Case 1:14-cr-00068-KBF Document 218 Filed 02/25/15 Page 1 of 187

F23qulb1 Trial UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 14 Cr. 68 (KBF) V. 5 ROSS WILLIAM ULBRICHT, 6 Defendant. 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. February 3, 2015 9 9:10 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. KATHERINE B. FORREST, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 BY: SERRIN A. TURNER TIMOTHY HOWARD 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 JOSHUA LEWIS DRATEL LINDSAY LEWIS 20 JOSHUA HOROWITZ Attorneys for Defendant 21 - also present -22 Special Agent Vincent D'Agostino Molly Rosen, Government Paralegal 23 Nicholas Evert, Government Paralegal 24 25

(In open court; jury not present)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: The continued matter on trial, the United States of America v. Ross William Ulbricht, 14 Cr. 68.

Counsel, state your names for the record.

MR. TURNER: Good morning. Serrin Turner for the government. With me at counsel table is AUSA Tim Howard and paralegal Molly Rosen.

MR. DRATEL: Good morning, your Honor. Joshua Dratel for Mr. Ulbricht who is standing besides me, also Lindsey Lewis from my office and also Joshua Horowitz.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you.

We have several housekeeping matters to go over this morning. Let me make sure that the agenda I have corresponds with the matters which you folks agree we should raise.

I would like to check in and find out what the status is of the testimony of Bridget Prince. We left that as an open issue last night. Defense was going to think about it some more. I didn't receive any submissions on that, so I just wanted to find out where that stands.

MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, we're not going to use the timeline during her testimony. We informed the government of that last night.

THE COURT: All right. Then for inigo, we need to go over that and then we need to go over the defense-requested jury instructions, so those two final matters, since I think we

| FZ39uIDI

have then taken care of the one, are where we are.

Are there things which you folks would like to raise?

MR. TURNER: No, your Honor. I responded to the inigo issue.

THE COURT: Mr. Dratel, anything from your perspective you would like to raise in addition to those items?

MR. DRATEL: No.

THE COURT: In terms of inigo, I have received the letter from defense counsel. Let me just preview that I think it breaks into analytically into two very separate inquiries though they're related: One is the hearsay issue relating to reading into the record the statement that inigo, a cooperating witness, gave to the government and as recounted in the letter of December 29. So there's the hearsay issue and then there's a separate request for a missing witness charge in the event that the statement is otherwise disallowed. So I think analytically those are related but stand separately.

Mr. Turner, I didn't receive a written response from the government. I knows you folks are busy, but why don't you tell me your views.

MR. TURNER: Sure. As the government sees it, this is sort of another example of the defense assuming they can get in their case through our witnesses. So the defense has known for approximately two weeks that we were not going to call Mr. Jones. They made no effort to contact or subpoena

Mr. Jones until the eve of the defense case. They didn't ask us to immunize him. They made no effort to draft any stipulation even though we told them that we were open to a stipulation until the eve of their case. And now the defense is trying to use the lack of time, which is an issue of their own making, to try to force the government to agree to whatever stipulation language the defense wants, even though it does not include language that is favorable to the government.

Defense counsel had no right to assume that he'd be able to rely on a stipulation to get in facts they want from Mr. Jones. You have to have a witness lined up in case a stipulation falls through. That's why for Alex miller with Stack Overflow, we wanted to get that in through stipulation. We weren't able to work that out. We had Alex Miller ready to testify. They were obliged to do the same thing with Mr. Jones.

Defense counsel is trying to make it out as we engaged in some sort of tactical maneuver by not calling Mr. Jones. We didn't call Mr. Jones because we felt like we no longer needed it for the case. That was our right. That was our call. And the defense was not entitled to rely on our calling a witness during our case and them getting in some fact from Mr. Jones through his testimony on our case.

The confrontation issue that they have tried to raise is ludicrous. This is a stipulation we're talking about. So a

stipulation can present any statements that the witness would be able to testify to. And it would be perfectly appropriate if he were to testify about this conversation he had to explain his understanding of the conversation, to explain his state of mind during the conversation. It happens all the time when you have witnesses testifying about conversations they're having with other people and what's going on, the context of those conversations. That's all we were trying to put in this stipulation and the defense didn't want that in. We think it's necessary to be balanced.

So if they're not amenable to a stipulation, then it's up to them to call the witness. You can't just get in core hearsay because the government won't stipulate to putting information in a stipulation. You can't just take a letter that the government sends, which is not the declarant's statement, that is the government's disclosure, that is the government's characterization, that's not been adopted by the declarant, so you can't just ignore the hearsay rules and just submit a letter.

THE COURT: Let's go to the hearsay rules. As I said,
I think this breaks analytically into two pieces, each of which
have their own independent evidentiary standards. One is 8043,
there's a typo in defense letter but we understood from
yesterday what he was referring to, so it's not 803. It's 8043
which is a statement against penal interest, which is an easy

juxtaposition to make, that statement against penal interest, as the Court understands it, requires two parts: It requires subpart A and subpart B. Subpart A requires a statement against penal interest, which typically is a statement made under circumstances which indicate that no person would have made it unless they were telling the truth because it was so contrary to their interest under those circumstances to do so. And it also requires B, which is big letter B, B also requires some independent corroborating evidence as to the trustworthiness and/or reliability.

Why don't you address whether or not, putting aside the circumstances over not reaching the stipulation, whether or not the hearsay statement otherwise meets the standard under 8043.

MR. TURNER: First of all, it's not his statement. It's not like an email that he sent. It's not an affidavit he signed.

THE COURT: No. It's your recitation of his statement.

MR. TURNER: That is hearsay.

THE COURT: I understand we're dealing with hearsay.

I'm saying tell me why it doesn't fit within the hearsay exception.

MR. TURNER: The point is, it's not just the declarant's statement; it's somebody else's statement about

what the declarant said, so it's double hearsay.

THE COURT: Lovely.

MR. TURNER: And that's part of the problem. That's a characterization of what this declarant said. It's not the statement itself.

THE COURT: So we go to both pieces of it, okay.

MR. TURNER: Right.

THE COURT: Mr. Turner, I'm trying to cut through because let me be perfectly blunt: I don't think this meets the hearsay standard. I don't think under 8043 this is a statement against penal interest. The reason for that is because the witness at the time was already under a cooperation agreement.

Under a cooperation agreement, under Second Circuit law, there is clear law that says that you're no longer under criminal penalty for making a particular statement; (B), based upon the representations of the government, there's no corroborating evidence for reliability because there's no chat that ever indicates apparently that this ever happened.

There's no indication in the record so far that there is an absence of chats and, therefore, the absence here, there's just nothing to corroborate this as a reliable statement. So I don't think it meets 8043.

Do you disagree with my analysis?

MR. TURNER: We absolutely disagree, and we just also

believe there are further reasons that it doesn't even come under 8043 to start with because it's not this witness' statement. It's the government's statement about what he said.

THE COURT: Why don't you go to the missing witness charge, which I think is analytically separate.

MR. TURNER: Again, this is an issue of the defendant's own making. If they wanted to call this witness, that's something they should have realized right after they learned we weren't going to call him. If they thought he was that important to their case, they should have asked can we immunize him, can we call him. That could have been worked out two weeks ago.

THE COURT: Would you have immunized him or is this sort of an argument that you can make because they didn't ask but you would not in fact have immunized him?

MR. TURNER: No. I'm not representing that at all. It think we would have immunized him. He's under our control and we would not have resisted allowing him to testify. The point is, even a stipulation was not proposed until the eve of the defense case when government counsel was busy preparing for closing, preparing for possible cross of the defendant, preparing for the witnesses that were going to be part of the defense case.

This was sprung on the government on the last minute. It's an issue of the defense's own making and to say that, oh,

now there's an unavailable witness because they don't have time now to scramble and subpoena this witness and work out the immunity issues, it's their fault.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, I thought that Mr. Dratel had information that indicated this witness would take the Fifth if called.

MR. TURNER: Apparently he called his counsel, he didn't call me, he called — this is just based on what Mr. Dratel said in court, I didn't even talk to counsel for Mr. Jones since then. But I understand that he called counsel for Mr. Jones and counsel said, well, he'd take the Fifth. But defense counsel can still contact the government and see if we would immunize the witness so that he couldn't claim the Fifth Amendment. We never had that discussion. We were never consulted about that.

MR. DRATEL: It's not the government's position to immunize a witness. It's the Court's authority under the statute. The government has never immunized a defense witness, never.

THE COURT: They make an application, which is then so ordered by the Court but typically it's within the prosecutorial discretion as to whether to suggest immunization, so they are related.

MR. DRATEL: That's the most specious argument, the most disingenuous argument I have heard. This is completely

outrageous. By the way, last weekend we were told that

Mr. Turner would not agree to anything and would not discuss
anything with us, and that's what we were told last week. I'm
just -- I want to call Mr. Turner as a witness. We'll
eliminate the double hearsay problem. He wrote the letter and
signed it. He's disavowing it. This is so disingenuous, so
outrageous. A prosecutor has obligations that transcend
wanting to win the case at all costs, and this is what we have
here.

THE COURT: Let's take these two issues analytically separately; one is the hearsay issue whether we think of it as single hearsay or double hearsay, 8043, whether or not those standards are met.

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: If they're not met, then we are into the world of the missing witness charge. If they are met, then there is some other issues as to whether we can read it in.

MR. DRATEL: Two things: One is, it is a statement against penal interest. He is not sentenced. All of these things can be raised at sentencing. That's why he has a Fifth Amendment privilege is because the statement against penal — even if he's cooperating, and the truthfulness and the trustworthiness aspect of it, there's a chat that substantiates the first part of it, so that indicates the trustworthiness. They went and found the chat. They didn't have the chat

beforehand. They went and found the chat which substantiated the first part, and he is under an obligation to tell the truth or else he loses his cooperation agreement. Every jury is told that and argued by the government why would — they're going to argue it here with respect to Mr. Duch. They're going to argue it here with respect to Mr. Bates. They're going to say this guy has an agreement. He would never lie to you. What more trust — they can't have it both ways.

They continually want it both ways. This is a preposterous argument. I want a page and—a—half stipulation that they don't have time to read. They knew exactly what was in the — my stipulation is completely what's in the letter. And what I objected to in their stipulation is what they're not entitled to. They could have called the witness if they wanted balance.

THE COURT: Hold on. I want us to pull back and take a deep breath and focus on --

MR. DRATEL: It's just an outrage. That's all. It's an outrage.

THE COURT: I hear what you're saying. I do want us to focus on the evidentiary rules because --

MR. DRATEL: Part of it is fairness. Part of it is Chambers v. Mississippi. Part of it is due process. Part of it is they can't do a bait and switch. I called the lawyer. He's on trial, by the way. I called him on the weekend and he

told me he's taking the Fifth.

They never offered — this immunity is preposterous. You should ask them right now. He's said no, we're not saying we're going to immunize him. Of course not, because they're not going to. This is a bogus argument, bogus, bogus, bogus, and it's coming in a way that is completely disingenuous.

He should be a witness, and it's a problem 100 percent of his making because they had him on the witness list. In the middle of trial, they say he's not testifying. He's the best witness; Mr. Turner wrote the letter. He heard the statement. He was there.

THE COURT: You folks are sufficiently emotional about it. I have the government's statement. I have your letter. I have read your letter. I have also looked at case law. Let me be sure that I understand the chats which do exist versus the chats which don't exist.

As I understand it, the chat which does exist is the October 16, 2012 chat which indicates the "recommend a good book Rothbard" answer, that that chat has been found.

MR. DRATEL: Correct.

THE COURT: I understand that paragraph C, which is really the heart of what we're discussing here, the chat as to whether the key identifying question was asked, that chat has not been found.

MR. DRATEL: Because it was a Pidgin chat, which are

not saved. It's different. It's a different type of chat.

THE COURT: There are some.

MR. DRATEL: Well, not the Pidgin chats, no.

THE COURT: Here, let me just tell you my ruling on the 804(3) issue. On the 804(3) issue, putting aside the double level of hearsay, just assuming that this is a faithful representation of what the witness said, it's an out-of-court statement; without a doubt it's being offered for the truth. It has to meet both provisions of 804(3).

I do not believe that it was against the declarant's penal interest as the case law interprets it because he was under a cooperation agreement at the time. Moreover, the chat itself independently and in itself doesn't carry any particular penal impact; in other words, it's not the equivalent of a statement saying I sold the drugs or the equivalent of saying I did X, Y or Z. It's simply whether or not a particular communication occurred. So it does not meet some of the circumstances that are anticipated under (A).

Under subpart (B), it also needs to be -- and there's an "and" between those subparts -- corroborated by circumstantial evidence clearly indicating its trustworthiness. Its trustworthiness is not whether or not it was said to Mr. Turner. Its trustworthiness is whether or not it ever occurred. There's nothing that I'm aware of that indicates the trustworthiness as to whether or not it ever occurred.

Therefore, it is not a hearsay statement which can come in under 8043.

Under a missing witness charge, I've received the government's now oral response and I've also looked at the defendant's papers. Important in this regard are several Second Circuit cases, which the Court pulled this morning. One is the Myerson case, 18 F.3d 153 at pin cite 159; the other is the Burgess v. U.S. case, which is a DC circuit case — the Myerson case is a Second Circuit case — the Burgess case is a DC circuit case which is quoted at length in the Myerson case favorably. That's at 440 F.2d 226. And then there are a series of other cases. There's the U.S. v. Torres case, Second Circuit, 845 F.2d 1165, pin cite 1169 to 70.

In the *Myerson* case where there's a question about a missing witness, the Court is to look at a series of things:

One the relation of the parties, not only physical availability, and I think that there are some questions as to whether or not there was in fact true physical availability which would include the immunity issues and everything else, but the Court does note the special relationship between the parties by virtue of the cooperation agreement and that, therefore, there is some further ability by the government to control this witness.

Whether or not that the defense did all that it could have I think is open to question but, frankly, I'm more

persuaded that the government does have control over this witness. That does not end the analysis. That just clears us to the point where we're able to ask the substantive question. The substantive question is whether or not — and by the way, immunity is only given under extraordinary circumstances and I don't think that immunity here would be extraordinary circumstances.

But putting that aside, the question really is, and
I'm quoting from the Second Circuit, "When the court is asked
to give the instruction, then a judgment is to be reached as to
whether, from all the circumstances, an inference of
unfavorable testimony from an absent witness is a natural and
reasonable one."

From the *Burgess* case, I'm going to recite a longer paragraph because it gives really the basis for what all of the circuit courts do in this regard and it's the *Burgess* case is widely cited for setting this standard.

"When the court is asked to give the instruction, then a judgment is to be reached as to whether, from all the circumstances, an inference of unfavorable testimony from an absent witness is a natural and reasonable one. In reaching a decision, the court will have in mind that it is not ruling upon an offer of evidence. The missing witness instruction is not evidence, but is concerned with the absence of evidence.

While the context in which the question arises may clothe the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

missing witness with significance, there is the danger that the instruction permitting an adverse inference may add a fictitious weight to one side or another of the case. When thus an instruction is sought, which, in a sense, creates evidence from the absence of evidence, the court is entitled to reserve to itself the right to reach a judgment as wisely as can be done in all the circumstances."

It is the Court's view having looked at the proffered language, and assuming that the witness, if called, would testify to that language, is that this is not reasonably exculpatory when all things are considered. This witness says he asked a first question. There's no indication that it was not answered -- I quess the only implication is it was not There's no implication that it was answered wrongly. answered. There's no implication as to whether or not multiple things were going on at the same time. Eleven months had passed. second question was then asked to reveal identity, just as Google does to reveal identity of people all the time where you get three or four different questions to figure out what your first dog's name was, that second question was answered correctly; and therefore, the only reasonable inference to be drawn from this is that the DPR identification was completed. Any other inference would be, in this Court's view, an unreasonable inference, so the inigo issue is resolved. There will be no missing witness instruction on that issue.

MR. DRATEL: Then I'm signing the stipulation that the government proposed.

THE COURT: Go ahead. Do you want to agree to the stipulation?

MR. DRATEL: He already did. He proposed it to me.

MR. TURNER: Let me just consult, your Honor, over the break.

THE COURT: That's fine with me. If you stipulate to facts, that takes it out of the Court's hands, then I have no reason to make an independent evidentiary ruling.

Now, on the jury instructions, we will accept the defense jury instruction on the character evidence with the addition of two sentences from the Sands instruction. Sands for character evidence also includes — I don't have the exact language right here, but it's essentially, here it is, the testimony is not to be taken by you as the witness' opinion as to whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty, that question is for you alone to determine.

So it will say an independent — there will be an independent instruction on character: You have reputation evidence about the defendant's character trait for peacefulness and nonviolence. This testimony is not to be taken by you as the witness' opinion as to whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. That question is for you alone to determine. You should consider character evidence together with and in the

same way as all other evidence in the case. So that will be included.

MR. DRATEL: I object to that sentence being added. Sand also has that a character testimony alone can provide a reasonable doubt and I left that out because generally most of the circuits don't have that and they don't have the other sentence. What I took is from the Seventh Circuit. I believe it's the same as the Ninth Circuit. It's a very simple instruction and I object to that additional sentence.

THE COURT: Your objection is noted.

As to supplemental instructions number two, three and four as well as five, those will not be included for the following reasons: Number two is an incorrect statement of the law. Conduct outside of a district when combined with sufficient jurisdictional conduct within a district is fine.

As to three, it's confusing and misleading and, in fact, the undercover purchases becomes argumentive because they're not by themselves. These are combined with a whole variety of other evidence, so that's not an issue. But in any event, by themselves, they would nonetheless be potentially evidence of a variety of things.

The Homeland Security seizures could be, for instance, evidence of sales over the Internet. They could be evidence of sales of a narcotics conspiracy or substantive narcotics violations. The venue issue the Court has already discussed at

length.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In terms of fake identification documents, that's just an incorrect statement of the law.

In terms of supplemental defense instruction number five, this is not applicable under the circumstances here. This is not about a law enforcement confession. There are independent indicia of reliability for these statements indeed because they were stated in chats where this individual believed that the communications were quite secure and anonymous; but in any event, the cases cited are inapplicable to this statement. So that's the Court's ruling on those instructions.

Are there any other applications we should take up before we bring the jury out?

MR. TURNER: Not from the government.

MR. DRATEL: Well, I want to know about the stipulation before we start the case.

MR. TURNER: I'll need to confer, your Honor.

THE COURT: You folks do that outside of the presence of the Court. We're waiting, I think, for everybody else to be gathered for the jurors. We had most of them but not all.

We have three witnesses. Who is going to be the first witness?

MR. DRATEL: We only have two witnesses.

THE COURT: Who is the one who is not going to be

testifying?

MR. DRATEL: Schiller.

THE COURT: Schiller will not be here?

MR. DRATEL: Correct.

THE COURT: So we'll have Kincade and Prince. And Prince is going to be talking about an investigation which she herself conducted and has firsthand knowledge.

MR. DRATEL: Put in some documents mostly. She'll be putting in documents.

THE COURT: Let's take it step by step. I assume she's got some independent foundation and basis. She can't be a generalized custodian of records but we'll take it --

MR. DRATEL: She reviewed certain discovery that they provided. It's clearly authentic because it's provided by the government. And you wouldn't let me get it in through the guys who authenticated the actual material, so I'm putting it through my witness. Like you said, put on a witness.

So I'm putting on witness who has reviewed the material provided by the government. I'm putting in two documents through her that were government exhibits back in December. These are two documents that were government exhibits, Government Exhibit 242 and Government Exhibit 252. They were government exhibits back in December, and I'm putting them in.

THE COURT: What's her basis for firsthand knowledge

as to those documents?

MR. DRATEL: She has reviewed the image of the laptop that the government provided us. The government is going to back off that then, fine; if they're going to make that argument, that's another argument that is really --

THE COURT: Mr. Dratel, I simply asked you for just what she had looked at. You've answered that. Exhibit 242, I thought this came in.

MR. DRATEL: Which?

THE COURT: 242.

MR. HOWARD: To be clear, some of the exhibits were renumbered, so I think he's referring to what was originally numbered as 242.

THE COURT: What is the current number?

MR. DRATEL: There is no current number because the government pulled it. It's our exhibit I believe it's D. I have the original government exhibits here, your Honor.

THE COURT: And what's the second document?

MR. DRATEL: I'm sorry. 243, not 242. 243 and 252 is the original exhibits.

THE COURT: Basically what she's going to do is say I reviewed the hard drive. These are documents which I saw on the hard drive. They're true and correct copies of what I saw on the hard drive?

MR. DRATEL: Correct.

THE COURT: And she's not going to interpret the content?

MR. DRATEL: I'm going to read.

THE COURT: That's fine. If they're received into evidence, you would read it.

Is that going to create any problems?

MR. TURNER: We don't have any authenticity objections. I think we're going to have a relevance objection to Exhibit N. I don't know how it's relevant to the defense case. And if I'm guessing why they want to put it in, then I think we're going to object for the basis.

THE COURT: Let's see how that goes. If there's no authenticity issue so far as this witness is concerned, she can do what Mr. Dratel is suggesting, which is to say I reviewed the hard drives, these were on the hard drives, I printed them off, here they are. They'll be received into evidence.

Mr. Dratel will then -- unless you object on relevance grounds, I'll take a look at it -- but Mr. Dratel will read in whatever he's going to read in.

MR. TURNER: Right. I think our objection is going to be in the nature of relevance and hearsay.

THE COURT: Why doesn't somebody hand me them so I can look at these while we are waiting for the jury. We're waiting for four. They have gotten used to us.

MR. DRATEL: C and N.

THE COURT: Is she going to do anything apart from those two documents, Mr. Dratel?

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor. She's going to talk about her review of the Google production with respect to emails during periods of time that we have already established. There was a gap in the login. And then she's also going to recite from the complaint about four sections, probably about four sentences.

MR. TURNER: We object to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I understand what their issues are, do you have any issue with the witness saying I reviewed the Google production and there's a gap between X period of time and Y period of time? This is what I have personally observed from my review of these hard copies. There's nothing for X to Y.

MR. DRATEL: No. The opposite, that there are emails.

THE COURT: Okay, whatever it is. My personal observation of the production is that there are emails covering whatever the period is.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ TURNER: The issue is whether she has foundation to opine about --

THE COURT: She's presumably looked a the production.

MR. TURNER: Right, but there are two issues. We can

look at the emails in the email account and then there's the logs, the IP logs which show the defendant log into a Gmail

account. I know from having dealt with Google before that those IP logs are not complete; they don't log in every log, for example --

THE COURT: But she won't be speculating as to why. She'll just be saying this is what's here; this is what's not here. So be it.

MR. DRATEL: Why did we present a stipulation that those are accurate records if he knows they're not? I don't get it.

THE COURT: I don't even follow that one. I'm focused on one very small thing, which is, it sounds like she's reviewed this production.

MR. DRATEL: It's simple.

THE COURT: And she just wants to say I review it, here's what is here.

MR. TURNER: The problem is, your Honor, if she's interpreting --

THE COURT: She can't interpret, right, because she's not a Google witness.

MR. TURNER: If that's implicit in the testimony, then she's interpreting what the Google records mean.

THE COURT: We'll get to each question as it comes, but in terms of her ability to say I reviewed the Google production, this is what I have observed personally in terms of the Google production in terms of the date ranges are as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

follows X, Y or Z, that's fine.

MR. DRATEL: They can put on a witness to say that the records mean something else. I'll argue that in summation.

I'm not going to ask her to argue it.

THE COURT: I take it she's not going to draw conclusions from the presence or absence of documents; is that right?

MR. TURNER: That's what I'm --

THE COURT: I'm trying to figure out from Mr. Dratel.

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: She's not going to draw conclusions.

She's just going to state the facts.

MR. DRATEL: No.

THE COURT: That's fine. We'll take it step by step.

These are the two documents I understand she'll be doing other than that and reciting from the criminal complaint.

MR. TURNER: I just want to be clear on what is being offered because the government is getting conflicting messages.

One of the exhibits looks like this.

THE COURT: That I have as Defense Exhibit C it looks like. It's the multipage document.

MR. DRATEL: No, no. It's D actually. C.

THE COURT: I have C.

MR. DRATEL: C is the law enforcement file.

MS. LEWIS: Here is a copy of C.

MR. TURNER: This I think raises problems, your Honor, 1 and I think we need to address it at side bar. This raises 2 3 significant problems. 4 THE COURT: Let me read this. 5 MR. DRATEL: This was a government exhibit. 6 This was originally a government exhibit? THE COURT: 7 MR. DRATEL: Yes; 243. MR. TURNER: It's different. 8 9 MR. DRATEL: I printed it this morning from their 10 first disk. I can give the Court the copy that I printed this 11 morning from their disk. 12 MS. LEWIS: Actually, I even have a copy here that I 13 put a sticker on weeks ago. You can see on the back. 14 MR. TURNER: This means nothing. We need a side bar. 15 THE COURT: Hold on. You know what, I'll tell you, I need to read this and 16 17 I can't do it with you folks because you interrupt my train of 18 thought. 19 Joe, how many are we waiting for? We are still 20 waiting for four. 21 MR. TURNER: I'd also note this was not emailed to us 22 before the Court's deadline for disclosure of exhibits. It was 23 just sprung on us now.

not going to quibble with timing in light of the back and forth

THE COURT: All right. Well, we've had issues.

24

25

THE COURT:

He wants to put it in as an admission.

25

1 Anc

And actually whether or not it would come through this witness and whether or not Mr. Dratel would stand up and state it as an admission I think is not -- the vehicle is not the issue; it's the content.

MR. DRATEL: One is the \$79.8 million in commissions. That's one. That's in paragraph 22C. And then paragraph 24A, the Silk Road forum in its current form was created on or about June 18, 2011.

At 24CII, the first sentence which is a quote from on or about December 1, 2011, DPR announced that he had changed the onion address for the Silk Road website, stated Silk Road now resides at a new more easily remembered URL address.

And III: On or about October 19, 2011, DPR posted a message concerning an outage of the Silk Road website explaining we are having to rebuild the site from a backup.

DPR assured the sites users, etc.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, in terms of the DPR October 19 posting, is it the case that that posting is somewhere on the hard drives that have been received into evidence?

MR. DRATEL: Yes, from the servers.

THE COURT: Is it also the case that the quote from on or about December 1, 2011 where DPR announced that he had changed the onion address for the website, stated Silk Road now resides at a new more easily remembered URL address, I actually

thought we had gotten that into evidence at one point.

MR. DRATEL: We may have, your Honor. I'll withdraw that one.

THE COURT: I think that came in early. But in any event, I would assume that would actually be part of a post also that is on the servers.

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: So I understand the lay of the land, would you state the date of the complaint?

MR. DRATEL: Okay. I'll do it how ever the Court wants me to do it.

THE COURT: My copy of the complaint, which I used to carry faithfully because this was a big issue, I left downstairs. Does somebody have a copy I can take a look at?

MR. DRATEL: I have it, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's 22C.

MR. DRATEL: May I add one thing. With respect to Ms. Prince, I would have, had the Court not precluded Defendant's E earlier, I would have also moved to introduce that through her.

THE COURT: So noted. Are you planning on reading the entire -- it looks like the October 19, 2011 post is just a post. Are you going to read that entire paragraph, or just the top part? You've highlighted just a piece of it.

MR. DRATEL: Right. I'll read the whole thing if

2

3

45

6

7

8

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

that's the way the Court wants me to do it. I was trying to be as surgical as possible.

THE COURT: The one thing you shouldn't do is talk about based on his training and experience what it means.

MR. DRATEL: Right.

MR. TURNER: Your Honor, we addressed this issue, you may recall, in our January 22 letter.

THE COURT: I remember.

MR. TURNER: There's *United States v. Purdy*. It clearly holds you cannot just introduce a bill of particulars, prior indictment, certainly not a complaint without some showing that is inconsistent with the position the government is taking now.

If they want to produce these forum posts, they can introduce the forum posts. There's no need to get them in through the complaint. They have the forum posts.

THE COURT: Right, but I have the ability, if there is an easy and efficient way to do something and that these are accurate reflections of forum posts, just to have it done through these, right?

This doesn't strike me as something which is particularly earth shattering and you can address the timing and what inference should be drawn from the timing.

MR. TURNER: But getting it in through the complaint suggests that the government is taking some different position

1 now.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Dratel, are you amenable to just saying that you're going to read the following into the record --

MR. DRATEL: Sure.

THE COURT: -- from posts from Silk Road?

MR. DRATEL: Yeah.

THE COURT: You can use the complaint's recitation as a faithful representation of what those posts said?

MR. DRATEL: That's fine.

THE COURT: So you won't cloak it in the ermine cloth, such as it is, of a complaint.

MR. DRATEL: No, not of Mr. Turner's complaint.

THE COURT: Fine. You can do those. That issue is done. Hand back the complaint. Just don't call it a complaint and please, as a result, you can just say that these come from posts on Silk Road. Now, if those paragraphs don't come from posts on Silk Road, you're going to have to modify that language in some manner.

MR. DRATEL: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

MR. TURNER: I'm sorry to belabor the issue, but I'm not clear. There were two posts and then there were two other things from the complaint that the defense wanted to read that were not in the nature of posts.

before, 401C, it's another post.

MR. DRATEL: Right. Then also on December 1 the page

24

25

THE COURT: It's a post.

MR. DRATEL: Yes, December 1, 2011.

THE COURT: If it's a post, you can read it as a post.

MR. DRATEL: What does the Court want me to say --

THE COURT: About the 79.8, which apparently that may have changed. One can argue an inference that it did or did not change over time, but that is based upon information as of this date.

MR. TURNER: We ask that the context of that sentence in the complaint be read in in full, because the complaint is very clear that this was based as of the date of the arrest.

THE COURT: Fine. Why don't you pull out that language and make sure you all agree on the highlight on that.

MR. TURNER: I'd also like an instruction to the jury that they're not to infer that there is some sort of inconsistency here. This is why it's being put in, because the defendant is trying to confuse the jury that the government said that \$80 million in bitcoins were seized or were part of the commissions and now it's only saying that \$13 million in commissions. It is apples and oranges, and they're trying to treat it as the same thing.

This is being introduced for no other purpose but to confuse the jury and that's why *Purdy* is important.

THE COURT: All right. I will give the instruction.

Mr. Dratel, you'll give the entirety of that context, all

```
F23gulb1
                                Trial
      right?
1
 2
               MR. DRATEL: Okay.
 3
               THE COURT: We're still waiting on three. We'll come
 4
      back out as soon as they have or I have a resolution of this
 5
      situation.
 6
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
 7
                (Recess)
 8
                (Continued on next page)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Trial

- 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 2 BY MS. LEWIS:
- 3 | Q. What is your name?
- 4 A. Christopher Kincaid.
- 5 | Q. How old are you?
- 6 A. 31.
- 7 Q. And where do you live?
- 8 A. 235 Monterey Boulevard in San Francisco.
- 9 | O. That's in California?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And where do you currently work?
- 12 A. I work at Room & Board, a furniture store in San Francisco.
- 13 | Q. How long have you worked there?
- 14 A. It's been about three months at this point.
- 15 Q. OK. What did you do before that for work?
- 16 A. I worked for a chi tea company for a short period of time,
- 17 | and then before that I worked for a mattress company and
- 18 managed their flagship store for seven years.
- 19 Q. OK. What is your educational background?
- 20 | A. Currently I'm working on my associate's degree and hoping
- 21 to transfer to State or UC. I am a psyche major.
- 22 | Q. Are you familiar with Ross Ulbricht?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. OK. And how are you familiar with Ross?
- 25 A. I was living with Ross for a couple of months roughly 15 or

- Kincaid direct
- 1 16 months ago.
- And that was until his arrest? 2 OK. Q.
- 3 Yes. Α.
- 4 OK. So from about August to September -- I'm sorry, August Q.
- 5 to October?
- That sounds right. 6 Α.
- 7 And that is 2013? Q.
- 8 Α. Yes.
- 9 And do you see Ross in the courtroom today? Q.
- 10 Α. Oh, yes.
- 11 And can you identify him by an article of clothing that he
- 12 is wearing?
- 13 Yeah. He's got a gray sweater on and a white collared
- 14 shirt.
- 15 Q. And how did Ross come to live with you?
- A. A room in our house opened up and we posted a Craigslist 16
- 17 ad, and there were several people who came to look at the room.
- 18 We had a good feeling about Ross from the first conversation
- 19 that we had with him. He was actually trying to decide between
- 20 two places to live, and ultimately he decided to move in with
- us and we were happy to have him. 21
- 22 Q. When you say "our house," who is that?
- 23 That was myself, my wife and our other roommate Alex.
- 24 And so how many people were living at the house at
- 25 that time?

Kincaid - direct

- Including Ross, there was four of us. 1 Α.
- How big is the house? 2 Q.
- 3 It is a three-bedroom. Α.
- 4 Did you ever know him by any other name besides Ross Q.
- 5 Ulbricht?
- 6 Α. No.

7

9

- Did you socialize with him while he was living with you? Q.
- Oh, yeah, absolutely. 8 Α.
 - And in what ways did you socialize?
- 10 It was common for us to hang out in the living room, and he
- 11 would play on his djembe, his drum, and I would play my bass
- 12 quitar and, you know, talk about random life events. And there
- 13 was a time he had a gathering of people out at the beach and we
- 14 all just kind of hung out and celebrated. I mean, he
- accompanied me to a friend's birthday one time, as well. 15
- we ended up leaving and going on this long walk to the city and 16
- 17 ended up food shopping and eating some crepes. And it was good
- times? 18
- 19 Did he ever bring people over to the house?
- 20 Oh, yeah. Absolutely. His childhood friend Rene and his
- 21 girlfriend came by for dinner one night, and Ross and them and
- 22 my wife and I all sat down in our living room and had dinner
- 23 together. And we shared childhood stories about Ross, and we
- 24 all kind of laughed at some of the peculiar things that he
- 25 shared. Yeah.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Kincaid - direct

- 1 And did you ever meet anyone else -- anyone else come over 2 to the house?
 - Absolutely. His family came and stayed with us A. Oh, yeah. for a couple of nights. I think they were on a road trip and his parents --
 - MR. HOWARD: Objection. Relevance.
 - THE COURT: Overruled.
 - You can continue.
 - His parents stayed with us for a couple of nights, and I was fortunate to meet his brother during that time as well.
 - So which of his family members did you meet then?
- 12 It was his mother Lynn and his father Kirk and his brother 13 Travis.
- 14 Q. Around what time was this that they came to visit you or came to --15
- I want to say it was like somewhere between two and three 16 17 weeks before Ross was arrested.
- 18 OK. And where exactly did his family stay?
- They slept in his bed and he slept in the couch in the same 19 20 bedroom even though he was too tall for the couch and his legs 21 were hanging off the side.
- 22 Q. OK. And if you know, how much time did Ross spend with his 23 family during that visit?
- 24 I don't know exactly because I was working at the time, but 25 every time I was home he was there with his family. I think

Kincaid - direct

- they stayed for a few days beyond that as well, if I remember
 correctly.
- 3 MS. LEWIS: Thank you. No further questions.
- 4 | THE COURT: Thank you.
- 5 Mr. Howard.
- 6 MR. HOWARD: Thank you. I will be brief.
- 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 8 BY MR. HOWARD:
- 9 Q. So, Mr. Kincaid, you said on direct examination you only
- 10 knew the defendant for a couple of months before he was
- 11 | arrested, correct?
- 12 A. Yes, that's right.
- 13 | Q. And you weren't with him on the day that he was arrested,
- 14 were you?
- 15 A. No, sir. I was at work.
- 16 | Q. You sublet a room to him through Craigslist, right?
- 17 | A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
- 18 | Q. You sublet -- you leased a room in your house to him
- 19 | through Craigslist, correct?
- 20 A. That's right.
- 21 | Q. And he paid for the first month with a money order, isn't
- 22 | that right?
- 23 A. That sounds right.
- 24 | Q. You had no idea what he was doing for a living at the time,
- 25 | isn't that right?

- Α. I didn't.
- And now on direct examination you described you had a 2
- 3 social relationship while you lived with him, is that right?
- That's right. 4 Α.
- 5 Do you remember meeting with an FBI agent in late October,
- a couple of weeks after the defendant's arrest? 6
- 7 That sounds right.
- And do you remember telling -- isn't it true that you told 8
- 9 him that you barely spoke with the defendant during the two
- 10 months you lived with him?
- 11 I don't recall.
- 12 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
- 13 THE COURT: You may.
- 14 Would you just take a look at that document and let me know Q.
- 15 when you've finished reading it?
- 16 Α. OK.
- 17 Q. Does that refresh your memory?
- 18 Where would you like me to start, from the top --Α.
- I am not asking you to read it. 19 Q.
- 20 THE COURT: Don't read it out loud.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Oh, OK.
- 22 Does that refresh your memory about whether you told that
- 23 to the FBI agent?
- 24 It doesn't. Α.
- 25 MR. HOWARD: No further questions.

Kincaid - cross

- 1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
- Ms. Lewis, anything further from you? 2
- 3 MS. LEWIS: Just a couple of questions, your Honor.
- 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- BY MS. LEWIS: 5
- Q. Just to be clear, the activities you described, did you do 6
- 7 all these things with the defendant while you were living
- together? 8
- 9 Which activities? Sorry.
- 10 The ones you spoke about in your direct examination, the
- 11 parties you went to when you went to eat crepes, you know,
- 12 hanging out in the house playing the djembe drum, going on that
- 13 long walk together.
- 14 A. Yes. And there were times we went out to eat together as
- 15 well.
- He lived with you for two months, right? 16
- 17 That's right. Α.
- 18 Were you working during that time?
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 About how many hours a week were you working? 0.
- 21 Probably 45 to 50 hours. Α.
- 22 And was just on weekdays? Q.
- 23 No. I worked weekends and then I'd have two days off
- 24 during the week.
- 25 Thank you. No further questions. MS. LEWIS:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down, sir. 2 (Witness excused)

THE COURT: All right. Would the defense like to call its next witness, please?

MR. DRATEL: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

I call Bridget Prince.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Prince, please.

THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Stand.

Please raise your right hand.

BRIDGET PRINCE,

called as a witness by the defendant,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state and spell your full name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Bridget Prince, B-R-I-D-G-E-T

16 P-r-i-n-c-e.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Prince, please be seated. And it will be important for you to adjust that microphone so that you can speak into it clearly and directly, and there is water there on your left.

THE WITNESS: Great.

THE COURT: Mr. Dratel, you may proceed, sir.

MR. DRATEL: May I just have a moment, your Honor,

25 because I think there was a miscommunication? 1 (Pause)

2 Thank you, your Honor.

- 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 4 BY MR. DRATEL:
- 5 Q. Good morning.
- 6 A. Good morning.
- 7 | Q. Could you state your name again, please?
- 8 A. It's Bridget Prince.
- 9 | Q. And how old are you?
- 10 | A. I'm 39.
- 11 | Q. And how are you employed?
- 12 A. I'm an investigator and researcher.
- 13 Q. And what kind of investigation and research do you do?
- 14 A. I run a company called One World Research, and we carry out
- 15 \parallel a variety of investigations primarily for attorneys and NGOs.
- 16 | O. What are "NGOs"?
- 17 A. Nongovernmental organizations.
- 18 | Q. Can you give us an example of an NGO that you have worked
- 19 | for?
- 20 A. Human Rights Watch or the ACLU.
- 21 | Q. And how long have you been doing this job of One World
- 22 Research?
- 23 | A. I've worked for One World research since 2007.
- 24 | Q. And before that?
- 25 A. Before that I worked the Habeas Corpus Research Center in

Prince - direct

- 1 | San Francisco as an investigator, and before that I worked for
- 2 | a private investigator company called Murphy & Associates in
- 3 | San Francisco.
- 4 | Q. And what is your education?
- 5 A. I have a master's in human rights from the London School of
- 6 Economics and a bachelor's in Philosophy from Kings College,
- 7 | London.
- 8 Q. And you were retained by the defense in this case to be an
- 9 | investigator?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 | Q. I show you what's -- did you have access to the image of
- 12 | the defendant's laptop, Mr. Ulbricht's laptop?
- 13 | A. Yes, I did.
- 14 | Q. I'm going to approach and show you what's marked as
- 15 Defendant's M, as in Mary, and ask you if you recognize that
- 16 document.
- 17 | A. Yes, I do.
- 18 | Q. And can you just explain what it is generally?
- 19 | A. This is a document that was found on the laptop.
- 20 | O. And is it a file?
- 21 A. Yes. It is a text file.
- 22 | Q. And what is the name of the text file?
- 23 A. It's named "market rewrite."
- MR. DRATEL: I move Defendant's M in evidence, your
- 25 Honor.

Prince - direct

```
1
               MR. TURNER: No objection.
 2
               THE COURT: Received.
 3
               (Defendant's Exhibit M received in evidence)
 4
               MR. DRATEL: And could we publish Defendant's M,
 5
     please.
6
               (Pause)
 7
               THE COURT: Mr. Horowitz, will you be able to brighten
      that a little bit also?
8
9
               MR. HOROWITZ: I believe that once the projector warms
10
      up, it will probably be brighter.
11
               THE COURT: All right.
12
      BY MR. DRATEL:
13
      Q. So this document says: "For later.
14
               "Use auto focus on pages with form inputs.
15
               "reso center message format to make admin message
16
      clear.
17
               "Minimize cache parameters in silkroad," and then a
18
      symbol "users.
19
               "Group listings under category tree on vendor pages.
20
               "Update placeholders.
21
               "Style pagination links.
22
               "Flag URLs in discussion posts and reviews.
23
               "Cleanup order process.
24
               "Cleanup old orders still processing.
25
               "Add transaction hash to withdrawal and deposit
```

F23DULB2 Prince - direct

- 1 records.
- "Restrict item title characters. 2
- 3 "Change - one quantity to deleted flag.
- 4 "Move constants to global config."
- 5 And it is essentially a list, correct, the rest of it?
- That is right. 6 Α.
- 7 Now, did you have a chance to review production of
- Mr. Ulbricht's Google account? 8
- 9 Yes, I did. Α.
- 10 And did you review emails associated with that account?
- 11 Α. Yes, I did.
- 12 And did you review whether there were emails between June
- 13 24, 2013 and June 28, 2013?
- 14 Yes, I did. Α.
- 15 Q. Did you find emails from Mr. Ulbricht -- from Mr.
- Ulbricht's account for that period of time? 16
- 17 A. Yes, there were.
- 18 Q. And approximately how many emails did you find during that
- period that you looked? 19
- 20 A. Approximately six.
- 21 MR. DRATEL: May we approach, your Honor?
- 22 THE COURT: Yes. Do you mean to the sidebar?
- 23 MR. DRATEL: Yes. I'm sorry.
- 24 THE COURT: Sorry. I thought you meant the witness.
- 25 MR. DRATEL: Yes. I have one question.

(At the sidebar) MR. DRATEL: I just wanted to make sure. I am not going to ask her about the complaint. I am just going to read that in separately. THE COURT: Yes. MR. DRATEL: OK. (Continued on next page)

F23DULB2 Prince - direct 1 (In open court) MR. DRATEL: I have nothing further, your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 Anything from you, Mr. Turner? 5 MR. TURNER: No. Thank you. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down. 7 (Witness excused) THE COURT: Mr. Dratel. 8 9 MR. DRATEL: Yes. 10 I am just going to read what has been stipulated as 11 coming in. 12 THE COURT: These are posts from the Silk Road forum, 13 is that correct? MR. DRATEL: Yes. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. MR. DRATEL: DPR's first posting to the forum was 16 17 June 18, 2011. At that time DPR's username on the forum was 18 simply "SilkRoad." MR. TURNER: Your Honor, may we have one moment? 19 20 THE COURT: Yes. Hold on one second, Mr. Dratel. 21 MR. TURNER: This document is already in the record

MR. TURNER: This document is already in the record your Honor as 125A.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. So do you want to point out 125A, Mr. -- let me just take a look at it, but it is already in evidence. We can do it either way. You are certainly

1 | welcome to point it out now, if you would like.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DRATEL: That is a June 18, 2011 post from DPR with the username silkroad -- I'm sorry, it is from username silkroad. It is a June 18, 2011 post --

THE COURT: Do you want to just --

MR. DRATEL: -- by DPR.

THE COURT: Do you want to see the version that is in evidence? It might be helpful.

MR. DRATEL: OK.

THE COURT: Here. I can give you my hardcopy.

MR. DRATEL: OK. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: (Handing to Mr. Dratel).

MR. DRATEL: June 18, 2011, at 1:44 a.m.

"Hey, gang,

"Really sorry for the dead time there. Hopefully most of you got the message on the bitcoin forum or at silkroadmarket.org. The only major change is this forum. We have it running on a separate server with its own url so if the main site ever goes down again, first check here for updates. Unfortunately this means we have separate logins for the main site and the forum.

"As we mentioned before, everything was backed up and totally restored, but if for some reason a deposit didn't make it into your account or something like that, just let us know and we'll track it down and credit you. Also, we're giving

everyone a 4 day grace period on taking orders to the resolution center before they are auto-resolved, so sellers, you may see some orders past due for a few days.

"Thanks everyone for hanging in there with us. This work is scary and exciting all at the same time, and I'm really very happy to be on this journey with all of you.

"Cheers, Silk Road staff."

Another post, December 1, 2011, from the Silk Road staff. It says: "Silk Road now resides at a new more easily remembered URL" -- and I'll leave out the URL. "Please update your book marks and memorize it: Silk Road vb5piz3r.onion."

October 19, 2011, Silk Road staff posted a message as follows: "We're having to rebuild the site from a backup.

There was no security breach or anything to worry about that led to this situation. Release server space in different locations around the globe through unaware third parties. We do this to hide the identities of those that run Silk Road in the event of a security breach in one of the servers.

Unfortunately this means we have to deal with some unreliable people."

October 21, 2011, Silk Road staff posted: "The light at the end of the tunnel is getting bigger. We have a full capacity server online and are in the process of configuring it."

October 22, 2011, Silk Road staff posts: "The site

1 just went live. The new server is more powerful and secure than the one we were on before the outage and at least through 2 3 a more professional proxy. So I have high hopes that it will 4 last us a long time." MR. TURNER: Your Honor, could I just note for the 5 record that most of that post is contained in 125E. 6 7 THE COURT: 125D --8 MR. TURNER: Yes. 9 THE COURT: -- is also a record of the October 19th, 10 2011 post. Yes. 11 MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, I'm just going to return your 12 copy. Thank you. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thanks. 14 MR. DRATEL: And there are two additional issues that 15 I don't know that we have resolved yet with respect to defense exhibits. 16 17 THE COURT: The one that we spoke about? 18 MR. DRATEL: Yes and the other one. THE COURT: We didn't resolve it? 19 20 MR. DRATEL: Well, we resolved it. I just -- should 21 we have a sidebar?

THE COURT: OK. That's OK. Let me just sort of tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury -- actually, you know what we'll do, we'll take a break. This is what we do, right, when we are within striking distance of a break and we are going to

22

23

24

25

F23DULB2

have a sidebar.

Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, of the jury that we are very close to the end of the evidentiary record. So I don't want you to talk to each other or anybody else about this case. If you use the breaks to look at any kind of news reports or anything else, make sure you do not read anything about this case. Take a break and we'll be back in a few minutes and we'll take it from there.

Thank you very much.

THE CLERK: All rise as the jury leaves the courtroom. (Continued on next page)

1 (Jury not present) THE COURT: All right. Let's all be seated. 2 3 As I understand it, there are the three components that we had talked about. Were there other items which you had 4 5 identified? 6 MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor. Just that --7 THE COURT: Do you want to hand me the document? MR. DRATEL: Sure. 8 9 THE COURT: Or is there language that you are 10 suggesting we add? 11 MR. DRATEL: Yes. Well, let me try to -- I can hand 12 you the document but I also kind of need this. 13 THE COURT: Actually, I realize I have a copy from 14 earlier. 15 MR. DRATEL: OK. THE COURT: Tell me the component that you are 16 17 thinking of adding. 18 MR. DRATEL: Yes. One is that DPR was informed that the concentration was on the forum and administrators and 19 20 moderators. 21 THE COURT: The "concentration." What do you mean by 22 concentration? 23 MR. DRATEL: In other words, the investigation was 24 focusing -- I'm taking it from the document directly --25 focusing on the forum and your admin and mods. So rather than

1 putting it in slang, administrators and moderators.

THE COURT: Let me get the other one and then we will talk about this.

MR. DRATEL: OK. There are references to Mr. Wonderful as one of the people who is conducting -- who was one of the undercovers.

That Mr. -- I'm sorry, that DPR is paying for the information.

THE COURT: All right. What else? Anything else?

MR. DRATEL: There have been efforts to DDos, distributed denial of service, the site and the forum.

THE COURT: That came in through the law enforcement investigation? Didn't he know about those? There is already evidence in the record about DDos attempts.

MR. DRATEL: Not -- he didn't have information that the government may have been responsible for it. I'm not saying that is true or not.

THE COURT: I know, but that is coming in for the truth, though.

MR. DRATEL: It is not come in for the truth. It is coming in for his state of mind as to what he is going to do after he learned this.

THE COURT: All right. Let me get the complete list.

MR. DRATEL: OK. There have been attempts to run exit nodes and track traffic across TOR, and that there also is a

focus on bitcoin exchanges as part of the investigation. 1 2 THE COURT: Anything else? 3 MR. DRATEL: That's it, your Honor. I mean, obviously, we would like the whole document but this is --4 5 THE COURT: I understand. 6 Mr. Turner. 7 MR. TURNER: We would have no objection to the first change about administrators and moderators. Everything else we 8 9 would object to for the reasons stated in camera. 10 MR. DRATEL: That he was paying for it? 11 THE COURT: Let me just tell you what I think is 12 within the scope of what I believe is appropriate and straddles 13 the lines between the hearsay issues and the 403 issues, which 14 are the three statements that we had previously talked about: 15 That DPR learned in the spring of 2013 that law enforcement was investigating Silk Road and attempting to identify DPR. 16 17 Number two, that on Ross Ulbricht's laptop there was a multipage document entitled "LE Counterintelligence," which the 18 parties agree means "law enforcement counterintelligence." 19 20 This document contains communications to DPR 21 about a variety of information relating to purported ongoing 22 law enforcement efforts with respect to Silk Road and DPR. 23 Four -- these are new -- DPR learned that the

investigation included the forum, administrators and moderators, and bitcoin exchanges.

24

25

And, five, DPR was providing payment for the information. Full stop.

MR. TURNER: We'd object to the mention of bitcoin exchanges, your Honor, for the reasons we've stated.

THE COURT: All right. I think that in terms of bitcoin exchanges, let me be clear. That is not to be confused with a reference to Mr. Karpeles, but to the extent that there was investigation as to whether or not the movement of funds could be a focus of the investigation and might give some indication as to anything having to do with Silk Road, I think that that is just part and parcel of what was being investigated. Whether or not it caused a reaction by DPR is, I think, entirely different. So I'm not suggesting that the Karpeles, Mount Gox piece is incorporated in that.

MR. TURNER: I understand your Honor is not suggesting that, but I think that is a suggestion that is going to be made to the jury and it is based on hearsay and it is --

THE COURT: Well, I think that the fact that it included bitcoin exchanges is fact, right?

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: And you can't use from that, Mr. Dratel —just so that we're clear, you can't extrapolate from that that Mr. Karpeles did it.

MR. DRATEL: I will not use it in connection with Mr. Karpeles, your Honor.

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. That's what I am going to
 2
      allow.
 3
               All right. Do you have those down?
 4
               (Pause)
 5
               MR. DRATEL: No. I can read what the Court has
      written down, if that's OK, but -- your Honor, I took some of
6
 7
      the notes --
8
               THE COURT: You have my notes.
9
               MR. DRATEL: Yes.
10
               THE COURT: But I'm going to --
               MR. DRATEL: I'm one of those jurors who don't like to
11
12
      take notes and listen at the same time.
13
               THE COURT: Tell me if you can't decide on
14
     particularly the placement of the word "purported," and I think
15
      it should be introduced with "The parties have agreed to the
16
      following."
17
               (Continued on next page)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DRATEL: The only part I can't make out is it says "ongoing law enforcement efforts," I think it says "with respect to ID'ing Silk Road or DPR." Is that --

THE COURT: Silk Road and DPR; yes.

MR. DRATEL: Okay.

THE COURT: Now, there was a second item.

MR. DRATEL: Whether the government is going to stipulate with respect to Mr. Jones the stipulation that they proposed to me that I ultimately am unable to get the statement in --

> THE COURT: What's your position?

MR. TURNER: No.

MR. DRATEL: I move for mistrial, your Honor, on that.

THE COURT: That does actually have the benefit of actually evening out the number of times you have moved for a mistrial. Between this trial and the last one we tried, the count makes it five movements, five applications denied. So that application is denied. My ruling is as it was previously and there's no basis to change it.

Here's what I'd like to ask you folks to do: bring the jury right out now, go through the one final thing and then take another short break before closings, or we can take our own short break right now, do the one final matter and go directly into closings.

Preferences?

MR. DRATEL: With respect to the last thing: I think that when the party offers a stipulation and the other party accepts it, it's not a question of asking the defendant to accept it and the defendant has to do it because that's a different issue. But when one party offers a stipulation and the other party accepts it, it's a stipulation, and they can't then withdraw it in a fit of pique.

THE COURT: These are contract principles in part.

And there are lots of things which go into whether or not you have a binding agreement, and there is the old saying that it's not over 'til it's over, etc. You got to see the signature wet on the page, etc. There are some instances, but that's not the case. I'm not going to force the government into a stipulation. In the absence of a stipulation, it's hearsay.

MR. DRATEL: The government's email to me last night was take it or leave it, so I'm taking it and now they renege.

THE COURT: So be it.

Do you folks want to take a break right now and come back, and then we'll go from this last piece, which I think will take a minute or two, into the closings, which I think makes more sense because the jury is already breaking right now.

Are you ready?

MR. TURNER: Sure. Can we have a 15-minute break just to make sure we have all of the electronics lined up.

1 MR. DRATEL: I object.

THE COURT: Yes. The answer is yes. Over objection, the Court grants the application to set up the equipment.

Why don't you tell the jury that we'll resume at 11:30. We'll have the remaining matters at 11:30 and then straight into closing statements. Thank you.

(Recess)

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Just so you're all aware, we're going to start and go directly into the closings. When we get to 12:45, the closings after Mr. Dratel has completed what he's going to do, I will need to get a signal from you as to whether or not we should try to go 'til 1:00, if that's a more logical place to stop or we can stop at 12:45, but we need to break for lunch between 12:45. I suspect we'll be in the middle of something at that point or not quite done. If you have a preference as to when, just somehow make it clear if you can.

MR. TURNER: Okay.

THE COURT: If you keep going beyond 12:45, I'm going to let you go to 1:00, but then I'll stop you at 1:00.

MR. TURNER: If I have maybe five minutes left at 1:00 --

THE COURT: Then why don't you just tell me that. Say your Honor, I have a few more minutes left. And we have lunch brought in for the jury, so they will be fine with that to have

```
F23gulb3
                                  Trial
      you stop at that point.
1
 2
                MR. TURNER: Okay.
3
                THE COURT: Let's bring out the jury.
 4
                (Continued on next page)
5
6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

(In open court; jury present)

THE COURT: Thank you. Let's be seated. Mr. Dratel, you may proceed.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

The parties have agreed to the following: DPR learned in the spring of 2013 that law enforcement was investigating Silk Road and attempting to identify DPR. There was a document -- withdrawn.

There was a multipage document on the Ross Ulbricht laptop titled "LE Counterintel," which the parties agree means law enforcement counterintelligence. This document contains communications to DPR about a variety of information relating to ongoing law enforcement efforts with respect to Silk Road and DPR. DPR learned that the investigation included the forum administrators and moderators and bitcoin exchanges. DPR was providing payment for the information.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything further from the defense?

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor. The defense rests.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the evidentiary record in this matter is now closed. You have now heard all of the evidence in this matter. Let me just describe to you how we're going to proceed from here. We're now going to go directly into closing statements. I told you at the outset

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that there are two opportunities for the lawyers to address you The first is during the opening statements when they directly. give you an overview as to what they expect the evidence will show; and the second comes at the end of the case when they may argue to you as to what they believe the evidence that's in the record has shown. They will argue to you as to what inferences they think you should draw.

What the lawyers say is not evidence. The evidence is that which was received into evidence in this matter through the witnesses, through the documents during the trial.

During closings, as at any other point in time, what lawyers say is not evidence, with the sole exception as to when they are reciting a stipulation. But other than that, what lawyers say is not evidence. So your recollection of evidence and ultimately the inferences that you determine should be drawn from the evidence is what controls.

The closing statements will not be completed in their entirety before lunch. After all the closing statements are completed, I'll then charge you on the law and I'll be giving you a copy of the jury instructions to follow along with me and then you'll start your deliberations.

I don't know that you'll get to your deliberations today. It may be tomorrow morning. We'll have to see how things go and be a little bit fluid. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Turner.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TURNER: Thank you, your Honor.

At the beginning of this case we told you that we would prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant Ross Ulbricht was the creator, the owner and the operator of the digital drug-trafficking enterprise that was Silk Road, and that's exactly what we've shown.

The evidence presented by the government comes from multiple independent sources. It's interlocking, it's overwhelming, and to a significant extent, it's undisputed. There is no dispute in this case that the defendant started the Silk Road website. The defense counsel conceded that right off the bat. There's no dispute that it was used to sell drugs from the start. There's no dispute the defendant started it on the Tor network so that the users of the site and the dealers on the site and the site itself would be hidden. And there's no dispute that when the defendant was arrested, he was logged into the Silk Road website as the Dread Pirate Roberts.

The dispute in this case isn't even about whether the defendant operated the Silk Road website. The defense has already granted that he did. It's about when and for how long. I'll explain later under the law it doesn't even really matter --

MR. DRATEL: Objection.

MR. TURNER: -- but the evidence is clear that he ran it from beginning to end. He started it. It was his baby.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And he stayed with it enthusiastically for nearly three years. It was his secret livelihood. It was his passion. He built it he grew it, he operated it from top to bottom until the very end when he was arrested logged into the site as its mastermind.

How do you know that it was Ross Ulbricht the whole time behind his computer? Because of the mountain of evidence you've seen that he ran it the whole time. Let's start with the files on his computer, ladies and gentlemen. His computer is filled with evidence related to Silk Road. There are hundreds of files spread across numerous folders. entire copy of the Silk Road website itself. There's an entire copy of transaction records covering the whole duration of the site.

There are There are chats with Silk Road employees. Silk Road bookkeeping records. There are lists of Silk Road servers, there's Silk Road to-do lists, Silk Road reports, Silk Road maintenance logs and on and on. These files date from 2013 all the way back to 2010 when the defendant was first starting to work on the site. This is not what you'd expect to see if Silk Road had been just some passing fad and passing interest of the defendant that he pursued for a few months back in 2011. It's what you'd expect to see on a person's computer who had been running the site continuously for years, and the details of so many of these files are damning, so let's start

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with the personal journal that the defendant kept on his laptop.

THE COURT: Can you speak up a little bit.

MR. TURNER: Sure.

These files go from 2010 to 2012. And it's absolutely clear that the defendant wrote these journal entries. They're filled with personal details about the defendant. So in these entries, the defendant talks very explicitly about starting and running and continuing to run Silk Road. The 2010 journal entry begins "I started the year in the middle of my stint with Good Wagon Books." Remember this is something he did before Silk Road. The journal entry goes on and on about Good Wagon Books for a few paragraphs and the defendant's personal life.

And then it says, "While all of this was happening, I began working on a project that had been in my mind for over a year. I was calling it Underground Brokers, but eventually settled on Silk Road. The idea was to create a website where people could buy anything anonymously, with no trail whatsoever that could lead back to them. I had been studying the technology for a while, but needed a business model and strategy. I finally decided that I would produce mushrooms," magic mushrooms, illegal drugs, "so that I could list them on the site for cheap to get people interested. I worked my ass off setting up a lab in a cabin out near Bastrop off the grid. In hindsight, this was a terrible idea and I would never repeat

F23qulb3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it, but I did it and produced several kilos of high quality shrooms. On the website side, I was struggling to figure out on my own how to set it up."

How do you know that's Ross Ulbricht? Well, for one thing in the defendant's Gmail there's an email around the same time showing that he was looking for a place to rent in There's also a copy of the book on the defendant's computer titled "The Construction and Operation of Clandestine Drug Laboratories." It's filled with instructions on how to set up your own laboratory custom built for drug dealing. So from the very beginning the defendant conceives that Silk Road as a website for drug trafficking and he was setting up to be its very first drug dealer.

In 2010 journal entry ends with an express of high hope for Silk Road in the coming year. "It says" in 2011, "I am creating a year of prosperity and power beyond what I have ever experienced before. Silk Road is going to become a phenomenon and at least one person will tell me about it, unknowing that I was its creator." The same journal entry, the same quy. It's clear from this entry that Silk Road is not some little experiment he's pursuing for a few months. It's an obsession. He wants power. He wants prosperity. He is relishing the thought, the site becoming a phenomenon with him the secret mastermind behind it. Those are long-term ambitions, ladies and gentlemen.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We see these ambitions continue in the journal entries into 2011 and beyond. So the 2011 journal starts out, "Still working on Good Wagon Books and Silk Road at the same time. Programming now. Patchwork PHP MySQL. Don't know how to host my own site. Didn't know how to run bitcoind. Got the basics of my site written. Launched it on freedom hosting. Announced it on the bitcointalk forums. Only a few days after launch, I got my first signups, and then my first message. I was so excited I didn't know what to do with myself. Little by little, people signed up, and vendors signed up, and then it happened. My first order. I'll never forget it. The next couple of months, I sold about ten pounds of shrooms through my site."

How do you know that's Ross Ulbricht? First of all, he says he launched his site on Freedom Hosting and there's an email in his Gmail account where he's contacting somebody about setting up a Tor hidden service. The person recommends Freedom Hosting.

Second, the journal entry says he announced the site on the bitcoin talk forums. And you saw evidence recovered from the bitcointalk.org website showing that that was one of the places where Silk Road was first publicized on the Internet. Remember, that's how IRS Agent Gary Alford caught up to the defendant's trail. He found a message on bitcointalk.org that quoted a message by another user named

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Altoid from January 2011 publicizing Silk Road. Altoid's original message had been deleted from the forum, but the quotation still remained. The defendant didn't realize that. There's a chat on his computer where the defendant is telling a Silk Road employee about how he first publicized the site. says he made one thread on the forums at bitcointalk.org but it got taken down pretty quickly. The defendant must have thought that once his original Altoid post had been deleted from the site, there was no longer any link between that Altoid username and Silk Road, because months after that Altoid post, he would use the same Altoid username to post a message on bitcointalk, unrelated to Silk Road, where he mentioned his true email address, rossulbricht@gmail.com. That's how Special Agent Alford was able to tie the Altoid username of the defendant, and that's another way that you know that the defendant was the author of that 2011 journal entry where he's talking about announcing the site on the bitcointalk forums.

Now, he also talks about, in that journal entry, the shrooms that he grew. He said those were the first things he sold on Silk Road. And you know that another place the defendant first advertised Silk Road was on a website called the Shroomery and you see that in his Gmail account, too. And you see there was another forum that he advertised on, drugsforum.com where he's actually sort of punished by the forum for spamming. So, these emails show, again, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant knew what he was doing. He wasn't starting up some content-neutral economic experiment. He was creating a drug-trafficking website. That's why he's spamming about it in discussion forums relating to illegal drugs.

Going back to that 2011 journal entry, there is nothing in there, nothing to indicate that Ross Ulbricht ever walked away from Silk Road a few months after starting it. To the contrary, the journal entry goes on and on about how the site grew bigger and bigger over the course of 2011. He says "For the first several months, I handled all of the transactions by hand." And he rewrites the site. "Rewriting the site was the most stressful couple of months I've ever experienced." Then he perseveres. "When I finally got the site ready, there were several new features including a tumbler and an automated payment processing."

He keeps going: "Two U.S. Senators came out against the site..they made a big deal out of it and called for a shutdown of the site. I started getting into a bad state of I was mentally taxed." Then he ends with "Eventually we mind. got through it and entered a more calm and harmonious phase." Later: "Some major advances were price pegging, vendor ranking, a more sophisticated feedback system, buyer stats, transaction logging, building up the admin toolset. importantly, the market began its path to maturity. making about 100k and up to a good 20- to 25k monthly, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

decided it was time to bring in some hired guns to help me take the site to the next level. For the next three months, SYG," one of those hired guns, "had my full attention."

So the journal entry goes through the year. continuing to run Silk Road. It's getting big enough to attract the attention of government officials. It doesn't dissuade him. He sticks with it. He grows it bigger. And there's a separate file on the defendant's computer with a journal entry for 2012 which makes it clear again he's still running the site. "Well, I'm choosing to write a journal for 2012," he says. "I imagine that some day I may have a story written about my life, and it would be good to have a detailed account of it. "So it's clear at this point the site has only gotten bigger and the defendant's ego has gotten bigger with it.

It goes on to talk about his life in Australia where Ross Ulbricht was living at the time. And he talks about personal things like his friends inviting him to hang out but he can't, he says, he's too busy, it's just too much time away from Silk Road.

How else do you know that the defendant didn't just run Silk Road for a few months? Because the evidence from these journal entries dovetails with what you heard from a personal friend of the defendant, Richard Bates. Mr. Bates was only one of two people in real life who he confided his secret

l to.

You saw Mr. Bates testify on the stand. He was not happy to tell you about that, ladies and gentlemen. He did not want to be here. You could tell it was painful for him to testify about his former friend. But Mr. Bates' testimony makes clear that the defendant talked with him about running Silk Road for many months in 2011 until the defendant moved to Australia and cut his ties to Mr. Bates.

Mr. Bates told you the defendant started acting mysteriously in late 2010 when the defendant kept contacting him with programming questions. He wouldn't say what it was for. Instead the defendant would only say top secret. And again, we saw the journal entries where in 2010 he says "On the website side I was struggling to figure out on my own how to set it up."

Eventually at the end of February 2011, Mr. Bates told the defendant he wasn't going to help him until you tell me what your secret is, right? I'm officially forbidding you from mentioning your secret project to me again unless you're going to reveal it. So the defendant gave it and he let him in on his carefully-guarded secret. The defendant showed Mr. Bates the Silk Road website. He was full of pride about it. And Mr. Bates told you he continued to talk with the defendant about Silk Road regularly in the months that followed.

Mr. Bates told you he remembered conversations where

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the defendant mentioned he was making commissions from the site. He told you he remembered a conversation where the defendant said the site was getting too big for himself and he needed to hire admins, and he actually asked Mr. Bates if he wanted to be an admin.

All of this lines up with what you saw in the 2011 journal entry. Do you remember how Mr. Bates told you he remembered Senator Chuck Schumer issuing a statement about Silk Road calling it to be shut down by law enforcement. That's also referenced in the 2011 journal entry. And Mr. Bates told you after that happened, he tried to dissuade the defendant from continuing to work on Silk Road, work on something legal, but the defendant didn't drop it; he continued working on Silk Road and talking with Mr. Bates about it.

How do you know he's telling you the truth? Because you see references to Silk Road in the communications between Mr. Bates and the defendant all the way through October 2011. Mr. Bates told you that after the defendant told him about Silk Road whenever they'd mention it in chat, they wouldn't say "Silk Road," they talked about "the site," right.

"My site had a 40-minute spot on a national radio program."

"I might tell people about the site if that's okay." This is from March 2011.

April 2011: "All my friends think your site is really

cool."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

October 2011: "You don't have a job besides the site right now, do you?"

"Nope."

Now, in November 2011, things changed between the defendant and Mr. Bates. The defendant got nervous about how much Mr. Bates knew. You remember that Mr. Bates testified that he invited the defendant to an 11-11-11 party, November 11th party and the defendant shows up early to talk to Mr. Bates in private. He was panicking. He asked Mr. Bates have you told anybody, have you told anybody about my involvement with Silk Road. Mr. Bates says no. The defendant explained that the only other person who knew his secret, his ex-girlfriend, had told someone else, and that person had posted a message on the defendant's Facebook page saying I'm sure the authorities would love to know about your drug-trafficking site.

The defendant told Mr. Bates he had deleted that message and unfriended the poster. And Mr. Bates warned the defendant, you've got to shut this thing down. And the defendant responds I can't shut it down, I've already sold it. That was a lie. It was a lie that the defendant told so he could cut his ties to Mr. Bates and eliminate him as a potential source of liability. Chats recovered from the defendant's computer make that crystal clear. You remember

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those chats. They were read into evidence right after Mr. Bates testified.

Those charts were with VJ, Variety Jones, who went later by the name Cimon, and you can tell from the chats he's kind of a mentor to the defendant. The defendant talks about him in that 2011 journal entry. He says around the end of 2011 that Variety Jones shows up. This was the biggest and strongest willed character he had met through the site so far. He quickly proved he had value in pointing out a major security hole I was unaware of. And he says he helped me interact with the community about Silk Road, delivering proclamations, handling troublesome characters, running a sale, changing my name. He's been a real mentor.

The idea of "changing my name," changing the defendant's username on Silk Road came from a chat the defendant had with VJ about Bates. It's dated December 9, 2011, about a month after that party where the defendant told Mr. Bates he had sold the site.

And VJ asked the defendant: "IRL," in real life, "is there anyone with a clue at all?"

"myself: Unfortunately, yes. There are two, but they think I sold the site and got out."

"Good for that - when do they think you've sold."

"About a month ago," right when he told that lie to Mr. Bates.

Then about a month later, VJ comes up with the idea of changing the defendant's name on Silk Road to the Dread Pirate Roberts. And as you heard during the trial, Dread Pirate Roberts is a movie character and part of the legend is that there's not just one Dread Pirate Roberts. When one person gets tired of being Dread Pirate Roberts, he hands off the title to someone else to be the successor. So VJ suggests this to the defendant to clear his trail.

"Have you ever seen The Princess Bride? Do you know the history of the Dread Pirate Roberts? You need to change your name from admin to Dread Pirate Roberts, clear your old trail - to be honest, as tight as you play things, you are the weak link from those two previous contacts," those two previous contacts being Mr. Bates and his ex-girlfriend. And that's what happened. So on the site about a month later -- well, about a month later, the defendant changes his name on Silk Road: My new name is Dread Pirate Roberts.

That's whole point of the Dread Pirate Roberts nickname, ladies and gentleman. It's a con. It's a bogus cover story designed to fool people into believing there was some sort of rotating command over the site. The defendant and VJ explicitly talked that way about it in other chats. For example, this one from October 2012: The DPR thing is great, and we need to make at least one publid set of statements that indicates that the old admin is long gone, and dpr is now in

charge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Myself: yea, I was thinking the same thing. back story for him.

Cimon: I suggested DPR when I first realized I could track you. I don't give a shit who you are, and it's to my and everyone's advantage no one else can. DPR by it's very nature indicates a rotating command. We'll play that."

Which brings us to the TorChat logs on the defendant's computer, the chat logs you saw so many of between DPR and the Silk Road employees and advisors like VJ. And like the journal entries, they are incredibly damning. There are reams of them. Some of these chat logs are hundreds of pages long. The one with VJ is over 1,000 pages long. And there is no real dispute that the person reflected as "myself" in those chats is DPR, the operator of the Silk Road website.

Here is an example. This one is with Squid Shepard, who was a member of the Silk Road support staff labeled here as sSh, and he starts the chat by confirming that he's talking to DPR.

"May I ask to whom I'm speaking?"

"Myself: DPR, and you are?"

And that's consistent with all of the other chat logs you've seen. In each one "myself" is either specifically referred to as DPR or Dread Pirate Roberts or Silk Road admin or the context otherwise makes clear that "myself" is the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

operator of the Silk Road website.

How do you know that the user reflected as "myself" a/k/a DPR is the defendant, Ross Ulbricht? Well, first of all, Mr. Bates communicated with the defendant through TorChat later in 2011. And he told you he recognized who was who. "r," Richard, Richard Bates; "myself" was the defendant. This is the same TorChat program that generated all the other TorChats you see on the computer. So it's true for all the other chats that involve Silk Road employees and coconspirators. The user "myself" is the defendant.

But of course, you don't have to rely on Mr. Bates' testimony to infer that because repeatedly and these chats "myself" reveals little details about what's going on in his life that match up perfectly with the details of Ulbricht's life. The details don't pop up regularly, but when they do, it's often a perfect match between what they talked about in the chat and what we see in the email account or Facebook account or other evidence of what's going on in the defendant's life.

For example, whenever "myself" talks about traveling or being away in his chats, it matches up with the defendant's travel plans. An example is this chat with h7, who was one of the programmers who worked for Silk Road, and in these chats, "myself" is clearly the boss and h7 -- he gives programming assignments to h7. He tells h7 when he's going to be paid. Ιn

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other words "myself" is DPR.

Now, at one point in these chats between "myself" and h7, "myself" tells him I'm going to be unavailable from 4:00 a.m. UTC Friday to 4:00 a.m. UTC Sunday. At that point, the defendant is living in Australia, which is 12 hours ahead, so that makes him unavailable from Friday to Sunday afternoon, and that's what you see in the defendant's email account. He's going house-boating starting Friday 7:00 p.m. staying two nights. So it's the defendant who is speaking as "myself" in a chat with h7. He is the boss of h7.

Here is another example, a chat with VJ, January 26, 2012. He tells VJ he's in a relaxing environment, friendly folks everywhere. VJ says "Sounds very Thai."

DPR says "Haha, I didn't expect you to start quessing."

Well, where is the defendant at that time? His Facebook account shows that he is in Thailand. A few days later there's more chats with VJ where "myself" says "Took the day off. Ran around beaches and jungles with some girls, very little on my mind."

"VJ: Girls and jungles, life don't get any better for 'ol Dread Pirate Roberts."

Where is the defendant that day? Beaches and jungles, ladies and gentlemen. This is his Facebook album "Thailand, February 2012." There are many more examples like this.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The chat with VJ -- now he's using the name Cimon --"myself" says "I changed timezones today." There's an itinerary in his Gmail account where he's flying from San Francisco to Austin.

November 2012, DPR says "I'm done traveling, at least for a while anyway." What does the defendant's email account show? He was traveling to Dominica that day. He just got done with three flights.

February 2013, DPR tells Cimon he's going to be away over the weekend. What does the defendant's Facebook account show? He went camping that weekend.

And it's not just travel. It gets a lot more specific than that. Another example relates to a series of chats that DPR has with VJ from March to May 2012 where DPR is talking about how he is applying for foreign citizenship so he can eventually renounce his U.S. citizenship. And they specifically talk about what it takes to buy citizenship in foreign countries, and DPR mentions he is specifically looking at applying for citizenship in the Caribbean island of Dominica.

Elsewhere on the defendant's computer there's a brochure about Dominica's Economic Citizenship Program where you can buy citizenship with a cash investment in the form of a donation to the government, to the Dominican government. And there's a filled-out application form signed by -- or with the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

name "Ross Ulbricht," and the metadata is May 2012. How do you know that it's the defendant who is talking with VJ about these things? Well, in the defendant's Gmail account there are several emails to friends where he says May 1, 2012, lines up with the chat, "I'm applying for a second citizenship to an island in the Caribbean called Dominica." And then he says in the second paragraph, "You may wonder why I'm doing this crazy There are opportunities available, tax opportunities." And he says at the end "It's a bit of a political hedge if things ever get dicey here in the U.S." What does that mean, ladies and gentlemen? Why would things ever get dicey for the defendant here in the U.S.? Because he was still running Silk Road at the time, and that's why he's talking with VJ about getting non-U.S. citizenship.

This isn't the only time you see the defendant thinking about things getting dicey for him. You saw on July 2013, he orders nine fake IDs from Silk Road, nine fake IDs with different guises from different states, from different Is this normal, ladies and gentlemen? You saw the countries. messages on the Silk Road where those IDs were ordered. He doesn't use his own DPR account to write those messages because you have to give an address for the order. He uses a sham buyer account, shefoundme account, Government Exhibit 935.

And what does he ask the vendor of those IDs in placing the order? He says things like will these IDs get me

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

through airport security; will these IDs work if I get pulled over by a cop? He's not going bar-hopping with these IDs, ladies and gentlemen. He's worried about the possibility of a life on the lam.

So back to the Tor chats: There's another chat on the defendant's computer with, again, VJ. And you can see in this chat the defendant actually crosses over chatting with VJ to his Gmail account and then back to the chat with VJ. they're talking about improving the bitcoin tumbler on Silk Road, part of the bitcoin payment system. And VJ suggests find me some statistician they can consult somehow about the math involved. And DPR says he knows a statistician, he knows her and her husband well. And VJ tells DPR to ask her who are the top five statisticians in the world.

Five days later, we see the defendant emailing someone, apparently the husband, with this very question. are the top five statisticians in the world besides Heather?" An exchange of emails ensues. "Wow. Good question. In terms of lifetime achievement or current hotness?"

And then we see after that DPR passes the exact same email exchange to VJ. It says "Here is my convo with my stats friend. Who are the top five statisticians in the world? Wow. Good question."

So it's undeniable that these chat logs from the defendant's computer, hundreds of pages of chats, in which DPR

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is assigning tasks to people, consulting about matters with VJ/Cimon, the person behind those chats reflected as "myself" is the defendant, Ross Ulbricht.

The evidence on the laptop does not stop by any means with the journal entries in the chat logs. There's still more. There's a file labeled "sr accounting," Silk Road accounting. It's a bookkeeping record of Silk Road. How do you know that it was created by the defendant? Well, for one thing, it starts all the way back in July 2010, July 17, 2010 start.

What sort of expenses does it list to start off? This is the same time when, according to the defendant's journal, he's renting a cabin in Bastrop to grow magic mushrooms, and that's what you see here: Lab clothes, petri dishes, HEPA filter. And in the defendant's Gmail account, you find matching receipts for the same items: HEPA filter, carryover from 2009. 2009, 88.94. \$89. The same thing later: Humidifier, August 15, 2010, \$33. There's an August 16 receipt from Amazon, \$33.

And the SR accounting document keeps going for months. It doesn't stop after a few months. It keeps going all the way through July 2013 like the journal entries keep going well after the site is launched.

And notably, it contains a number of entries for commissions and that matches up with data found in the Silk Road server. The commissions start on the spreadsheet in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

May of 2011. As Brian shaw testified, the transaction data from the server starts up in May 2011. And this also matches up with the 2011 journal entry in the defendant's computer. He says there after making about 100k and up to a good 25k monthly, I decided it was time to bring in some hired guns and that's what you see. He starts making 25k or so monthly. There's no break in the document or an indication that someone different starts to maintain it. In fact, there's an entry in that sr accounting spreadsheet for the defendant's laptop, This is, like, a year later, April 28, 2012, \$1,150 for a laptop. What do you see in the defendant's Gmail account? A matching receipt, April 27, 2012, just a day apart, \$1,149.99, one cent off, and it's a Samsung silver laptop, Model 700Z, the same laptop that was seized from the defendant at the time of his arrest. He considered it a Silk Road business expense at the time, and it's clear why: Because he planned to use it to run Silk Road, just as he was caught doing on the day he was arrested.

There's another spreadsheet on the defendant's This one is labeled "networth calculator," and the entries on it go all the way from August 6 through June 2012 and it lists a bunch of different assets, including one that is astronomically bigger than the rest labeled "SR Inc., \$104 million." Now, how do you know it's the defendant who gave SR Inc. that valuation? Look at the other items in the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

spreadsheet. There's the Samsung 700Z, there's the laptop. There's also entry for USAA and PayPal accounts. And if you look at the USAA records for June 2012 where the last entry was made in the spreadsheet, you see matching balances: 1347 in the USAA account, \$1,400; 46.89 in the PayPal account, \$50. So, this shows you in June 2012, the defendant counts SR Inc. among his assets. Why? Because he is, of course, still running it.

Another document in the defendant's computer worth noticing, it's labeled log.txt, and on its face, it's clearly a log of actions taken in connection with operating Silk Road. So there are entries in there like tried moving forum to multi.onion config, finished rewriting Silk Road.PHP controller, rewrote orders page, paid attacker -- it was a hacker -- 50,000 weekly ransom. And these entries go from March 20, 2013, all the way through September 30, 2013, the day before the defendant's arrest.

How do you know that the defendant was the person who maintained this log? Because, again, every now and then there are references to personal details that match up with information known about the defendant. So there's an entry for May 3, 2013, "I'm sick." What do you see in the defendant's Gmail account? Same date, "How are you feeling today?"

"A lot better. I took NyQuil last night. Got a good night's sleep."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

September 11, four months later to 18th says he got covered in poison oak. What does the defendant's email account show? "I have poison oak from head to toe."

It also says went on a first date with Amelia from OKC. What do you see in the Gmail account: Okaycupid messages dating services, involving Amalia, "Be there in a few. Nice meeting you."

But perhaps the most revealing of the defendant's emails is a May 2, 2013 email. If you look at the log file around this time, you'll see a number of entries relating to smed, smedley, one of the programmers that worked for Silk Road. And these log entries reflect that who ever is keeping the log, DPR, was working closely with smed in early May to deal with attacks on Silk Road: Helping smed to fight off attacker, working with smed to put up more defenses.

Well, smed shows up in the defendant's Gmail account at this time. And what appears to be a keyboard accident, this email is sent to -- this is May 2, 2013 -- sent to somebody named Curtis and has a screenshot attachment, no body in the message, just a screenshot. And the screenshot appears to have been taken just a minute earlier before the email was sent if you adjust for Pacific timezones. And there is the photo that was attached, the screenshot.

Now, presumably what the defendant was trying to do was just send a screenshot of his desktop with this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bizarre-looking lizard on it. But he probably didn't realize that what happened was he had two monitors open and when he hit "print screen," both screens are included in the screenshot because on the other screen at the time was a chat with smed, "smed: Morning, hey, good morning," the same programmer that according to the log DPR was busy working with at the time. And if you look even further at the chat window, you'll see there's another tab indicating the defendant had a chat going with the username MG. MG is also mentioned in the log file, that Pidgin chat working with inigo working with MG. And what's more is that both MG and smed show up on the defendant's computer the day of the arrest on his chat buddy list along with cirrus, libertas and all the other Silk Road employees, and the part of the defendant's chat buddy list where his own username was listed as dread.

So in short, there is overwhelming evidence that all of the files on the defendant's computer relating to Silk Road -- the journal entries, spreadsheets, TorChats, the log -all of them were authored and created by the defendant in the course of operating Silk Road.

But there is even more, there's even more on the computer that links the defendant to Silk Road. There's evidence that links him directly to the Silk Road server, the server that hosted the website. Remember that the name of the defendant's computer, the name of his user account on that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

computer was frosty. And we see from his Gmail account that this is a nickname of the defendant's. The email is referring to him as Rossty Frosty. And you remember that when the defendant was arrested, frosty was the name of his user account on his computer.

And you're familiar with this: When you have a computer at home, you log in, you can set up an account where you can name it anything you want. And the name of the defendant's computer itself was frosty. So you know, you have a Windows computer. It might be called "My Computer," but you can rename it anything you want. The defendant's user account was frosty. His computer name is frosty. And Special Agent Chris Beeson told you that's how that's reflected in sort of the computer terminal on the defendant's screen, frosty@frosty.

Well, then, let's look at the Silk Road server at the authorized keys file that you heard about. As Mr. Shaw explained, this authorized keys folder defines the computer users -- the computers that can log into the Silk Road server automatically without having to enter a password. So it's a way for a website administrator to log on quickly. The server just recognizes the person's computer so he can automatically log in. And you can see from the top entry in the file that one of the computers that had the special permission was frosty@frosty, the defendant's computer.

How long had the defendant's computer had this access

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to Silk Road, the Silk Road Marketplace server? Since the very time the server had been set up. The last modified date of this file is March 26, 2013. That's the last time it would have been changed. And if you look back at the log file on the defendant's computer, you see that that's exactly when this server was being set up by the defendant. On 3/27, there's an entry, "set up servers." So we have the Silk Road server was set up right around this time, including the authorized keys folder, and from the very beginning, the defendant's computer had automatic access to it.

There's another revealing connection, though, between the defendant's computer and the servers used to run Silk Road, and that's the bitcoin wallet on the defendant's laptop. defendant had simply an enormous trove of bitcoins on his laptop, 144,000 at the time he was arrested, worth \$18 million at the time. Those were Silk Road bitcoins.

How do you know that? Besides the obvious, besides the obvious fact that no one is going to store \$18 million worth of bitcoins on their laptop as opposed to, you know, a bank if you're dealing with proceeds from legitimate activity but you know these are Silk Road bitcoins from the mastermind page for one thing that was on the defendant's laptop at the time he was arrested.

There's an entry there for cold BTC, 144,000 bitcoins, the same amount of bitcoins found on the defendant's laptop

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Remember Agent Yum explained that cold storage refers wallet. to a bitcoin wallet that's offline, not constantly being accessed on the Internet. There are wallets on the Silk Road servers that had a lot smaller amounts of bitcoins on it, and they're used to process the payments on a daily basis. But if the site gets hacked, those bitcoins are vulnerable. So as a result, you want to keep the excess funds offline.

Just think of it like a business owner, okay? You have a cash register at a store and you have a safe at home. You don't want to keep too much cash in the store because if it gets robbed, you're going to lose it. So you take your excess cash and you keep it in a safe at home protected. You can always move it back if you need it, but if you have access, you're going to keep it at home, and that's exactly what the defendant did.

Mr. Yum, former Special Agent Ilhwan Yum, showed you how there was a long history of bitcoin transfers from the wallets on the Silk Road server to the wallet found on the defendant's laptop from September 2012 to August 2013 totaling over 13 million based on the transfers -- the value of the transfers at the time they were made, and that's because the laptop was being used for cold storage. It's the defendant taking money out of the register for the night and putting it in a safe at home.

And the evidence is also clear that the wallet on the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant's laptop had been on the laptop for months. didn't suddenly appear on the day of his arrest. Look at the metadata for the wallet file. Date created: 4/7/2013. Computer scientist Tom Kiernan told you the "date created" date means that's the date the file initially hits the computer, either it's created on that computer at that point or it's transferred in from somewhere else. That April 7 date matches up exactly again with an entry on the log file on the defendant's laptop: 4/7/2013, moved storage wallet to local machine. In other words, the defendant must have kept the storage wallet elsewhere before on a server he controlled. April 7, he decides to move it to his local machine, his laptop, which is exactly where it was found on the date of his arrest. Again, this is just more evidence that the defendant controlled the Silk Road website, including the massive proceeds from the website.

There's one more truly damning connection between the defendant's laptop and the Silk Road server, and that's the connection with the murder-for-hire messages found in the Dread Pirate Roberts' account on the Silk Road server. You remember what those messages were about. A Silk Road vendor, FriendlyChemist, was trying to blackmail the defendant threatening to leak the names of thousands of Silk Road customers, as well as a handful of vendors. So Dread Pirate Roberts tries to identify this person. He's told his name is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Blake Krokoff and then he gets in touch with the username redandwhite who he is told is involved with Hell's Angels.

And Dread Pirate Roberts tells redandwhite FriendlyChemist is causing me problems, that he wants to put a bounty on his head. And he elaborates: "He's threatening to expose the identities of thousands of my clients. This kind of behavior is unforgivable to me. Especially here on Silk Road, anonymity is sacrosanct."

And Dread Pirate Roberts contracts with redandwhite to put a hit out on FriendlyChemist for the price of \$150,000 for 1,670 bitcoins. Redandwhite answers back a day later, "Your problem has been taken care of." Dread Pirate Roberts says "Excellent work. Send me a picture," which redandwhite apparently does.

Well, you see that the log file on the defendant's computer contains entries matching up with the private messages that are recovered from the Silk Road server. So the private messages with redandwhite, they're from the Silk Road server. Here you have the log entries that match up with that precisely:

3/28/2013: "Being blackmailed with user info. Talking with large distributor (Hell's Angels.)"

3/29/2013: "Commissioned hit on blackmailer with angels."

4/01/13: "Got word that blackmailer was excuted.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Created file upload script. Started to fix problem with bond refunds over 3 months old." He is doing this as he's fixing server bugs, ladies and gentlemen.

Then you saw that the messages between Dread Pirate Roberts and redandwhite didn't stop there. Redandwhite tells DPR that before FriendlyChemist was killed, the hitmen extracted information from him that he was working with another person, Andrew Lawsry. And Dread Pirate Roberts says "I would like to go after Andrew, too." Redandwhite says, "Well, he's living with three other people. You can put a hit out on just Andrew. But redandwhite says "I prefer to do all four because it would be better than having to get Andrew somewhere else and having no chance of recovering any potential product/money he may have." And astoundingly Dread Pirate Roberts says "Hmm, okay, I'll defer to your better judgment and hope we can recover some assets from you." And he agrees to pay redandwhite \$500,000 this time for four more murders-for-hire, 3,000 bitcoin. And a week later redandwhite reports back "The problem was dealt with." So again, you see that in the log file, 4/6/2013: "Gave angels go ahead to find tony76." 4/8/2013: "Sent payment to angels for hit on tony76

and his three associates."

Again, how do you know that the Dread Pirate Roberts behind these chilling chats was Ross Ulbricht? Because it's the same log file that has the entry "I'm sick" in May.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

matches up with the defendant's emails that has the poison oak, the date with Amalia. It's the same person.

And there's also a separate file in the defendant's computer labeled ops.txt like black ops, operations, and the file contains information that appears verbatim in the Dread Pirate Roberts messages about the murders-for-hire. Blake Krokoff lives in an apartment near White Rock Beach, tony76, Andrew Lawsry. This is the same information that's discussed in the communications between redandwhite and DPR.

And there's a chat with Cimon where "myself" talks about it, again, the same "myself" that we've already matched up with DPR in numerous ways. The same date range, April 3, 2013:

"Myself: I get blackmailed by a guy saying he's in deep shit with hell's angels. He says he was fronted \$700k in LSD from them. I said, have the hells angels contact me so i can work something out.

Cimon: ha!

Myself: very foolishly he did. They said they caught up with lucy, got the product back and killed him.

Cimon: Well, I bet ya he won't use the HA," the Hell's Angels, "as a reference again any time soon."

But beyond that, the most devastating link between the defendant and DPR's murder-for-hire message is the payment trail. The payment trail shows that March 31, 2013 redandwhite

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is talking with FriendlyChemist about sealing the deal and he's given a bitcoin address to send the money to redandwhite. he tells redandwhite I paid you, here is the transaction info for 1,670 btc, the bitcoin address that redandwhite gives him, and he even gives him the transaction number so you can look it up on the block chain and make sure the payment is done. And if you look it up on the block chain, as there was testimony, those payments were made. Same thing for the April payment of \$500,000 in bitcoins.

Here is the text where he says after redandwhite said I prefer to kill all four, DPR: Hmm, okay, I'll defer to your better judgment. 500,000 has been sent to bitcoin address, transaction number. You look it up on the block chain. There is the payment. The payment was made. How do we know that the payments were made by the defendant? Because they were sent directly from the defendant's bitcoin wallet. That's what Special Agent Yum testified to. Those payments came from addresses that were found on the defendant's laptop, the same wallet we were just discussing earlier, the wallet that was moved to the defendant's local machine right around the same time; in fact, it was moved to the defendant's laptop on April 7 and then on April 8th, he's making the payments. was the defendant who made these payments. It was the defendant who was trying to murder five people.

Now, to be clear, the defendant has not been charged

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for these attempted murders here. You're not required to make any findings about them. And the government does not contend that those murders actually occurred. The defendant may have fallen for a big con job, which would only go to show that the Dread Pirate Roberts is not a criminal super-genius that the defendant wants to make him out to be, but what the murder-for-hire exchanges do show is how far the defendant was willing to go to protect his criminal enterprise if users got the idea that their anonymity wasn't safe on Silk Road, that their identities could be leaked en masse, they weren't going to use the site, and the defendant was going to lose business, and he was willing to use violence to stop that from happening.

For him, it was trivial. The click of a mouse, send \$500,000, half a million dollars' worth of bitcoins, wait for the picture of a dead body. Thank goodness it does not look like any murders occurred. Thank goodness that this man's power trip was stopped before he managed to connect with a true hitman through his criminal website.

Let's talk about how he was finally stopped. Let's talk about his arrest, which gives you even more evidence, perhaps the clearest evidence of all that Ross Ulbricht and Dread Pirate Roberts were one in the same because he was caught red-handed, okay.

You heard from Agent Der-Yeghiayan, the first witness that took the stand and the second witness, computer scientist

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Tom Kiernan about how the arrest unfolded. The afternoon began with the defendant at home. He was under surveillance by FBI agents. Meanwhile, Agent Der-Yeghiayan was sitting on a bench elsewhere in the neighborhood with Mr. Kiernan keeping DPR under surveillance online by monitoring him on the Silk Road staff chat.

And while Mr. Ulbricht was at home, DPR was online and at 2:47 p.m., DPR goes offline. And a few minutes later, the defendant is seen leaving his home heading towards the area where Agent Der-Yeghiayan and Mr. Kiernan are stationed. Just to be clear, you remember it says 9:47 here but Agent Der-Yeghiayan testified it was UTC. It was seven hours ahead of the local time.

So what happens? Well, about 15 minutes later, Agent Der-Yeghiayan and Mr. Kiernan see the defendant approach. He crosses the street, pops his head into an Internet cafe, sees it's crowded and then he heads next door to the public library. Mr. Kiernan follows him inside with a number of other FBI agents. And they assemble at the top landing of the stairwell waiting to get a signal for the arrest.

Meanwhile, Agent Der-Yeghiayan remains outside waiting for DPR to pop up online, and that's what happens. A few minutes later, after the defendant enters the library at 3:08 p.m. DPR shows up on staff chat. At this point, the defendant's had enough time to open his computer in the library

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and log on. And Agent Der-Yeghiayan starts chatting with him at that point using his undercover account as a Silk Road staff member, cirrus. He says hi. And DPR responds, and he knows who cirrus is. He's been chatting with him for months. that's why when Agent Der-Yeghiayan tells DPR "Can you check out one of the flagged messages for me," DPR knows exactly what he's talking about. DPR had trained cirrus, had trained Agent Der-Yeghiayan, on the use of that flagged messages screen a month and-a-half earlier in August, we went over that during Agent Der-Yeghiayan's testimony. DPR doesn't say hmm, you'll have to remind me what the flagged message screen is all about cirrus, I don't remember that. No. He says sure, let me log In fact, a couple lines later, DPR says you did bitcoin exchange before you started working for me, right? Agent Der-Yeghiayan told you that was not something he had told DPR before; the person he took over the cirrus account from back in July had operated a bitcoin exchange. She had told DPR that months before the arrest, and the defendant remembered that because he was DPR back then, just as he was on the day of his arrest.

A minute later into the chat, when it's clear DPR had logged in where he says "okay, I'm here, which post," Agent Der-Yeghiayan gives the signal to arrest. It's approximately 3:14 p.m. Remember, it's seven hours ahead. So agents quickly move in for the arrest. The defendant is behind his laptop.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Two agents distract him by faking a domestic dispute. The defendant turns his head, they grab him, they pull away the laptop and handed it to Tom Kiernan.

And Mr. Kiernan immediately starts keeping the computer alive and taking pictures on the screen. This is just a minute or so after Agent Der-Yeghiayan had given the signal Remember, Mr. Kiernan had a Blackberry set to to arrest. Eastern Time because he's from the New York field office. was from 3:15. And there's the chat right there on the screen where the discussion had left off.

Not only that, but they go back in the web browser. They see the defendant had logged in as Dread Pirate Roberts and gone to the Silk Road mastermind page, which Agent Der-Yeghiayan had never seen before. Not only that, but agents follow up by searching the defendant's residence, and what do they find there? They find a couple of crumpled notes in the And what are those notes about? They're about a revamp of the Silk Road buyer rating system -- seller rating system, excuse me, that Dread Pirate Roberts had been posting about on the Silk Road forums since way back in August, August 11. And there's a match of specific terms: Solid, would recommend. matches a post from September 12 where he's talking about the changes he's thinking about making to the rating system. agents also find a couple of thumb drives on the defendant's night stand, one of which contains a backup of many of the same

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Silk Road-related files that were found in his laptop.

So the evidence is overwhelming, ladies and gentlemen, that this man Ross Ulbricht is the same person who started Silk Road and kept it running up until the very end, up until the moment he was arrested logged into the Silk Road server as the mastermind of the site under the Dread Pirate username chatting with someone he believed was a Silk Road employee. There is no way he can credibly explain away this evidence, and the defense's attempts to do so throughout this case have been absurd.

At the beginning of this case, Mr. Dratel admitted, he had to, admitted that the defendant started Silk Road, but he said the evidence would show that operating the site became too stressful to him, so he handed it off to other people. There's been no evidence to show that. It's just the same bogus cover story that he told to Richard Bates to throw him off his trail.

The defendant is trying to dust off the old Dread Pirate Roberts play and try it out one last time on you, ladies and gentlemen. It's not surprising the defendant is used to living a lie at this point.

Remember, this chat, he was talking with inigo, one of his customer support representatives. Inigo asks: "If you don't mind me asking, what do you tell your family that you do?"

"I live a modest life still. Security requires it.

Case 1:14-cr-00068-KBF Document 218 Filed 02/25/15 Page 102 of 187

F23gulb3 Summation - Mr. Turner

So I have my little alibi. I'm clever, so I can be when I need to but I hate having to lie to people. And friends will tell me shit like why don't you do this or that, like I have all this free time. I just want to scream at them 'because I'm running a goddam multi-million dollar criminal enterprise!!!!"

(Continued on next page)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Turner

MR. TURNER: He still thinks he's clever. He thinks he can pull one over on you.

MR. DRATEL: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. TURNER: And then there is the defendant's attempt to explain await mountains of evidence on his computer. It's a hacker.

MR. DRATEL: Objection.

MR. TURNER: It's a virus.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. TURNER: It's a Stephen Colbert show he was watching or downloading into his computer. It's ludicrous. There were no little elves that put all of that evidence on the defendant's computer. It was the defendant who put all that evidence on the defendant's computer and in his trashcan, in his nightstand, in the Silk Road server, his Gmail account and his Facebook account, from the bitcoin talk forum and the shroomery, everywhere else you have seen the digital fingerprints. Use your common sense, ladies and gentlemen.

But even if there were any reason to believe the defendant's story, which there is not, it wouldn't even make a difference under the law. The government doesn't have to prove that the defendant's criminal activity continued from start to finish, from the beginning of Silk Road to the end. expect the Judge will instruct you, it doesn't matter when a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Turner

person becomes part of a criminal conspiracy, even if it's just at the beginning or just at the end, he is liable for everything that happens as part of the conspiracy as long as it is foreseeable to him, before or after he joins. You don't need to go there because the evidence is absolutely clear. This man ran the site from start to finish.

So let me now talk with you about what the defendant is charged with, what he's liable for as a result of masterminding Silk Road. The defendant is charged with seven offenses. The first four relate to drug trafficking. The fifth relates to the computer hacking tools and services sold on the site. The sixth, to the fake passports and IDs that were sold on the site, and the seventh relates to money laundering, the laundering of the proceeds from all the illegal sales conducted on the site.

Let's take the drug charges first. Count One charges the defendant with distributing illegal drugs or helping others to do so. Count Two charges the defendant with much the same thing, distributing drugs but over the Internet specifically, or helping others do so.

MR. DRATEL: I object to this, your Honor. We were not given this in advance.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. TURNER: And Count Three charges the defendant with conspiring to distribute drugs, which just means agreeing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with others to distribute drugs.

To be clear, the Judge will instruct you after the addresses about what the law is and her instructions control, but this is what I expect her to instruct you.

Now, these charges -- these first three charges, they are not complicated. The basic question is were drugs distributed through Silk Road and did the defendant help distribute them, or agree with others to do so. Now, if you don't believe that drugs were distributed through Silk Road, then you must have been watching the wrong trial because that is what the site was all about. There were thousands of listings on Silk Road every day for drugs -- heroin, cocaine, LSD, methamphetamine, ecstasy, speed, steroids, prescription pain killers, pretty much every possible controlled substance you can imagine; even cyanide the defendant was willing to sell on the site.

You heard Agent Der-Yeghiayan explain how Silk Road first came to his attention. Right? Ecstasy and other drugs started showing up in the international mail in O'Hare in ways that had never been seen before. The packaging was stealthy and professional. There was a business model behind it. And those packages started as a trickle and eventually turned into a flood. And he told you how he was able to tie many of those packages back to drug dealers operating on Silk Road.

He also told you about the undercover buys he himself

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did on Silk Road, over 50 of them, from dealers in more than ten different countries, and all of those purchases, except one, tested positive for illegal drugs.

You also heard a stipulation that the DEA New York Field Office here, in the Southern District of New York, did undercover buys from Silk Road as well, more than a dozen of them from September 2011 to May 2013 -- heroin, cocaine, oxycodone, and all of them positively tested for drugs.

You also heard from Brian Shaw, who told you about the staggering sales figures in the transaction database on the Silk Road server. The silk Road server showed that the site executed over one-and-a-half million transactions during its lifetime, involving over 100,000 unique buyer accounts. Nearly 3700 unique seller accounts. And it took in over \$213 million in revenue. Some of those sales were done before Silk Road kept track of the categories being sold. But of the 190 million reflected in the database of categorized sales, sales that had a category of goods associated with them, 96 percent, \$182 million of them were for illegal drugs. So there is no doubt that drugs were sold through Silk Road in massive quantities.

You also heard from Michael Duch, who once ran his IT business, his own IT business, but started dealing drugs on Silk Road as a way of supporting his own heroin addiction, and he told you how easy it was to become a Silk Road drug dealer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All he had to do was buy heroin off the street in the same New York City area where he bought it, and he was able to sell it at 100 percent markup on Silk Road because the customers he was selling to were located all over the country, where heroin is a lot more scarce. Within six weeks, he told you, he was shipping out around 500 glassine bags of heroin a day, making 60 to \$70,000 in revenue per month.

So did the defendant help distribute these drugs? course he did. The defendant was the one who made this entire enterprise possible. He custom built Silk Road to be an online storefront for drug dealing. He attracted customers by making it easy for them to buy drugs on the site anonymously. attracted suppliers by making it easy for them to deal drugs on the site. And he manned the cash register to make sure that he got his cut from every sale because it was his store. site's customers were his customers. The sales from the purchases were his sales, just as much as they were customers and sales of the individual drug dealers on the site.

The defendant made no bones about that. Here is a post of his, January 10, 2012, in which he responds to a series of complaints he was getting at the time from drug dealers on the site about the commission rates he was charging. He says: "Whether you like it or not, I am the captain of this ship. You are here voluntarily, and if you don't like the rules of the game, or you don't trust your captain, you can get off the

boat."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Here is another post, where he's responding to a user who is complaining about getting taxed by the site. The defendant responds: "What you are referring to is more appropriately called a commission or broker's fee. It would be a tax if I tried to take money from you based on a transaction I wasn't involved in. You are free to sell whatever you want to whomever without my interference, but if you are going to use" Silk Road, "the Silk Road platform to meet your customers and advertise your wares, you will need to pay a commission."

The defendant was involved in every single sale on Silk Road, and that's why it was so important to him to enforce the rule the site had against vendors selling outside of escrow, or OOE. Right? You heard about this. Collecting payment outside of Silk Road to avoid paying commissions, doing side deals.

That rule was prominently posted in the seller's Right? "Do not create listings that instruct customers quide. to pay outside of escrow. If you do your privileges will be revoked." There are chats with VJ where he talks about enforcing the rule by searching through vendors' listings and users' private messages to check to make sure that they are not doing side deals outside of Silk Road's payment system.

Here is a private message the defendant sent to one Silk Road seller telling him why he had lost his privileges.

Summation - Mr. Turner

The defendant explains, "You do not have a right to the business I generate for you through Silk Road. Your status as a vendor here is a privilege that is contingent on you following the rules."

The defendant knew his site was critical to generating business for the drug dealers operating on it.

Think back to what Michael Duch told you. Michael
Duch had never dealt drugs in his life. He was an IT guy. He
had never considered dealing drugs on the street. But with
Silk Road, what had once been unthinkable for him became a
no-brainer of a business decision. Silk Road supplied
everything he needed to become an online drug dealer
overnight -- a fully anonymous online sales portal, a huge
preexisting customer base, instructions on how to package drugs
to evade detection, an escrow system and a support staff to
make sure that he would get paid by his customers if he shipped
out the drugs as ordered.

And as you saw, Duch was able to reach customers all over the country through Silk Road. He would never have been able to do that on his own. That's the legacy of Silk Road. It lowered the barriers to drug dealing by enabling drug dealers to reach customers online they could have never met on the street.

That was how the defendant facilitated drug dealing through Silk Road. And because he knew the value of his

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Turner

services, he knew how prized his drug dealing territory was. He required drug dealers to agree to his terms of service. You remember this, the Seller Agreement that you had to click on in order to create a vendor account on the site. Every time a new dealer clicked on that agreement, they were agreeing with the defendant to deal drugs together. The agreement was you get to use my site; I get a piece of your deals. It is a criminal business partnership.

Again, that's the defendant's own words. Here is one private message where he tells a user: "Silk Road isn't some bureaucracy. I consider us business partners."

So the defendant helped others deal drugs on the site. He distributed drugs. He agreed with others to distribute drugs. And that covers Counts One through Three of the Indictment.

And, you know, he himself acknowledges this. Who knew that a softie could lead an international narcotics organization? Thank you for being here. Thank you for being my comrades."

THE COURT: Mr. Turner.

MR. TURNER: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Would now be an all right time to stop?

MR. TURNER: I've probably got 10 to 15 more minutes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's stop here and then we'll pick up,

F23dulb4 Summation - Mr. Turner

ladies and gentlemen, right after lunch, and so we'll pick up at 2 o'clock. Joe has had lunch arranged to be brought in for you.

Now, it's very important that while you've heard the government's -- most of the government's closing summation, you haven't yet heard from the defendant. You haven't heard the government's rebuttal, and you haven't been charged on the law. So do not be tempted to talk to each other at this point. All right? Don't talk to each other about this case or anybody else about this case. The time for you to do that is coming soon but it's not yet.

Thank you very much and have a nice lunch.

THE CLERK: All rise as the jury leaves.

(Continued on next page)

Summation - Mr. Turner

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, the reason for taking the break there, Mr. Turner, was one of the jurors I thought was indicating that they needed a break. So when you reached a point where it seemed like I could interrupt, I did. I don't like to interrupt. I would have otherwise let you go 'til 1:05.

MR. TURNER: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: So is there anything we need to raise before we take our lunch bread? No.

I will see you folks back promptly at 2 o'clock. Thank you.

THE CLERK: All rise.

(Luncheon recess)

F23dulb4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:06 p.m.

(Jury not present)

THE CLERK: All rise.

THE COURT: All right. Let's bring out the jury.

THE CLERK: All rise as the jury enters.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen. Let's all be seated.

All right. Mr. Turner, you may proceed, sir.

MR. TURNER: Before I go into Count Four, let me touch briefly on drug quantities. Assuming you find the defendant quilty on Count One, Two or Three, you will be asked to make a further finding, whether certain quantities of drugs were involved in the offenses, how much of these substances did the defendant help others distribute, or agree with others to distribute. More than a kilogram of heroin. More than five kilograms of cocaine. At least ten grams of LSD, or at least 500 grams of methamphetamine.

So for heroin it's easy. Michael Duch told you he alone distributed over three kilograms of heroin as a dealer on the site, which by itself puts the amount over the threshold and that's just one vendor. So you know the total amount of heroin the defendant helped others distribute or agreed with others to distribute through Silk Road is well beyond that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For other substances, take a look at Government Exhibit 940E. This is data from the Silk Road transaction database. For cocaine, for example, there were 82,582 orders of cocaine on the site. Even if each of those orders was only a tenth of a gram of cocaine, there would still have been 8 kilograms of cocaine distributed through the site to be above the 5-kilogram threshold.

If you look at Government Exhibit 911A, pictured under here, all the cocaine -- 1 gram, 3.5 grams, 7 grams, 5 grams -they are all well above -- well above .1 grams. And you can go through the same sort of calculation for the other drug quantities. The quantities of drugs distributed through Silk Road were massive.

So let's go on to Count Four.

Count Four charges the defendant with operating a continuing criminal enterprise. Basically what this means, as the Judge, I expect, will instruct you is that the defendant engaged in drug trafficking on a continuing serious basis, and that he oversaw others and made substantial profits in doing so.

So to find the defendant quilty on this charge, you have to find that the defendant committed a series of three or more drug crimes, oversaw five or more persons in the process, and received substantial profits from his crime.

Now, here the defendant clearly committed a series of

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

three or more drug crimes. He was facilitating drug deals every day. You only have to agree on three such crimes. Just pick a few. Pick three of the thousands of drug sales that

undercover purchases of drugs done by Agent Der-Yeghiayan or

Michael Duch did himself over the site, or pick three of the

DEA New York. All of those were drug deals the defendant was

7 involved in as a middleman.

> Did the defendant oversee five or more persons as part of his operation? Of course he did. First, he had employees. If you look back -- this is an exhibit with his to-do list. He has employees -- a list of employees that he pays every week. There are chats with the employees on the computer. There are other references to the employees.

Look at the government exhibit numbered here, if you want to go back and take a look and see what those individuals did as part of the operation. Basically some were the support staff, the customer support, who would basically make sure everything ran smoothly on the site. If there were disputes between buyers and dealers, they would resolve those disputes. That was partly what Agent Der-Yeghiayan, in operating his undercover account, was involved in, as support staff.

Then you have the back-end people, the computer programmers, Smedly, Syq, H7. In one of the chats with H7 they talk about having a team of programmers. So he has people working under him, working for him. He is a boss of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

enterprise.

Not only that, you don't even have to limit yourself to the employees that the defendant supervised. He was the leader of the whole site. He organized the hundreds of vendors of drug dealers that sold drugs on this site. He harmonized their operations into one essentially orderly business enterprise. And that is acting as an organizer. And that, too, is a basis for finding that he oversaw five or more people as part of his operation.

Finally, did he make substantial profit from his enterprise? Of course he did. He earned millions of dollars in commissions. So far at least, he earned the millions of dollars that were recovered from his laptop in bitcoins.

Next there is Count Five, conspiring to commit or aid and abet computer hacking. Now, computer hacking tools and services were offered on Silk Road. Agent Der-Yeghiayan told you that he would see those listings in the digital goods section, in the computer equipment sections of the website. And although we didn't look at them in detail during the testimony of Brian Shaw, the government introduced a sampling of the computer hacking listings found on the Silk Road website when the FBI seized it. There were keyloggers. There were email account crackers. There were password stealers. were DDos services for knocking websites offline. You heard from Agent Alford about how he made an undercover purchase of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

some of this hacking software and it worked as advertised.

And you have seen evidence that the defendant controlled what was sold on the site. Customer support chats about cyanide, for example. The customer support staff part of the role is looking for stuff that is not supposed to be sold on the site. Computer hacking was a feature on the site throughout. So this was something that the defendant allowed to be sold on the site. And then vendors were only allowed to sell on Silk Road at the pleasure of the defendant. He let them sell on the site; they agreed to give him a cut of the proceeds, he's conspiring with them as well.

It is the same thing with the trafficking or aiding and abetting trafficking of fraudulent identity documents. You've seen the fake IDs and passports regularly offered on Silk Road. You even saw forum posts where the defendant announced the creation of the forgery section on the site where fake IDs and passports were specifically supposed to be listed. And you saw that the site did over a million dollars in sales in fake IDs and passports, including the ones the defendant bought. Just like the drug dealers on the site, the sellers of these fake IDs and passports all had to enter into an agreement with the defendant to sell their wares on the site. conspired with them, too.

Finally, Count Seven charges the defendant with conspiring to commit money laundering. Now, the Judge will

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

instruct you on the elements of money laundering in more detail. But basically money laundering is taking proceeds of certain crimes, like drug trafficking, and moving the money from one account to another, for example, or exchanging it from one form to another, with the purpose of either promoting illegal activity, where the illegal activity came from, or concealing the money from law enforcement. Through his operation on Silk Road, the defendant agreed to do that for the sellers on the site in basically two ways.

First, in operating the Silk Road payment system, he was agreeing to help drug dealers on the site get the funds from their illegal sales and move them off the site anonymously. That was why he chose bitcoins as the coin of Silk Road because it is an anonymous currency. And not only that but Silk Road's payment system included a tumbler built into it. What this means is money didn't go straight from a buyer's bitcoin address to a seller's bitcoin address when a payment was made. Money would be tumbled through a bunch of dummy bitcoin addresses before it hit the seller's account in order to make the payments harder to trace on the block chain. You read about this on the buyer's guide. "Just when you thought Silk Road couldn't be more secure, we went one step further. The tumbler sends all payments through a complex semi-random series of dummy transactions, each one with a new, one-use receiving address making it nearly impossible to link

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

your payment with any coins leaving the site."

That feature, all those features of the payment system, were designed to help drug dealers move their dirty money through the site without being tracked. That's money laundering.

How else did the defendant agree with others to launder their money? Well, we already had a whole section on the site of money laundering services. That was what the money section of the site was about. And that section allowed drug dealers on the site to take their bitcoins and exchange them for cash or anonymous credit cards or other forms of money that couldn't be traced back to them.

Here you have -- you can trade your bitcoins in for \$10,000 in cash delivered to your door. This vendor advertises you will be mailed genuine U.S. currency that has not been altered or linked to criminal activity. Here is one for anonymous credit cards and debit cards. It's a normal debit card but hasn't got your personal information. It's totally anonymous.

So the defendant agreed with these money laundering service providers to allow them to operate on the site so that they could help the drug dealers on the site anonymously cash out their illegal proceeds. That's another way he conspired, agreed with others to commit money laundering.

Let me talk about one more legal requirement and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's venue. You have to find that the defendant, or people he aided or abetted or conspired with, caused something to happen here in the Southern District of New York in furtherance of his crime. For the drug crimes in the case, you can find venue multiple ways. You know, for example, that Michael Duch based his heroin dealing operation here, in Orange County, in the Southern District of New York, where he lived. And as a Silk Road vendor he is a co-conspirator of the defendant. is someone who is aided and abetted by the defendant, and he performed his drug dealing operation out of this district.

You've also got undercover drug buys by DEA New York in which the drugs were ordered from here and delivered here. Again, the drug dealers who were to ship those orders were co-conspirators of the defendant, aided and abetted by him. The defendant is involved in each of those deals as a middleman.

But there's also another basis for venue that actually provides venue for all the counts in the Indictment and that's the Silk Road website itself. The Silk Road website was projected across the Web, accessed throughout the world, including here in the Southern District of New York. And as I expect Judge Forrest to instruct you, venue could be based on the transmission of a website into the Southern District of New York where the operation of the website is in furtherance of the criminal activity at issue and where it's reasonably

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Turner

foreseeable to the defendant that the website could be accessed by someone here.

Here, the operation of the website was critical for the offense, and it was obviously reasonably foreseeable that people in New York, in this district, could access it. In fact, you know it was accessed here because, for example, it was accessed by DEA New York in conducting their undercover buys. It was accessed by Mr. Duch every time he had to log onto the site in order to do his business.

So, for example, for the fake ID charge, it's enough for venue that the defendant ran a website with offerings for fake IDs and broadcast those offerings through the Web into this district. It is as if he put a billboard up here in this district in furtherance of the effect. The same thing with the computer hacking and money laundering charges and the drug charges.

And that's where the action was in this case, ladies and gentlemen. The hundreds of thousands of drug deals and other illegal transactions that occurred on Silk Road didn't take place on some street corner; they took place in a dark corner of the Internet. That was the defendant's criminal turf.

But just because he operated in cyberspace doesn't make his crimes any less real. Those were real drugs he was selling through his site, just as dangerous and addictive as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Turner

drugs sold on the street. Think of Michael Duch. All he was doing -- all he was doing was taking drugs off the street and using the defendant's site to redistribute them across the Think of the messages he got from his customers that you saw. On a daily basis, anxiously waiting for their shipment to arrive before debilitating withdrawal symptoms set I am extremely dope sick and need something by tomorrow. Those are real people, real families, with real addictions. And it was the defendant's website that made it easier than ever before to feed those addictions, for people to get hooked in the first place, and it was the defendant's website that made it easier for drug dealers to get users hooked, users from all over the world.

Based on his operation of the website, which the government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt, the defendant is liable for all the crimes charged in the Indictment. His conduct was brazenly illegal. He knew perfectly well what he was doing the whole time, and you should find him guilty on all counts.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Turner.

Mr. Dratel.

MR. DRATEL: Could we just have one second just for the technical changeover?

THE COURT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Pause)

MR. DRATEL: May it please the Court?

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, thank you for listening. Thank you for paying attention thank you for being here sometimes in weather that was inclement and difficult. So we really appreciate it, and it is a reflection on your recognition of how important this case is for Mr. Ulbricht.

This will be my last chance to speak to you about the The government is going to get another opportunity after case. I'm done, and I'll talk about that towards the end of my closing statement.

Obviously, in a trial that's lasted this long with as much testimony and documents as have come in, I am not going to be able to talk to you about everything. I'm going to pick items and concepts that illustrate why Ross Ulbricht is not quilty of each and every count in the Indictment; why the government has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, as it must do, each and every element unanimously to all of you, to each of your satisfaction, and the other counts in the Indictment.

Some of this stuff has been technical. Some of it may be a little technical during my summation. But as I told you in opening, the fundamentals, the foundation of all of this is common sense. It's your life experience. It's what you know

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and what teaches you, from the evidence in this case, that Mr. Ulbricht is not quilty.

I talked about this in my opening. It is apparent from everything we've heard in the case. It is that the Internet is not what it seems. The very first witness, a government agent, assumed multiple identities on the Silk Road Multiple. As many as a dozen. So he had dozens of accounts that he was controlling. No one realized that the usernames had changed when he assumed an account. No one realized when he created an account that he was law enforcement. He never took a lesson. He didn't know anything about computer technology, necessarily, more than the average person. He was able to do it, just like his colleagues. said they all had accounts. All of them were operating accounts.

The Internet permits, and thrives on, to a certain extent, deception and misdirection. They were never caught as law enforcement operating undercover. In all of the posts that they did and all of their interaction here on Silk Road -- the buyers, sellers, administrators, moderators, all of that. You heard Michael Duch talk about his wariness of customers because he agrees, you never know who precisely is on the other side of that computer screen.

Even Agent Der-Yeghiayan, during cross-examination, recalled that there was a period of time where he was so

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

convoluted in his own mind that he didn't quite know who was supposed to be who. He said who's on first. And he was a person who knew the inside of it, that he was playacting, that his colleagues were running accounts. He even knew that and he couldn't keep track.

You don't even know if any of the screen names that the government has pointed to, that any of them, is a separate They could all be the same person and you wouldn't know. You can't conclude that here, I submit to you. You have no evidence that there are different people. They could all be Agent Der-Yeghiayan -- not that they're Agent Der-Yeghiayan, but just like Agent Der-Yeghiayan, they could all be the same person operating multiple usernames. Where is the proof that they are separate people? Where is the proof from the witness stand, from anyone who came in and said that was me, that was me, that was me? No. We don't know. You don't know. can't make a conclusion beyond a reasonable doubt based on that.

Reasonable doubt, it is what protects us all. protects Mr. Ulbricht. It protects us all in this system. It. is the bedrock of the system. It requires the government to prove its case, to satisfy you beyond a reasonable doubt. Judge will instruct you, reasonable doubt is a doubt that appeals to your reason, your judgment, your experience, your common sense. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt must, therefore,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act upon it in the most important of his or her own affairs. If you have such a doubt as would reasonably cause a prudent person to hesitate in acting in important matters in his or her own affairs, then you have a reasonable doubt and it's your duty to find the defendant not guilty.

One of the fundamental principles in this case is that DPR and Mr. Ulbricht cannot be the same person. That's what the evidence, I submit, shows you. And the government hasn't proved beyond a reasonable doubt -- certainly, that's the burden -- that they're the same person. Let's just look at some of the evidence.

DPR starts February 5, 2012, with a post that says I'm announcing my name. By that time the only witness with firsthand knowledge, Richard Bates, has already testified that Mr. Ulbricht is already out of Silk Road by February 2012. They could talk all they want about documents -- and we'll talk about them -- that could be created, edited, moved. But their witness, the only person who actually knew Mr. Ulbricht, told you Mr. Ulbricht said it was sold as of November 2011. I submit to you it was even before that. That's just when they talked about it.

There is also just a difference in the way security is handled here so you can tell that Mr. Ulbricht is not DPR, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the evidence hasn't proved that to you beyond a reasonable doubt that they are the same person. First, if you look at Mr. Ulbricht from what we know, you have those posts attributed to him in early 2011. That's even before Silk Road starts, and then where he started he posts as Altoid, which is directly linked back to him.

Does that sound like DPR? The day of his arrest he's facing out the window with his back to the people in the library. He's already said in a chat that they've -- DPR has already said in a chat that they put in evidence to someone working for him, he said: The worst that could happen, your only vulnerability is someone coming behind and looking over your shoulder, which is exactly the position that Mr. Ulbricht was in in that library the day he was arrested.

Saving those chats, does that sound like DPR? You have to actually enable the chats to be saved. The government witness, Mr. Kiernan, testified to that. You actually have to choose to save all of the incriminating evidence. Does that sound like DPR?

Keeping a journal like that and then saving it on your laptop? A little too convenient. Does that sound like DPR? That's Government Exhibit 241. And we'll talk more about that, too.

Keeping your PGP keys in a file named "Key," something that's supposed to be secret, something that's supposed to

keep -- that's something that is supposed to enable you to communicate in an encrypted fashion. There are a lot of blinking neon signs in this case that have been created to incriminate Mr. Ulbricht, and I submit to you DPR wouldn't do any of that.

BitTorrent, a program, a peer-to-peer file sharing program for people on the network, on the Internet. At the time that he was arrested Mr. Ulbricht is on a program that connects him to other people on the Internet. The photos that we put in as Defendant's G and Defendant's H show that he is connected to nine people. That he uploaded the Colbert Report. There were nine peers on his system, nine people connected to an open port on his computer. Think about that from the point of view of Internet security, computer security, when you've seen from government witnesses, one after the other, talk about hacking tools and what can be done when someone gets access to your computer. I will talk more about that, too.

They had said he had a thumb drive of the entire site. Why do you have it on your laptop if you have it on a thumb drive if you want to be secure? What's the purpose? Would DPR do that?

Let's look at DPR for a second on that issue. You had a long -- first of all, in the seller's contract, which is Government Exhibit 121B, it says -- basically, it is all about security. It is how to keep your -- the vendors had to keep

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them secure, how to keep their customers secure about destroying addresses and identifying information and all of that packaging and all of these things to make sure that everyone is secure on the site and that this security is paramount for DPR. You had a law enforcement professional, Agent Der-Yeghiayan. You had many of his colleagues -- he doesn't even know how many around the world -- in the United States, and he said, around the world, who were on that site trying to identify DPR.

He got on that site first -- the first time he went on that site was October of 2011. Two years. Did DPR give away anything to him? No. He was an administrator. He was inside. By August of 2013, he was inside. He took over an administrator account. He had direct communication and private chats with DPR. Still, this law enforcement professional, who is all over the Silk Road site, thousands of hours on the site, could not get any personal information about DPR.

I submit to you -- and I'll talk more about this as I continue, but I submit to you that that in and of itself and the Cirrus chats, which is Agent Der-Yeghiayan, for a three-month period, prove that those other chats, that pretend to have personal information about Mr. Ulbricht, are phonies. Maybe not in the entirety in the sense that they are not Mr. Ulbricht, but they're DPR's, but that they're edited, sprinkled with facts about Mr. Ulbricht's life that are out

there and available not only in the public but to anyone who would have access to his computer and his accounts.

Look at Government's Exhibit 936, which is the redandwhite friendly chemist, series of chats. I read some of that yesterday. There is one section where DPR gives redandwhite advice. We will put it up there for you. Where he gives redandwhite various concrete detailed advice about how to scrub metadata from a photo image so that it could be sent without revealing incriminating information.

Look at Mr. Ulbricht's computer. Look at all the metadata the government showed you. Metadata, of course, that can be edited, as the government witnesses acknowledged.

It is not the same person. It is not like a person who has two contrasting character traits that don't seem to go together. It is not something like a virtuoso player who can't boil an egg. It's not a virtuoso piano player who can't play Happy Birthday. That is what this really is when they talk about security, when they talk about DPR, what they are trying to say about Mr. Ulbricht. It doesn't fit. It is a little too convenient.

Now, one of these chats -- and the government talked about it in summation earlier -- that said "told two people." Well, in fact, whoever wrote that chat didn't know that there were more than two people involved in this whole thing. Whether all of them had to do with Mr. Ulbricht or not is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unclear. But I submit to you, they put one of those people in there because they didn't know about a couple of others that Mr. Ulbricht had been in contact with at the early part. So, for example, they put in someone named Jessica, and that's 240C. Let's show that.

Well, he talks in a chat. There is a journal that says "I went out with Jessica and I told her I have secrets and I'm so stupid. I trust people."

That's one. Bates would be two. Mr. Ulbricht's real girlfriend, Julie Alan, would be three. A woman with the Facebook post, that's four. That's not two.

Just to give you an another example of how easy it is or how convenient it is to say something and then to try to make something of it by putting together facts that don't fit, which make an assumption that doesn't fit beyond a reasonable doubt. If I say to you "beaches," do you think Thailand? you have to say Thailand in return? That's the first guess? He's in Australia at the time, Mr. Ulbricht.

They want to create the person or persons who created those chats, they wanted to create this as if it were somehow connected to Mr. Ulbricht's life.

Now, how do we know that DPR was not Mr. Ulbricht? Well, first of all, like I said, Mr. Bates told you. And then Mr. Ulbricht leaves for Australia for six months in October of 2011. Then in April of 2013 there is evidence that DPR has

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

changed again. That's from Agent Der-Yeghiayan.

And, by the way, he had been on that site from October 2011. But he doesn't know anything, by the way, about the beginning of the site. No one knows anything about the beginning of the site. There are no witnesses, there are no documents, there is no anything about Silk Road in terms of transactions or anything like that from the beginning of the site. We haven't heard any evidence of that.

Now, with respect to a timeline for 2011, I think it's important to look at the timeline for 2011.

If you look in March -- February, March and April, there is a lot of conversation between Bates and Mr. Ulbricht about programming. And of course we know that the site was launched around that time. But then that part drops off after June. And there are things that happen in June. You heard this morning, the Silk Road site in its current form, June 18, 2011, with that first post from the Silk Road site that they were down for a little bit, and then they're back up. It sounds like a transition.

Now, you know from Mr. Bates also that Mr. Ulbricht had another project going on before Silk Road and in the beginning of it, Good Wagon Books, through the early part of 2011. Also, the government pointed out 240B this morning, but 240B also says no commissions at the beginning. You don't have a single piece of evidence that Mr. Ulbricht was responsible

Summation - Mr. Dratel

for any commissions.

Mr. Ulbricht was never a conspirator, as charged in the Indictment. He is not a conspirator at all. There is no agreement here. There is no evidence when that seller's account contract came into being on the site. Again, we don't have anything from the site until later on in 2011, after he's already gone from it.

(Continued on next page)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DRATEL: No evidence of when an escrow system was set up on the site, no evidence of Mr. Ulbricht set up an escrow system.

Now also on that timeline as we get through 2011, we see that it's only in October of 2011 that Agent Der-Yeghiayan starts to monitor the site and that November 11, 2011, Mr. Bates testified that Mr. Ulbricht tells him I've already sold it to someone else. Mr. Ulbricht leaves for Australia four days later for six months.

Now, there's a chat in April of 2013 that the government did not discuss in its submissions, Government Exhibit 1004, it's between Mr. Bates and Mr. Ulbricht. Okay. If we can blow up the first part. April 2013, baronsyntax, this is Mr. Bates: Did you see slashdot last week.

Mr. Ulbricht: Negative.

Mr. Bates: There was something posted on Friday that you might have found interesting.

I'll take a look. Thanks.

And then it says -- this is Mr. Ulbricht -- in April of 2013: "glad that's not my problem anymore," with a smiley face.

It says afterwards: "I have regrets, don't get me wrong...but that shit was stressful."

That's the only chat the government doesn't want you to believe, the only one that an actual witness came in and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

told you that he participated with Mr. Ulbricht. Not a single other chat is verified in any other way that Mr. Ulbricht was a participant. That one we know happened, and that one is the one the government doesn't want to talk about. It's the only government witness that ever met or spoke with Mr. Ulbricht until July of 2013. Won't talk about that interview with Agent Critten who testified.

Now, the chat in October of 2011, the government showed that today as well, but the one that says are you doing anything besides the site for a job, well, in fact, we put in the rest of the chat, which is R57, and it's all about the bitcoin exchange site that Mr. Bates and Mr. Ulbricht are working on at that time. Throughout the summer, Mr. Bates' testimony - again, a live witness telling you what happened, not a document created on the Internet, on a computer that anyone can do at any time - he testified that throughout the summer of 2011, they were working together on a bitcoin exchange website that people would go to and be able to synthesize prices and availability in the market.

Mr. Bates said he was working on the code. a contract that Mr. Ulbricht had sent him that was never signed, but they got as far as a contract to be partners in this. And in R57, it's all about the bitcoin site. It's not about Silk Road he says. Nobody talks about the site. a presumption. I submit to you that based on the rest of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

chat, it's not a valid presumption. It's not a presumption that permits you to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that they're talking about Silk Road, but it doesn't come up anywhere in the chat.

There's also an Altoid post, posted by Altoid on the bitcoin forum chat, Government Exhibit 306, in which, again, this is a post where Mr. Ulbricht is asking for advice about a bitcoin exchange. That's what the post is about. It's October 2011. It's at the very same time. That's what he's working on at that time. He didn't even change his address from the earlier Altoid post from early 2011. You know why? Because Silk Road -- he wasn't worried about security at that point but Silk Road was in his rear-view mirror. He was already out of it.

Now, Mr. Ulbricht's background: Physics degree, Master's of Material Sciences from Penn State University. There was a chat where something about the laws of gravity that was said in a way as if you have to be a physics major to know that gravity is a law of physics. I don't know what the other purpose was to try to make that kind of a leap for you.

Agent Shaw, the government's last witness -- not Agent Shaw, Mr. Shaw, I'm sorry -- said the first commission charge was May 16, 2011. There's no proof that Mr. Ulbricht was still involved at that time. He also didn't know -- couldn't tell you -- understand he had access to the entire server, all of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

these transactions. Look at what he went through to make those charts. He could not say when the first heroin sale was, could not say when the first cocaine sale was. We have no evidence of when any drug sale was made on Silk Road before that date. Talk about proof, not just taking a line and then extending it because it seems like it could have happened that way or it should have happened that way or it might have happened that way; it has to have happened that way beyond a reasonable doubt.

The changes in Silk Road over time, again, transitions, changes. We talked before, the site shut down in 2011, it was split from the Marketplace and the forum as two separate sites at that time. Big changes. I submit to you it's part of that transition from Mr. Ulbricht to the person he sold it to. The forgeries don't start until August of 2011. And again, in October of 2011, there's more activity, there's more shutdown, there's more transition. The URL changes at the end of 2011. DPR becomes -- is announced in February of 2012, a new commission schedule in January 2012.

Silkroad.org, remember that thing, that advertisement that takes you from the open web to Tor, that's not renewed. That is registered in March of 2011 and in April of 2012, it's not renewed. It's now owned by a quy in China who has nothing to do with it. It was not renewed. It was only up for a year.

25

Didn't make any seizures before -- Agent Der-Yeghiayan did not start making those particular seizures until October of 2011. By the way, as he admitted on cross-examination, what was coming in, he has no idea whether it was from the Silk Road or not specifically. That's like saying I order a book -- I go on Amazon and I see a book, and then I go to another site and I like the price better or the shipping costs or whatever it is or I got points, I'm a member, who knows what it is, I buy it from the other site, but it's advertised on Amazon and when it comes from my house, it means it comes from Amazon? No. You have to prove that. There's no proof. We know there are multiple sites out there.

These people can be working directly -- he admitted all of that. Buyer and seller can be working directly. They can be working over email. They can be working over a variety of different ways. There's no proof that that whole room -- there's no proof that anything in that room that is Silk Road.

They tell you about assumptions and being careful about assumptions, and they're all after Mr. Ulbricht has left Silk Road even if they could be attributed.

The same thing, by the way, with Michael Duch. He was not even on the site as a buyer until October 2012, not as a seller until April 2013, well after Mr. Ulbricht is gone. You know, he has spreadsheets he said he actually worked on for this trial. And I'm sorry, do you believe a thing he said

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

without some real corroboration, without some verification? Could you actually believe a thing he said for several reasons, one of which is at the time this is all happening he is doing, by his own account, a volume of heroin that probably defies reality, he's probably selling most of that that he says he's doing and he's probably selling it on the street. Second is, he's got a deal to get him out from under a life sentence, so I submit you can't take his word for anything without proof and not proof of a spreadsheet that he created. Do you know that what's on this spreadsheet is reliable? Can you trust it beyond a reasonable doubt in a matter of importance in your own affairs?

I want to look at the timeline again for the early part of 2013. A lot happens in the early part of 2013, the spring of 2013 in particular. First we have February 5 -- I'm sorry. I had the wrong date. The February 5, 2013 post of the chat where Ross says "Glad that's not my problem anymore, I have regrets, don't get me wrong, that shit was stressful," that's what he says to Bates, that's a chat that's in evidence, Government Exhibit 1004.

Then in March on the 16th, there's a Stack Overflow, that site the gentleman came in where you ask computer questions, Stack Overflow, all of a sudden, Ross Ulbricht is on there asking a question and then 30 seconds later he changes his screen name to frosty. I mean, really? Really?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think DPR would do that? Get on your own name and then change it to the name that supposedly connects you, absolutely connects you to Silk Road? This is March of 2013.

March of 2013 is also when the denial of service attack occurs on the Silk Road site. March of 2013 is also when the FriendlyChemist/redandwhite sets of chats all begin. And by the way, with respect to those, I submit it doesn't really matter because it's not Mr. Ulbricht, but I submit that it's indicative again about the Internet. There are no people of the type they named there. Can you explain what those chats mean since those people never existed? Can you explain it? Can you explain it beyond a reasonable doubt?

Money was paid? We don't know where the money went. It could have gone anywhere. Who knows who was on the other side of that wallet. Did we hear evidence of that? No. could have been a way for DPR to get his money out of Silk Road. Who knows? You can create an entire fiction, an entire fictional episode on the Internet, and you can sit here right now and not know whether it was real or not, much less beyond a reasonable doubt, and that's all the evidence in this case.

Let's keep going. In 2013, that's also the date of the first log entry of 241, Government's 241, that journal, that log journal. We have one for 2010, which is one entry of maybe a page; we have one for 2011, which is one entry, maybe a page; we have one at the beginning of 2012, January 1, 2012,

"I'm going to start a journal," nothing else for 2012 and then all of a sudden in March of 2013, presto, we have this very detailed piece trying to correspond to things.

Also you heard -- March 26, you heard from Mr. Shaw. March 26, 2013, the SSH key, the security key to get into the site was modified to frosty@frosty. We don't know what it was before then. We do know there's another key that allowed someone else access at root@bcw. Any evidence about that, who that could be? No.

So Mr. Ulbricht, they want you to believe, on March 16, 2013 outs himself as frosty by affirmatively changing on the Stack Overflow site his name from Ross Ulbricht to frosty, his account name, and then ten days later, puts that as the SSH key for Silk Road. Does that sound like DPR?

You know what else happens in the spring of 2013, it's not on the timeline, but you just heard it today? It was the last thing that was read, and this is not a coincidence — that's when DPR learns that the investigations are for real; that's when he's paying for information; that's when he knows they're look at bitcoin exchanges; they're look at moderators; they're trying to turn all of his people against him. He knows the walls are closing in and it's time to implement an escape plan.

And what you have is a series of events that no one would do with respect to frosty@frosty -- and by the way, you

| FZ3Gulb3

heard from frosty@frosty with the SSH keys and they made it seem like it was something important when you heard it on direct, but on cross, it turns out you could do that from any computer. I could get on a computer right now and create a frosty@frosty SSH key. It's that simple and that fast. But in terms of speed, when you start it in March and you have until October, there's a lot you can do to frame somebody.

And then you have the May 2013 seizure of the accounts from Mr. Karpeles, and you heard that. You heard about Mr. Karpeles. By the way, Mr. Yum was able to do a very detailed bitcoin analysis in a week. Thousands of transactions. What if you had four, five, six months to work on a project like that? It's easy to create or edit chats and computer files and spreadsheets and all of that. You heard that.

The prosecutor in summation said there's no break in the documents. How would you know? How would you know? You know you can get on a document, edit it, save it in a way that no one is going to know it was edited. Sophisticated people know how to eliminate, modify, manipulate metadata. You heard that, too: Metadata can be edited just like content and you saw evidence of it. You have a FBI computer scientist standing in San Francisco, California with a phone on Eastern Time. You have an FBI computer forensic examiner whose phone is 40 minutes off the real time. You can do any of this stuff

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

manually. You can manipulate it all.

And it was easy to reconstruct Mr. Ulbricht's activities from Facebook pages, from YouTube, from access to his email account. Again, you heard about all the hacking stuff that goes on. It's a bit disturbing, all of them. if someone were trying to frame you. Even Agent Alford's searches that got him to the original Altoid posts on bitcoinforum talk and shroomery.org, those are regular Google searches he found those. Anywhere you find those. out there. It's easy to reconstruct this in a way that would frame Mr. Ulbricht. Not only can it be edited, it can be moved from computer to computer over the Internet. And Mr. Yum acknowledged that these bitcoin wallets can be moved from computer to computer. The addresses in a bitcoin wallet can be moved from wallet to wallet. It's not as if you know it was created there, it's not as if you know the money went in there when it was there.

Also, these text files, all these chats, all these spreadsheets, they are tiny files. They take no time to upload onto someone's computer without them knowing.

You know, trying to think of an analogy: If you saw footprints of a shoe in the snow and I said a-ha, here is Mr. Ulbricht's shoe, it fits, I submit to you, not unless you see him walking, you don't know who was wearing those shoes when he was walking. You don't know if they're a different

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pair of shoes. You don't know if it's someone on his shoes. And on the Internet, it's much worse. Remember, it has to be beyond a reasonable doubt, not a set of circumstances that sounds convenient. There are some metadata anomalies the government didn't even try to explain.

Let's look. Now, remember, Mr. Ulbricht was arrested October 1, 2013 at about 3:00 in the afternoon, Pacific Time. Let's look at Government Exhibit 250. There's a file on there called todo.txt and what's the time? 9:45 p.m. on October 1, 2013. How do you explain that? Now, by the way, with respect to Pacific Time, they wanted you to believe that the computer was set to Pacific Time on the conversations with cirrus before, not that day, but before they said what's -- this was during Agent Der-Yeghiayan's testimony: And what does it say? It says Pacific Time.

Let's look at 251, it's the same directory, it's the same document, todo.txt, the same time: 9:45 p.m., six hours after Mr. Ulbricht is arrested.

Let's look at 212A, again, Government Exhibit, a document called homepage.php, again, October 1, 2013 at 8:46 p.m. on October 1, 2013. How is that explained?

Now, let's talk a bit about Mark Karpeles. And as you heard, he was under investigation. You heard he had computer experience. He had computer expertise. He had resources. Не ran the primary bitcoin exchange in the world. You heard he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had confederates. You heard that his platform for some of his sites was the same as the Silk Road site, and it was a non-updated version that forum hosts don't use very much. It's MediaWiki 1.17.

You heard that he was the original -- that his companies were the original hosts for the Silk Road site, his hosting company. We know that also that web host -- there was testimony web hosts know their customers' activity very carefully, just like a GPS in a rental car, the same thing as bitcoin exchange -- bitcoin exchange owners and their customers' accounts. Just like in a bank, they know.

I submit to you he also had motivation because Silk Road was a major player in the bitcoin market, and look what happened after Mr. Ulbricht's arrest: The price went from 100 to \$1,000 for bitcoin. Who profits by that?

And you heard also about someone named Anand Athavale who Agent Der-Yeghiayan investigated, did a whole comparison, pages and pages, a comparison of language between those posts on mises.org that he linked to Mr. Athavale and DPR, the commonality. You can do that with anyone, same here with Mr. Ulbricht - you take pieces of people's lives and you can put them together in a way that makes it look like anything could happen.

By the way, with respect to Karpeles and Athavale, the government has never seen their electronic devices. They have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

never seen their computers or laptops or phones. These are people who don't live in the United States. Der-Yeghiayan also told you that the government was under pressure to make an arrest in this case. They had the servers, the government had access to the Silk Road servers since July 2013. Think about it. They're letting the largest drug operation in the world operate from July 2013 through the end of September. You think there was pressure to make an arrest? All this money flowing out of the country to drug dealers overseas unrecoverable, drugs coming into the country, which they didn't capture, which they didn't seize. those families, Michael Duch's customers. You think the government wasn't concerned about that that they needed to make an arrest? They needed to make an arrest. They wanted to shut They needed to make an arrest.

Now, let's talk about computer insecurity, the hacking tools you saw. Slaves, botnets, things that allow you to get inside somebody's computer, keylog, there are all these things. You saw it in other aspects of the evidence, too. It gives you full access to computers.

It's interesting that Agent D'Agostino used eharmony.com as a way of stealing passwords and things like that. Well, we saw an okaycupid exhibit from Mr. Ulbricht. I'm not actually saying that things on Gmail are necessarily invented, though they might be, we don't know, but the point

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is, if you have access to that and you know when someone takes a trip, then you create a chat that says, oh, I'm traveling tomorrow, and you have no way of knowing when that chat was created and whether what's in that chat is real or not.

You heard about PGP keys. I don't think the government went into it on summation, but again I won't be able to speak to you again, so I'm trying to anticipate, but there's nothing customized, nothing personal. It's spit out by a computer, you cut and paste. And you see people sending their public keys. Private keys can be sent the same way; they can be shared. That key was created in April of 2011, so Mr. Ulbricht could very easily have that key.

THE COURT: Mr. Dratel, we're going to take a break in just a couple of minutes.

MR. DRATEL: Five minutes good?

THE COURT: Five minutes. Thank you.

MR. DRATEL: With respect to computer manipulation, remember this peaceloveharmony discussion I had with Agent Der-Yeghiayan, there was someone named peaceloveharmony, a username at Silk Road, sitting on DPR's profile for hours right around the time that Mr. Ulbricht was arrested, like the day before, someone monitoring that account, not law enforcement because we know because it wasn't anybody on the arrest team because Agent Der-Yeghiayan asked. It wasn't anybody. monitoring what was going on on DPR's account. We don't know

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

who peaceloveharmony is. Can't find that out.

By the way, BitTorrent was still open, connected to the Internet, even after Mr. Ulbricht's arrest. If you look at G and H, you'll see that it goes from about nine megs up loaded to 26 megs uploaded by the time Beeson takes the photo later that night. It's uploaded -- it's been uploaded from four to five to six hours depending on how you count Mr. Beeson's clock.

And you heard about Live Capture. By the way, you heard also about the belt program, about the hacking stuff, that you can actually embed something that then disappears that destroys itself so that you can't even tell, but we don't even know that because the FBI crashed the laptop. They lost the RAM memory, and they acknowledge it. We'll never know what processes were running on that computer that day at that time.

Agent Beeson did not get even an MD5 Hash value, which is not the gold standard, obviously, because we know there are vulnerabilities with respect to that to try to make sure one file is the same file that you're looking at in terms of copying, but he didn't even do that until October 3rd. Mr. Shaw didn't get a hash value on the Silk Road servers for a week after Mr. Ulbricht was arrested, October 8. There is so much to question in this case, and when we come back from the break, I'll continue. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, take a

Summation - Mr. Dratel

short break. Then we'll come back, we'll hear from Mr. Dratel, and then we'll hear once more from the government for their rebuttal. Then after that, I think we'll have time where I'll start instructing you on the law, all right? So let's just take -- again, do not talk to each other, we're not at that point yet, or anybody else about this case but we're close. Thanks very much. Take a short break.

> THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise as the jury leaves. (Continued on next page)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Is there anything we need to raise before we take our own break?

MR. TURNER: Not from me, your Honor.

THE COURT: The reason I stopped you, Mr. Dratel, is one of the jurors needed a break.

MR. DRATEL: I understand.

THE COURT: I appreciate your breaking now because I don't know how much leeway we had, and I want them to be able to concentrate.

Mr. Howard, are you going to do the rebuttal?

MR. HOWARD: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Approximately how long? I'm not trying to constrain you. I just want to get a sense of what kind of timing we've got.

MR. HOWARD: It's hard to say. Maybe a half an hour or so.

THE COURT: One thing I want to make sure is -- we won't finish, I don't think, charging the jury today, but I want to make sure that you folks have ample time to discuss exactly what exhibits are going to go back into the jury room with the jurors.

As soon as they're fully instructed and released to go speak to each other in the jury room, I'll want at that minute the cart with things to go in. And that requires you folks to

Summation - Mr. Dratel

confer to make sure that you've got the right things and not other things. You folks will take care of that.

Here is the indictment, a copy of the indictment. If you folks want to inspect it to make sure that it's the correct version, you are welcome to. And that will go into the jury room with the jurors at the appropriate time. That may not be until tomorrow.

Let's take our own short break and come back. I'm hoping for ten minutes, but I always hope for that. Thanks.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.

(Recess)

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Let's bring out the defendant and then let's bring out the jury.

(Pause)

Now let's bring out the jury.

(Continued on next page)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court; jury present)

THE COURT: Let's all be seated. Thank you.

Mr. Dratel, you may proceed.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

I want to go to October 1, 2013, the date of Mr. Ulbricht's arrest, and recapping again what happened that day in the sense that Agent Der-Yeghiayan, acting as cirrus, saw that Mr. Ulbricht was online, not on the Silk Road site, but on Pidgin chat, separate and completely from Silk Road, engaged him in a conversation and asked him to get on the site. And as you saw during the prosecutor's summation, he said okay, I'll log on.

Now, there was a lot made of the mastermind page, but we found out from Mr. Shaw that if you log on as DPR, you automatically go to the mastermind page for the tech support panel, which is where cirrus asked Mr. Ulbricht to go.

By the way, we know that more than one person could have access to the Silk Road servers or log on as DPR as long you have the credentials.

Now, some other things we know, that during the period of a couple of days before Mr. Ulbricht's arrest, Agent Der-Yeghiayan noted, and Agent Alford, too, that DPR on the Silk Road forums and on the site was unusually quiet during those couple of days. And then you have Mr. Ulbricht out, talk about security, out in a public place using a public Wi-Fi when

he could have easily been in his room at 235 Monterey conducting the business of Silk Road if that's what he was doing and he was DPR.

Now, want to go back to Government Exhibit 225B because, again, this is DPR in January of 2013 talking to scout, just to demonstrate how complicated it can get about identity, scout becomes cirrus, but it's still the original scout and cirrus, it's not yet Agent Der-Yeghiayan. That doesn't happen until July of 2013.

This is January 2013, this is scout, and DPR gives scout some advice and about -- if you go down further -- here, "There is nothing on your laptop for them to use." Nothing on your laptop for them to use; that's what DPR is saying, nothing on your laptop. Think about what was on Mr. Ulbricht's laptop. "And if you obscure your bitcoins properly," another security measure DPR is instructing, then it says "realistically, the only way for them to prove anything would be for them to watch you log in and do your work." And let's go further down, the third one in "Sure, someone could stand behind you without you realizing it." There's Mr. Ulbricht -- that's DPR. And there is Mr. Ulbricht in the library looking out the window with his back to everyone who walks in, including a squad of FBI agents.

Now, there was -- in the prosecution's summation this morning, he talked about the exchange between cirrus, who you recall at that time was Agent Der-Yeghiayan, on October 1, 2013

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Mr. Ulbricht about the bitcoin exchange: Did you use to work at a bitcoin exchange? Well, I submit to you that if he had been working with him all that time, he would have know He wouldn't have had to have asked that question. had been communicating with him for all those months, it indicates someone who is not familiar with cirrus as opposed to someone who is.

And then the day of the arrest when the arresting officers go to Mr. Ulbricht's residence, and you heard, by the way, from Mr. Kincade this morning so I'm not going to go into it about Mr. Ulbricht's time there, under his own name living there, and the Government's Exhibit 130, those handwritten notes found in the waste basket. And we heard from Agent Der-Yeghiayan that as early as August of 2013 and then throughout September of 2013, the subject that's on those handwritten notes has already been discussed for six weeks by DPR in great detail. Does DPR sound like a guy who takes pages of handwritten notes? What we put in today may not have looked like anything, but that Exhibit M that we put in this morning through Ms. Prince, it's a to-do list. DPR knows how to make a to-do list on a computer. I submit to you that those handwritten notes are much more likely to have been notes that someone takes during a telephone call.

It's also interesting how much in those last ten days shows up in these documents. The Amelia from OKC, who, by the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

way, has not been identified, poison oak, except for that "I'm sick," which, again, you could go find those emails and then create one in three seconds of typing, "I'm sick," to put it in there to match something that's part of Mr. Ulbricht's life. DPR and his confederates would be able to do that in a matter of seconds. But then it's only at the end when you see that in the last couple of entries, it's gilding the lily, it's a set-up, it's way too convenient, and you cannot rely on it beyond a reasonable doubt.

There's an instruction about withdrawal from a conspiracy, we're not relying on that. Mr. Ulbricht was never a conspirator at the beginning or at the end. Remember, that first -- that 240A: I want to establish a site where anyone can sell anything. Not a drug site, not an illegal site. Where anyone can sell anything. It sounds like Amazon. sound like eBay.

And about the thumb drive, why wasn't that updated? It's about ten days old, the date on that one. I submit to you that's not because it's a backup from the computer; it was something that was uploaded into the computer, received by Mr. Ulbricht.

Now, a couple of concepts, bitcoin, Tor, I think they were demystified for you enough that you know that they're not synonymous at all with anything illegal. I think that was established to everyone's satisfaction.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Mr. Yum acknowledged that the bitcoin wallets and the bitcoin addresses -- excuse me -- that Silk Road was used and could be used as a wallet itself putting money in and out, putting money in and out. And if you look at those amounts of bitcoins, those were small amounts of bitcoins going into those addresses.

But the one thing he never did was where the money went, the 700,000 bitcoins going into Mr. Ulbricht's wallet -in the wallets, the addresses, the ones that are on his computer; by the way, they're not, again, necessarily his. don't know. We don't know. They're on the laptop the day he's arrested.

And they may come back and talk about metadata. know metadata can be edited. Metadata can be manipulated, but where is the money? 700,254 bitcoins in; 144,000 there. There's no analysis of anything going out. There's no evidence of anything going out.

(Continued on next page)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DRATEL: Where is the money?

Now, that 556,000 bitcoins that are unaccounted for, if you look at -- that would be worth at the time of Mr. Ulbricht's arrest about \$85 million. By November 22, 2013, six weeks later, they were worth a thousand dollars a bitcoin. Do you know what that comes to? \$556 million. Would you spend 13 million -- would you spend 144,000 bitcoins, 19 million, to get 556 million? Would that be a sacrifice worth making, to put that on someone's wallet, if you could get away with the rest of it? And we know that November 22, 2013, from Mr. Yum, that there was a transaction of 195,000 bitcoins that was quickly broken up into three smaller numbers. Whose bitcoins are those? DPR's. Not Mr. Ulbricht's.

The government was absolutely correct this morning. They said who stores \$19 million of bitcoins on a laptop? Exactly.

Also, there were 90,000 bitcoins -- 89,854, almost 90, not attributed to the Silk Road wallet. Some of them may say, well, they were from wallet to wallet, but we didn't hear how much. If there had been a significant amount, I'm sure you would have heard about it from the government.

No evidence of Mr. Ulbricht cashing out, ever. He's living with roommates for a thousand dollars a month, three different places. One place he is living with three people. Another place three people -- four people, rather.

F23du1b6

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DPR knew as of April 2013 that the bitcoin exchanges were being monitored. They were under scrutiny. Does Mr. Ulbricht, do we know that Mr. Ulbricht did anything during that time period with respect to his bitcoins? No. know that he was a trader. We know from the Bates chats that he was interested in bitcoins. We know that he wanted to start a bitcoin site. We know that he was an investor and a speculator. And we know that bitcoin in 2010 was infinitesimal pricing, perhaps a dollar, maybe even less. So you could make money and then reinvest and reinvest and continue to make money. Think about even a price that goes from 60 cents to \$60, think of what your return on investment is after a year, year-and-a-half period. At one point it went up to \$250.

So we don't know who DPR is, but we do know who Ross Ulbricht is. You heard from four witnesses, three of them character witnesses.

The government says that those redandwhite chats, Government Exhibit 936, demonstrates that DPR would resort to violence to protect this site. Assuming that those are true at That's why, you know, that DPR is not Ross all, agreed. Ulbricht. Because one thing that the people who know him for his whole life know is that his reputation is for peacefulness and nonviolence. Challenge yourself. Look at the credibility of those witnesses. Assess the sincerity of those witnesses as to the honesty of those witnesses and their experience with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Summation - Mr. Dratel

Ross Ulbricht, which is real corporeal, like you and I speaking here today, not behind a computer screen, where you cannot tell who is who, when is when, or what is what.

You also know that Ross is a person who gets stressed out. It is the only evidence we have that's real. You heard that voicemail, Government Exhibit 1005, to Mr. Bates. panicked. You saw 1004. Silk Road was too stressful. heard Mr. Bates. Again, these are real witnesses, really experiencing things that actually happened. That he thought Ross was stressed out, that he thought Ross was overwhelmed.

And then 2012, by the way, what's the message from Ross when Bates reaches out to him? Chillin'.

Look at the journal entries in 2010, 2011, full of crises and anxiety. Look at 2013, starting in March, that one that is 241. There is nothing like that in there. There is nothing from Ross except at the very end. They talk about Amelia and poison oak, which is stuff that you could get from his Gmail account in two seconds.

What about those IDs? Life on the lam. What did he ask KingOfClubs. Let's assume it is Mr. Ulbricht. It was delivered to his address. Domestic U.S. flights, life on the lam in the U.S. like that? Really. For a guy sitting on 700,000 bitcoins. That's safe?

He is asking, if you look at those -- look at Government Exhibit 935. He asks about the details -- and I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

read it yesterday so I want to go over it today, I spent time But he asks about features of these fake IDs. Does that sound like DPR, or a novice? He asks about being held at Do you have any problems with your customers? Does that sound like DPR, or a novice?

He knew about all of that, and yet when Homeland Security, Agent Critten came to him, he spoke to him voluntarily, even though he did not have to. Does that sound like DPR, or a novice? Critten, by the way, had no idea that it was a Silk Road package.

Mr. Ulbricht volunteered the information about Silk Road when they said speak hypothetically about -- help us out. Speak hypothetically. Would DPR do that? Does that sound like DPR to you? To say, well, on Silk Road you could order anything. Imagine DPR doing that.

Now, Ross gave Agent Critten his valid Texas driver's license. He gave him an email address -- on Tor, no less. Imagine DPR doing that.

He said he was a currency trader. That's what Ross told him. And he admitted that he used a false name with his roommates at that time. Later on, when you heard that he moved to Crazy Cape after knowing that homeland security had come to him and he had spoken about Silk Road with them, he goes back to using his real name when he moves. Sound like DPR?

You heard about his travel. There is no evidence of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

anything going on, foreign-to-foreign travel, or anything like that. You saw the passports.

By the way, after the visit by Homeland Security, what does Ross do? Does he make travel plans? Does he leave the country? Are there bitcoin movements? Does he go underground? Live under an assumed name? No. The exact opposite. He does nothing.

And what did they find when they arrested him? Only -- the only passport was his. That's more than two months after his encounterer with Agent Critten. He didn't run. didn't go underground. He didn't remove any bitcoins or any money. He doesn't do anything that one would expect someone like DPR to do. Nothing that would indicate the security-savvy, security-conscious DPR.

Agent D'Agostino gave you an example of how people get into other people's emails and get into their computer. You send an email that says "cute puppies" and you hope that people click on the link. Well, sometimes it comes from people you know. A pishing email. Would you judge that person you know based on that pishing email? Would you judge a person you know based on an email that says I'm stuck in a foreign country and I just got robbed, please send me a thousand dollars so I can get home? Would you judge that person on that email?

I submit to you that you cannot find proof beyond a reasonable doubt in this case -- there is so much at stake for F23dulb6

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Ulbricht, his future -- based on evidence that so easily can be fabricated, edited, distorted, moved and manipulated.

We experience with our senses. We make decisions based on our perceptions. And we employ our common sense based on facts you can rely on. We reach conclusions based on all of those elements. Yet, the Internet and the impenetrability of the computer screen deprives us of the ability to do that the same way we do "IRL," in real life. There is a reason that's a phrase, that is an acronym on the Internet, because there is a distinction between the Internet and IRL. We are here in IRL, and we have to make judgments based on IRL.

The Internet denies us the ability to say for sure what is a masquerade, what is truth, what is fiction, what is transparent, and what is hidden from us. With all this digital evidence of chats and journals and logs and private messages and bitcoin wallets, not a single witness, other than Mr. Bates -- you ought to have a look at that material -- other than Mr. Bates, not a single witness came in and said created by Mr. Ulbricht, that Mr. Ulbricht was the person on the other side of the screen, except, again, that day of the arrest, after he was lured back in, I submit to you, with a phone call about the rating system, with a thumb drive. Again, we don't have to prove anything. It's up to the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

Your common sense and your life experience will tell

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you this kind of evidence we've seen here cannot be trusted beyond a reasonable doubt. Think about yourself. Think about those close to you. Think about the definition of reasonable doubt in important parts of your own affairs, important decisions in your own affairs. Judge that way.

This case is not about a specific document here or there, because the entire process lacks integrity in terms of your ability to judge its reliability. That's what reasonable doubt is all about.

Again, this is the last time I'll speak to you during the case. And because of that, I would ask you that when the government gets up again and speaks to you, that in your head you challenge the government on these issues. Where is the proof? Where is the reliability? Where is anyone who said that Ross Ulbricht composed those? Where is anyone that said they were composed on that laptop? Where is anyone that says when they were composed that the metadata isn't manipulated somehow. All we know is as easy as a keystroke.

Challenge the government in your head. Where is the proof beyond a reasonable doubt that can be relied on in a matter of such importance in your own affairs. I'm confident when you do that, and when you do that in deliberations, you will reach only one conclusion: Ross Ulbricht is not quilty on every count in the Indictment.

Thank you very much.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dratel.

Mr. Howard.

Thank you, your Honor. MR. HOWARD:

So I get it. The defense theory appears to be that he was the victim of a complicated conspiracy, a huge setup with many, many layers. He admitted that he started the site, but then he quickly left and was set up at the very end. He was the fall guy. He was just in the wrong place at the wrong time.

The defendant's story is absolutely ridiculous and defies all common sense. This is a desperate attempt to create a smokescreen, a distraction from the mountain of evidence that shows that that man created and ran Silk Road.

Ladies and gentlemen, his digital fingerprints are on everything, which shows that he ran Silk Road from beginning to end. All the files on his laptop computer, the thumb drive found on his bedside table, the \$18 million worth of bitcoins that were found on his laptop computer, his personal email, Facebook account and bank records, the posts on the various Internet forums that he made advertising the site, and on top of all of that evidence, the defendant simply cannot escape the fact that he was caught with his fingers on the keyboard. He was caught redhanded in the middle of a conversation as the Dread Pirate Roberts with an undercover agent who he thought at the time was posing as a member of his support staff.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He was right there, logged into Silk Road as the Dread Pirate Roberts. But he claims that he had no control over what he was doing. He was not running Silk Road at the time. had absolutely nothing to do with the thousands of pages of chat logs on his computer, journal entries, expense reports, all regarding the operation of Silk Road. Those aren't his, even though they were mixed with very intimate personal details about his life, details that match precisely in dates and content with his personal email account, on his Facebook account, and his bank accounts. These documents cover years In the face of actual evidence, his story is absolutely ridiculous.

This case is about -- this is about the evidence in this case. It's about the conduct of the defendant in this case. It's what each of the witnesses told you about the evidence against the defendant in this trial. It's about all the evidence that shows through and through that that man was the digital kingpin of the Silk Road underground criminal empire.

The defense theory is a complete distraction that is not supported by any actual evidence. He tries to create boogie men and talk about hypothetical computer vulnerabilities. He comes up with an incredible fantasy, that he set up, that all the evidence was planted, all of the evidence was fabricated.

He was caught redhanded, with a computer full of incriminating evidence. So what does he do? He pedals the same Dread Pirate Roberts story that he invented after he realized a mistake by telling too many people that were close to him about his secret. The one that came up with VJ -- the one that VJ and him came up with together after he had told VJ that he had told a couple of people in real life and told them that he had sold the site. And VJ said, you remember that chat. VJ said, you know what, you should come up with a new identity on the site. Remember the Princess Bride? You should become the Dread Pirate Roberts. That's exactly what he did in real life, and that's exactly the story he's trying to sell to you now, that he sold the site and someone else was the one running in.

He knows he has to carefully craft the defense story right now because there are some things he simply cannot deny. He simply cannot deny that he started the site; the evidence is way too powerful on that point. And he can't deny that he was caught redhanded at the end. So he tells us now that he started and created Silk Road. He may have gotten too stressful, left quickly, and then was set up at the end by some mysterious hacker or little elves that put all of these files on his computer. This story does not add up. It defies all common sense. The defendant is the Dread Pirate Roberts and ran the Silk Road empire the entire time.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, let's just start with something simple, the money, something that he does get. During opening arguments he didn't claim it was planted on his laptop, the 144,000 in bitcoins, almost worth \$18 million at that time. And during open arguments this was legitimate investment income, or something about bitcoin mining. He admitted that they were his back then. But that's not true. You heard the testimony of former Special Agent Ilhwan Yum, which is absolutely devastating to that story that that was investment income.

He showed you that he analyzed the bitcoin addresses that were recovered from the servers that were running Silk Road, and he analyzed the bitcoin addresses that were found on the defendant's laptop, the personal laptop that had 144,000 bitcoins, almost \$18 million at the time of his arrest. Mr. Yum's analysis was clean and simple. It looked at direct transfers from Silk Road to the defendant, to the defendant's computer.

The defendant is trying to cause confusion by trying to make bitcoins sound more complicated than they are. But don't be distracted. As Mr. Yum explained, it's much like bank accounts. You had one set of bank accounts here from Silk Road and another set that was associated with the defendant's laptop. And he found over 700,000 bitcoins and over 4,000 transactions in a year's period that flowed directly from Silk Road to the defendant's computer. He did that by looking at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

public records, the block chain. This was not legitimate This was Silk Road money. investment income.

But now, after hearing Mr. Yum's testimony, there is a suggestion that that was planted, too. Just like the chat logs and the journal entries and the expense report, like all of those things, that was planted, too.

But this is just the beginning. Let me just talk about a few of the things the defense also told you that defies common sense, the smokescreens that are designed to take your focus off the actual evidence in this case.

Mr. Dratel talked a lot about this theme that the Internet is not what it seems. Multiple people company use different accounts. It thrives under deception and misdirection. Yet, the only deception and misdirection is the story they're trying to push right now. This is not that complicated.

Imagine a bank robber in a case where the bank robber is robbed just as he's leaving the bank, holding the bag of cash, the bag with the gun, the getaway plan, and the cell phone with text messages going back for months where he's planning every single detail of the robbery. This is no different just because it happened on the Internet. He was caught red-handed with his hands at the keyboard. Computer crimes can be solved just like any other crime. investigation showed that that man was the man behind the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

keyboard, the Dread Pirate Roberts.

Now, the defendant makes a whole series of arguments that there's no way that he could have been the Dread Pirate Roberts because there is no way that the Dread Pirate Roberts could have been that sloppy. DPR was so careful and security conscious that he could not be the defendant. He would never have stored his encryption keys in a folder labeled "Keys" or accessed Silk Road from a library. He would have never kept a journal detailing all of the stuff that he did on Silk Road. The defense wants to paint the Dread Pirate Roberts as a perfect cybercriminal.

Ladies and gentlemen, criminals make mistakes all the That's how they get caught. No one is perfect. And time. there are plenty of opportunities to make mistakes when you're running a massive online criminal enterprise for a period of years, which is processing hundreds of millions of dollars in illegal transactions. But the fact is he thought he was completely protected. He thought he was completely safe for two reasons. First, he thought he was safe because of the protections that he got from the Tor network. Second, he thought he was safe because he had a fully-encrypted computer. That was what he relied on to preserve his anonymity and protect himself from law enforcement.

This was not the first time he had used someone else's wireless connection to access Silk Road. You may remember the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony of Richard Bates, how when the defendant went over to Bates' house to show him Silk Road after he was forced to do so otherwise he wouldn't get any more help from Mr. Bates. He used the neighbor's Wi-Fi just to be sure in case -- in case he was wrong and something would get traced back to him. That's why he didn't use his house, ladies and gentlemen. That's why he went to a library. In case there was a mistake, it could have been any of the patrons in the library. It wouldn't be traced back to the defendant's home. He did that for his own protection.

Tor was his shield. Sure, he told Special Agent Critten, after Critten tried to deliver the nine counterfeit driver's licenses to him, that hypothetically someone could buy these kind of things or drugs from Silk Road. He thought he had no chance of being caught. He thought he was smarter than everyone else. It's his ego, ladies and gentlemen. You see it in the journal entries. He thought he was safe because of Tor. He thought he was completely anonymous. And it didn't matter what Special Agent Critten might have learned about Silk Road based on his statements.

He thought he was completely safe from law enforcement because his computer was encrypted. The defense showed you Government Exhibit 225B, the chat with Scout talking about where the Dread Pirate Roberts tells Scout put yourself in the defendant's -- the shoes of a prosecutor. They'd have to get

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right behind you and see you logon. Ladies and gentlemen, that's exactly what we did here. The FBI did exactly that. They were able to get behind him and catch him redhanded, logged on to the site, before he had a chance to close his computer and protect all the files that were in there through encryption.

It doesn't matter what the names of the files were or the folders on the computer, whether the keys were stored in a folder named "Keys" or the aliases that he used, like Richard Page, you might remember, were stored in a folder named -- it didn't matter because no one would get anything so long as the encryption worked. But the FBI made sure that they got the computer before he could engage the encryption.

If he had closed the laptop, it would have been, as Mr. Kiernan told you, a brick. He thought he was safe. He thought Tor and the encryption was going to save him. thought we would never be able to show you all the documents we've shown you in court over the past few weeks.

The defendant talks about Mark Karpeles. I am not going to talk about him very long. There is really no real evidence to support that. It is an utter distraction and a red herring. Remember what we learned about the ask any connection, any real connection that Mark Karpeles had to Silk The Silk Road market.org website, not the Silk Road market on Tor but a simple website that was used to advertise

labeled "Aliases."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Silk Road, tell people how to get there. But it's even --Mark Karpeles is even farther away than that. He owned a -- he ran a company that hosted hundreds and hundreds of websites, or servers where people could host their websites, and someone registered -- someone else registered the Silk Road market.org Web page, Web server at his company. And who was that? That was Richard Page. We showed you the registration information. That was Richard Page. There was a phone number. There was an address. And where do we find all of the same information about Richard Page? On the defendant's computer, in the folder

Silkroadmarket.org was not -- was tied to the defendant, not Mark Karpeles. Without -- and that's all you It's completely, completely smoke. have.

Let's talk a little bit about Mr. Bates, Richard Mr. Turner told you you could tell he wasn't happy to be here to talk about his friend. They want to use his testimony and he did. He got up there and told you that on November 11, 2011, he had a party, the 11/11/11 party. were excited that the days were all the same.

And at that party the defendant got there early, had a private conversation with Mr. Bates, because he was worried. Mr. Bates told you that he saw that the defendant was nervous. Who else have you told? Who else have you told my secret to? Because he was having a crisis. He was having a crisis because

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he had also told his girlfriend, who was sloppy with the secret, and someone else posted on his Facebook. He was freaking out.

That's not a man who had sold the site six months ago. That's a man who was connected to the site.

So Bates got up there and told all of you that he believed the defendant when he told him he sold the site. defense makes a big deal about Government Exhibit 1004, our exhibit which we showed, the 2013 conversation. Do you remember that conversation where Mr. Bates tells the defendant do you see the article on I think it was slashed out -- some article he was referencing on the Internet. And the defense says, Sheesh, I'm glad that that is not my problem anymore.

Those are lies. Those are lies that are part of the story that he invented back then, that he had sold the site. You saw that almost exactly one month later, on December 9, 2011, he talked to VJ. VJ asked him whether he had told anyone else in real life. He told him he had told two people. He claimed that he had sold this story on them. He spun the story on them that he had sold the site and they believed him. Mr. Bates believed the defendant, that's true. But there you have it, a chat log on his computer where he admits that that's a lie. And then one month after that, that's when VJ comes up with the bright idea, let's deal with those loose ends, those people that you shared your secret with. Let's invent this new

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

identity on the site, the Dread Pirate Roberts, as part of this whole scheme from the very beginning to claim that it's someone else.

It's the same story from the very beginning. And he's trying to pull it over on you right now.

None of this really matters. As Mr. Turner told you, he admitted to starting the site. He was logged in at the end. He had to have known the Dread Pirate Roberts' password. was running Silk Road. Listen to the Judge's instructions, ladies and gentlemen. Just listen to the instructions.

Once you put all the distractions off to the side, there is overwhelming evidence the defendant is guilty -- the laptop and everything on it. The defendant wants you to believe that it was all planted there at the last second, through BitTorrent or something, but this is ridiculous. He wants you to believe that all of those writings weren't his. Those weren't his words. But they absolutely were. He wants you to believe that literally thousands of pages of highly incriminating chats were invented from thin air and planted. That's not all. During the hundreds of files on that computer, all of those files were neatly organized by some boogie man who downloaded them to his personal computer at the last minute -the Silk Road keys, the list of servers, the Silk Road accounting spreadsheet, the copy of the Silk Road website and the transaction database that was on his computer, the computer

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rebuttal - Mr. Howard

filled with documents, and the same documents talk about Silk Road and also talk about his personal life. Remember the spreadsheet in which he listed all of his assets, which had showed that he thought that Silk Road was worth \$104 million to him, but then also had references to his job at Good Wagon Books and entries to the exact amount of money that he had in his USAA account and his PayPal account the last time that spreadsheet was updated. It is the same thing with the chats.

Those chats, as I've mentioned, and as Mr. Turner mentioned, include details about his personal life that match up exactly with things you saw from his Facebook account and his email account. The trip to Thailand, his travel and his weekend getaways, the poison oak incident, getting sick. Remember the email in 2012 to his friend about statistics? same email that was found copied almost exactly into the chat that was talking about Silk Road?

He wants you to -- he's claiming that the part about his personal life are real but everything else is fabricated and planted. You have got to be kidding me.

And how about the evidence seized from his residence? I just want to hold up. This is Government Exhibit 502A. These are the thumb drivers. They are very small, but one of these is very, very important; it is a powerful piece of It was a thumb drive that the FBI found on that evidence. man's bedside table.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, Mr. Kiernan talked to you about this thumb drive. It contained backup copies of the Silk Road website, the same copies of files that were also found on the computer. It contained backup copies of other files from his computer, many of the incriminating documents you've seen during this trial. And Mr. Kiernan showed you the date that backup was made, September 23, 2013, weeks before he was arrested.

So these files were planted on both the laptop and the thumb drive weeks apart? The same mysterious hacker or Mark Karpeles, or whoever you want it to be, broke into his house and planted that thumb drive on his bedside table?

This shows that he was running the Silk Road website, ladies and gentlemen. He backed up his files to a thumb drive and he had left it on his table. It was encrypted. Mr. Kiernan was able to figure out the encryption, and the evidence is very powerful.

Mr. Kiernan showed you one of the files, the log file, the one that also contains the references to the murders for hire, when he talks about, you know, getting confirmation that the blackmailer was executed, the same file that had details about his personal life, about getting sick, that's corroborated by his Gmail account about the poison oak, about the date with Amelia. There were two different copies. was a copy on the thumb drive that was up to date as of the date that the backup was made, September 23rd, and he had a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rebuttal - Mr. Howard

copy on the laptop which had a more recent update about what he had done on Silk Road since the backup was made. devastating evidence, ladies and gentlemen. It's devastating. The story does not make sense, his story that has no actual evidence to support it.

How about the piece of trash? Was that planted, too? The piece of paper with details about the vending system formula that was on the Silk Road website for weeks. placed a telephone call and he blindly listened and wrote it down on a piece of paper, the exact same formulas that the Dread Pirate Roberts was talking about on Silk Road for changing the vending system? It doesn't make sense. simply cannot be explained away.

And, third, the money trail. The absolutely devastating evidence the bitcoins on his laptop were from Silk Road and not from legitimate investing as, you know, they wanted you to believe in opening statement. That money trail also shows you that he made two payments of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars for those murders for hire.

Again, we don't think -- there is no evidence those occurred, and hopefully they did not. But he felt threatened and he made those payments to arrange for a hitman to take out five different people. Thank God that didn't work out. As Mr. Turner explained, it showed he was willing to stop at nothing to protect his illegal empire, his multimillion-dollar empire.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence is overwhelming that that man, Ross Ulbricht, built and operated Silk Road.

At the end of the day, Judge Forrest will tell you that what I say is not evidence, what Mr. Dratel says is not evidence. Reasonable doubt is not about flights of fancy, ridiculous stories of conspiracy theories that do not match up with the actual evidence. It's your job to apply the evidence that you've heard, the actual evidence, to the law as the Judge will instruct you. Use your common sense and don't let the defendant insult your intelligence.

You, the jury, are entrusted with finding the facts. Look past all of these distractions and look at the actual evidence. Listen to the Judge's instructions. Use your common sense. If you do these things, I expect that you will see the defendant's wild conspiracy theories do not hold water. There is only one real conspiracy here. That's the conspiracy that was created and run by that man -- to create Silk Road, to control every single aspect of that illegal empire, and for that he took his cut, his piece, of all the drugs and illegal goods that were sold on the site.

(Continued on next page)

23

22

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOWARD: The evidence overwhelmingly shows that Ross Ulbricht was the digital kingpin of the underground online illegal marketplace that was Silk Road. We respectfully request that you return the only verdict consistent with the law, the defendant is guilty as charged. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Howard.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think we have quite enough time to really get going with the jury instructions this afternoon, so instead, we'll adjourn for the day and then pick them up tomorrow morning.

It will take me about, so you have your mind set, it will take me about an hour and 15, 20 minutes to get you the instructions. Now, let me just assure you that you're each going to have a copy of them on with you. We'll hand them out to you tomorrow morning so you can follow along. It will be what I say that's actually the instruction, but the instructions, it's pretty scripted, but every once in a while, I make a change. So it's important that you listen, even if you're following along. But we'll go through that and then and then immediately after that, you'll be allowed to go and deliberate. My expectation is that if we all can get going with our usual hope springs eternal, as soon as we can tomorrow morning, that you'll be deliberating before lunch for sure and then you can deliberate through lunch.

One thing that I want to tell you about now which is

you all have to be there together in order to deliberate. In other words, if somebody takes a cigarette break, you have to wait, right? Also, you can't in the morning start before everybody is there. So same thing with the instructions: We have to have everybody in our seats to get going. All right.

And we'll talk about the role of the alternates also tomorrow as part of that whole discussion. So for tonight, I know that you have now heard all of the evidence in the case. You have now also heard the closing statements. However, you haven't been given the instructions on the law.

So it does remain extremely important that you not talk to anybody, including each other or anybody else about this case. We're very close to the point that you'll be able to deliberate, but it's important that you hear my instructions on the law before you even speak with each other about the case. As you read news articles and things, anything that you think might be related to this case, you must turn your eyes and do not read that article. I instruct you that you cannot read any news articles until this case has been fully completed. I'll see you folks tomorrow morning and we'll hopefully start as close to 9:30 as we can. We're always trying. Have a good night.

(Jury excused)

(Continued on next page)

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Is there anything that you think we should go over before we break ourselves, before we break for the evening?

MR. TURNER: Not from the government.

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Unless there is anything to be raised tomorrow morning, I don't think we need to gather before being all in our places and ready to go at 9:30.

MR. DRATEL: Just as long as our previously stated objections are incorporated for purposes of the final charge that the Court has prepared. In other words, that we don't have to go through all of our prior objections that we made during the charge conferences.

THE COURT: Yes. So let me just describe how it works because you have received now a final and then you've received an "as delivered." The difference between the two are some of the changes that I had given yesterday. I have given you absolutely every iteration. You're welcome and I encourage you to run a blackline against it if you want to look for any additional typographical errors, things that may have changed in there. Otherwise, I believe I released an opinion yesterday that went through my resolution of most of the substantive objections.

To the extent that I didn't have a particular

objection expressly pointed out in that written decision, it's relatively obvious after our discussion, I just went with one position or the other based upon the Court's review of the law. So all objections that were lodged, either orally or in the written submissions, there were both letters which the Court, when this is all done, will post on the docket for the jury instructions, as well as the additional defense instructions.

My practice is to have 100 percent of that go onto the docket so that if anybody ever chose to do so, they could recreate, between the transcript and those written submissions and the track changes, exactly what's occurred, so I think there will be a complete record.

MR. DRATEL: I'm saying it so we don't have to restate again. I prefer not to. Believe me.

THE COURT: Your objections as they have been set forth so far are preserved. If there's anything new that you think you needed to raise, then you'd have to do it. But the ship has sort of sailed, but if you did have something, I wouldn't want you not to say something, but the objections you've already made have been made.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there is anything that you folks want to go over, get ahold of each other and I'll be here in any event and we can deal with things at 9:00; otherwise, let's try to be here as close to 9:30 as possible.

MS. LEWIS: One logistical matter.

THE COURT: Let's sit down. I thought it would be quick.

MS. LEWIS: One logistical matter and we mentioned the exhibits, there are a lot in this case, would you prefer we check the exhibits tonight then?

THE COURT: I don't mind, frankly, logistically whether you do it tonight or tomorrow morning before 9:30, but you need to have resolved everything that's going into the jury room in agreement between the parties. And if there's any dispute, I will resolve it.

In other words, if there's a demonstrative and somebody thinks they're sending it back into the jury room, right, and there's a dispute, then you folks need to discuss it and then you need to raise it with me if you can't resolve it.

The reason I say that is I've actually had cases where after it's gone back into the jury room, a verdict is ready to come out before they have the documents rolled in because it can sometimes — that, I don't expect to occur in this case, but it has trained me that it needs to get rolled in at the same time because I do want to recite that all the documents were there and available to the jury.

Whenever you want to do it, do it, but the moment that I'm done with the charge, I wanted to launch that there.

MR. TURNER: So I'm perfectly clear, are you saying

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that all of the exhibits should go in or that the parties should confer about which selection go in?

THE COURT: Here is my view: Anything that has been received into evidence as evidence in this case, in other words, let's put aside things that were just shown marked for identification and potentially depending upon your view of the demonstratives, and that can be how you folks decide, that should go back, right? I'm not saying pick and choose ten exhibits here, ten exhibits there.

There's an entire list of exhibits and my view is they should go in order, all of them, into the jury room.

MR. TURNER: Okay. Understand. Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, the other issue, and I assume that you folks will have this automatically, is to have -- the U.S. Attorney's Office always has this -- is an electronic version of the transcript available in case there are questions which require us to extract testimony so that we can do that relatively quickly. It's a lot easier than the cutting and pasting, so I assume you folks have that capability on this case.

MR. TURNER: We have been working on that.

THE COURT: Terrific. I told you I'm going to send the indictment back, and I left it up for inspection. It's up here as well. I will send back into the jury room -- the four alternates will be told to go home. They are not going to be

dismissed. I'm sure we've all had it, I've had it, where there's been an alternate called upon and the jury deliberations must commence anew, so the alternates remain part of the jury panel until it's done, but they won't, in the initial instance, deliberate with the panel of 12.

But I will send 13 copies of the verdict form into the jury room; that's one for each juror and an extra because they tend to mark them up and they need an extra. So, that's why we have the 13 here. If you're wondering what they look like, they're right here. It's what you've seen before. It's what was already circulated. I hadn't made the initial changes apart from adding signature lines. It is my practice to have each of the 12 jurors sign, as well as whoever they choose as the foreperson, the actual verdict form.

The one thing I did want to say was in terms of once the jury is charged, I need one lead counsel from each side — and, of course, the defendant will need to remain available throughout the entire deliberation process all day — until we get a verdict in how ever many days it takes, so if we have questions, people aren't running over from wherever they're running over from. So we can reach you, it doesn't mean you have to be right here, but Joe needs to know exactly where in the building you are. So if you have gone to the cafeteria or someplace else, Joe needs to know exactly where to find you. And you guys I'm sure your experience is the same: Typically,

F23gulb7

Trial

if you're going to get a question, you often get it in the first hour, hour and-a-half and then there might be a delay when they're talking, but they might have an initial question and then a delay before additional questions. Anything else? MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor. THE COURT: We are adjourned for the evening then until tomorrow morning. THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. (Adjourned to February 4, 2015 at 9:30 a.m.)

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	
2	Examination of:	Page
3	CHRISTOPHER KINCAID	
4	Direct By Ms. Lewis	.2099
5	Cross By Mr. Howard	.2103
6	Redirect By Ms. Lewis	.2105
7	BRIDGET PRINCE	
8	Direct By Mr. Dratel	.2107
9	DEFENDANT EXHIBITS	
10	Exhibit No.	Received
11	M	.2109
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		