IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

| UNITED  | STATES  | OF  | AMERICA,   | ) |          |
|---------|---------|-----|------------|---|----------|
|         |         | P]  | laintiff,  | ) |          |
|         |         | vs  | S <b>.</b> | ) | 1:17CR34 |
| REALITY | / LEIGH | WIN | INER,      | ) |          |
|         |         |     | efendant.  | ) |          |
|         |         |     |            | ) |          |

SENTENCING HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE J. RANDAL HALL
THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 2018; 10:00 A.M.
AUGUSTA, GEORGIA

## FOR THE GOVERNMENT:

Bobby L. Christine, Esquire United States Attorney Post Office Box 8970 Savannah, Georgia 31412 (912)652-4422

Jennifer G. Solari, Esquire U.S. Attorney's Office Post Office Box 8970 Savannah, Georgia 31412 (912)201-2561

Julie Ann Edelstein, Esquire U.S. Department of Justice 600 E Street NW, 10th Floor Washington, DC 20002 (202)233-2260

David C. Aaron, Esquire U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530 (202)307-5190

## FOR THE DEFENDANT:

John C. Bell, Jr., Esquire Titus T. Nichols, Esquire Bell & Brigham 457 Greene Street Augusta, Georgia 30901 (706)722-2014

Joe D. Whitley, Esquire
Brett A. Switzer, Esquire
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
3414 Peachtree Road, NE, Suite 1600
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(404)223-2209

Matthew S. Chester, Esquire Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC 201 St. Charles Avenue, Suite 3600 New Orleans, Louisiana 70170 (504)566-5231

Thomas H. Barnard, Esquire
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
Legg Mason Building
100 Light Street, 19th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
(410)862-1185

## OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:

Lisa H. Davenport, RPR, FCRR Post Office Box 5485 Aiken, South Carolina 29804 (706)823-6468

(Call to Order at 10:00 a.m.) 1 2 THE CLERK: The court calls case number 1:17CR34. 3 United States of America v Reality Leigh Winner. Bobby Christine, Jennifer Solari, Julie Edelstein, David Aaron for 4 the Government. Joe Whitley, Matthew Chester, John Bell, Titus 5 Nichols, Brett Switzer and Thomas Barnard for the Defendant. 6 7 Here for sentencing. 8 THE COURT: Good morning. (Group responds simultaneously.) 9 10 THE COURT: Is the Government ready to proceed with 11 sentencing? 12 MR. CHRISTINE: The Government is ready, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Is the Defense ready? 14 MR. WHITLEY: Yes, sir, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Realty Leigh Winner appeared before this 16 Court on June 26, 2018, accompanied by several of her attorneys 17 for a Rule 11 proceeding. Pursuant to a Plea Agreement 18 Ms. Winner plead guilty and was adjudged guilty of count one of 19

Court on June 26, 2018, accompanied by several of her attorneys for a Rule 11 proceeding. Pursuant to a Plea Agreement

Ms. Winner plead guilty and was adjudged guilty of count one of the Indictment charging her with willful retention and transmission of national defense information in violation of 18, United States Code, Section 793(e). Upon completion of that Rule 11 proceeding and this Court's acceptance of her guilty plea, the Court then directed the probation office to prepare a Presentence Report and to disclose the report to the Government and to the Defendant.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Has the Government seen the report and had an opportunity to read it and do you have any objections to its contents?

MS. EDELSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor. The Government has no objections.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Now the Defense -- have you gone through the report with Ms. Winner?

MR. WHITLEY: Yes, sir, Your Honor. We have.

THE COURT: And I note that you have a single objection to paragraph 81 which is a potential ground for departure under Guideline Section 5K2.14. Reviewing your Sentencing Memorandum and the addendum to the agreement it appears that that is still an outstanding objection that needs to be addressed; is that correct?

MR. WHITLEY: Your Honor, we would like to make a statement as to that objection, if I might.

THE COURT: Sure. Go right ahead.

MR. WHITLEY: Your Honor, we believe that it's within the Court's discretion to sentence this defendant under Rule 32 without addressing that issue. We believe that we've adequately addressed it, we hope, for the Court's benefit in our pleadings that we filed with the court. We read the Presentencing Report and there is something -- some authority in the Circuit that would support saying this would be double counting in this particular situation. However, we believe

we've adequately addressed it and we would defer further discussion of it and we would rest with the Court's decision on acceptance of the 11(c)(1)(C) plea in the situation as opposed to going into an extended presentation with the Court this morning.

THE COURT: Any thoughts from the Government on that objection?

MS. EDELSTEIN: Your Honor, the Government agrees with the Defense that the objection need not be resolved in this case. The Government thinks that this is a potentially-applicable policy statement in the sentencing guidelines. However, the Government is not in this case seeking an upward departure or a sentence above the sentencing guidelines; therefore, the Government agrees with the Defense that this objection need not be addressed.

THE COURT: Very well. With the parties consenting, I'll move forward then.

MR. WHITLEY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will adopt the factual statements in the advisory guidelines that are contained in the report and in doing so the Court will now announce that the applicable advisory guidelines for purposes of this morning's sentencing are total offense level 29, criminal history category I, 87 to 108 months of imprisonment, one to three years of supervised release, \$30,000 to \$250,000

fine, and a \$100 special assessment.

All right. With that, obviously, we all recognize we have an 11(c)(1)(C) Plea Agreement here which is really our focus this morning, but I'll be glad to hear from -- Mr. Whitley, from you or whoever else you'd like to address any information in mitigation or more likely, I guess, in support of the Plea Agreement.

Ms. Winner, as with every defendant in a sentencing hearing, the law gives you the right to make a personal statement to the Court. If that is a right that you wish to exercise and make a statement, I'll be glad to hear from you, but I'll leave that up to you and your counsel.

So, Mr. Whitley, the floor is yours, sir.

MR. WHITLEY: Yes, sir, Your Honor. Thank you for that. I would defer to my co-counsel, John Bell, to speak first --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WHITLEY: -- and then I'll speak second, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. WHITLEY: And then after that, Your Honor, our client will make an allocution to the Court. Is that acceptable, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Bell?

MR. BELL: Yes, Your Honor, and I will try not to speak at length and I am not here to reargue the underlying facts. They are set up. I think the Court is quite familiar with the legal issues and the factual basis. What I do want to state -- and I take seriously anything I say in a court and I try to take seriously what I say outside of a court for I believe the candor -- not just honesty, but candor of a lawyer is essential to the functioning of our system of justice.

Over a little more than a year I spent a good bit of time with this young lady. I am the father of four very interesting daughters and each very different in their own way. I have been very extremely impressed with her as a person and I'm quite familiar with the imperfectibility of mankind for we have all seen folks including lawyers and bank presidents and politicians and even judges do things that they have to have known that they should not have done, and in some cases it reflects an evil and defective heart and sometimes it's just the imperfectibility of mankind.

She's a really good person. I never -- I have not heard any expressions of meanness, anger. I had talked with her at length independently on this Plea Agreement -- I didn't want anybody else around -- to make sure this is really what she wants to do and fully accepts that and she does. I believe that her acceptance of responsibility, including responsibility

that necessarily even under the Plea Agreement involves the loss of her freedom for a good portion of her life, particularly in her youth years when people are getting on with life, it's real, but she's never told me anything that I had reason to doubt as being truthful.

She's never expressed anything to me that would reflect disloyalty to the United States outside of how one might view what she's charged with. She is an honorably-discharged veteran. She is a person coming before this Court with no criminal history. She is a person who did amazingly well in school, received honors from the Air Force, who has shown a lot of humanity and interest in -- not in gaining wealth, but in serving others, trying to get jobs with non-profits and such.

We are here asking the Court to go with the plea bargain, but I say these words because the person before you is a very good person who has done something that she should not have done and she knew she shouldn't have done it and it is something that our federal laws do not concur, but she is not an evil person. I have no doubt that she will never again see the inside of a courtroom in a similar position and I give you those assurances from the bottom of my heart.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bell.

MR. WHITLEY: Your Honor, I'll say a few words.

There is an expression -- maybe Benjamin Franklin said it -- "I would have written you a shorter letter but I didn't have

time." You may have heard it and today what I want to do is keep brief and succinct in my remarks.

We have spent a good bit of time in this case over many, many months and I really thank the Court for the opportunity this morning to say a few words. It is part of our system and it's what makes our country exceptional and I have been working with exceptionally-great lawyers here in Augusta for many months -- John Bell and Titus Nichols -- two great lawyers here in this city.

I want to thank you again for the opportunity to speak on behalf of Reality. On behalf of her entire family, her defense team, I want to thank the Court, the prosecutors who sit back to my left here, the investigators who are back there -- there are people here from the intelligence community -- for the courtesy they've shown our client in this matter. There is something to be said for our adversarial system under our Constitution and Bill of Rights that protects a defendant's rights even if those to which she committed wrongful conduct that was controversial and arguably provocative. I believe our client is deeply remorseful as John said and apologetic for her actions and any harm that she may have caused the United States and the intelligence community.

The Court has earlier indicated that it will support a recommendation for a BOP facility requested by Ms. Winner which is FMC Carswell facility in Fort Worth, Texas. We thank the

Government also for not opposing this request. To that end for the reasons set forth in the declaration of Joel Sickler, an expert in correctional facilities, Mr. Sickler believes that FMC Carswell is the best facility for our client based on, Your Honor, three things: Location, safety, and available programs. And I won't go into all the details.

Now what is this case about? Not to minimize it, but this is a case that's unique in that every case is unique, but it is about one single document, Your Honor, on one single occasion that was shared with one media outlet sent by what is called "snail mail" today, but old fashioned mail. There were no --- fortunately, there were no foreign governments involved.

Reality Winner in this case acted alone, Your Honor, on naive political impulse. This was a poorly-considered act of political passion and protest with no financial benefit received by her. This was not a cyber crime that involved the use of cyber-related resources, Your Honor, or advanced technology of any kind. As to harm, Reality has admitted that she knew that the release of the information could potentially harm the United States. However, at the time I believe Reality never intended, Your Honor, to harm the United States.

There are a few key facts about Reality, the person, and John has touched on those. Reality is just 26 years old, Your Honor. She has had no prior criminal history. Again, as John suggested, her background is, indeed, exceptional. She was an

accomplished scholar in high school. She was offered a scholarship, Your Honor, to attend college at Texas A&M, but she turned that down to serve her country in the United States Air Force.

Reality excelled, Your Honor, in the Air Force. Colonel Ricky Mills, her commanding officer, said in 2016 in a commendation letter that Reality was selected over 60 of her peers to serve as a subject matter expert. Colonel Mills cited that she facilitated 816 intelligence missions, 3236 time-sensitive reports, and removed 100 enemies from the battlefield as well as aided in 650 enemy captures and 600 enemies killed in action.

There are some other personal circumstances worthy of consideration. Despite her laudable military service, Reality has faced personal family adversity all recounted quite well in Officer Chris Ingall's PSR. Specifically, there was a loss of her father in December of 2016 just months before her arrest. Dr. Adrian Davis, a clinical psychologist, has noted that Reality suffers from longstanding depression and she suffers and struggles with an eating disorder called bulimia. Dr. Davis said in the months leading up to the offense it was a time in Reality's life when she was "both depressed and suffering from bulimia." This contributed to her poor decision making in this situation when the situation required really clear thinking and sound judgment.

I want to briefly touch on the letters of support because we're not calling any witnesses, Your Honor, this morning to talk about Reality Winner. I believe the Court probably has had the opportunity to read those letters written by friends and family members. I wanted to highlight a few points about those letters. Really, it deals with the types of people who wrote those letters and they range from neighbors, people who served with her in the military, a friend in dog rescue, a fitness instructor, her aunt, her mother, stepfather, sister, adults in the small rural Texas town she grew up in. They're all supportive of the Reality Winner -- the Reality Winner that they know. These letters suggest that Reality has a high potential for rehabilitation and reentry into society.

Taken together with Reality's personal statement which you have heard or read in the materials and her allocution in a few moments, I believe it will suggest that Reality will in the next few years return to her freedom as a law-abiding citizen.

During the last year of her confinement in Lincoln County Reality has acknowledged in my conversations with her repeatedly the mistakes she made and the regrets that she feels.

In summing up, I would remind the Court of a few points.

The charged offense in this case is non-violent. There was no profit received and it was not cyber related. Reality is a first-time offender who has a strong potential for

rehabilitation, Your Honor. Accordingly, we respectfully ask the Court to accept the 63-month plea deal and endorse our request that she be designated to FMC Carswell in Fort Worth, Texas and be offered the opportunity to participate in the prison's inmate helper program for other inmates.

This institution is also proximate to her family's home in Texas. It is a suitable location for her health to be monitored, Your Honor, and, in particular, we would ask if she's not designated to that facility that she be designated to a low-security facility if not FMC Carswell.

I want to conclude by saying that this has been a real long journey for all of us working on this case. For most of us the journey is ending, but for Reality Winner her journey will continue and we hope that it continues on with the Court's acceptance of this Plea Agreement. We thank Your Honor for your attention to our request and that's all I have this morning to share with you. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Whitley.

Ms. Winner, would you like to speak?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. You may proceed.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to begin by expressing my gratitude toward this Court, the Department of Justice, the FBI, and our Government, and sincerely apologize and take full responsibility for my action. You have all treated me with the

most professionalism during my arduous time in my life which I greatly appreciate. I will spare the Court the details of my childhood and youth, save a few key details that shaped me into the person I am today.

I grew up with my mother, father, and sister in Ricardo,
Texas -- a small town approximately 3 miles south of
Kingsville, Texas. In 1997 my father moved about 80 miles
south to Harlingen. To say my father was unique would be an
understatement. Bless his heart and rest his soul. A
psychology and theology major, he expected us to engage in
intellectual discourse by the time we were out of diapers.

Despite his obvious intelligence, he never quite found a sense of belonging anywhere much as I have experienced in my own life. While he had some trouble in his life with the law, opioids, and questionable philosophies, he taught me some of the most profound and influential insights into our world that undeniably led me to my chosen career.

His chosen education had especially impacted the nature of our discussions in the years following the tragedy of September 11, 2001. Like many Americans, this event greatly changed us. However, part of our change was the intellectual pursuit of answers through research and discussion of the event, the cultures, and the languages of the people in countries involved as the global war on terror remained in the headlines. Language became a topic of sincere interest to me.

In school my favorite subject happened to be Latin -- in essence, the very structure of language itself.

An additional positive influence in my life came in the blessing of my stepdad. He was everything a dad should be: Discipline, structure, fun, my first soccer coach. The rock of our family, he redefined our family as normal for the first time and also expanded the small immediate family of my mother, sister, and me by more than double with my three additional step-siblings. A staunch conversative, I couldn't help but notice his pride when my oldest stepbrother joined the U.S. Air Force and it was then when I first learned about the military language programs.

By the time I became old enough to enlist my heart was set in joining the military in my stepbrother's footsteps and pursue a career as a linguist eventually learning Farsi, Dari, and Pashto within my six-year enlistment in the U.S. Air Force. By the end of my first year at my first assignment in Fort Meade I was a cryptological language analyst, the dream I had -- the career I had dreamed of. Pardon me, Your Honor.

By the final year of my enlistment our country was well into its second decade of the war in Afghanistan. Aside from my military career I had always participated in supporting various charities, most notably the Samaritan's Purse Operation Christmas Child in which shoe boxes are distributed across the world to refugee children or those afflicted by abject poverty

and famine. More than anything I dreamt of the day where linguistic meets compassion, strategy, and peace.

As my time in the military came to an end I decided that I intended to establish a life centered on obtaining the experience and education I would need to vie for a position within an organization like the UNHCR, USAID or UNICEF. To help that transition I decided to find a job where I could rely on and improve the language skills I developed in the Air Force and took a job as a contractor in Augusta. Aside from the potential job, I chose Augusta because I love this city.

It is not to be understated my understanding of the gravity of my circumstance; however, I implore the chance to share a few personal interests of mine that stand as the justification of my request for the Southern District of Georgia Augusta Division's judiciary recommendation and the Bureau of Prisons' amenity to our request that I serve my sentence at the Federal Medical Center, Carswell, in Fort Worth, Texas.

On the surface it is the BOP federal facility nearest to my family home in Kingsville, Texas. It will be nearly a full day's drive for my parents on visitation occasions, but it will be less of a strain than the airfare, lodging, and transportation logistics should I be placed out of my home state. Furthermore, I do intend to resettle in Texas and so the transition from incarceration to halfway house to

supervised release will benefit me more greatly if it all were to occur within the state of Texas.

On a personal note, one of my goals over the following years of my life, incarcerated or otherwise free, is to seek extensive treatment for bulimia, a condition that has been an inescapable part of my life for over 12 years now. I pray that FMC Carswell would provide the adequate mental healthcare level to allow me the opportunity to begin a lasting rehabilitation and relief. The disorder is a constant struggle for me and even now is the most pressing internal challenge in my day-to-day survival. My greatest fear would be assignment to a facility in which the mental health services are lacking and that conditions will provoke my bulimia to not only grow worse but also serve as my only coping mechanism of incarceration.

Lastly, as I am able to recover and strengthen my own self I understand that FMC Carswell is a unique facility in which inmates may progress to caretaking positions to serve fellow inmates. For both my health needs and vocational education interests as well as proximity to my home of record, FMC Carswell is a suitable facility in my opinion, and I humbly request that the Court and the BOP to consider my placement in Carswell.

Losing nearly everything has taught me that nothing is worth the time spent away from loved ones. Time removed from such dearness has allowed me to reflect thus far on what an

undeniable mistake I made in committing such a severe crime against the government of the United States. I would like to apologize profusely for my actions which have resulted in the damages caused and resources expended by the Government and this Court, and, in particular, I want to apologize to my family.

My actions were a crucial betrayal of my nation's trust placed in me, one for which I will spend my life in service of our communities as atonement. Nothing will be more greatly prized than the most simple pleasures of serving others, my family's love, or being out in the sunlight of another day, and, therefore, nothing would ever be done by me to jeopardize my lasting commitment to the government or to my own liberty ever again. I would, again, like to thank this Honorable Court and its servants for their time and fair consideration in this matter.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Winner.

MR. WHITLEY: Thank you, Your Honor. We would ask a bit of housekeeping. We have Dr. Adrian Davis' report. We'd like to move that to be part of the record, Your Honor, if that's acceptable, and I don't believe -- I don't know what the Government's position is, but I believe there's -- is there any objection?

MS. EDELSTEIN: There is no objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think what I'll order is that the

```
report be provided to the BOP but not incorporated as an
 1
 2
     attachment --
 3
               MR. WHITLEY: Okay.
               THE COURT: -- into the PSR, but I will order that it
 4
 5
     be provided.
               MR. WHITLEY: Yes, sir. Thank you. Thank you, Your
 6
 7
     Honor. That's preferential.
               THE COURT: Anything further, then?
 8
 9
               MR. WHITLEY: No, sir, Your Honor. We thank you for
10
     your courtesy this morning. Thank you.
11
               THE COURT: All right. Does the Government want to
12
     make its comments from the lecturn or from the table?
13
               MS. EDELSTEIN: Whatever is easier for Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Are they long remarks or no?
15
               MS. EDELSTEIN: I can keep them very short.
16
               THE COURT: Okay. You can stay right here. My
17
     normal practice is to let the counsel and defendant remain at
     the lecturn. If you'd like to stay right where --
18
19
               MR. WHITLEY: Yes, sir.
20
               THE COURT: -- you are, that will keep you from
21
    having to get up and down.
22
               MR. WHITLEY: Thank you.
23
               MS. EDELSTEIN: Your Honor, the Government's position
24
     is fully set forth in our Sentencing Memorandum as to why the
```

disposition of this case that was agreed to by the parties is

25

an appropriate disposition -- 63 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release. There are a few points I'd like to briefly highlight.

In terms of the seriousness of the Defendant's offense, it cannot be understated. The Defendant when she began work as a contractor with Pluribus in February of 2017 and signed paperwork -- important paperwork -- showing that she was agreeing to keep our secrets secret and that she was doing so without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion at the same time was taking actions that were clearly contrary to what she was swearing to.

The Defendant also was not a newcomer to handling our nation's secrets. She had had a security clearance for a good part of her six years that she was in the Air Force and knew the importance of protecting our national security information and the damages that unauthorized disclosure can cause.

Nonetheless, just two days before starting work with Pluribus the Defendant at the same time was just looking on her phone and captured an image of a web page that listed a number of sites that were seeking leaked classified information.

On May 5<sup>th</sup> an intelligence community agency published a report internally on classified databases that was classified at the Top Secret Special Compartmented Information level. The Top Secret designation shows that the disclosure of this report had potential to cause exceptionally grave damage to our

national security and what we call the "SCI" designation showed that it was even more protected than other Top Secret information, in part because it concerned our nation's sources and methods.

Nonetheless, on May 9<sup>th</sup> the Defendant purposefully searched for, identified, and printed this intelligence report. Instead of handling it in the proper procedures, she removed it from the secure facility where she worked. She put it in an envelope and she addressed that envelope to a news outlet. As she admitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation she did so with intent that the news agency publish the content of that report, and as the Defendant admitted when she pleaded guilty, this act was not an accident; it was not a mistake; and it was not done for any innocent reason. Rather, the Defendant acted willfully. She knew what she was doing was against the law. In so doing she knowingly and intentionally jeopardized the national security.

I gave you previously the definition of Top Secret information that it has potential to cause exceptionally grave damage, and in this instance the U.S. subject matter experts have assessed that the Defendant's disclosure did exactly that. It caused exceptionally grave damage to our national security.

The Defendant has now accepted responsibility for this crime and the parties agree that 63 months is an appropriate sentence. It reflects the seriousness of this crime. It is a

long prison sentence. The Defendant understood the harm that her disclosure could cause and she blatantly violated the trust that was placed in her.

In addition, the sentence confers significant benefit to the Government. It avoids the complex issues that would have been posed by a Classified Information Procedures Act proceeding both before this Court and on a potential appeal and it avoids the potential dangers of discussing a case which has at its core classified information in front of a jury which inevitably leads to the disclosure of more classified information.

Given the balance that we must strike in all of those cases as the Government between the needs to prosecute an individual and the damage that further disclosure of classified information can cause, this is a good result for the Government. The prosecutors have confirmed both with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the members of the intelligence community who are affected by the Defendant's disclosure, and all agree. We also think that this sentence will avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities in light of other cases that have been prosecuted under 783 for unauthorized disclosure of classified information.

Unless the Court has any questions, Your Honor, that's all the Government has. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. The Court is now

ready to impose the sentence in this case. I have listened to the Defendant and her counsel. I have carefully reviewed the Presentence Report prepared by the United States Probation Office. I have also considered letters of support filed by the Defense in this case and I have carefully considered the Sentencing Memorandums filed by both the Government and the Defense and, finally, have listened to argument of counsel in open court this morning.

In arriving at the Court's decision, I have carefully considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors. Based upon this the Court hereby approves the Plea Agreement under Rule 11(c)(1)(C) and will now sentence accordingly. Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 then it is the judgment of this Court that the Defendant, Reality Leigh Winner, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 63 months.

Now imposing -- in imposing this sentence this morning this Court has conducted a variance from the advisory guideline range pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1)(C) and the Plea Agreement in this case again and including the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors. In particular, in approving this agreement and the sentence that the Court has imposed, I have carefully considered the very serious nature and circumstances of the offense committed by this defendant and I have considered very carefully her history and characteristics.

This sentence by the Court reflects the seriousness of this espionage offense. It is designed to provide just punishment for this offense, and, very importantly, to promote respect for the law and, also, very importantly, to avoid adequate deterrence to future criminal conduct. While the Court doesn't have any -- has no sense, rather, that there is a need to protect the public from any further crimes of this defendant, the Court does believe that the public deterrence factor is very important in the Court's decision to approve this 11(c)(1)(C) agreement and to impose the sentence called for by that agreement. For all of these reasons this Court now finds that the sentence -- that a sentence outside of the advisory guideline range is appropriate and has imposed such a sentence.

It is recommended that Ms. Winner be evaluated by BOP officials to establish her participation in an appropriate program of mental health treatment and counseling during her term of incarceration. In addition, the Court orders that the psychological examination prepared by Dr. Adrian C. Davis dated July 1, 2018, shall be provided to the Bureau of Prisons as part of the record in this case but shall not be incorporated into the Presentence Report.

After considering the Sentencing Guideline 5E1.2D factors and in light of paragraph four of the Plea Agreement, the Court has -- will not impose a fine today upon Ms. Winner. I do,

however, order that she shall pay to the United States a \$100 special assessment which is due immediately.

Pursuant to the approval of the Plea Agreement Ms. Winner shall forfeit her interest in the items mentioned in paragraph 12 of that agreement.

Upon release from imprisonment Ms. Winner shall be placed on supervised release for three years. While on supervised release she shall comply with the standard conditions of supervision adopted by this court and the mandatory conditions required by 18 U.S.C. § 3583 which will include, but not be limited to, urine testing, a prohibition against possession of any firearm or other dangerous weapon, and a prohibition against the violation of any law. Further, she shall cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample as directed by the probation officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3583.

While on supervised release Ms. Winner shall comply with certain special conditions imposed by this court. The Court has considered various factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553 and 3583 along with relevant policy statements issued by the United States Sentencing Commission and has determined that these special conditions involve no greater deprivation of liberty than is reasonably necessary to achieve the purposes of sentencing; therefore, the following special conditions are imposed on her term of supervised release.

She must participate in a mental health treatment program

and follow the rules and regulations of that program. The probation officer, in consultation with her treatment provider or providers, will supervise her participation in such a program. She must pay the cost of treatment in an amount to be determined by the probation officer based on her ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment. She must take all mental health medications that are prescribed by her treating physician. She must pay the cost of such medication in an amount to be determined by her probation officer based on her ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment.

She must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information and authorize the release of any financial information. The probation office may share financial information with the United States Attorney's office. She shall not maintain more than one financial institution account or be a signer on any financial institution account without the prior approval of the probation officer.

She must complete 100 hours of community service within 12 months of her supervised release. The probation officer will supervise her participation in the program by approving the program and verifying the completed hours.

She must submit her person, property, house, residence, office, vehicle, papers, computers, other electronic-communications or data-storage devices or media to a search conducted by a United States Probation Officer. Failure

to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of her supervised release. Failure -- rather, she must warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. The probation officer may conduct a search under this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that she has violated a term or condition of her supervision and that areas to be searched contain evidence of the violation. Any search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

A curfew will apply during the term of supervised release. She must comply with the conditions of a curfew from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. daily. During the curfew time she will remain at her place of residence and shall not leave except when the leave is approved in advance by her probation officer.

She shall not collaborate on or consult about or otherwise assist or be involved in any communication of information related to classified subject areas to which she was exposed while working as an employee of or contractor for the United States Government with any other person or entity without first obtaining the express written permission of all relevant agencies or components of the United States Government.

She shall not circumvent her assignment to the United

States of any compensation, profits, proceeds, fee, honorarium,

money, or payments of any kind which she may otherwise be

entitled to receive in connection with any publication or

dissemination of information related to her work as an employee of or contractor for the United States Government and the facts and circumstances of the investigation of her activities or her prosecution, sentencing, or incarceration in this matter by assigning the rights to her story to an associate or to a current, former, or future member of her family or to any other person or entity who would provide some financial benefit to her, to her associates, or to a current, former, or future member of her family. Moreover, she shall not circumvent this assignment by communicating with an associate or family member for the purpose of assisting or facilitating their profiting from a public or private dissemination whether or not such associate or other family member is personally or directly involved in such dissemination.

The probation officer is now directed to provide

Ms. Winner with a written statement setting forth all of the conditions to which her term of supervised release is subject.

The Court has accepted this Rule 11(c)(1)(C) sentencing agreement that departs from the applicable guideline range because the Court is satisfied that there are justifiable reasons for accepting this agreement that I have previously set forth in this sentencing statement.

Consistent with the Court's judgment then it is ordered that Ms. Winner is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal. This Court will recommend to the Bureau of Prisons

that she be assigned to FMC Carswell, Texas to serve her incarceration -- term of incarceration. As a backup, the Court would recommend her assignment to another facility of the same risk level and with the same programs and other facilities that Carswell offers.

Pursuant to the Plea Agreement, with limited exceptions,
Ms. Winner has waived all rights conferred by 18 U.S.C. § 3742
to appeal this sentence. She has also waived the right to
appeal this sentence on any other ground and has waived the
right to attack the sentence in any post-conviction proceeding.

The sentence in this case has now been pronounced by this Court. Other than any objections which may have previously been stated for the record, does anyone now have any objections to the Court's findings of fact, its conclusions of law, or to the manner in which the sentence was pronounced by this Court?

Government?

MS. EDELSTEIN: No, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. WHITLEY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. With that, the sentencing hearing is now concluded.

(The hearing is concluded.)

| CDDMTDTCAMD | $\circ$ | $\Delta$ |          |
|-------------|---------|----------|----------|
| CERTIFICATE | OF      | OFFICIAL | KEPUKIEK |

I, Lisa H. Davenport, Federal Official Court Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically-reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

\_\_\_\_\_

Lisa H. Davenport, RPR, FCRR Federal Official Court Reporter