what I could get from it. I asked for 90 even 21 though I could have easily gotten 120. 2.2 And even Jennifer Monise (phonetic) -- well, it's now 23 Jennifer Meaux, the loan officer of that Gulf Coast Bank there on 24

State Street in Abbeville. She indicated I could borrow

considerably more, but the debt to equity ratio also determines
how favorable your interest. So I wanted better interest terms.

So I only took it to \$90,000.

THE COURT: I understand. But the next question -- you can just stand there next to your wife.

The next question I have is -- well, two questions that are important to me because, based on what was said while y'all were out of the room and everything I've seen up to now, I don't think your husband presents any threat to anybody.

MRS. CATON: Correct.

THE COURT: But -- go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: The last time I discharged a firearm -and I can say this because I remember it distinctly -- was at a
firing range while I was a reservist in 1979. That is the last
time I have ever fired -- discharged a firearm. That could be a
small arm, that could be an M16, whatever it was. It was in
1979.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I say it with the idea that I'm still under oath.

THE COURT: I understand and I appreciate that, you telling me that.

Now, the question I have for you is there's another issue that a judge in my position has to consider, the potential for a defendant fleeing.

Now, I choose to believe right now that Mr. Caton is not going anywhere.

MRS. CATON: He's not.

2.4

THE COURT: All right. But the question I have for you is as the owner of that house, will you agree to two things, one, to ensure his appearance at the sentencing of this case?

MRS. CATON: Yes.

THE COURT: If I release him on a bond, let that bond be secured by your house. And, two, even though you could go back and borrow another \$5,000 with that bank, don't borrow any more money. Can you agree to that?

MRS. CATON: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Mr. Caton, you being in some role, even though it's maybe against your own interest, I'm going to assume you have at least played a role in being the manager of the reason. Is there any reason that would put such an onerous burden on your wife if she did, in fact, do those two things?

THE DEFENDANT: No. It wouldn't put an onerous burden on her, but may I add something, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: I was never a flight risk. I was given complete -- the first charge that happened, which I don't want to get into that counterfeiting thing. That's another boondoggle that I won't get into, but I was free on my own recognizance. I was looking at a lot more time in that situation than I was in

this given the nature of it. I wasn't a flight risk in 1990 and I'm certainly not a flight risk today. I never was from the very beginning.

THE COURT: And like I told you earlier when you were having a hard time in the beginning -- or I was having a hard time with your answers. I'm just trying to do my job. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, what I'm going to do, I'm going to allow the defendant, after a \$75,000 bond has been posted based on using the house as security for the bond, because, based on what I've heard here, I think it could be secured by that.

I'm putting it at \$75,000 because I think the extra value there, in the event it was ever needed, would be a deterrent. I realize that if for whatever good reason it only brought \$50,000 dollars, which it easily would, that would still be sufficient for the purposes of what I'm setting a bond for.

Second of all, I'm going to -- a condition of that bond is that even though Mrs. Caton might be able to go back to the bank in Abbeville and draw down another \$5,000 against that floating loan, that she agrees not to do it. That's a specific condition of the bond, that she not do that, and I think she said she's agreed to do that.

I'm going to ask her again if she agrees -- if she understands, first of all, what I've just said as to both issues, one, to use the house, and, two, to not go and get any more

money.

2.2

MRS. CATON: I agree.

THE COURT: And you agree to that?

MRS. CATON: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, I would hope -- and I don't know how long it's going to take, because that's not what I do, to get this paperwork done. You can't do it today, so he's not going home tonight, but I can't imagine why it would take more than a day to do that.

Mr. Regan, I don't know how that works.

MR. REGAN: I don't either. I think -- I think I've only seen this happen one time before in federal court and that was in Lake Charles where somebody had to put up their house. They have to work through the clerk of court's office. That's all I know.

THE COURT: Well, I will tell you this. I know Howard Parker knows how to do it because in that murder for hire trial he had and I let one of those guys go, that's what they did. So I don't know what we do.

And, Mr. Unglesby, you've been representing folks for a lot of years. Maybe you've had this happen all the time. This is the second or third time I've ever done it in ten years.

Mr. Regan says it's only the second time he's seen it.

MR. UNGLESBY: What normally happens, Your Honor, is we get the documents from the court which say that the bond is as

you've set it out and the conditions of the bond.

She goes to the sheriff's office -- excuse me -- to the assessor's office in Lake Charles and they give her a validation of the assessment.

THE COURT: Excuse me just a minute. Call Cathy right now and see if she's there. Cathy is the deputy in charge.

Maybe she can help us.

Go ahead, Mr. Unglesby.

MR. UNGLESBY: Then she takes that to the sheriff and he approves the bond. He approves that this house is worth -- has that much equity, \$75,000. Then she posts that like a mortgage right there at the courthouse.

Now, I think then in the federal system she brings all of those documents to the marshal and he approves that they're correct, and if he thinks they're correct, then he releases the prisoner. If he doesn't think they're correct, he tells her what's wrong with them and she goes back and fixes it.

THE COURT: Ms. Jordan, is Cathy there?

THE CLERK: (SHAKING HEAD)

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. UNGLESBY: But we'll work on this tomorrow. We'll get it right.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anybody down there, Paula, that might know?

THE CLERK: I'm seeing if Charlotte knows anything.

2.0

2.1

In a perfect world, Mrs. Caton, I'd get him THE COURT: 1 out of there today, but we don't live in a perfect world. 2 MRS. CATON: God bless you. 3 Thank you very much for that. THE COURT: 4 Magistrate judges are always smarter than district 5 judges and I'm saying that for the record. Who's the magistrate 6 on this case? Do we have one? Who was the magistrate? 7 Magistrate Wilson, Your Honor. MR. REGAN: 8 THE COURT: I'm in Lafayette now and I'm going to be 9 using one of our guys. 10 It was Mike Hill when we started here. MR. UNGLESBY: 11 When we came to Lafayette, it was Mike Hill. 12 THE COURT: Why don't you call Judge Hill? 13 it's 5040. Is that right? Who are you getting, Charlotte? 14 They say Greta would know. 15 THE CLERK: THE COURT: Greta would know. Oh, okay. Well, let's 16 just hang on a minute. 17 Why don't you call Judge Hill right now if he's still 18 If he is, I want to talk to him, and if he's not, call 19 Judge Methvin. 20 Now, we've got the clerk employee coming up here with a 21 packet of something. So we're going to look at it and figure it 22 out a little bit. And, again, we're still jumping the gun. It's 23

going to be tomorrow I'm sure, but, anyhow, we're going to figure

24

25

that out.

Now, let me just go ahead. We'll finish the business 1 I've said what I need to say on that. we need. 2 What's the sentencing date for Mr. Caton? 3 August 24th, 2004, at two o'clock. THE CLERK: 4 All right. The sentencing date, Mr. THE COURT: 5 Unglesby, Mr. Regan, is August the 24th at two o'clock. 6 All right. Let's just go ahead and let me just say 7 this and then I think we can go off the record. 8 Judge Hill is coming up here and we've got the 9 courtroom deputy here, I believe. Between the two of them, maybe 10 they can train me. 11 So is there anything else we need to do on the record 12 here from the government's perspective? 13 Not from the government, Your Honor. 14 Mr. Unglesby. THE COURT: 15 16 MR. UNGLESBY: No, sir. All right. And one other thing I wanted to THE COURT: 17 put in there. 18 And this is important, Mrs. Caton. 19 Mr. Caton, you need to understand this, too. 20 21 I expect Mr. Caton to report to pretrial services as I instructed earlier so we can get this presentence report 22 prepared. I'm going to also instruct you to report every week to 23 the probation office in Lake Charles, or they may want to come to 24

your house, whatever they say, but that would be once a week, Mr.

Caton. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: That would be between now and the date of the sentencing. THE DEFENDANT: I understand. THE COURT: Okay. And I'm not sure I understand the benefit of getting the opportunity to self-report, but after your sentence, it would be my intention, assuming you've abided by all of these conditions, that I'll allow you to self-report. I think you get some benefit within the Bureau of Prisons. It will help you. So I'm inclined to do that as long as you do everything you're supposed to do between now and the date of sentencing. Okay? THE DEFENDANT: I understand, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We're off the record.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA 2 LAFAYETTE-OPELOUSAS DIVISION 3 4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 5 DOCKET NUMBER 04-20075 6 vs. GREGORY JAMES CATON 7 8 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 9 I, LaRae E. Bourque, Official Court Reporter for the 10 United States District Court, Western District of Louisiana, 11 do hereby certify that the foregoing 72 pages are a true and 12 accurate transcript of the proceedings had in this matter, 13 as hereabove set forth, and that I have no interest of any 14 nature whatsoever regarding the ultimate disposition of this 15 litigation. 16 I further certify that the transcript fees and format 17 comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial 18 Conference of the United States. 19 20 21 22 LARAE E. BOURQUE, Official Court Reporter 23

24