	F5QJNASS Sentence	
1		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2x	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	v. S1 13 Cr. 95	50 TPG
5	PETER PHILIP NASH,	
6	Defendant.	
7	7	
8	3	
9	May 26, 2015 4:40 p.m.	Ō
10	=	
11		
12	Before:	
13	HON. THOMAS P. GRIESA,	
14	District Jud	lge
15		
16	APPEARANCES	
17		
18	PREET BHARARA,  United States Attorney for the	
19	II	
20	· ·	
21	ANDREW J. FRISCH, AMANDA L. BASSEN,	
22	·	
23		
24		
25		

1 (In open court) (Case called) 2 3 THE COURT: Sit down, please. 4 Mr. Frisch --MR. FRISCH: Yes, your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: -- have you gone over the presentence 7 report, et cetera, with your client? 8 MR. FRISCH: Yes, we have gone over the report. 9 THE COURT: Any objections? 10 MR. FRISCH: We have identified our objections, your 11 Honor, beginning on Page 3 of our sentencing memorandum 12 submitted to the court. 13 THE COURT: Is there anything I need to take care of 14 now? 15 MR. FRISCH: Your Honor, I think that if you order 16 that the memorandum be appended to the PSR so that the 17 objections are noted, my objections on Mr. Nash's behalf are noted --18 19 THE COURT: That's what we'll do. 20 MR. FRISCH: -- I think that will satisfy us. Of 21 course, we can discuss the relevant features of the objections 22 when we get to the sentencing itself. 23 THE COURT: All right. What would you like to add? MR. FRISCH: The only thing I would add, your Honor, 24 25 is that I think that Mr. Nash should be sentenced to

time-served.

THE COURT: What?

MR. FRISCH: I believe Mr. Nash should be sentenced to time-served. Your Honor, let me address sentencing, as your Honor has requested.

I believe Mr. Nash should be sentenced to time-served. I urge your Honor to do so. I was very pleased to read the government's memorandum, at Page 10 to 11, which in my experience is unusual. They point out that they believe the conduct that lands Mr. Nash here is an aberration, that his role was while not unimportant, was more attenuated to the Silk Road web site than others involved. He was the least culpable of the people involved who have been charged.

I think it is more than that, though. Mr. Nash has been in custody approximately 17 to 18 months and the conditions of his confinement are more severe than your typical defendant. He was extradited here from Brisbane in Australia where he lives. He was in custody there for about six or seven months. He has been at the MCC now for 11 or so months. He knows no one here other than counsel now.

His family and friends who live respectively in

Australia and in the United Kingdom don't have the funds to

make the trip, and in the case of his elderly parents in the

United Kingdom, are too infirm, too elderly to make the trip.

In the time he has been incarcerated here, he is isolated from

family and friends which, of course, is atypical.

I point out in the sentencing memorandum something else that is atypical. When he was in Brisbane in custody on the extradition warrant out of the Southern District, he was gratuitously beat up not because of anything he did, but because apparently in this facility, that is the way they attempt to restore order when someone else violates a rule. Of course, the United States Government is not responsible for that, but it would not have happened but for his custody as a result of this case.

Mr. Nash is the kind of person I think all of us should want to know. We have submitted a video of four statements of people who know him well and a flurry of letters. His job in Australia and in his life before Australia was counseling intellectually-disabled people, often people who were facing jail, a thankless job.

He was on call at times around the clock. He got awards for his work. A few years ago he became very stressed about it, as we have documented in our papers and corroborated by people who have submitted letters on his behalf. He turned to the Silk Road web site. He knows he should not have done so and he did so for two reasons:

He never sold drugs. He never was part of the hierarchy of the people who ran Silk Road. He wasn't involved in transactions. Most important, he did not profit. He got

involved because it gave him social connection that helped get through the stress of his life, and also in Australia I have come to learn it is difficult to get drugs, and Silk Road gave him an opportunity to find cocaine and ecstasy, to which he became addicted.

He ultimately served the people on the web site as chat forum moderator, didn't know the people personally but only online. For doing that in total he made approximately \$25,000, which he then put back to buying more drugs. He didn't profit beyond that.

His conduct in custody at the MCC is exemplary. We have appended to our sentencing memorandum a certificate of completion of every program you can possibly avail yourself of at the MCC including drug programs. I believe that the government notes that in their very nice letter at Page 10, very nice memo at Page 10 and 11.

Another good thing, he has friends who are clinical psychologists by virtue of his work. They're among the people shoe submitted the video statements and they're waiting to help him when he returns to Brisbane to honor his commitment to staying away from drugs and not getting involved in anything like this at all.

I respect what the government has done in this case.

I think they've done great work in Silk Road. I respect the legitimacy of what they have done here. It does no disservice

to their legitimate agenda for Mr. Nash today to be sentenced to time-served. Why? Because they have already sent the message if you're halfway around the world in Australia and you're an addicted professional, and you get involved in a web site even in a very minor role, the United States Government in New York may extradite you halfway around the world, isolated from family and friends and keep you in custody.

I think that sends a very significant message to anyone similarly situated who might be inclined to become involved in such a thing. I don't think there is anything to be gained by keeping Mr. Nash incarcerated for a moment longer. If your Honor can see clear to sentence him to time-served today after his 17 months, we are prepared to get him on a flight to London tonight or tomorrow morning. I say London because his elderly parents are there and it is easier to get him to the United Kingdom than Australia.

I would urge your Honor to sentence him to time-served. Our dealings with him over the past year and a half we have been representing him have been exemplary. He is a great guy. He has proffered with the government and satisfied the safety valve. They have found him truthful. He consented to the extradition. He has provided the government all the information about this episode that he knows.

I understand that it is criminal conduct. He takes full responsibility for it, but I you would simply say to your

Honor that he doesn't need to serve another day in jail for this. 17 months is adequate, and I would urge your Honor to impose a sentence of time-served.

THE COURT: Does your client wish to make a statement?

MR. FRISCH: He does, your Honor, yes.

THE DEFENDANT: I want to offer my sincere and heartfelt apology to everyone negatively affected by my actions. It was never my intention to cause harm, but needless to say, that is what has happened. These past 17 months have been incredibly challenging not only for me, but for many others, and I have had a lot of time to reflect what got me into this very you unfortunate and highly regrettable situation.

The consequences of my actions have cost me dearly, and I am mindful my loss is mirrored by many others who suffered greatly themselves. I have a fiance in Australia waiting for me to come home so we can have our wedding and rebuild our lives.

I have elderly parents in the U.K. desperate to see their son again. It is my hope you can see me for the man I truly am and not the person who made very poor choices at a difficult time in his life, and I hope you can see fit to hand down a sentence that will allow me to get back to my life so I can start to move forward and put this chapter behind me.

THE COURT: Does the government have any motion?

Is it appropriate to have a motion about the safety valve?

MR. TURNER: Yes, your Honor, we move for safety valve relief. The defendant is safety-valve eligible based on proffering and the fact he meets the other conditions.

THE COURT: Motion granted and the safety valve applies. We'll come to the sentence, and the sentence is time-served and \$100.00 -- how many counts?

THE CLERK: Two counts.

THE COURT: Time-served on each of the counts and a \$200.00 special assessment, and that is the -- I don't think there is any issue about a motion or an appeal. Has that been waived?

MR. TURNER: No, your Honor. There is no plea agreement. I would add that the parties do have a consent forfeiture order for \$25,000 that we have for your Honor to sign.

THE COURT: I'll do that.

MR. TURNER: Thank you. We'll move to dismiss Count 2 of the superseding indictment as to this defendant and also the original indictment in its entirety against this defendant.

THE COURT: Those motions are granted. I have signed the forfeiture order. Let me reiterate that the sentence on both counts is time-served, to be serving concurrently. There will be a \$200.00 special assessment, and that is the sentence.

For the record, if there has been no waiver of right of appeal, I advise him for the record that he has a right of appeal. Thank you very much.

(Court adjourned)