

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

United States Courts
Southern District of Texas
FILED

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

AUG 1 1 2005

HOUSTON DIVISION

Michael N. Milby, Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CASE NO. CR-H-05-286

S

VERSUS

§ HOUSTON, TEXAS

§ JULY 14, 2005

CHRISTOPHER CALGER

§ 10:35 A.M. TO 11:12 A.M.

REARRAIGNMENT

BEFORE THE HONORABLE LYNN N. HUGHES UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

SEE NEXT PAGE

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

SEE NEXT PAGE

CASE MANAGER:

DAWNA KELLY

COURT RECORDER:

CARMEN PEEBLES

PREPARED BY:

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, INC.

P.O. Box 925675

Houston, Texas 77292-5675

Tel: 713-697-4718 ▼ Fax: 713-697-4722

www.judicialtranscribers.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

MS. LINDA A. LACEWELL, AUSA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ENRON TASK FORCE

10 TH & CONSTITUTION AVENUE, N.W.

BOND BUILDING, 10TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

MS. PATRICIA A. PILEGGI

ATTORNEY AT LAW

26 BROADWAY, 18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10004

1	THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated.
2	United States of America versus Christopher
3	Calger. Is that how you pronounce it?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
5	THE COURT: All right. Come up.
6	Raise your right hand, please, sir.
7	(The Defendant is sworn)
8	THE COURT: What's your name, please, sir.
9	THE DEFENDANT: Christopher Calger.
10	THE COURT: How old are you?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Thirty-nine.
12	THE COURT: How much education do you have?
13	THE DEFENDANT: I received a Masters degree.
14	THE COURT: In what?
15	THE DEFENDANT: In business.
16	THE COURT: Of what country are a citizen?
17	THE DEFENDANT: United States.
18	THE COURT: Are you under the care of a physician or
19	a psychologist?
20	THE DEFENDANT: I'm not.
21	THE COURT: Using drugs or alcohol?
22	THE DEFENDANT: No.
23	THE COURT: Are you okay this morning?
24	THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
25	THE COURT: Have you had a chance to discuss this

```
case with your lawyer, -- Pileggi?
             MS. PILEGGI: That's correct, Your Honor. Thank you.
2
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
3
              THE COURT: Are you happy with the work that she has
4
   done for you?
5
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
6
              THE COURT: Have you read this information that
7
   charges you?
8
              THE DEFENDANT: I have.
9
              THE COURT: Do you think you understand it well
10
    enough that I can skip reading it to you now?
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
12
              THE COURT: Has he waived the indictment?
13
              MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor, he waived the
14
    indictment before Magistrate Stacy, and she also read almost
15
    verbatim the information to him.
16
              THE COURT: Did you discuss the waiver of indictment
17
    and what grand juries do and don't do and --
18
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
19
              THE COURT: -- then what they are? Because, what
20
    you're proposing here is to give up the grand jury and the
21
    little jury.
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Right. I discussed it extensively
23
    with counsel.
24
              THE COURT: All right. How do you plead to the count
25
```

in the information?

MS. PILEGGI: The defendant is prepared to enter a guilty plea, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct, I plead guilty.

the Court: Mr. Calger, do you understand that under the Constitution, you have right to a trial by a jury, the little one. At that trial, you will be considered innocent. You would remain innocent unless the Government proved its charges beyond a reasonable doubt. The Government would have to prove that you're guilty by bringing witnesses into court to testify in front of you about what you did. Your lawyer could object to the Government's evidence. Your lawyer could ask questions of the Government's witnesses for your side of the story. And she could bring in other witnesses for your side of the story, if there are any.

At the trial, you could testify if you wanted to. If you chose not to testify, no one could use it against you that you did not testify, and no one could make you testify.

If you plead guilty, there'll be no jury, no exhibits, no witnesses, no trial, and you'll have to testify against yourself, because I'm going to ask you about what you did to make sure you really did what the Government has charged you with.

Have you discussed these rights, and do you still want to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: I have discussed them, and I still want to plead guilty.

THE COURT: You're charged in Count One with conspiring to commit mail fraud.

MS. LACEWELL: Excuse me, wire fraud, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What difference does that make?

MS. LACEWELL: It's a different statute, Your Honor, Use of wires instead of use of the mails.

that someone, some two people, at least, got together and came up with a plan to commit a crime. And at least one of those folks did something to carry out the plan rather than just talking about it. That you found out about the plan or were originator. If you weren't originator, you knew the illegal purpose and you joined in to help accomplish the illegal purpose, not by accident or mistake. And the plan included using interstate instrumentalities of wire communication for the purpose of cheating somebody out of a bunch of money. Any question about the elements?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: The penalty is up to five years in prison and up to a quarter of a million dollar fine or twice the loss, three years of supervised release, and most ridiculous of all,

a hundred dollar tax. Any question about the punishment?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: And I can tell you a quarter of million dollars is. I cannot tell you what the Government thinks the amount of the loss is. But I need to tell you that the Government frequently thinks the amount of the loss is everything that ever happened bad to anybody that had anything to do with Enron. I'm not going, probably, to be the one to sentence you. It can be anything from the direct loss, occasioned by exactly what you did. The reasonably direct loss from this particular conspiracy are all related conduct. And I have no what position they'll take, but so your fine could range from up to a quarter of a million dollars up to 60/70 billion.

And this supervised release business is sort of like being on probation. And so for three years you would be reporting to a Probation Officer. If you didn't do what she said, I could send you to prison for three more years. So, essentially, by pleading guilty, you're giving me reasonably absolute control of your life for 11 years. The five years then three years, because if on the last day of the three years, you messed up, I could then ruin your life for three more years.

Has anybody threatened or forced you to plead quilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Now --

(Government attorney whispers to Defense Attorney)

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right, I understand you made a deal with the Government. And that deal is if you plead guilty to this information, it won't prosecute you for any other crimes.

(Pause)

THE COURT: I'm not sure about paragraph 13.

MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor, the breach paragraph?

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LACEWELL: I think that paragraph is just meant to spell out the consequences should the defendant breach the agreement.

THE COURT: Well, I know, but if the Government decides it wants to rescind the deal because of his breach, shouldn't the entire contract be rescinded?

MS. LACEWELL: If that's the bargain between the parties, Your Honor, that the Government would have the discretion -- Well, not that the Government could unilaterally decide to rescind, but should the defendant breach, the Government could in its discretion decide to tear up the agreement, that's right.

THE COURT: No, this paragraph, as I read it this morning, and I only had one cup of coffee when I read it so it

1 may not have soaked in, but if you decide he breached, you can cancel the -- all your obligations to him and his obligations 2 3 to you continue. MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor, that's the standard 5 language that --6 THE COURT: Ma'am, there's no such thing as a 7 standard contract. Contracts are negotiated between two 8 parties, and they may endlessly repeat themselves. That's a fact. But that seems peculiar. 10 MS. LACEWELL: Well, I simply wanted to let the Court know for whatever worth it may have that this is the agreement, 11 the language that we have been using in the various interim 12 13 prosecutions. THE COURT: Well, I know, but you don't want to 14 15 invite me to criticize the language of this agreement. We'd be here all day. 16 17 MS. LACEWELL: That's right. But this is the agreement that supports, as the Court suggests, that was 18 19 negotiated between the parties. 20 (Pause) 21 THE COURT: Is there a paragraph in here about 22 bankruptcy fraud and terrorism? 23 MS. LACEWELL: No, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: I thought you all were putting that in

25

your everything.

MS. LACEWELL: Not to my knowledge, Your Honor. THE COURT: Apparently, some Congressman complained 2 that it shows up in plea agreements all the time now. 3 not releasing you if they catch you having committed bankruptcy 4 fraud, and there's something else, terrorism and things that's 5 just not likely to be relevant in -- as you suggest. I don't think they have the dignity that boilerplate has. And that's a 7 8 nice industrial thing that functions. Rubbish might be a better description. That's stuff they just keep throwing in. 9 That's the deal you want to make? 10 THE DEFENDANT: It is, Your Honor. 11 That if you mess up, they're not going to 12 THE COURT: do anything for you, but you're still stuck to do everything 13 you told them you'd do? 14 THE DEFENDANT: That's part of the overall deal. 15 THE COURT: Has this agreement been signed? 16 MS. LACEWELL: No, Your Honor, it was my 17 understanding we should sign before Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Suits me. 19 (The parties sign plea agreement) 20 THE COURT: You all are moving downhill. Rosenthal 21 22 is gone so it went to Hittner. Hittner is gone so you're down to me. 23 MS. LACEWELL: We're more than happy to be in front 24 of you. 25

THE COURT: Has anybody promised you anything other 1 2 than what's in that written agreement? 3 THE DEFENDANT: No. 4 THE COURT: Ms. Lacewell hasn't told you anything good that she might do for you or --5 THE DEFENDANT: 6 No. Ms. Pilleggi hasn't told you anything 7 THE COURT: 8 that if you do this something else will work out good? (Defendant shakes head). THE DEFENDANT: 10 THE COURT: Do you understand that you won't be able to change your mind and change your plea back to not guilty? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: Understood. THE COURT: All right. I read the information. 13 14 that what you did? THE DEFENDANT: 15 Yes. 16 THE COURT: All right, I actually haven't read the thing on the plea agreement. Is that what you did? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 18 19 THE COURT: Tell me why what you did was wrong? 20 THE DEFENDANT: I signed a dash, a deal approval 21 sheet call at Enron related to the Coyote Springs transaction. THE COURT: So, the affect to your signature was to 22 23 give it accounting approval? THE DEFENDANT: Not accounting approval, but I was --24 the employees that I supervise that had originated the Coyote 25

```
Springs transaction, and there was an approval process at Enron
   in order for a transaction to be consummated there is people
2
   within the chain of command had to sign off on it. And I
3
    approved the transaction by signing the deal approval sheet,
4
    even though --
              THE COURT: Okay. So your staff worked it up, but it
6
   couldn't go to the executive vice president for Pipelines and
7
   Transmission without your approval?
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Correct.
10
              THE COURT: And what was it that was illegal in the
11
   deal?
              THE DEFENDANT: The deal approval sheet did not
12
    include or mention the role of LJM in the transaction.
13
14
    not include that aspect of the transaction.
              THE COURT: But who owned the equity in LJM?
15
              THE DEFENDANT: I do not know that.
16
17
              THE COURT:
                          Do you?
             MS. LACEWELL: Your Honor, there were limited
18
    partners. Many in the financial community and others who were
19
    investors in that, but Mr. Fastow, the chief financial officer
20
    of Enron was the managing partner.
22
              THE COURT: So this is one of those special purpose
    vehicles?
23
              MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: As I understand it, you split the
25
```

transaction into two deals so that you could trade the turbine as income and the other would be a capital transaction? THE DEFENDANT: That's correct. THE COURT: But LJM, is that the name of it? MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: LJM agreed with Asto Vista --THE DEFENDANT: Avista, THE COURT: -- Avista to buy for a fixed price the turbine if Enron did not in fact sell the pipeline and the compressor station, or whatever it was. THE DEFENDANT: The rest of the power plant. THE COURT: For the purposes of Enron, what difference did it make that LJM had a liability to acquire the turbine? THE DEFENDANT: It facilitated Enron's ability to recognize the earnings from the sale of the turbine. THE COURT: But that's not illegal. THE DEFENDANT: I think the fact that there is a liability from LJM back to Enron, and that relationship was not disclosed to its auditors. (Attorney and Defendant whisper) THE COURT: If I could -- Tell me if Enron had a liability to LJM? THE DEFENDANT: That is correct. And LJM had a liability to Enron. If Avista put the turbine back to LJM

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, INC.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Enron was obligated to take that turbine back from LJM.
1
2
             THE COURT: All right. It wasn't clear. So, the
3
   problem was the sale of the turbine was potentially circular?
             THE DEFENDANT: Correct.
4
5
             THE COURT: And the LJM put was covered by the
   obligation of Enron to pick it up if they did. So it really
6
7
   was a put issued from Enron to Avista, and that was not
   disclosed?
8
             THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.
9
             THE COURT: If it had been disclosed, would that have
10
   destroyed the accounting advantage of splitting the deal?
11
             THE DEFENDANT: I believe so.
12
             THE COURT: Is that right?
13
14
             MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: I mean I don't know anything about
15
    accounting. But --
16
             MS. LACEWELL: Enron has required that there be no
17
    intertwining of the turbine and the rest of the plant, and the
18
19
    fact that we tied them together.
20
              THE COURT:
                          How long would the option have to have
21
    had to run before the auditors would have treated them as
22
    separate transactions?
              MS. LACEWELL: Well, the put option was for the 14
23
    days between --
24
25
              THE COURT: I know it was far. The question was,
```

```
If -- You're telling me 14 days was insufficient separation,
   because there's nothing illegal about a put. There's nothing
2
   illegal about dividing the transaction as long as you divide
3
   the transaction. And so, if Enron's obligation to reacquire
4
   the turbine had extended for 18 months, would that have been
   objectionable to the auditors?
6
             MS. LACEWELL: Your Honor, all I can tell the Court
7
8
   is that if Anderson had been aware that there was the 14 day
   put between phase one --
9
                          I want to know how much difference there
10
              THE COURT:
   is -- how much --
11
             MS. LACEWELL: The existence of the puts of any
12
   duration, the existence of an oral agreement for Enron to buy
   it back; the existence of an oral agreement for LMJ to refund
14
   most of the put payment to Enron if the put was not in fact
15
   exercised, each of those were things that were concealed from
16
17
   Anderson, and that --
              THE COURT: But the premium on the put was
18
    immaterial.
19
              MS. LACEWELL: No, the premium -- Enron -- Well, it
20
    was not immaterial under the circumstances of this case, Your
21
22
    Honor, because --
              THE COURT: But it was immaterial from an accounting
23
    point.
24
```

MS. LACEWELL: Not according to Enron's auditors,

25

Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: How much was it? THE DEFENDANT: Three point. 3 MS. LACEWELL: LJM priced the puts at a daily receive 4 \$400,000 plus a 3.1 million dollar premium, which they would 5 kick back to Enron if the put was not exercised. Enron paid 6 for the put by carding that amount. 7 THE COURT: We've already agreed that it was an Enron 8 obligation. MS. LACEWELL: 10 The premium was not immaterial. the other reason it wasn't immaterial is because --11 12 THE COURT: How much -- the put was three million dollars? 13 MS. LACEWELL: The put was three and a half million 14 dollars. 15 THE COURT: Okay. And you're telling me a three and 16 a half million dollar transaction is material to Enron's 17 accounting activity? 18 MS. LACEWELL: I misunderstood the Court's question. 19 The amount was material to this deal, but if you're asking 20 whether this deal was material to the ENA business unit, that 21 22 was a separate question, and we're not required to prove materiality to ENA. We have not charged securities fraud. 23 We charged, obviously, the one put. 24

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, INC.

It has to be a material misrepresentation

THE COURT:

25

even in wire fraud. MS. LACEWELL: It was material to this deal. 2 It was material to Anderson. 3 THE COURT: How much was the turbine? MS. LACEWELL: Ah --5 THE COURT: And the Government is certainly not 6 7 relying on Anderson as the gold standard for judgment in these case, since you've indicted the entire company. 8 9 MS. LACEWELL: Your Honor, without getting into that, 10 which is a material -- because that was a completely separate 11 matter. THE COURT: Wait a minute. You've just told me that 12 it made a difference to Anderson and therefore it should make a 13 difference to me when the Government has said that Enron are a 14 bunch of crooks. I mean, Anderson was a bunch of crooks. You 15 can't stand here and represent the work they did and their 16 judgment with Enron is a standard I should apply. 17 18 MS. LACEWELL: Your Honor --19 THE COURT: And (indiscernible) down, two floors down to Harmon. 20 MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Two floors down, tell Judge Harmon that

MS. LACEWELL: Your Honor, most respectfully, to accept this plea, the Court need only find that the defendant

they were all a bunch of lying conspirators.

22

23

24

25

```
conspired or agreed to engage in this scheme to defraud.
    the Court need not make these other findings.
              THE COURT: I want to know that the fraud -- The only
3
    reason it's fraudulent wasn't disclosed.
                                              The only fraud that
5
    was committed was reliance by other people on the numbers that
6
    did not disclose things, right?
7
              MS. LACEWELL: I'm not sure I understand the Court's
8
    question.
9
              THE COURT: Who got cheated in this deal?
10
             MS. LACEWELL: Enron, because the defendant and
11
    others violated their duty of honesty and royalty to the
12
    company.
              THE COURT: Okay.
13
14
             MS. LACEWELL: The shareholders, the SEC.
15
              THE COURT: No.
             MS. LACEWELL: This is not --
16
17
              THE COURT:
                          How much did the SEC lose in the deal?
18
              MS. LACEWELL: Your Honor --
19
              THE COURT:
                          How much did the SEC -- That's a number.
    Tell me, how much did the SEC lose in the deal?
20
21
              MS. LACEWELL: False statements --
              THE COURT: How much?
22
23
              MS. LACEWELL: I can't answer that question.
              THE COURT: Yes, you can, it's zero. We all know the
24
25
             It was what's known in some circles almost as a
```

```
rhetorical question. How much did Enron lose on the deal?
1
             MS. LACEWELL: Enron did not lose money on the deal.
2
   That's not the theory of the information before the Court.
3
             THE COURT: Then, just answer my question.
4
             MS. LACEWELL: Okay, I think I --
5
             THE COURT: Enron did not lose any money on the deal.
6
             MS. LACEWELL: That's right.
7
8
             THE COURT: In fact, it made money on the deal.
             MS. LACEWELL: Illegally. Enron should never have
9
   declared the gain on this deal.
10
              THE COURT: Let's wait a minute. Enron made money on
11
12
   it?
             MS. LACEWELL: Yes.
13
              THE COURT: And apparently, would Enron have made
14
   money if it had not had -- Well, actually, they were
15
    structuring it so that they would pay more taxes, weren't they?
16
    More taxes would have been owed as current income instead of
17
    capital gain.
18
19
             MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor.
                          So they structured the deal so that they
20
              THE COURT:
21
    would owe more taxes.
22
              MS. LACEWELL: I don't know exactly how the tax
    effect would work, but it's certainly true they were declaring
23
24
    more --
              THE COURT: You don't know the difference between
25
```

their capital and their current income transaction? 1 2 MS. LACEWELL: I do, Your Honor, but I'm not steeped 3 in how Enron did its tax practices and whether this would have had any effect. 4 THE COURT: Well, whether it had any effect, the 5 structure of this deal would have been to increase Enron's tax liability. Whether it actually did depends on whether that 7 8 increase is offset by other things. So we don't know the net effect. But we do know that this transaction could not have 9 10 been a tax avoidance scheme, right? 11 MS. LACEWELL: That's right. 12 THE COURT: So the only people who could have been 13 cheated by this fraud would have been investors who bought or did not sell, based on this transactions effect on Enron's 14 earnings. That's your theory of the case? 15 16 MS. LACEWELL: In part, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: And what's the other part? MS. LACEWELL: 18 Well, Your Honor, this is charged 19 principally as a conspiracy predicated on the right of honest 20 services, because this was done as a fraud. And so I don't 21 want to omit that when you say, you know a separate theory potentially of the case. 22 23 THE COURT: So you want to convert every default by a corporate officer into a wire fraud case? 24

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, INC.

25

MS. LACEWELL: Judge, I'm not trying to do any such

thing. I'm simply presenting this information to the Court, 1 which charge is a serious offense and not any default. charge is serious conduct by this defendant and others. 3 THE COURT: I'm only worried about what he did this 4 morning. 5 6 MS. LACEWELL: Judge, I'm not at liberty and I'm not 7 authorized to get into broader policy questions of things that the Government may or may not pursue in other cases. 8 THE COURT: I'm not asking you to do that. I'm 9 asking you simple questions about this transaction and its 10 11 context. 12 MS. LACEWELL: Okay. THE COURT: We do that in bank robberies. 13 MS. LACEWELL: Okay. Well, this case, it's more than 14 a simple default by an officer. He's in charge of the group 15 16 that was running this deal. He knew that the auditors were 17 being lied to. He knew that there were side deals that should have been in writing. He knew there was an oral refund 18 19 arrangement --THE COURT: And we know all of that, and that's not 20 wire fraud. 21 MS. LACEWELL: And that the wires were being used in 2.2 23 furtherance of the scheme, and that Avista was wiring money to Enron and to LJM. Your Honor, most respectfully, that is wire

fraud.

25

THE COURT: Now, according to your employer, 1 everything is wire fraud. It's a far cry from what the statute 2 was intended to do when it was adopted. Mr. Favio down there, 3 if you rob a bank and you deposit -- if you mail the money to your mother after you rob a bank, that's mail fraud too, isn't 5 it? 6 7 MS. LACEWELL: It may be, Your Honor. THE COURT: So the Government's principal theory in 8 this case is that the accounting manipulation deprived the corporation. They were cheated out of some proportion of this 10 guy's salary, because he wasn't doing what they were paying him 11 12 to do. MS. LACEWELL: Yes, Your Honor, and others involved 13 14 in the scheme also. 15 THE COURT: Not others. MS. LACEWELL: Well, that's what the information 16 17 charges, Judge. That his and other folks --THE COURT: 18 It's a conspiracy. 19 MS. LACEWELL: Right, and with respect to whose 20 honest services are at issue, the information says Calger and 21 others employed by Enron. THE COURT: Well, who are the others now? 22 23 MS. LACEWELL: Well, there are at least two 24 identified in the information, Andrew Fastow and Richard Causey. And the factual statement, Appendix A, --25

THE COURT: Who is -- Who is Causey? 1 2 MS. LACEWELL: He was at the time in issue the 3 accounting officer of Enron. THE COURT: Okay. 4 5 (Pause) THE COURT: I've forgotten, what's the status of 6 Fastow's case? 7 MS. LACEWELL: He's pled guilty and he's awaiting 8 sentencing, Your Honor. 9 10 THE COURT: To what did he plead guilty? 11 MS. LACEWELL: I believe he pled quilty to two conspiracy charges. 12 13 (Pause) 14 THE COURT: Why didn't the auditors have access to 15 the legal risk memorandum? 16 MS. LACEWELL: It was just the practice that Enron 17 adopts on internal document, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, what do the auditors look at? 18 19 Auditors look at internal documents. 20 Do you know that nobody at Anderson never looked 21 at legal risk memoranda? 22 MS. LACEWELL: I know that they did not look at the one in this case. And I know that they typically did not see 23 24 them, and they were privileged. 25 THE COURT: There are a lot of what auditors look at

that's privileged. 1 2 (Pause) THE COURT: How much were you paid? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Sir? 5 (Counsel whispers to Defendant) THE COURT: How much were you paid? 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: My salary was approximately \$200,000 8 per year. (Pause) 10 THE COURT: Do you agree with the characterization that you consciously and intentionally agreed to cheat Enron, 11 omitted material data and used the wires? 12 THE DEFENDANT: 13 Yes. THE COURT: And there's a factual basis for your 14 I find you guilty as charged on Count One, and your 15 sentencing is set for November 15th, 2005 at 8:45 a.m. You're 16 going to get a copy of the order, before Judge Rosenthal, 17 unless she's out of town; Hittner will do it; but if he's out 18 19 of town, I'll do it. Anything else this morning? 20 21 MS. LASEWELL: No, Your Honor. Thank you very much for seeing us on short 22 23 notice. We appreciate it. 24 THE COURT: Sure. Anything else? 25 MS. PILEGGI: Nothing else, Your Honor. Thank you,

```
Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Thank you.
2
          (These proceedings concluded at 11:12:37 a.m.)
3
4
5
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Ko	7	Mona	
Signature	of	Transcriber	

Date