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(In open court, defendant present.)

THE CLERK: All rise.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'll have the appearances. Everyone else may
be seated.

MS. EMEHELU: Good morning, your Honor.

Assistant United States Attorney Shirley

Emehelu on behalf of the United States.

With me at counsel table is Special Agent
Richard Tylenda of the FBI.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Good morning, your Honor.
K. Anthony Thomas, Assistant Federal Public Defender, on behalf of Bobby Boye who is seated to the right of me.

THE COURT: Thank you.

We are here for the sentencing of Mr. Boye in connection with his guilty plea to a count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud.

I know that all counsel have received the Presentence Report.

Mr. Thomas, have you had sufficient opportunity to fully review the report with your client?

MR. THOMAS: Yes, your Honor, I did have an opportunity to review the Draft Presentence Report.

There are no Guideline corrections or objections, and our objections with regard to certain matters in the Presentence Report are noted in the final version of the Presentence Report.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Then with that $I$ will begin by calculating the Guidelines in this matter.

To begin, the base offense level in this matter is found in Sentencing Guideline $2 X 1.1(a)$, and it is a level 7 under 2B1.1(a)(1).

There is an increase of 18 levels under 2B1.1(b)(1)(J), since the amount of loss exceeds \$2.5 million, but is less than $\$ 7$ million, and that is agreed to by the parties, and therefore the total offense level is a 25.

With regard to specific offense characteristics, the only adjustment upward is under 3B1.3, which is that Mr. Boye abused a position of trust in a manner that significantly facilitated the commission or concealment of the crime. There is a two-level increase for that making it an adjusted offense level of 27.

I find that Mr. Boye based on prior statements
would qualify for the two-level adjustment for acceptance of responsibility.

And the government is moving for the additional one level?

MS. EMECHELU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

I will grant that and thus the total offense level is a level 24.

With regard to criminal history, there are four criminal history points and thus he is in a criminal history category of 3 .

So based upon a total offense level of 24 and a criminal history category of 3, under the statute it is up to 20 years imprisonment. The Guideline range is 63 to 78 months.

Supervised release under the statute is up to 3 years, with a Guideline range of 1 to 3 years.

Under the statute, probation is a range of 1 to 5 years. He is ineligible under the Guidelines.

The fine under the statute is $\$ 250,000$, with a Guideline range of $\$ 10,000$ to $\$ 100,000$.

I will discuss restitution in a moment, though my understanding is that there was a stipulated amount of restitution of $\$ 3,510,000$.

I understand that there may be some other
items that the victim wanted to have addressed. I'll deal with those in a moment. But the stipulated amount is the $\$ 3,510,000$.

Then there is the mandatory special assessment of $\$ 100$ for the single count of conviction.

There is also, I understand, a forfeiture order that's going to be entered.

First, counsel, are there any disagreements with the Guideline ranges as I've read them to you?

MR. THOMAS: No, your Honor.

MS. EMEHELU: None from the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

We should turn before $I$ hear any sentencing comments to the issue of restitution.

As I've indicated, I know that the parties in the plea agreement had stipulated to the number of $\$ 3,510,000$ which represented the contract payments that were made to Mr. Boye that underlie the substantive offense here. Correct?

MR. THOMAS: That's correct, your Honor.

MS. EMEHELU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

And while $I$ understand that the victim in this case -- are we going to refer to it as Country $A$ as
opposed to by its name? Everyone put it in the papers already.

MS. EMEHELU: For today we can refer to the country by name. We preferred from the government's standpoint in the publicly filed documents, as we do with all victims, that we not identify the victim by name.

THE COURT: All right.

They had brought to the attention of the government and the court that there were other losses and tax revenue proceeds from another matter which was referred to as the Macau scheme. But as the government concedes, it was prior to the time charged in this conspiracy, and that amount had been \$859, 706.30 .

They do concede and understand that because it is prior to the time charged in the conspiracy, it must be excluded from the restitution award. That will not be entered.

There is also, Country A would like to receive the $\$ 130,000$ in salary payments that were made to Mr. Boye. The government points out in not actually putting this forward that, first, they were payments that could have been outside of the temporal period of the charged conspiracy.

In any event, there would still be the issue of offsetting them as to any kind of legitimate services that were actually provided by Mr. Boye. Nothing has really been presented to me at this point and it would be very difficult to determine whether there would be offsets to it based upon the services that he gave or not.

Therefore, under the statute this would obviously complicate and prolong the sentencing process and would require additional hearings, and, therefore, balancing of the factors, that will not be awarded either.

The last is investigative costs and attorney's fees. My understanding here is that there is a claim for investigative costs and auditing costs in the amount of $\$ 379,169$ that were paid to Deloitte.

MS. EMEHELU: Yes, your Honor, to Deloitte.

THE COURT: And then there were also claiming to be in this certification that was submitted legal expenses totaling at least \$600,000.

First of all, there is the issue under the MVRA whether investigative costs and attorney's fees qualify as, "other expenses incurred during participation in the investigation of prosecution of the offense," which may be reimbursable.

I'll hear from counsel on this issue. I understand that the government based upon the plea agreement is abiding by the stipulation of the restitution amount. Is that correct?

MS. EMEHELU: Yes, your Honor.
The government abides by the stipulation that the restitution amount due from Mr. Boye is $\$ 3,510,000$. But would note as required by the parties plea agreement that the government is obligated to providing information requested by the court or to clarify any issues that may arise.

And so just for the record $I$ would note that there is some legal precedent for the award of investigative costs, auditing costs, and attorney's fees. The government has cited that case law in its sentencing memorandum dated October 13th, 2015 .

For example, there is a Third Circuit case, United States v. Hayward, 359 F.3d 631, in which the Third Circuit affirmed the District Court's awarding reasonable costs that were incurred in the return of the victimized children from London and making the children available to participate in the investigation and trial.

Here we are not dealing with victims participating in trial, testifying as witnesses. But
in that situation the court certainly did find that reasonable costs were reimbursable and subject to restitution.

I also cited a Second Circuit case, United States v. Amato; United States v. Gordon, out of the Ninth Circuit; and United States v. Phillips out of the Fifth Circuit.

Now of course the wrinkle here though is the government did try to parse out what subset of the claimed investigative auditing costs and attorney's fees are attributable to the charged offense, because of course the victim provided information related to the Macau scheme which your Honor has noted predated the charged conspiracy here.

And in speaking with the victims's counsel, it's my understanding that the billing, for example, the attorney's fees were not itemized to segregate out attorney's fees associated with simply the investigation of the charged consulting contract scheme.

And so this may render this basket of claimed expenses including the auditing investigative expenses as really being too difficult to confirm. And as your Honor has already noted under the Mandatory Victims Rights Act, Section $3663(A)(c)(3)(B)$, if the
determination of restitution would complicate or prolong the sentencing process to a degree that would result in the need to provide restitution to the victim being outweighed by the burden on the sentencing process, the court in its discretion can roll back determining whether that restitution claim, that specific claim -- the Court can essentially take a pass and say it's too complicated. It's going to prolong this proceeding unnecessarily.

The parties have already stipulated the terms of the charged scheme, the restitution due and owing is $\$ 3,510,000$. And, in any case, the parties have also entered into a forfeiture order that provides that the forfeiture money judgment here in this case is \$4, 233,015.42.

So the defendant certainly will be forfeiting proceeds, a large portion of which will go toward making the victim whole, and he's agreed to forfeit even more than what he's agreed is the restitution number in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Thomas, do you want to be heard on this?

MR. THOMAS: Certainly, your Honor.

Respectfully, your Honor, we ask the Court to exercise its discretion because of the convoluted
nature of the request for either attorney's fees or for accounting.

As the Assistant U.S. Attorney indicated, we signed a forfeiture agreement that far exceeded what we stipulated for restitution, and that forfeiture agreement was signed away before any of the victims submitting additional claims for restitution.

If your Honor is not inclined to exercise the Court's discretion, we will respectfully request that a hearing be conducted in order to ascertain the true amount of money that should be attributed to this offense with regard to the accounting firm and also with regard to the law firm.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
I've had an opportunity also to do some additional research on the issue, and, first, I should also point out that there is certainly case law that would support investigative costs and/or attorney's fees as being part of the recovery under the Mandatory Victims Restitution Act.

Specifically, the Second Circuit and the Ninth Circuit have ruled in that way. There are other Circuits, the Seventh, Tenth and others that have found that consequential damages such as attorney's
fees are not recoverable under the MVRA.
While $I$ think this is an issue that they may be recoverable, it's really not completely settled in the Third Circuit. I nonetheless will go about why in this particular case $I$ will not be ordering either the investigative costs or attorney's fees.

First of all, let me note, for instance, in the Second Circuit, which has allowed such expenses, the Court has found that what must be done is to show by a preponderance of the evidence that:

One, the expenses were necessary;
Two, they were incurred while participating in the investigation, prosecution, or attendance at proceedings regarding the offense;

Three, they were incurred by a victim as defined by the MVRA;

And, four, they do not require unduly complicated determinations of fact.

First, obviously, the third factor, they were incurred by the victim. Here, Country A had to pay these fees. But the other factors are the ones that I think at this point are problematic.

The first is obviously some kind of investigation would have been necessary in this case. But as has been candidly pointed out by the government
because -- I must first say that the certification that has been submitted was bare bones at best and a hearing would have been required to determine whether indeed all of the expenses being claimed or what portion of them were necessary, and then whether they were incurred in connection with the investigation, the prosecution for this particular crime, and whether they do not require unduly complicated determinations of fact.

So looking ahead on this record they would not be allowable. I could not find by a preponderance that the factors would have been satisfied. If a hearing were held, what I'm hearing at this point is that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to parse out what portions of the investigative costs and attorney's fees were attributable solely to the conspiracy for which Mr. Boye is being sentenced as opposed to investigating the Macau scheme, or any other items that they may have looked at in connection with Mr. Boye's employment and that go beyond the particular scheme that we are looking at that involved this \$3.5 million. So understanding that even if I had a hearing that it would basically not be possible to parse out those fees.

The last factor also cannot be satisfied in
that it would require unduly complicated determinations of fact that frankly it does not appear the Court could even make based upon the proffer as to what might have been able to be provided by way of testimony or documentation because of the manner in which those services were incurred and the fees billed to the country.

Therefore, while they might have been recoverable items of damages -- and I'm not making that legal determination either because, as I said, the law is really in flux as to whether those would constitute consequential damages that are clearly recoverable in this Circuit -- it is not necessary for me to make that legal determination because I find that $I$ would not be able to satisfy or the government would not be able to satisfy me of those factors.

Thus, the restitution will remain at the stipulated amount of $\$ 3,510,000$.

I also note in making this determination, because $I$ do appreciate that clearly there were some costs involved by the country, that the forfeiture order, as it has been pointed out by the government, includes properties that will yield a recovery to the country in excess of the restitution amount that's been stipulated to, as well, and therefore will give
them some more relief towards any other expenses that they may have incurred.

Therefore, I find also that that provides them with some hopefully solace and recovery that they were looking for in connection with these other fees and costs.

With that, we will go on to the sentencing comments. I understand from both letters and from the plea agreement that there are no applications for variances or departures. Is that correct?

MS. EMEHELU: None from the government, your Honor.

MR. THOMAS: That's correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: Then, Mr. Thomas, I'm ready to hear from you with regard to sentencing.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, your Honor.
Your Honor, based on my submission to the Court, we respectfully request a sentence of 63 months. 63 months, your Honor, it accounts for Mr. Boye's fraud, it accounts for his criminal history.

As your Honor points out, his criminal
history, he has four criminal history points. That moves him to category 3. Had he not been in category 3 or been in a lower category, your Honor, obviously the penalty would have been much lower.

The Guidelines account for his abuse of trust. There is no question, your Honor, that Mr. Boye abused his trust with regard to Timor-Leste and acted as a tax advisor for that country. He abused his trust. In his plea allocution to your Honor, he indicated that he was in a position of trust. He did not disclose his interest when he submitted his bid. And, yes, it's a bid.

And as the Assistant U.S. Attorney attached to the sentencing letter, the company he created was absolutely fraudulent. There is absolutely no question about that. We are not standing here disputing that. Mr. Boye admitted that the company he created in order to submit this international tax consultant bid was fraudulent.

But one of the things that strike me as odd from the very beginning, your Honor, is that at its inception Mr. Boye created a fraudulent company in order to get the tax consultant work to try to benefit the country of Timor-Leste.

In the victim's submission that's attached to the government's brief, it's silent, your Honor, with regard to the actual product that Mr. Boye produced. And, in fact, your Honor, what Mr. Boye produced is still being used by the country.

Your Honor, the last time I touched contract law was probably in law school 20 years ago. But I think there is a concept, I'm not sure whether it's still valid or not, but back then 20 years ago there was a concept called unjust enrichment.

THE COURT: It still exists.

MR. THOMAS: What we have here, your Honor, is clearly a fraud from the very beginning. Unlike other fraud cases where you know somebody is going in to commit fraud and they are not going to worry about the end product because they are going in to grab the money and run, what we have here is Mr. Boye created this fraudulent company from the very onset, all right, but he did the work.

It's no excuse. It is absolutely no excuse for committing the fraud to begin with. You can't, you can't get the benefit of that, and I'm not saying he should. But in fashioning a reasonable sentence, your Honor, one that's sufficient but not greater than necessary we should look at the total picture.

At one point when $I$ first got involved in this case I looked at the country's 2012 annual report and there is nothing in there that talks about the fraudulent nature of what -- the product, the end product, the work product that he did. Nothing in
there talks about that. The attorneys don't mention that the country is in irreparable harm because the product he submitted was lousy and insufficient.

They hired a big law firm in California that did at least $\$ 600,000$ plus -- close to $\$ 900,000$ of investigation and nothing is said about the fact that the work product was faulty. They still use it to generate funds and it's going to be continued to be used to generate funds.

So what we have here is somewhat of an unjust enrichment. And, no, your Honor, $I$ am not saying, I am not saying one bit that his original fraudulent conduct should be excused. Absolutely not. It should not be excused. But when you look at the total picture, your Honor, and you compare this fraud case to others -- I don't know if there is any traditional fraud case. There probable should not be. But just your typical fraud case, your Honor, this case doesn't cry out for a sentence at the high end of the Guideline range.

Simply put, your Honor, we respectfully ask that this Court sentence Mr. Boye to 63 months.

With that said, your Honor, Mr. Boye has been on bail conditions prior to me being appointed to represent him. There has been no issues with regard
to his compliance on bail.
We would respectfully request that Mr. Boye be allowed to voluntary surrender. Specifically, your Honor, Mr. Boye's lease on his current residence expires on November 30th, which is a Monday, and we would respectfully ask that a voluntary surrender date be sent for November 30th.

Finally, your Honor, and I've explained to Mr. Boye that the only thing your Honor can do is make a recommendation with regards to the facility, we respectfully request that $M r$. Boye be designated to Fort Dix.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Boye, you may speak on your own behalf at this time.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I stand before you humbled for my misconduct. This is very painful, your Honor. Timor-Leste gave me an opportunity that I did not deserve and this, my conduct, is highly unjustifiable. In that country I was very friendly with everybody in the government there. They gave me this opportunity and $I$ abused it.

But also, your Honor, the sad part of it is that the good I have done for that country has been
ruined by my criminal conduct. I volunteered as a professor in the school for two years. I was teaching there without any regulations on top of my employment. I was buying books for the students that $I$ was teaching at the university.

But all of that and all of that good stuff this single criminal conduct this is something that until $I$ go to my grave $I$ will continue to regret because $I$ had enough goodwill from that country. If I had disclosed that $I$ owned this company based on my professional competence, if they wanted to grant this contract, they would have given it to me. The demons misled me into this.

Your Honor, I assure you that until I go to my grave, $I$ will continue to regret this and $I$ pray to you, your Honor, that you administer justice -- I have two young children, one is two years old, one is four-year-old -- so that when I come back home I can be a good role model and I could be a good father to them. So I urge you, your Honor, to just have mercy on me.

And to the people of Timor-Leste who are represented here today, I extend my apologies to the people and government of Timor-Leste. If there is any way $I$ can make this up in my life, any good deed that

I could do, and that's the reason why all the properties that I owned I disclosed to them and I forfeited them without any question.

So, finally, your Honor, I pray for mercy. THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Emehelu.

MS. EMEHELU: Your Honor, the government submits that a sentence firmly within the applicable Guideline range of 63 to 78 months would be a just result in this case.

The defendant, Mr. Boye, preyed upon a young poor nation ravaged by years of civil war that was just now embarking upon a period of independence and critically had to rely on the expertise of international advisors in an array of different areas, but most particularly with respect to the management and cultivation of its vast petroleum resources, really it's only major source of national revenue.

Mr. Boye's history is quite remarkable. This is an individual who was convicted in the state of California for almost the same scheme. Different facts, but the bottom line was he embezzled money from his then employer and entered into a plea agreement, was sentenced to 3 years, was released in 2007 after having had the good fortune of serving out that
sentence in a halfway house for white collar offenders.

At that point he was at a crossroads. He could have taken a path toward leading an honest and righteous life given his education, his intellect. He is a person of tremendous abilities and yet what he did was he relocates to the East Coast. He's no longer Bobby Ajiboye. He's now Bobby Boye.

He's admitted to practice law in the state of New York. We don't know whether he disclosed his California conviction to the Character and Fitness Board in New York in connection with his admission to the bar there.

We do know he certainly did not disclose his prior conviction to country $A$ or to the Kingdom of Norway who actually was the nation who hired him because Norway through the International Humanitarian and Development Program was helping Country A identify the creme de la creme of legal advisors and other experts who could help the country really lift up and develop and progress.

And Mr. Boye was one of those individuals who was identified as being somebody who could make a real contribution to the nation, and again he was at a crossroads. He could have just proceeded as a legal
advisor. He was drawing a very good salary from that position and he could have done what his duty was. He had made a commitment to helping this country and what does he do? Well, my salary is not enough. I need more money. The lifestyle that I aspired to I guess cannot be satisfied by making $\$ 100,000, \$ 130,000$ a year. I need more money. And so he creates this sham company.

This theme was so methodical and planned out. This wasn't just some rash decision. He puts together what appears to be a legitimate law and accounting firm under the name Opus \& Best and creates documentation that would lead one to believe and certainly led Country A to believe that this was a long-standing legitimate firm with accountants and lawyers, with 20,30 years experience in the area of petroleum taxation who had worked at various places, whether the IRS or for some of the big accounting firms, or the most prominent law firms, and these were going to be the very people who would be staffing this project -- quote, unquote-- when Opus \& Best won the contract.

At no time did Mr. Boye disclose that clearly
I am Opus \& Best. I am the only member of Opus \& Best. Opus \& Best is no other than me and I only just
created it. Actually, he didn't even formally file the articles of organization until after he submitted his bid, but certainly it was not in existence decades before as falsely represented in the bid documents.

Now, Mr. Boye stands up today and says, oh, I should have just been honest. Surely they would have granted me the contracts given the relationship I had with the country at the time. Well, $\quad$ don't think that has been shown and I don't think any rational Bid Review Committee would award a contract to an interested party.

Here the bid review process required the disclosure of any conflicts of interest and Mr. Boye who not only is Opus \& Best but is also a member of the three member Bid Review Committee. He's clearly on both sides of the transaction here. He doesn't disclose the conflict of interest. He doesn't disclose that he is the real beneficiary of the contract if it is awarded to Opus \& Best. None of that.

He creates fictitious individuals, employees of Opus \& Best. He has one of these fictitious partners send an email to country A attaching the fraudulent bid documents that he, based on the metadata for those documents, authored along with a
relative of his. He has a website created by that relative again setting forth numerous false representations as to the credentials of this opus \& Best, and ultimately Country $A$-- again, they are a young nation, inexperienced. Granted, Mr. Boye had experience in this area of petroleum taxation and so they relied upon his recommendation.

As a member of the Bid Review Committee, he recommended, don't award the bid to these other accounting and law firms that are much more prominent that a lot of us would know. I highlyly recommend Opus \& Best. And the country relied on his recommendation because he held a position of trust. They trusted him.

And then what does he do? Well, he sets up a bank account so that monies that are paid from country A to Opus \& Best go to an account in New York that he controls, and he then in no time spends the $\$ 3.51$ million that's paid under the consulting contract.

He's not just using money to feed his family. No. He's buying a Rolls Royce. He's buying a Bentley. He's buying an SUV. He's buying lucrative rental properties, not one, but two, three multiple properties. He's buying expensive watches. It goes on and on. And, again, at no time is he disclosing
his affiliation with Opus \& Best.
Now, Mr. Thomas has argued that, well, in mitigation my client did provide some work product under the consulting contract. Well, Your Honor, the government would submit that was an essential part of the scheme. If he had just blown it off and not provided any work product, he wouldn't have gotten the continuous payments under the contract. The payments were not paid up front. They were paid in installments based on the delivery of work products and he continued to get paid because he was providing some services under the contract.

Now, in terms of the value of those services, as the government noted in its sentencing memorandum, the Sentencing Commission in its creation of the Commentary to Section 2B1.1 has certainly indicated that where there are false representations as to the licensing of particular professionals who are rendering services in a particular scheme, that there should be no credit for the value of services provided.

Your Honor, that is because, the government would submit, that there is a special kind of abuse of trust and a special kind of manipulation that occurs when an individual is posing as a trusted licensed
accredited individual. Here he was posing as various licensed accountants who claimed were CPAs, other attorneys, and he needed to create an aura of expertise in order to get the contract, and then once he had the contract to ensure the continued payments in installments under the terms of the contract.

In fact, even after the $\$ 3.51$ million is paid to Mr. Boye, he again impersonating a fake employee of Opus \& Best seeks to get paid an additional amount of money in excess of $\$ 600,000$ under the terms of the contract saying this is what is owed to Opus \& Best.

He even goes so far as to try to obtain a separate contract with an Opus \& Best basically subsidiary that he creates in Hong Kong, again, not disclosing his affiliation with that Hong Kong branch, if you will, of Opus \& Best and trying to obtain an additional contract with that country.

And so it just is unquestionable that the offense perpetrated by Mr. Boye was serious, it was meticulously planned and executed, and he undoubtedly abused his position of trust and did so for greed. Again, he did so for greed. He was already making substantial income.

In fact, throughout his career he has made substantial income from the various employments that
he's held, whether it be at the job where he embezzled money and which led to his California state conviction, as well as in other subsequent employment. So this is certainly not somebody who had to resort to fraud in order to just make ends meet. He resorted to fraud to live a lifestyle beyond his means.

Now, in terms of the need for deterrence, your Honor, the government would submit deterrence is absolutely necessary in this case. Apparently, the California state conviction and sentence had no deterrent effect upon Mr. Boye, since just some years after that, he commences this scheme and he got a break there. Again, it's a 3-year sentence, he only serves a part of that sentence, and gets to serve it in a halfway house.

In addition, your Honor, some years before he's censored by the New York Stock Exchange. And in that case, again, elements of fraud. He had engaged in trades through clients' accounts without their authorization and as a result he was censored and barred from any affiliation with the New York Stock Exchange.

Again, this goes back. This is even before the embezzlement from the prior employer. But it shows a pattern, a life-long pattern of fraud starting
from the New York Stock Exchange where he was censored, to the California state conviction, and ultimately to his federal proceedings here in the District of New Jersey.

And so the government submits that specific deterrence is necessary as well as general deterrence. Again, this country, Country A, like other small countries who have been ravaged by civil war, by unrest, really was in a vulnerable situation.

So a message needs to be sent to those who look for opportunities in other countries that are facing similar challenges rather than working for the public good there, who seek to convert opportunities to their own personal good at the expense of those countries, and there needs to be a clear message that will not be tolerated.

Turning to the history and characteristics of the defendant. I've gone through his criminal history, his prior instances of fraud. This is a man of tremendous intellect, training and experience who squandered those abilities and opportunities by exploiting the trust of his employers and clients time and again in order to satisfy his own personal greed.

So for all these reasons including the impact on the victim -- and I would note for the record
present in the courtroom today is Embassador Domingos Sarmento Alves. He is the U.S. Embassador to Country A who has also submitted a victim impact statement which is attached as Exhibit B to the government's sentencing memorandum who gives in that submission just some background about Country A, its people, the challenges it faced in post-colonization period and its rise to independence, as well as the impact this specific offense has had.

It weakened some of its diplomatic relations with other countries, particularly, Norway which actually hired Mr. Boye initially, as well as it compromised some of their relationships with major oil companies because the work product in this case involved the generation of highly complex tax regulations that the result of which is to basically collect tax revenue from oil companies and other entities within Country A.

So when you have a situation such as this where the entity that was supposed to be generating those tax regulations and levies was a sham, that certainly puts Country A at some risk whether it be litigation or just in terms of negotiating future contracts and tax arrangements with these oil companies.

So it's not such an easy situation where we can say that some work product was provided and so no harm, no foul essentially. Really the true impact, I would say, of Mr. Boye's offense may not be known today, but may have long-term consequences in terms of future contractual relationships with multi-national oil companies operating in Country A.

So for all of these reasons, your Honor, the government submits that a sentence within the applicable Guideline range of 63 to 78 months would be appropriate in this case.

The government also suggests a supervised release period of 3 years following any term of imprisonment.

In terms of a fine, given the substantial restitution obligations in this case, as well as the forfeiture money judgment, the government would submit that a fine probably should be waived in this matter, so that Mr. Boye can meet his other financial obligations.

The government thanks you for your time, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Emehelu.
I'll make my comments now with regard to the $3553(a)$ factors. Starting with the nature and
circumstances of the offense and the seriousness of the offense.

I think that the government has just spent substantial time going through, in fact, what the offense was which on its face demonstrates the seriousness of it. So I will make only a few comments which should not in any way be interpreted as because they may not be as lengthy as the government's that it minimizes in any manner the seriousness of this offense.

It is correct that the victim in this case was a very young and poor nation that relied principally upon this asset that it had, its natural resource of petroleum, and that it was using and relying on advisors to assist them with it, and also Norway that was involved in this endeavor and locates the defendant.

The fraud here was really of such a major level that $I$ can't say enough about it in that Mr. Boye was given a wonderful opportunity. There was employment, yes, and he was going to be paid well for that employment. But it was more than just the salary he was going to get. He accepted a position that was really of a new kind that was going to assist this country.

He was going to be on the ground floor of assisting them in moving forward in an economic way. That opportunity to not only perform professional services that appears from his educational background that he had the ability to do and advise upon, but to also do what I would call "do good" to assist this country in moving forward in a very important way, and a country that had been ravaged by civil war and was looking to get itself on its feet and move forward based upon this very important and valuable natural resource. So the opportunities for Mr. Boye were tremendous to accomplish some very, very good things.

And you had a country who based upon its in many ways naivete about this industry upon which it was embarking and how to go about it clearly needed the advisors to assist it, was taking the assistance from Norway in selecting such individuals, or suggesting to them the individuals, and obviously having made the selection put great trust and faith in Mr. Boye in performing the services and having a loyalty and fidelity to them that they expected to have.

And even today Mr. Boye says how fond he was of the country and how well he was treated by the government. Obviously, particularly because of the
kind of small country it was and where they were going and the number of limited people involved in assisting them, this position of trust was obviously fostered and created at an early stage. This country welcomed him and made him one of their own which makes even more egregious the fraud that was then committed upon them. It wasn't simply some stranger committing the fraud that we sometimes get in bid-rigging or things of this nature, but this was one of their own at this point who decided to abuse that trust.

In that connection $I$ need to comment obviously upon the manner in which it was carried out and the comments that were made that Mr. Boye seems to think because he was held in such good light by this country that if he had simply disclosed that he could do this work he would have been picked. Don't pull the wool over my eyes.

We all know that you placed yourself in a tremendous conflict of interest and you understood that which is why you hid it so well. But it wasn't just you presenting that this was an Opus \& Best with one man at the top -- not you, whoever you wanted to claim it was going to be -- but you had a host of professionals that you represented to be part of this company with resumes to match that would indicate they
were looking at a multi-million dollar contract of work that was going to go forward to give them advice both from an accounting and legal perspective, which is why when you created this company you didn't just make it a two or three-person company. You presented it as a dozen people, 20 people who could perform all these different services.

Because as we know when you are talking about something of this level nobody goes out and hires the solo practitioner out there with the shingle out, but looks for the big firms that have many individuals that can perform the different kinds of work at any given time. So you very well plotted out what it would be that would be necessary to convince, one, the other two on the committee to make a recommendation and ultimately the country to accept this sham company.

So let's not be fooled today that if you just said, I could do all the work for you, that they would have said, great, come in, do everything, be our advisor, be everything else too, a one-man-show. Obviously, though, you have great talents because you were able to do the work.

I must say when I read through all of what you did and the way you described these individuals, some fake -- I don't know if you found real names out there
somewhere and put some resumes on -- but whatever it was it was quite sophisticated and involved to come up with this. And all to get, not to help the country, because there were others out there that could have done a good job too that could have helped the country, but to line your pockets. And what did you do with the money? Expensive cars, jewelry, properties. Partly the reason why there is an ability to get this forfeiture and hopefully compensate to more or less say because you spent your money on things.

And the victim here, the country, the fact that they received services that you described as services that are still being used and good services doesn't mitigate the crime. One, it was of course important that you perform the services because otherwise Opus \& Best would have been terminated if they weren't providing services, but moreover it's not novel to me.

I have sat and seen many defendants in fraud cases obtaining contracts from government. Here it's generally here in the US. This happens to be a foreign country. But obtaining contracts that are sent out for bidding and obtaining them through fraud or bribes. And in virtually all of those cases they
did the work. Whether it was a demolition contractor, or whoever it might have been, it wasn't a mitigating factor because they did the work. That was the only way they were going to get paid and they may have been capable of doing the work. But here it's how you went about getting it and the fact that not only did you do it dishonestly, but it prevented honest bidders from getting the work that could have also done the work and been paid the same money. It's a fraud upon the country.

It's more egregious in my mind because it was not just upon a corporation who may have some kind of insurance or whatever that could make them whole, and not just done to our country, but you were really sent out there in some ways as a personal ambassador to this country hand picked by Norway to assist an underdeveloped poor country.

It's almost akin to what we call the vulnerable victim here, but it's not exactly. But I'll point out, this particular country that welcomed you and that you took advantage of, the crime is extremely serious and $I$ won't go through all the aspects of it at this point.

Now, looking at deterrence both from a specific and general deterrence perspective. As to
specific deterrence, it is absolutely an important consideration here. This is not the first time that you committed a criminal act, defrauded. What is incredible to me is given how obviously intelligent and educated and able that you were to do good work, that you were employed by very high ranking companies, Morgan Stanley, Mastercard, and this company out in California that I'm not familiar with, that you embezzled from the company and you received a sentence and apparently the sentence allowed you to serve it in a halfway house for white collar criminals.

We don't do that here in federal court for some important reasons, but that did not act as a deterrence to you because you would have thought that someone of your intellect that would have been a wake-up call. I escaped prison. I did something really wrong. I could never do anything like that again to an employer or anyone else, and lo and behold here you were a few years later doing the same.

And even with your employer there of course preceding that was the employment with Morgan Stanley and your actions there that ultimately result in you being banned by the New York Stock Exchange. Frankly, it boggles my mind that one of the things apparently when you went to California was telling Morgan Stanley
that you were on a medical leave with some illness, and it turns out you took another job in California and then they terminated you upon discovering that and all the investigation occurs and that's where it comes out. And here too at some point this investigation begins when you told Timor-Leste that you had a life threatening illness and they started looking into that.

There is a pattern here and it's a pattern that unfortunately goes back to your days working with Morgan Stanley, your other employer, that's more than a decade old and you have not learned the lesson. So specific deterrence is a very important consideration for this Court and you clearly have never served real prison time.

As to a general or public deterrence, it is an important consideration for this Court because also different than how you were treated in California by, quote, this halfway house for white collar criminals, we take seriously fraud, white collar crimes, and there has to be a recognition of that by the public that no matter how educated you are, how good you are at what you do, you commit a serious crime, you have to do serious time.

There is also of course the concern of the

Court for disparity of sentencing for similar crimes and $I$ must consider that as well.

Looking at your personal history and characteristics. Some of the things that I've mentioned about, the prior activity in your employment both with Morgan Stanley, the criminal history that you had already speak to that somewhat, but let me point out that what I've got here is, it was indicated, $I$ do understand that there is some difficulty in early childhood, your father, but you went about succeeding.

You got a law degree in your home country of Nigeria. You came to the US. You attended UCLA. You got a LOM. Then got a Masters in Business Tax at USC. First of all, amazing schools, opening up amazing opportunities for you. You are clearly a very intelligent man and able and capable man and had a law degree. I'm not quite sure how New York State admitted you to the bar considering your prior conviction, but that's not for me to determine.

All of those degrees that you had, you earned those degrees, and clearly when you went to Timor-Leste you were capable. You did work as an advisor and you pointed out even the other advice that you gave them was a one-man show without the advantage
of a big firm behind you. It was real. It was good work product.

As I said, I am stymied by what greed must have motivated you to do this because you could have achieved and accomplished so many things just because of the qualities and education that you had, and instead you used that to take advantage.

I know that you currently have two small children. I know it also appears from the PSR that you are in the midst of divorce. Clearly, your relationship has broken down. On a personal level, you have a lot of things to make up for, mending to do at some point if you want relationships with your children.

Now, what you are going to do when you are released from prison is going to be up to you. Presumably, with this felony conviction, you are going to be disbarred. There are certain limitations you are going to have on what you are able to do. But certainly given your natural innate abilities, you should be able to do and accomplish a number of things, but you are going to need a major change.

I have considered all of those $3553(a)$ factors and in fashioning a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary I, one, disagree with the
request by the defendant for a sentence at the bottom of the Guideline range. I think that absolutely does not suffice as a sufficient sentence.

A Guideline sentence is appropriate and I am going to impose a sentence of 72 months in this case.

I am also going to impose a 3-year period of supervised release in this matter.

I would also agree that given the large restitution and forfeiture order in this case that he would not have the ability to satisfy a fine. My interest is in making sure that restitution is paid. So I will waive the fine.

Sentence is as follows:

It is the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Bobby Boye, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 72 months.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of 3 years.

Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the Probation Office in the district to which he is released.

While on supervised release, the defendant
shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime, shall be prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous device, shall not possess an illegal controlled substance, and shall comply with the other standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court.

Based on information presented, the defendant is excused from the mandatory drug testing provision. However, he may be requested to submit to drug testing during the period of supervision if Probation determines a risk of substance abuse.

The following special conditions shall apply:

There will be had a new debt restriction that will be in place until the restitution is satisfied. There will also be a self-employment or business disclosure condition as well. Those are the only conditions being imposed.

It is further ordered that the defendant shall make restitution in the amount of $\$ 3,510,000$. I will waive the interest requirements in the case. Payments shall be made payable to the U.S. Treasury and forwarded to the Clerk of the Court in Trenton, for distribution to Ambassador Pierre-Richard Prosper, and there is an address for that.

The restitution is due immediately. It is
recommended that the defendant participate in the Bureau of Prisons Inmate Financial Responsibility Program. If he participants, the restitution shall be paid from those funds at a rate equivalent to $\$ 25$ every 3 months.

In the event the entire restitution is not paid prior to the commencement of supervision, the defendant shall satisfy the amount due in monthly installments of no less than $\$ 500$ to commence 30 days after release from confinement.

Defendant shall notify the United States Attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of mailing or residence address that occurs while any portion of the restitution remains unpaid.

As I've indicated, $I$ find the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine. I will waive the fine in this case.

Einally, it is further ordered the defendant shall pay to the United States a total special assessment of $\$ 100$ for the single count of conviction, which is due immediately.

I advise the parties of their right to appeal this sentence.

I will also be entering a forfeiture order that is going to be submitted to me upon consent. Is
that correct?

MS. EMEHELU: Yes, your Honor.
A preliminary forfeiture order has already been entered and filed in this matter. The United States will be submitting a corrected consent judgment of forfeiture that simply corrects the description of the Elizabeth properties that has the correct street number. That's the only correction.

THE COURT: Thank you.

The last thing, there has been a request for voluntary surrender. Is there any objection by the government?

MS. EMEHELU: No objection, your Honor.
THE COURT: I think you were requesting a November $30 t h$ date.

MR. THOMAS: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: If he has not yet been designated at that point -- where is he currently living?

THE DEFENDANT: Mahwah, New Jersey.

THE COURT: If you have not gotten a designation, you are to report to the Marshal's Office in Newark on November 30th. It's a Monday. Just so he doesn't have to come down to Trenton, we'll have him report to Newark.

I know you asked that I recommend Fort Dix.

I'll recommend it. You know that it's totally up to the BOP, however.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, one last issue with regards to the $\$ 500$ per month while on supervised release.

Would your Honor be inclined to put a range and leave it up to the discretion of Probation and not more than $\$ 500$ ?

THE COURT: We don't know what his employment will be. I put that out there at this point because I think he is capable of getting employment. It can be adjusted. I usually say adjust it based upon what his employment is at the time, but $I$ can't leave it totally at the discretion of Probation.

Mr. Martenz, is that correct?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Set an amount now and it could be adjusted. An amount has to be set.

THE COURT: Right. It has to be set. And it can't be like saying a range or up to. We have to set it.

MR. THOMAS: Can we put at least 500?

THE COURT: No. Or $I$ wouldn't even say at most because if he got a job that was very high paying it could be more than 500. We don't know. I'm putting out a number there that's based upon what his
education is and a possibility of getting employment.
Absolutely, one, if he doesn't obtain
employment immediately, he can't make that; and, two, when he does get employment Probation may adjust that. Absolutely.

MR. THOMAS: My concern is, your Honor, it's setting him up for failure for a potential violation. That's all.

THE COURT: Well, it wouldn't be a violation anyway because they wouldn't violate if he doesn't have employment that would allow him to pay that.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Correct. It has to be willful.

THE COURT: Right.

And I must tell you, I haven't seen a violation on a failure to pay restitution unless there are a lot of other things going on at the same time.

It will be adjusted. I have it on the record that I've indicated that is to be adjusted based upon whatever his employment situation is at the time.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. EMEHELU: Thank you, your Honor.

THE CLERK: All rise.
(Proceedings concluded.)
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