## P33EGUOC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 23 Cr. 118 (AT) v. 5 MILES GUO, 6 Conference Defendant. 7 8 New York, N.Y. 9 March 3, 2025 1:00 p.m. 10 11 Before: 12 HON. ANALISA TORRES, 13 District Judge 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 MATTHEW PODOLSKY United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 BY: JUSTIN HORTON 17 JULIANA MURRAY RYAN FINKEL 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant 20 BY: SABRINA SHROFF SIDHARADHA KAMARAJU 21 E. SCOTT SCHIRICK 22 Also Present: 23 Tua Wong, Interpreter (Mandarin) 24 25

1 (Case called)
2 MR. HORTON: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Justin Horton, Juliana Murray, and Ryan Finkel for the government.

MS. SHROFF: Good afternoon, your Honor.

On behalf of Miles Guo, Sabrina Shroff, Sid Kamaraju, and Scott Schirick.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

I would like the interpreter to please identify himself.

THE INTERPRETER: Good morning, your Honor.

Mandarin interpreter Tua Wong.

THE COURT: And I'd like my law clerk to swear the interpreter, please.

(Interpreter sworn)

THE COURT: On December 10 last year, I received a letter from Mr. Guo's attorneys seeking leave to withdraw as counsel. Following a hearing on the matter on December 20, I received a copy of Mr. Guo's CJA Form 23, Financial Affidavit. I received the affidavit on January 1.

By email, dated January 6 of this year, I directed the government to opine on Mr. Guo's financial eligibility for appointment of counsel. On January 13, I received a letter from the government in which the government stated that it was "unable to take a position on Mr. Guo's eligibility for

publicly funded counsel" without first reviewing Mr. Guo's financial affidavit.

By email, dated January 14, I disclosed Mr. Guo's financial affidavit to the government pursuant to the Second Circuit's guidance in *United States v. Harris*, 707 F.2d 653, 662 (2d Cir. 1983), in which the Second Circuit discouraged the use of sealed *ex parte* proceedings to inquire into a defendant's eligibility for the appointment of counsel. I then directed the government to opine on Mr. Guo's financial eligibility. In a letter dated January 21, the government set forth its position to which --

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I apologize, but the interpreting equipment is not functioning properly.

(Counsel, defendant, and interpreter confer)

THE COURT: So, we're contacting the interpreter's office in order to get functioning equipment. We'll take a pause.

(Recess)

(Resumed)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Is the equipment functioning now?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All righty then.

By letter dated January 21, the government set forth its position with respect to Mr. Guo's eligibility. Mr. Guo

responded to that letter on January 28.

The correspondence I've just described has not yet been filed on the public docket. I would like to hear from the parties as to whether the letters exchanged with the Court from December 10 through January 28, including Mr. Guo's financial affidavit, may be filed on the public docket, and, if so, whether they should be filed publicly or not.

I'll start with the government.

MR. HORTON: Thank you, your Honor.

These documents should be on the public docket. They go to a matter of great public concern. We've included, I think, in all three of our letters our view that they should be docketed. And in terms of authority, we cited to Judge Furman's opinion in the Avenatti case, which goes on at great length about the need for public adversary proceedings for these questions.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, in keeping with the practice of this courthouse, financial affidavits executed by defendants seeking assigned counsel, as the government knows, are not made public in 99.9 percent of the cases. To the extent that Mr. Guo's financial affidavit was accompanied by publicly filed documents, we do not have objection to those publicly filed documents being on the docket.

I would have to go back and look at our January 28 filing to see if it's in need of redaction, but to the extent

## P33EGUOC

that there is discussion of the law and non-privileged statements made, we would have no objection to filing it on the docket.

THE COURT: So, do you want to make a submission to me then?

MS. SHROFF: Yes, please.

THE COURT: By when?

MS. SHROFF: Within a week.

THE COURT: All right then.

All right. I will now address matters that concern solely Mr. Guo and his attorneys. Because these are sensitive matters appropriate for ex parte proceedings, I will excuse the attorneys for the government and any members of the public who are in the courtroom. I will invite you to return when the ex parte matter is concluded.

(Pages 6-7 SEALED)

(Continued on next page)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

1 (In open court; all parties present)

THE COURT: The ex parte portion of today's proceeding has concluded and the attorneys for the government have returned to the courtroom.

Defense counsel's motion to withdraw as counsel remains pending, and I am going to resolve that as soon as possible.

Sentencing in this matter remains adjourned until further notice.

Are there any applications?

MR. HORTON: May I have just one second, your Honor? (Counsel confer)

MR. HORTON: Thank you, your Honor.

We'd ask to the extent there is any additional submissions or things that would be helpful for the government to provide the Court, that the Court provide some sense of the process for that today, including so that we can endeavor to make any submissions that we might think would be useful.

THE COURT: I wish I could find a way to make the government useful in this process, but it would not be appropriate.

MR. HORTON: Thank you, your Honor.

Anything further from the defense?

MS. SHROFF: No, your Honor.

Thank you.

P33EGUOC

THE COURT: All righty. The matter is adjourned. MR. KAMARAJU: Thank you, your Honor. Have a good afternoon. (Adjourned)