Case: 15-3779 Document: 003112188030 Page: 76 Date Filed: 01/25/2016

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CRIMINAL NO. 15-196-(FLW)-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : TRANSCRIPT OF

: SENTENCE

V.

: OCTOBER 15, 2015

1

BOBBY BOYE, a/k/a, BOBBY AJIBOYE a/k/a, BOBBY AJI-BOYE Defendant

CLARKSON S. FISHER, UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 402 EAST STATE STREET, TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08608

B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE FREDA L. WOLFSON, USDJ

APPEARANCES:

PAUL J. FISHMAN, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY BY: SHIRLEY UCHENNA EMEHELU, AUSA On behalf of the Government

K. ANTHONY THOMAS, ESQUIRE On behalf the Defendant Bobby Boye

ALSO PRESENT:

DON MARTENZ, US PROBATION OFFICER

\* \* \* \* \*

VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, CCR, CRR OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER (609)588-9516

Case: 15-3779 Document: 003112188030 Page: 77 Date Filed: 01/25/2016

CERTIFICATION

PURSUANT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C., SECTION 753, THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPT IS CERTIFIED TO BE AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

S/Vincent Russoniello
VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, CCR
OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER

2

Case: 15-3779 Document: 003112188030 Page: 78 Date Filed: 01/25/2016

```
32
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
             THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Emehelu.
             I'll make my comments now with regard to the
24
25
    3553(a) factors. Starting with the nature and
```

circumstances of the offense and the seriousness of the offense.

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

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

The fraud here was really of such a major level that I can't say enough about it in that Mr.

Boye was given a wonderful opportunity. There was employment, yes, and he was going to be paid well for that employment. But it was more than just the salary he was going to get. He accepted a position that was really of a new kind that was going to assist this country.

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

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

And even today Mr. Boye says how fond he was of the country and how well he was treated by the government. Obviously, particularly because of the

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

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

We all know that you placed yourself in a tremendous conflict of interest and you understood that which is why you hid it so well. But it wasn't just you presenting that this was an Opus & Best with one man at the top -- not you, whoever you wanted to claim it was going to be -- but you had a host of professionals that you represented to be part of this company with resumes to match that would indicate they

were looking at a multi-million dollar contract of work that was going to go forward to give them advice both from an accounting and legal perspective, which is why when you created this company you didn't just make it a two or three-person company. You presented it as a dozen people, 20 people who could perform all these different services.

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

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

Obviously, though, you have great talents because you were able to do the work.

I must say when I read through all of what you did and the way you described these individuals, some fake -- I don't know if you found real names out there

somewhere and put some resumes on -- but whatever it was it was quite sophisticated and involved to come up with this. And all to get, not to help the country, because there were others out there that could have done a good job too that could have helped the country, but to line your pockets. And what did you do with the money? Expensive cars, jewelry, properties. Partly the reason why there is an ability to get this forfeiture and hopefully compensate to more or less say because you spent your money on things.

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

I have sat and seen many defendants in fraud cases obtaining contracts from government. Here it's generally here in the US. This happens to be a foreign country. But obtaining contracts that are sent out for bidding and obtaining them through fraud or bribes. And in virtually all of those cases they

did the work. Whether it was a demolition contractor, or whoever it might have been, it wasn't a mitigating factor because they did the work. That was the only way they were going to get paid and they may have been capable of doing the work. But here it's how you went about getting it and the fact that not only did you do it dishonestly, but it prevented honest bidders from getting the work that could have also done the work and been paid the same money. It's a fraud upon the country.

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

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

Now, looking at deterrence both from a specific and general deterrence perspective. As to

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

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

And even with your employer there of course preceding that was the employment with Morgan Stanley and your actions there that ultimately result in you being banned by the New York Stock Exchange. Frankly, it boggles my mind that one of the things apparently when you went to California was telling Morgan Stanley

that you were on a medical leave with some illness, and it turns out you took another job in California and then they terminated you upon discovering that and all the investigation occurs and that's where it comes out. And here too at some point this investigation begins when you told Timor-Leste that you had a life threatening illness and they started looking into that.

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

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

There is also of course the concern of the

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

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

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

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

of a big firm behind you. It was real. It was good work product.

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

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

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

I have considered all of those 3553(a) factors and in fashioning a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary I, one, disagree with the

4.3

request by the defendant for a sentence at the bottom of the Guideline range. I think that absolutely does not suffice as a sufficient sentence.

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

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

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

Sentence is as follows:

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

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

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

While on supervised release, the defendant

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

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

The following special conditions shall apply:

There will be had a new debt restriction that
will be in place until the restitution is satisfied.

There will also be a self-employment or business
disclosure condition as well. Those are the only
conditions being imposed.

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

The restitution is due immediately. It is

recommended that the defendant participate in the Bureau of Prisons Inmate Financial Responsibility

Program. If he participants, the restitution shall be paid from those funds at a rate equivalent to \$25 every 3 months.

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

Defendant shall notify the United States

Attorney for this district within 30 days of any
change of mailing or residence address that occurs

while any portion of the restitution remains unpaid.

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

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

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

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

46 that correct? 1 2 MS. EMEHELU: Yes, your Honor. 3 A preliminary forfeiture order has already been entered and filed in this matter. The United 4 5 States will be submitting a corrected consent judgment 6 of forfeiture that simply corrects the description of 7 the Elizabeth properties that has the correct street 8 number. That's the only correction. THE COURT: Thank you. 9 The last thing, there has been a request for 10 voluntary surrender. Is there any objection by the 11 12 government? 13 MS. EMEHELU: No objection, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: I think you were requesting a November 30th date. 15 MR. THOMAS: That's correct, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: If he has not yet been designated at that point -- where is he currently living? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Mahwah, New Jersey. THE COURT: If you have not gotten a 20 21 designation, you are to report to the Marshal's Office 22 in Newark on November 30th. It's a Monday. Just so 23 he doesn't have to come down to Trenton, we'll have 24 him report to Newark. 25 I know you asked that I recommend Fort Dix.

47 1 I'll recommend it. You know that it's totally up to 2 the BOP, however. 3 MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, one last issue with 4 regards to the \$500 per month while on supervised 5 release. 6 Would your Honor be inclined to put a range 7 and leave it up to the discretion of Probation and not 8 more than \$500? THE COURT: We don't know what his employment 9 will be. I put that out there at this point because I 10 think he is capable of getting employment. It can be 11 adjusted. I usually say adjust it based upon what his 12 13 employment is at the time, but I can't leave it totally at the discretion of Probation. 14 15 Mr. Martenz, is that correct? 16 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Set an amount now and 17 it could be adjusted. An amount has to be set. 18 THE COURT: Right. It has to be set. And it can't be like saying a range or up to. We have to set 19 20 it. 21 MR. THOMAS: Can we put at least 500? 22 THE COURT: No. Or I wouldn't even say at 23 most because if he got a job that was very high paying it could be more than 500. We don't know. 24 25 putting out a number there that's based upon what his

```
48
    education is and a possibility of getting employment.
1
 2
            Absolutely, one, if he doesn't obtain
 3
    employment immediately, he can't make that; and, two,
    when he does get employment Probation may adjust that.
 4
 5
    Absolutely.
 6
            MR. THOMAS: My concern is, your Honor, it's
 7
    setting him up for failure for a potential violation.
 8
    That's all.
            THE COURT: Well, it wouldn't be a violation
 9
    anyway because they wouldn't violate if he doesn't
10
    have employment that would allow him to pay that.
11
12
            THE PROBATION OFFICER: Correct. It has to be
    willful.
13
14
            THE COURT: Right.
            And I must tell you, I haven't seen a
15
    violation on a failure to pay restitution unless there
16
17
    are a lot of other things going on at the same time.
            It will be adjusted. I have it on the record
18
    that I've indicated that is to be adjusted based upon
19
    whatever his employment situation is at the time.
20
21
            MR. THOMAS: Thank you, your Honor.
22
            THE COURT: Thank you.
23
            MS. EMEHELU:
                           Thank you, your Honor.
24
            THE CLERK: All rise.
25
            (Proceedings concluded.)
```

## CERTIFICATE

I, Vincent Russoniello, Official United States

Court Reporter and Certified Court Reporter of the

State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the

foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the

proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me

at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set

forth.

I do further certify that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in this action.

Vincent Russoniello, CCR, CRR
Certificate No. 675

S/Vincent Russoniello