

MAY 15 2008

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
HARRISONBURG DIVISION**

JOHN F. CORCORAN, CLERK
BY: 
DEPUTY CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	CASE No. 5:07cr00063-8
Plaintiff)	
v.)	REPORT AND
)	RECOMMENDATION
)	
ISIDRO HERNANDEZ-HERNANDEZ,)	
)	By: Hon. James G. Welsh
Defendant)	U.S. Magistrate Judge
)	

The Grand Jury previously returned a Superseding Indictment (“Indictment”) charging this defendant in **Count One** with knowingly combining, conspiring, confederating, and agreeing with diverse persons, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to manufacture, distribute, and possess with the intent to distribute, more than five kilograms of a mixture or substance containing Cocaine HCL or more than fifty (50) grams of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (commonly called “crack”), Schedule II narcotic controlled substances, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1) and 841(b)(1)(A), all in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 846; in **Count Sixty-One** with the aiding and abetting and with the knowing and willful distribution and possession with intent to distribute, more than five hundred (500) grams of a mixture or substance containing Cocaine HCL, a Schedule II controlled substance, on or about November 15, 2007, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1) and 841(b)(1)(A), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2; in **Count Sixty-Three** with being an alien illegally in the United States on or about November 15, 2007 and with the knowing and intentional possession or receipt of a firearm which had previously moved in interstate commerce, in violation of Title 18, United

States Code, Sections 922(g)(5) and 922(a)(2); in **Count Sixty-Four** with using and carrying a firearm in relation to the drug trafficking crime described in Count One, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 924(c); in **Count Sixty-Six** with being an alien illegally in the United States on or about November 15, 2007 and with the knowing and intentional possession or receipt of a second firearm which had previously moved in interstate commerce, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 922(g)(5) and 922(a)(2); and in **Count Sixty-Seven** with using and carrying a second firearm in relation to the drug trafficking crime described in Count One, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 924(c).

The defendant was previously arraigned and entered pleas of Not Guilty to each of these charges. The defendant having now indicated an intent to change one or more of his pleas, this case was referred to the undersigned for the purpose of conducting a plea hearing in accordance with the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(3).

The plea hearing was conducted before the undersigned on April 28, 2008. The defendant was at all times present in person and with his counsel, Roger A. Inger. The United States was represented by Donald R. Wolthus, Assistant United States Attorney. The proceedings were recorded by a court reporter. *See* Rule 11(g), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Also present was a properly qualified Spanish language interpreter for the defendant whom the defendant could understand and who could understand him. *See* Rule 28.

With the defendant's informed and written consent, the undersigned made a Rule 11 inquiry; the government presented an oral proffer of evidence for the purpose of establishing an independent basis for the pleas, and the defendant entered pleas of guilty to Counts One and Sixty-Four of the Indictment.

A. DEFENDANT'S RESPONSES TO RULE 11 INQUIRY

The defendant was placed under oath and addressed personally in open court. He expressly acknowledged that he was obligated to testify truthfully in all respects under penalty of perjury and that he understood the government's right, in a prosecution for perjury or false statement, to use against him any statement that he gives under oath. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(A).

The defendant testified that his full legal name is Isidro Hernandez-Hernandez, that he is twenty-two (22) years of age, that he completed high school and had some additional schooling in Mexico, that he can neither read nor write English, and that his understanding of English is very limited. He testified, however, that he is able to understand and participate fully in the proceedings with the assistance of the Spanish language interpreter. He denied having any medical condition, either physical or mental, which might interfere with his ability to understand and participate fully in the proceedings; he similarly denied using any medication or drugs which might impair his ability to understand and participate fully in the proceedings, and he stated that his mind was clear. Counsel for the defendant represented that he had no reservations about the defendant's competency to change his pleas and to enter pleas of guilty to the offenses charged in Counts One and Sixty-Four.

The defendant testified that he had discussed the charges with his attorney and that he had previously received a copy of the Indictment against him and that it had been fully translated and read to him. He testified that he understood each of the charges against him, and he understood that each was a felony. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(G). He also testified that he had discussed any defenses he might have and had been given adequate time to prepare any defenses he might have to the charges contained in the Indictment. He stated that he was fully satisfied with the services of his attorney, and that it was his intention and desire to change his prior pleas and to enter pleas of guilty to two of the charges pending against him.

The defendant confirmed that he fully recognized and understood his right to have the Rule 11 hearing conducted by a United States district judge, and he gave his verbal and written consent to proceed with the hearing before the undersigned United States magistrate judge. The defendant's written consent ¹ was filed and made a part of the record.

The attorney for the government informed the court that the defendant's proposed pleas were to be made pursuant to a written plea agreement. The government's understanding of the plea agreement was then stated in some detail, including: an outline of the charges against this defendant set forth in the Indictment and the range of punishment for each (§ 1); the defendant's agreement to plead guilty to the charges set forth in Counts One ² and Sixty-Four (§ 2); the defendant's

¹ Before executing his written consent, it was fully translated and read to the defendant by the interpreter.

² Counsel for the government noted for the record that this defendant's personal involvement in the conspiracy was limited to activities pertaining to the distribution of powdered cocaine (cocaine HCL).

acknowledgment of the maximum and applicable mandatory minimum sentences for the offenses set forth in Counts One and Sixty-Four (¶ 2); the government's agreement to request the dismissal of the remaining charges against this defendant at the time of sentencing (¶ 3); the parties' agreement to be bound by the court's factual determination of drug weight for purposes of Guideline sections 2D1.1 and 1B1.3 (¶ 4); the agreement's provision pertaining to the defendant's offense role (¶ 5); the acceptance of responsibility" provision (¶ 6); the defendant's obligation to pay a Two Hundred Dollar (\$200.00) special assessment (¶ 7); the provision relating to any proffer of evidence by the defendant (¶ 8); the defendants's duty to provide a financial statement (¶ 9); the terms of the defendant's waiver of his right to appeal either his conviction or any sentencing guideline issues (¶ 10); the terms of the defendant's waiver of his rights to attack collaterally either his conviction or any part of the sentence which might be imposed by the court (¶ 11); the terms of the defendant's waiver of any right to access investigation or prosecution records (¶ 12); the agreement's substantial assistance provision (¶ 16); the agreement's provisions pertaining to the forfeiture of assets and contraband (¶¶ 13 and 17); and the substance of the agreements other terms (¶¶ 14, and 18 through 21).

Counsel for the defendant and the defendant then separately stated that their understanding of the plea agreement was the same as that set forth by the government's attorney. Counsel for the defendant further represented that all of the terms of the plea agreement had been translated and reviewed with the defendant and that he was satisfied that the defendant understood each of its terms. The defendant was then shown the original of the plea agreement; and he affirmed it to be his signature on the document, and he confirmed that it had been previously fully translated and read to

him. In addition, he stated that no one had made any other, different or additional promise or assurance of any kind in a effort to induce him to enter a plea of guilty in this case and that no one had attempted in any way to force him to plead guilty. The plea agreement was then received, filed, and made a part of the record, and the undersigned noted for the record that the written Plea Agreement constituted the best statement of its terms, and as such it “speaks for itself.”

The defendant testified that he knew his pleas, if accepted, would result in him being adjudged guilty of two felony offenses and that such adjudication may deprive him of valuable civil rights, such as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess any kind of firearm. He also expressly acknowledged that he was proposing to enter pleas of guilty to Counts One and Sixty-Four of the Indictment which charged him with the specific conspiracy and firearms offenses set forth above and also set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the written plea agreement.

After the attorney for the government stated the mandatory minimum penalty provided by law for the offense charged in Count One of the Indictment and the mandatory minimum enhanced penalty provided by law for the offense charged in Count Sixty-Four of the Indictment, the defendant acknowledged unequivocally that he understood ten (10) years imprisonment to be the mandatory minimum penalty³ which the court would be required to impose if his plea of guilty is accepted to Count One and that he understood an enhanced penalty of five (5) years imprisonment to be the

³ The defendant was informed that a sentence of less than the mandatory minimum, however, was possible only if the government in its discretion chose to make a motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) on his behalf.

mandatory minimum penalty which the court would be required to impose if his plea of guilty is accepted to Count Sixty-Four. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(I).

After the attorney for the government stated the maximum possible penalties provided by law for the offenses charged in Counts One and Sixty-Four of the Indictment, the defendant expressly acknowledged that he understood the maximum possible penalty provided by law for conviction of the felony set forth in Count One of the Indictment to be confinement in a Federal penitentiary for the remainder of his life, and a \$4,000,000.00 fine, and the maximum possible penalty provided by law for conviction of the felony set forth in Count Sixty-Four of the Indictment to be confinement in a Federal penitentiary for the remainder of his life, and a \$250,000.00 fine. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(H). He also stated that he knew that he would be required to pay a mandatory Two Hundred Dollar (\$200.00) special assessment. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(L).

The defendant was informed, and he expressly acknowledged, that the court's determination of his sentence would include consideration of multiple factors, including: the nature and circumstances of the offense; the defendant's history and characteristics; the seriousness of the offense; the need to promote respect for the law; the need to provide for just punishment and afford adequate deterrence; the need to protect the public; any determined need to provide the defendant with educational or vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most efficient manner; the kinds of available sentences; the pertinent sentencing guidelines and policy statements; the need to avoid unwanted sentence disparities; and any need to provide for restitution.

The defendant testified that he and his attorney had talked about how the Sentencing

Commission Guidelines might apply to his case, including the obligation of the court to consider these Guidelines and the court's discretion to depart from them under certain circumstances and in accordance with applicable court decisions. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(M); *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005). In addition, he acknowledged that he understood the court would not be able to determine the recommended guideline sentence for his case until after the presentence report had been completed and he and the government each had an opportunity to challenge the facts reported by the probation officer. He acknowledged that he understood, irrespective of any sentence imposed by the court, he would have absolutely no right to withdraw his plea of guilty. He was informed and acknowledged that parole had been abolished and that he would not be released on parole. Likewise, he acknowledged that upon release from prison at the conclusion of any sentence of imprisonment, he would be obligated to serve a significant term of supervised release which could include a specific condition that he be deported and remain outside the United States in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 3583(d), and he stated that he understood that any violation of the terms of supervised release could result in his being returned to prison for an additional period of time.

He acknowledged that, when applicable, he could be ordered to make full restitution to any victim (*See* Rule 11(b)(1)(K)), and he acknowledged that in the event the government was seeking forfeiture of property, it could seek forfeiture of substitute assets, and he acknowledged that he was waiving his rights to a jury determination of forfeitability (*See* Rule 11(b)(1)(J)) and to appeal any issues of proportionality. *See Libretti v. United States*, 516 U.S. 29 (1995) and *Austin v. United States*, 509 U.S. 602 (1993). He expressly acknowledged that by pleading guilty he was giving-up his right to have a jury determine beyond a reasonable doubt any of the facts alleged in Counts One

and Sixty-Four, including those that may relate to sentencing. In addition, he stated that he fully understood that, pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement, he was waiving any right to appeal his conviction, any right to appeal any sentencing guideline issues, any right to appeal any sentence of the court within the guideline range on the ground that it is not reasonable, and any right to challenge his conviction or his sentence in any post-conviction proceeding.

Each of the defendant's procedural rights surrendered on a plea of guilty was also explained, including: his right to persist in his previous pleas of not guilty to the offenses charged against him; his attendant right to a trial by jury and right to be represented and to have the assistance of counsel at trial and at every other stage of the proceeding; his right at trial to see, to hear, to confront and to have cross-examined all adverse witnesses; his right to be protected from compelled self-incrimination; his right to testify and to present evidence in his defense; his right to the issuance of subpoenas, or compulsory process, to compel the attendance of witnesses to testify in his defense; his presumption of innocence; the obligation of the government to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; the right on his part to decline to testify unless he voluntarily elected to do so in his own defense; and his right to have a unanimous guilty verdict. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(B)–(E). The defendant testified that he understood his right to persist in his pleas of not guilty and the attendant rights that he would waive upon entry of guilty pleas to Counts One and Sixty-Four. *See* Rule 11(b)(1)(F).

The defendant then stated under oath that he was pleading guilty because he was in fact guilty of each of the crimes charged in Counts One and Sixty-Four of the Indictment. When asked what

he did that he felt made him guilty, the defendant stated, "I disrespected the law by selling drugs and possessing a gun, but I didn't use it."

In response to further questioning to ensure that his proposed plea was voluntary, the defendant again stated that (other than the promises expressly set forth in the written plea agreement) his plea did not result from any force, threats, or promises of any kind (*See* Rule 11(b)(2)), that his decision to plead guilty was in fact fully voluntary on his part, and that it was being made with the advice and assistance of counsel.

To permit the court to determine that an independent factual basis existed for the defendant's guilty pleas, counsel for the government made an oral proffer summarizing the principal facts which the government was prepared to prove at trial. The defendant and his counsel then separately stated that the government's oral proffer fairly summarized the government's evidence.

After consultation with his attorney, the defendant waived a reading of the Indictment and entered a plea of GUILTY to Count One alleging the defendant's violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 846, and a plea of GUILTY to Count Sixty Four alleging the defendant's violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 924(c).

After entering his pleas as aforesaid, after an independent basis for each plea was established and after being informed that the undersigned would recommend acceptance of his aforesaid plea, the defendant reiterated that his pleas of guilty were fully voluntary and that he was fully satisfied with the advice, assistance and services of his attorney. After directing the preparation of a

presentence report, the defendant was then remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal pending its completion.

B. GOVERNMENT'S EVIDENCE

Pursuant to its oral proffer, the government was prepared at trial to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant, Isidro Hernandez-Hernandez, was a central participant in a conspiracy to bring 10s of kilos of Cocaine HCL to the Winchester, Virginia, area which he obtained from sources in North and South Carolina between November 2006 and November 2007. Some of which was sold in its powdered form (cocaine HCL) and some of which was "cooked" and sold as "crack" (cocaine base). As part of the conspiracy and to facilitate the distribution and resale of this cocaine, this defendant possessed multiple firearms and maintained a "stash house" located at a Windstone Court address in Winchester, a location in the Western Judicial District of Virginia. Two of this defendant's brothers were living at this address when it was consensually searched by law enforcement personnel on November 15, 2007. This search resulted in the seizure of two firearms (a 9 mm Ruger semi-automatic pistol and a .22 caliber Taurus pistol),⁴ bricks of powdered cocaine weighing 2.85 kilograms, and two empty "kilo" wrappers. The defendant's brothers separately stated that the cocaine and both guns belonged to this defendant. Separate searches, on or about the same date, resulted in the seizure of two additional firearms. In connection with the various coordinated searches, including the Windstone Court search, a total of approximately 8.5 kilograms of cocaine HCL was recovered by authorities. The search of a Wayfaring Drive residence in Winchester also resulted in the seizure of a semi-automatic pistol which had been provided to an

⁴ These are the two firearms which relate to the Count 64 firearms charge.

indicted co-conspirator by the defendant, and a search of the defendant's residence on Stoneleigh Drive in Winchester resulted in the seizure of a .22 cal. Walthur pistol which was found in the garage area of the residence.

Following the defendant's arrest on November 16, 2007, he admitted that all of the cocaine and both guns found at the Windstone address belonged to him; he acknowledged that the facts pertaining to the two other firearms, and he identified Jose Luis Jaimes-Perez, an indicted co-conspirator, as his principal cocaine source. Among other information provided after his arrest, Isidro Hernandez-Hernandez admitted that he had seen a very large "stash" of powdered cocaine in brick form in the possession of his North Carolina source, and he cooperated with investigators by making a number of recorded telephone calls to this source, by making a controlled trip to North Carolina trip to identify this individual, and by helping to ensnare Israel Arellano-Arellano, another indicted co-conspirator, in a three kilogram cocaine transaction.

Inter alia, the government's evidence generally pertinent to the alleged conspiracy would show that a total of approximately 8.5 kilograms of powdered cocaine was recovered from various of the co-conspirators in connection with their arrests, and it would show that several of the co-conspirators "cooked" the powdered cocaine and distributed the resulting cocaine base ("crack"). All relevant drug weights and proof of the Cocaine HCL content of all relevant drug seizures were confirmed by laboratory analysis.

C. FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on the evidence, representations of counsel, and the defendant's sworn testimony presented as part of the Rule 11 hearing, the undersigned submits the following formal findings of fact, conclusions and recommendations:

1. The defendant is fully competent and capable of entering informed pleas of guilty;
2. The defendant is fully aware of the nature of the charges and the consequences of his guilty pleas;
3. The defendant is fully informed, and he understands, the enumerated items set forth in Rule 11(b)(1)(A)–(N);
4. Before entering his pleas of guilty, the defendant and the government reached a plea agreement which was reduced to writing;
5. The defendant's entry into the written plea agreement and his tender of pleas of guilty to Counts One and Sixty-Four were all made with the advice and assistance of counsel;
6. The defendant's entry of a plea of guilty to Count One was made with knowledge and an understanding both of the nature of the offense and the full range of punishment which might be imposed;
7. The defendant's entry of a plea of guilty to Count Sixty-Four was made with knowledge and an understanding both of the nature of the offense and the full range of punishment which might be imposed;
8. The defendant's pleas of guilty are fully voluntary and did not result from any force, threats, or promises other than those contained in the plea agreement;
9. The plea agreement complies with the requirements of Rule 11(c)(1); and
10. The evidence presented by the government established an independent basis in fact supporting the two offenses to which the defendant is pleading guilty, including *inter alia* proof of the offense elements, venue, laboratory analyses, and criminal intent.

D. RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION

Based on the above findings of fact, the undersigned RECOMMENDS that the court accept the defendant's PLEAS OF GUILTY to Count One and Count Sixty-Four, that the defendant be ADJUDGED GUILTY of these offenses, that the government's motion to dismiss Counts Sixty-One, Sixty-Three, Sixty-Six and Sixty-Seven be granted, and that a sentencing hearing be scheduled before the presiding district judge on July 25, 2008 at 10:00 a.m.

E. NOTICE TO PARTIES

Notice is hereby given to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of this Report and Recommendation, any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by the rules of this court. The presiding district judge shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendations to which an objection is made. The presiding district judge may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the undersigned. The presiding district judge may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the undersigned with instructions.

Failure to file timely written objections to these proposed findings and recommendations within ten (10) days could waive appellate review. At the conclusion of the ten-day period, the Clerk is directed to transmit the record in this matter to the presiding United States district judge.

The clerk is directed to transmit a copy of this Report and Recommendation to all counsel of record.

DATED: 12th day of May 2008.

s/ James G. Welsh
United States Magistrate Judge