	Case 1:10-cr-10359-NMG Document 9 Filed 12/16/10 Page 1 of 21
	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
5	vs. ) CR No. 10-10359-NMG
6	) )
7	PETER A. SCHOBER )
8	
9	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE NATHANIEL M. GORTON
10	DIEN
11 12	<u>PLEA</u>
13	APPEARANCES:
14	OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY (By: Jonathan F.
15	Mitchell, AUSA), One Courthouse Way, Boston, Massachusetts 02210. On Behalf of the Government.
16	DUANE MORRIS LLP (By: Terry P. Segal, Esq., and Alissa M. Christie, Esq.), 470 Atlantic Avenue, Boston,
17	Massachusetts 02110-2600. On Behalf of the Defendant.
18	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
19	Courtroom No. 4 One Courthouse Way
20	Boston, MA 02210 Tuesday, November 23, 2010
21	2:48 p.m.
22	Cheryl Dahlstrom, RMR, CRR
23	Official Court Reporter John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
24	One Courthouse Way, Room 3209 Boston, MA 02210
25	Mechanical Steno - Transcript by Computer

## 1 PROCEEDINGS THE CLERK: This is Criminal Matter 10-10359, United 2 States vs. Peter Schober. Will counsel please identify 3 themselves for the record. 4 5 MR. MITCHELL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Jonathan Mitchell in behalf of the United States. 6 7 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Mitchell. MR. SEGAL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Terry Segal 8 and Alissa Christie on behalf of Peter Schober. 9 02:48 10 THE COURT: Mr. Segal, Miss Christie and Mr. Schober, 11 good afternoon to you all. As I understand it, Mr. Segal, your client is here to 12 13 enter into a waiver and to enter a plea as well, is that right? 14 MR. SEGAL: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Then if he would please take the witness 16 stand, you may join him if you wish. 17 (Defendant sworn.) 18 THE COURT: Good afternoon again, Mr. Schober. Do you 19 understand that you have a constitutional right to be charged 02:49 20 by an Indictment of a grand jury but that you can waive that 21 right and consent to be charged by what is called an Information of the U.S. Attorney? Do you understand that? 22 23 MR. SCHOBER: I do. 24 THE COURT: Now, instead of Indictment, these felony

charges against you have been brought by the United States

1 Attorney by the filing of an Information. Unless you waive Indictment, you may not be charged with a felony unless a grand 2 jury finds by return of Indictment that there is probable cause 3 to believe that a crime has been committed and that you have 4 5 committed it. And if you do not waive Indictment, the 6 government may present the case to the grand jury and request it to indict you; do you understand that? 7 MR. SCHOBER: I do. 8 9 THE COURT: Now, a grand jury is composed of at least 02:50 10 16 and not more than 23 persons, and at least 12 of those grand 11 jurors must find there is probable cause to believe that you have committed the crime with which you are charged before you 12 13 can be indicted. And a grand jury might or might not indict 14 you; do you understand that? 1.5 MR. SCHOBER: I do. 16 THE COURT: If you waive Indictment by a grand jury, 17 the case will proceed against you on the U.S. Attorney's Information just as though you had been indicted. 18 19 Have you discussed the matter of waiving your right to 02:50 20 Indictment by a grand jury with your attorney? 2.1 MR. SCHOBER: I have. 22 THE COURT: And do you now in open court waive your 23 right? MR. SCHOBER: I do. 24 25 THE COURT: Have any threats or promises been made to

1 induce you to waive that right? MR. SCHOBER: No. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Segal, do you know of any reason why 3 your client ought not to do so? 4 5 MR. SEGAL: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Then it is the Court's finding that the defendant's waiver of Indictment is made knowingly and 7 voluntarily, and the defendant's waiver of Indictment is, 8 9 therefore, accepted by this Court. The Court should have also acknowledged Mr. Riley's 02:51 10 11 presence in the courtroom from Pretrial Services. Good 12 afternoon to you. 13 Turning, then, to the plea itself, Mr. Schober, do you 14 understand that you are under oath, and that if you answer any 15 of my questions falsely, those answers may later be used 16 against you in a prosecution for perjury or making a false 17 statement? Do you understand that? 18 MR. SCHOBER: I do. 19 THE COURT: Would you please state your full name for 02:52 20 the record. 2.1 MR. SCHOBER: Peter Arthur Schober. 22 THE COURT: How old are you, Mr. Schober? 23 MR. SCHOBER: Fifty-one. 24 THE COURT: What is your educational background? 25 MR. SCHOBER: Undergraduate degree from Georgetown

1 University and a master's degree from the University of Pennsylvania, both an M.B.A. as well as an M.A. 2 THE COURT: All right. Have you ever been treated for 3 any mental illness or addiction to narcotic drugs of any kind? 4 5 MR. SCHOBER: No, I have not. THE COURT: Are you presently under the influence of any drug, medication or alcoholic beverage of any kind? 7 MR. SCHOBER: No. 8 9 THE COURT: If you take any medications, you can put 02:52 10 it on the record as to what you take and we'll proceed. 11 MR. SCHOBER: I do take medications for various ailments, none of which would influence my ability to --12 13 THE COURT: That's the question. Do any of them, in 14 your opinion, affect your ability to understand or respond to 1.5 my questions? 16 MR. SCHOBER: I believe none of them do. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Have you received a copy of the 18 Information pending against you in this case, that is, the 19 written charges made against you? And have you discussed those 02:53 20 charges and the case in general with Mr. Segal as your lawyer? 2.1 MR. SCHOBER: I have received them and I have 22 discussed them. 23 THE COURT: In your own words, what do you understand 24 you're being charged with here today? MR. SCHOBER: Failing to indicate on a tax return the 25

existence of a foreign bank account.

02:54 20

02:53 10

THE COURT: All right. Are you fully satisfied with the counsel, representation and advice given to you by Mr. Segal as your attorney in this case?

MR. SCHOBER: I am.

THE COURT: Now, I understand a written plea agreement has been entered into between you and the government. And I would ask Mr. Mitchell to please outline the provisions of that agreement for you and for the Court.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, your Honor. The defendant, your Honor, agrees in the plea agreement to plead to one count of willfully failing to comply with foreign bank account reporting requirements. The maximums for such an offense are set forth in Paragraph 2. Just for the record, your Honor --

THE COURT: We'll get to that in a minute.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay. Paragraph 3 sets forth the guideline calculation, your Honor. The defendant agrees that the loss is \$77,870.67. He also agrees that a two-level enhancement for the use of sophisticated means in connection with the offense is appropriate. The government agrees that a three-level downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility is appropriate. And that would, altogether, yield a range of -- excuse me, an offense level of 13.

The government agrees to a low-end recommendation, with no criminal fine. There are certain provisions concerning

obligations to report to the IRS certain information during his period of either probation or supervised release.

Mr. Schober also agrees to pay a civil money penalty, under the Bank Secrecy Act, of \$777,986 in connection with the same events that gave rise to the Information.

There is a reciprocal waiver of appeal, your Honor, in Paragraph 7. And there is also a cooperation provision, the standard one that you've seen in other plea agreements.

In addition, your Honor, of note is a -- for lack of a better word -- a side letter between the government and Mr. Schober concerning his conditions of release. The letter was made part of the plea agreement. And, in essence, your Honor, it requires Mr. Schober to turn over the deed to his home here in Boston in exchange for the ability to travel internationally while on release.

THE COURT: Where is that agreement outlined in the plea agreement, Mr. Mitchell?

MR. MITCHELL: I think it's Paragraph -- Paragraph 15, your Honor. That's where it's incorporated.

THE COURT: Paragraph 15?

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah. It's referenced in Paragraph 15.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further?

MR. MITCHELL: That's it. In general, your Honor, the
-- I will also note that Mr. Riley from Pretrial Services
suggests that instead of Mr. Schober turning over the quitclaim

17

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

18

19

02:56 10

02:56 20

2.1

22

23

1 deed to the government that he turn it over to the court. don't have a problem with that. 2 THE COURT: I was going to ask you about that. From 3 reading the conditions before, I've never heard of the deed 4 5 being held by the government, but I think it would be 6 appropriately held by the Clerk's Office. MR. MITCHELL: Yeah. I don't have a problem with it. 7 As I understand, Mr. Segal doesn't either. 8 9 THE COURT: That's fine. Are those the terms of your 02:57 10 plea agreement with the government, Mr. Schober, as you 11 understand them? 12 MR. SCHOBER: Yes, they are. 13 THE COURT: Has anyone made any other or different 14 promise or assurance to you of any kind in an effort to make 15 you plead guilty in this case? 16 MR. SCHOBER: No, they have not. 17 THE COURT: Do you understand that the Court does not 18 have to follow the government's recommendation or your 19 unopposed request; and if it does not, you, nevertheless, will 02:58 20 still be bound by your plea of quilty and will have no right to 2.1 withdraw it? Do you understand that? 22 MR. SCHOBER: I do. 23 THE COURT: Has anyone attempted in any way to force 24 you to plead quilty in this case?

MR. SCHOBER: No.

1 THE COURT: Do you understand that the offense to which you are pleading quilty is a felony, and that if your 2 plea is accepted, you will be judged guilty of that offense, 3 and that such adjudication may deprive you of valuable civil 4 5 rights such as the right to vote, the right to hold public 6 office, the right to serve on a jury, the right to possess any kind of firearm? Do you understand all of that? 7 MR. SCHOBER: I do. 8 THE COURT: Then, Mr. Mitchell, will you remind the 9 02:58 10 defendant of the maximum possible penalties involved in the 11 charges against him. MR. MITCHELL: Yes, your Honor. The maximums are five 12 13 years imprisonment, a \$250,000 fine, three years supervised 14 release, and a \$100 special assessment. 15 THE COURT: Do you understand the possible 16 consequences of your plea here this afternoon, Mr. Schober? 17 MR. SCHOBER: I do. 18 THE COURT: Now, under the Sentencing Reform Act of 19 1984, the United States Sentencing Commission issued guidelines 02:59 20 for judges to follow when imposing sentences in criminal cases. 21 Have you discussed those quidelines with your attorney and how 22 they might apply in your specific case? 23 MR. SCHOBER: I have. 24 THE COURT: Do you understand that a recent decision

of the Supreme Court has rendered those guidelines advisory

rather than mandatory, meaning that I have the discretion to sentence you anywhere in the range set forth in the statute governing the crimes to which you plead guilty and that I am not required to sentence you within the range proscribed in the guidelines or even based upon the factors contained in those guidelines? Do you understand that?

MR. SCHOBER: I do.

2.1

03:00 20

02:59 10

THE COURT: Do you further understand that the Court will not be able to determine even what advisory guideline applies until after a Presentence Report has been prepared for me by the Probation Department and both you and the government have had an opportunity to challenge the facts that are set forth in that report? Do you understand that?

MR. SCHOBER: I do.

THE COURT: Further, do you understand that after it has been determined what the advisory guideline is, the judge — in this case that means me — has the authority in some circumstances to impose a sentence that is more severe or less severe than those called for in the guidelines? Do you understand that?

MR. SCHOBER: I understand.

THE COURT: Further, do you understand that, for all practical purposes, you've waived your right to appeal except for those conditions that were outlined by Mr. Mitchell a few minutes ago? But for all practical purposes, you've weighed

your right to appeal; do you understand that?

2 MR. SCHOBER: I do.

03:01 20

03:01 10

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

MR. SCHOBER: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Then, Mr. Schober, do you understand generally that you have a right to plead not guilty to any charge against you and to persist in that plea and that you would then have the right to the assistance of counsel during the trial; you would have the right to see and hear all of the witnesses and have them cross-examined in your defense; you would have the right on your own part to decline to testify unless you voluntarily agree to do so; and you would have the right to the issuance of subpoenas or compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses to testify in your defense? Do you understand all of that?

MR. SCHOBER: I do.

THE COURT: Do you further understand that by entering a plea of guilty, if that plea is accepted by this Court, there will be no trial, and you will have waived or given up your right to a trial by jury as well as those other rights associated with such a trial that I just described? Do you understand that?

MR. SCHOBER: I do.

2.1

03:03 20

03:02 10

THE COURT: Then, Mr. Mitchell, will you please inform the defendant of exactly what facts the government would prove if this matter were to go to trial.

MR. MITCHELL: Your Honor, if this matter had gone to trial, the government would have proven beyond a reasonable doubt that, like many other American investors, Mr. Schober hid assets and income in accounts at UBS AG, the largest of the Swiss banks, for the purpose of reducing taxes he owed to the United States Government and that this was done principally through the formation of a shell corporation organized outside the United States.

In December of 2000, your Honor, Mr. Schober caused to be established a company called Small Guard Foundation, which was a Panamanian corporation that had no operations whatsoever. It was a complete shell.

In 2002, less than two years later, he opened an account at UBS in the name of Small Guard Foundation. In opening up the account, he was aware that -- in the name of Small Guard Foundation, he was aware that UBS would conceal his ownership and control of the account as well as any transactions or accrued interest in the account. As he was aware at the time, other American investors were doing the same thing.

In November of that year, that is, 2005, he had his sister transfer approximately \$800,000 from another phony

2.1

03:05 20

03:04 10

account at UBS into the Small Guard Foundation account; and then for the next two years, roughly, two-plus years, Mr. Schober caused funds to be wired in and out of the account for his own personal reasons.

Among those wirings was a deposit of almost \$300,000 in earnings that he received for professional services in connection with his consulting business. In addition, he -- during a period from November of 2005 to October of 2008, he earned approximately \$98,847 in dividend and interest income.

Now, as an American resident, he had a -- and now a citizen, as I understand it, he had an obligation to report both the assets in the account as well as the income he accrued from -- in that account to the United States Government. He was obligated, first off, to file reports of foreign bank account, which are called colloquially FBARs, that report each foreign account that had a balance of over \$10,000 which he controlled. At the same time, he was obligated to note on his Form 1040 for each year that he earned income from foreign bank accounts. He was aware of this all the time; and, nevertheless, willfully did not follow these rules.

In the tax years 2005, 2007, 2008, he signed under the pains and penalties of perjury and then filed FBARs that indicated that he had a financial interest in a foreign bank in England, in the United Kingdom, but he willfully omitted that he had an interest in the Small Guard Foundation account at

```
UBS. In 2006, he willfully failed to file any FBAR at all.
     1
                   For the tax years 2005 to 2008, he signed under the
     2
          penalties of perjury and filed Form 1040s with the IRS.
     3
          Schedule B of each of those returns, he indicated that he had
     4
     5
          foreign bank accounts -- he had a foreign bank account in
     6
          England but willfully omitted to note that he also had this
          Small Guard Foundation account at UBS. And in so doing, he
     7
          deprived the Internal Revenue Service of approximately
     8
     9
          $77,870.67.
03:06 10
                   THE COURT: Mr. Schober, do you have anything to add
    11
          to what Mr. Mitchell says the government would be able to prove
    12
          if this matter were to go to trial?
    13
                   MR. SCHOBER: May I consult my attorney?
    14
                   THE COURT: Yes, you may.
    1.5
           (Discussion held off the record.)
    16
                   MR. SEGAL: Could I respond --
    17
                   THE COURT: No. I'm going to ask your client to
    18
          respond. You can then add something, Mr. Segal, but I want to
    19
          have a colloquy with your client first.
03:07 20
                   MR. SEGAL: Okay. All right.
    21
                   THE COURT: Do you have anything to add, Mr. Schober,
    22
          to what Mr. Mitchell says the government would be able to
    23
          prove?
                   MR. SCHOBER: I believe the thrust of what Mr.
    24
    25
          Mitchell said is correct. The one thing I would correct was
```

that the original purpose to open the account was not to evade taxes; and, in fact, the account -- the original account dates back to 1993 or 4, I believe, preceding UBS. And until, as Mr. Mitchell correctly points out, 2006, when, in fact, there was income that should have been reported and wasn't reported, that until such time the account wasn't earning anything.

THE COURT: Mr. Mitchell?

MR. MITCHELL: I don't think that changes anything, your Honor. It's a -- the purpose and intent to evade is not one of the elements of the offense. The effect was, in the end, as I'm understanding Mr. Schober, is that he did, in the end, deprive the IRS of funds that I noted earlier. But I don't think the correction matters in terms of whether the elements of the offense were met.

THE COURT: Do you agree with Mr. Mitchell's summary, Mr. Schober?

MR. SCHOBER: I don't dispute that. That's correct.

THE COURT: And there's nothing else -- or is there anything else that you disagree with that Mr. Mitchell says the government would be able to prove?

MR. SCHOBER: Not of substance. I believe some of the facts may be slightly off, but I think that can be cleared up in conversation. I think the thrust of it is right.

THE COURT: Then I would ask the deputy clerk to inquire of the defendant as to how he now wishes to plead. Mr.

2.1

03:08 10

03:08 20

Schober, will you now stand.

03:09 20

03:09 10

THE CLERK: Mr. Schober, Count 1 of the single count Information charges you with willfully violating foreign bank account reporting requirements, in violation of Title 31 of the United States Code, Section 5314 and 5322A. How do you wish to plead to Count 1, guilty or not guilty?

MR. SCHOBER: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.

THE COURT: That being the case, it is the finding of the Court in the case of the United States vs. Peter Schober 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 charged. His plea is, therefore, accepted, and he is now adjudged guilty of that offense.

Mr. Schober, a written Presentence Report will be prepared for me by the Probation Department. Both you and -- actually, you will be asked to give information for that report, and your lawyer may be present if you wish. Both you and your lawyer will be given the opportunity to read the Presentence Report before the sentencing, and at the sentencing hearing itself, not only your lawyer but you will be afforded the opportunity to speak. Do you understand all of that?

MR. SCHOBER: I do.

```
1
                   THE COURT: Then the sentencing will be scheduled for
          Wednesday, February 8th, at 3 p.m. Any known conflict, Mr.
     2
          Segal?
     3
     4
                   MR. SEGAL: No, not at the moment, your Honor.
     5
                   THE COURT: You want to check your records?
     6
                   MR. SEGAL: My hope was to be out of state February,
          March and April, but I'm not sure I'll make it. But I can
     7
          report back. I'll know in about a week.
     8
     9
                   THE COURT: We could move it up a week if that would
03:10 10
          help you.
    11
                   MR. SEGAL: Well, I think Mr. Mitchell might have some
    12
          thoughts.
    13
                   MR. MITCHELL: I actually -- I have another sentencing
    14
          that afternoon, your Honor, in front of Judge Gertner.
    15
                   THE COURT: All right. We'll change the date.
    16
                   MR. MITCHELL: There's -- I know, as I noted before,
    17
          there's a cooperation provision in the plea agreement, so there
          may be -- we may be the asking the Court --
    18
    19
                   THE COURT: That's fine. If for those reasons you
03:11 20
          want to postpone it and it's a joint motion, the Court, of
    21
          course, will entertain one. But we want to get it scheduled
    22
          now, in default of which we will go forward. So if the 8th is
    23
          not good, we'll find another date for you, maybe earlier that
    24
          week.
    25
                   Thursday, the 9th. Any problem with that, Mr. Segal?
```

I thought Wednesday was the 9th.

```
MR. SEGAL: Tuesday is the 8th.
                   THE COURT: Wednesday, the 9th, is what we have down.
     3
                   MR. SEGAL: That's fine.
     4
     5
                   THE COURT: Wednesday, the 9th, at 3 p.m. Any problem
     6
          with that, Mr. Mitchell?
                   MR. MITCHELL: No, your Honor. That's fine, thanks.
     7
                   THE COURT: Then I understand there are certain
     8
          conditions that have been drafted by the Pretrial Services that
     9
          the Court will read into the record.
03:12 10
    11
                   The defendant is to be released on a $100,000
          unsecured appearance bond; to maintain his residence at 9
    12
    13
          Harcourt Street, No. 9, in Boston; his travel is restricted to
    14
          the District of Massachusetts.
    15
                   MR. SEGAL: Your Honor, may I ask -- I think I have
    16
          both the approval of Pretrial and Mr. Mitchell. If that could
    17
          be continental United States, I think both feel that that's
          appropriate in this case.
    18
    19
                   THE COURT: You mean rather than the District of
03:12 20
          Massachusetts?
    21
                   MR. SEGAL: Yes, your Honor.
                   MR. RILEY: That's agreeable as long as the defendant
    22
    23
          provides us with advance notice to travel outside of
          Massachusetts.
    24
    25
                   THE COURT: Yes. Any travel outside of the
```

Commonwealth of Massachusetts will be upon notice to the Pretrial Services.

MR. SEGAL: Thank you.

3

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.1

22

23

24

25

03:14 20

03:13 10

THE COURT: And then, as I was saying, the defendant is to surrender both his U.S. and Austrian passports to Pretrial Services. Apparently that has already been done. He is to seek permission of Pretrial Services one week in advance of any proposed international travel and is to provide Pretrial Services with complete travel itinerary. If approved, the defendant may obtain temporary release of his passports which must be surrendered upon his return to the United States, in Boston, on the next business day after return.

Any international travel authorized by Pretrial Services shall be limited to 24 days in duration, and failure to return to the United States by the 24th day shall cause the forfeiture of the \$100,000 unsecured bond.

Now, I do understand that the agreement has been further amended, that, in addition, the defendant is, before any foreign travel, to submit to the Clerk of Court, rather than to the government, a quitclaim deed on his property.

Where is that property located?

MR. SEGAL: He has -- your clerk has the deed, your Honor.

THE COURT: Property at 9 to 17 Harcourt Street, Unit 206, in Boston. And the quitclaim deed, which the Court -- at

```
least a copy of which the Court has in hand, is the one that's
     1
          to be turned over to the Clerk of Court?
     2
                   MR. SEGAL: I gave the Court the deed.
     3
                   THE COURT: All right. Now, all of those conditions
     4
     5
          -- first of all, Mr. Schober, your failure to attend your
     6
          sentencing, which has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 9,
          2011, at 3 p.m., in this courthouse -- failure to appear is a
     7
          criminal offense for which you could be sentenced to
     8
     9
          imprisonment. And all of the conditions on which you are
03:15 10
          released, which the Court just recorded on the record, continue
    11
          to apply, and the penalties for violating any of those
          conditions can be severe. Do you understand all of that?
    12
    13
                   MR. SCHOBER: I do.
    14
                   THE COURT: Is there any further business then to come
    15
          before the Court in these proceedings? Mr. Segal?
    16
                   MR. SEGAL: No, your Honor.
    17
                   THE COURT: Mr. Mitchell?
    18
                   MR. MITCHELL: No, your Honor.
    19
                   THE COURT: Thank you. We are adjourned.
03:15 20
           (Whereupon, at 3:13 p.m. the hearing concluded.)
    21
    22
    23
    24
    25
```

## 

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my skill and ability.

## /s/Cheryl Dahlstrom

## 12/16/2010

Cheryl Dahlstrom, RMR, CRR Dated

Official Court Reporter