1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA ORLANDO DIVISION
3	CASE NUMBER 6:11-cr-401-RBD-EJK
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :
5	Plaintiff, :
6	: Orlando, Florida v. : August 3, 2022
7	: 10:04 a.m. FREDERICK MERVIN BARDELL, :
8	: Defendant. :
9	
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF SHOW CAUSE HEARING
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROY B. DALTON, JR.
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Court Reporter: Amie R. First, RDR, CRR, CRC, CPE
22	Federal Official Court Reporter 401 West Central Boulevard, Suite 4600
23	Orlando, Florida 32801 AmieFirst.CourtReporter@gmail.com
24	Proceedings recorded by Realtime Stenography.
25	Transcript produced by Computer-Aided Transcription.

```
APPEARANCES:
2
 3
                   A. Lee Bentley, III
    Special Master:
 4
    Counsel for Government: Julie Posteraro
 5
 6
                                Lacy R. Harwell, Jr.
 7
    Counsel for Defendant: Kimberly L. Copeland
8
9
    Counsel for Warden Zook in her individual capacity:
10
11
                                Glenn S. Greene
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 PROCEEDINGS **** 2 3 (Court called to order.) THE DEPUTY CLERK: Case Number 6:11-cr-401, 4 United States of America versus Frederick Mervin Bardell. 5 6 Counsel, please state your appearances for the 7 record starting with the Government. 8 MS. POSTERARO: Julie Posteraro on behalf of the 9 Bureau of Prisons. 10 THE COURT: Good morning. 11 MR. GREENE: Good morning, Your Honor. Glenn Greene with the Department of Justice on behalf of 12 13 Warden Zook in her individual capacity. 14 THE COURT: Good morning. 15 MS. ZOOK: Kristi Zook, warden for the Bureau of 16 Prisons. 17 THE COURT: Good morning. 18 Mr. Bentley. MR. BENTLEY: Good morning, Your Honor. Lee 19 20 Bentley, appointed special master. 21 THE COURT: Good morning. 22 MS. COPELAND: Good morning, Your Honor. 23 Kimberly Copeland. I'm the former attorney for Frederick Bardell. 24 25 THE COURT: Yes, welcome, Ms. Copeland.

All right. We're here for the purpose of providing the Bureau of Prisons and Warden Zook an opportunity to respond to the report of the special master and to give the special master an opportunity to summarize for the Court, in addition to the written materials already provided, a summary of the investigation and findings of the special master pursuant to the Court's order to show cause directed to the Bureau of Prisons and Warden Zook as to why they should not be held in civil contempt for failure to comply with the Court's order of February the 5th of 2021. That's at document number 92.

I wanted to give the Bureau of Prisons and
Warden Zook an opportunity in open court to explain why
they should not be held in civil contempt for failing to
follow the Court's order that required Mr. Bardell's
release only after the development and approval of a
release plan that had been developed by the United States
Probation Office to assure that he had appropriate release
and was delivered into the care of healthcare facilities in
order to provide for his terminal colorectal cancer.

I think I've made clear my view about the way the Bureau of Prisons handled Mr. Bardell's confinement and his release. And I've expressed in my written orders my displeasure with what I perceived to be the Government's complete -- and when I say "the Government," I'm talking

about the Bureau of Prisons -- the Bureau of Prisons' complete indifference to Mr. Bardell's medical circumstances.

I also wanted to say, Ms. Posteraro, for the benefit of the local assistant United States attorneys -- I think it was Ms. Chang from the local office that was handling the responses to Mr. Bardell's motions for compassionate release -- that I was more than a little bit troubled by the responses that came from the Bureau of Prisons in opposition to the submissions by Mr. Bardell's medical doctors that he was not receiving adequate care and that the delay in providing him care was likely to lead to his death, which turned out to be prophetic. In fact, that is what happened.

So I'm not sure that my ire about the situation was adequately communicated in my written orders, and so I wanted to have the opportunity to have you all here before me so that I could perhaps elaborate on that and tell you why it's so concerning to me.

But what I'd like to do first, Mr. Bentley, the way we'll go forward is I'm going to give Mr. Bentley an opportunity to come to the podium and summarize the assignment that was given to the special master, the work that was undertaken by the special master in order to discharge the responsibilities imposed upon him by the

Court, a summary of his findings; after which I'll give the Bureau of Prisons and Warden Zook an opportunity to make any response that they want to make to the special master's findings. And then, if necessary, Mr. Bentley, I'll give you an opportunity to briefly respond.

And then I'll share with you my views about the appropriate disposition going forward after I've had some input from you all.

So, Mr. Bentley, let me invite you to the podium first. And lest I forget -- I don't think I will forget -- thank you for accepting this assignment which I think is vitally important in terms of the administration of justice and the requirement that the Bureau of Prisons comply with orders of the Court.

I know it's not something that falls within your ordinary wheelhouse of assignments, but as a former United States Attorney, I thought you were especially well put to conduct the investigation. And I want to commend you and commend Ms. Nwokolo for your very significant efforts in discharging the responsibilities imposed on you by the Court.

But let me turn it over to you, Mr. Bentley.

MR. BENTLEY: Well, thank you very much, Your Honor.

And let me begin by expressing my thanks to you.

It was a great privilege to be able to serve as special master in this matter. I was surprised when you called me. I was grateful and humbled to be asked to take on this task.

And I can tell you that I, with the very able assistance of Soma Nwokolo took your charge very seriously and endeavored to the best of our abilities to investigate thoroughly the circumstances regarding BOP and Warden Zook's disregard of this Court's order and in making recommendations with respect to the legal findings and sanctions that we've recommended here today.

You know, you mentioned, of course, the investigation that we undertook, and we really, Your Honor, engaged in a scorched-earth investigation to the best of our abilities.

We interviewed well over 20 individuals. Those included Mr. Bardell's former attorney, Kimberly Copeland, who's here in court today, who I might say is as compassionate a lawyer as I've ever dealt with in all my years of practice. Her heart went out to Mr. Bardell. And I was extremely impressed with everything she did for Mr. Bardell over the course of her representation of Mr. Bardell and for the Bardell parents after Mr. Bardell, Fred Bardell, passed away.

But, you know, we interviewed Ms. Copeland, her

legal assistant who was involved in this; at least five or six probation employees, U.S. Probation Officers. We interviewed some BOP employees. We interviewed at least four doctors, five doctors in counting the BOP doctor that we interviewed.

And we also took 13 depositions. All of those were of BOP personnel. Most of those were in Dallas. We deposed Warden Zook.

And we also, in addition to these interviews and depositions, we looked at all the documents, quite voluminous documents that were filed in the -- in this Court prior to my appointment as special master. And we also asked the liaison for the BOP, which was AUSA Julie Posteraro, to assist us in getting other documents that weren't publically available.

And I would also like to commend AUSA Posteraro. She was extremely cooperative. Everything that we asked for, she provided very promptly. She did her best to make every witness available to us on the timetable we asked. I mean, she could have dragged her feet and made things a little more difficult, but she did none of that. She was extremely forthcoming, and it made our job easier. So I want to thank her, you know, personally for that.

After doing these, you know, taking these depositions, doing the interviews, looking at the

documents, I endeavored to put together a report for your court, for this Court. It's been filed. I know you've had an opportunity to read it as have all the other parties in the courtroom today. And we attempted to lay out, you know, a pretty detailed summary of what we found.

And I want to make it clear here at the beginning what we didn't do in our investigation or report. I think probably the greatest tragedy here is that Mr. Bardell was not diagnosed with colon cancer earlier, when it moved to stage IV earlier.

And I know -- because I didn't investigate that, that was not part of my charge from the Court, you know, I didn't look into that in any great detail. But I know it's been alleged by at least one doctor who evaluated the reports involving Mr. Bardell that, you know, BOP should have discovered that Mr. Bardell had colon cancer back in, you know, mid-2019, long before the events that transpired here.

If he had, I think it's -- I guess I'm not in a position to say. I know some doctors believe he may have been able to survive the cancer. That, I don't know. But I just want to make it clear, that's not something that we examined in the course of our investigation.

It's also, in my opinion, very likely that if Mr. Bardell had been diagnosed with colon cancer earlier,

not only would his life possibly have been spared, but, in addition, almost certainly, he would have been transferred to a federal medical center.

And after conducting the interviews of all of the -- you know, all the BOP employees that we did in Seagoville, it became apparent that that facility, like most FCCs, is not accustom to dealing with inmates as sick as Mr. Bardell was.

And I believe if he had been in a federal medical center and the Court had issued a compassionate release order there would have been a lot more attention paid to what Mr. Bardell needed to get home.

In fact, it's probably very likely that some type of medical air transport would have been arranged by BOP.

It's quite common, as I understand it, for BOP at the federal medical centers, when someone is ill as

Mr. Bardell, to arrange for an air ambulance to take them to the place where they're going to be released.

And the folks at FCC Seagoville, they, again, don't see patients like that. None of them were aware of any prisoner release from that facility ever having an air ambulance.

And, in fact, when Ms. Copeland spoke to

Mr. Bardell's case manager on February 5th, which was

the day the release -- the Court's order was issued, you

know, granting the second motion for compassionate release, when she spoke to the case manager there, the case manager, when she was talking about air transport, he thought that Ms. Copeland meant some type of private luxury jet.

And that's what he told us. And, frankly, I believe him. He just didn't -- he just was not thinking at all about the potential need for an air ambulance.

But, again, that was not really the focus of our investigation, the fact that he should have been diagnosed earlier. And Mr. Bardell also probably should have been at a federal medical center where things would have come out quite differently, I believe.

What we focused on is what happened when the Court issued its order on February 5th. And as you know, the order is several pages, but there were two specific conditions that are critical for purposes of this proceeding.

One is, as the Court just mentioned, it ordered that Ms. Copeland, Mr. Bardell's attorney, work with the Probation Office to come up with a release plan. And that was one condition. And I can say with respect to that condition it's amazing to me how hard Ms. Copeland and the Probation Office worked to try to satisfy that first condition. Ultimately, Mr. Bardell was released before Probation had signed off on a release plan, but I will say

Ms. Copeland and the Probation Office worked very hard to do that as quickly as possible as the Court ordered.

And let me just further address that. The Court's order came out midday on February 5th. And

Ms. Copeland got the order. She was not, at first, sure who she should contact at Probation; but before the end of the day, she was able to reach the duty probation officer in Cocoa Beach, which is the office that handled New Smyrna Beach which is where Mr. Bardell owned a house where he hoped to reside upon his release.

And she told, you know, Nick Shea at Probation that, you know, Mr. Bardell was going to be released. She mentioned to him her plan to have an air ambulance handle the transportation. At least that's what Ms. Copeland told us.

Nick Shea does not specifically remember that

Ms. Bardell (sic) mentioned anything about an air

ambulance, but he doesn't deny he was told that. And I, as
a special master, believe what Ms. Copeland said, that she

did mention the air ambulance to Nick Shea.

Nick Shea was -- by the time he got the call, it was about 5:00 on a Friday night. He was about to leave. He sent an email to his supervisor letting him know what had happened.

The supervisor by the name of Lubinski on Saturday

sees the email, knows that urgent action is needed. He doesn't take any specific action over the weekend apart from forwarding the email to one of his senior probation officers in Cocoa Beach for her to deal with first thing Monday morning.

And that is what she did. She didn't see the email until she got into the office on Monday morning. But the probation officer in Cocoa Beach immediately began making phone calls, calling law enforcement authorities to talk about the potential release of Mr. Bardell to his home in New Smyrna Beach.

You know, she was told by law enforcement that Mr. Bardell could not be released there because his home was within 2500 feet of a school, and he was not grandfathered in. And she immediately began brainstorming to try to figure out what could be done.

You know, it was suggested by Ms. Copeland's legal assistant that he be released to a hospital in Jacksonville, and the probation officers in Cocoa Beach thought that was a good idea. That would work for purposes of getting the release order that was required by the Court. And the case was immediately transferred to a probation officer in Jacksonville named Joseph Pinto.

Mr. Pinto -- this is still on February 8th, the day of the release and the first business day after the

Court entered its order.

Mr. Pinto began talking to Ms. Copeland's office. He talked to the local hospitals. It was finally decided that Mr. Bardell was going to be released to the emergency room at Baptist Hospital and from there go to Baptist MD Anderson there in Jacksonville. And the admission through the emergency room was arranged through a doctor who had a relationship with Ms. Copeland. So Ms. Copeland and the probation officer were working very diligently to find a place that he could be released to.

And during the course of that day, you know,

February 8th, again, that first business day when

things were happening, the primary focus of Ms. Copeland

and -- you know, Ms. Copeland and the probation officers

was where can he be released to since he can't be released

to his home, at least for purposes of Probation's

reporting, and they had not quite gotten around to

addressing -- at least the Probation Office had not gotten

around to thinking about what the means of transport would

be.

Ms. Copeland already had that lined up. She made arrangements for Angel air to be on stand by and that they would go to, you know — they would go to the closest airport they could find near FCC Seagoville and be ready whenever Mr. Bardell was released, but that had not been

discussed with the probation officers in Jacksonville because they were still focused on making sure he could be released to the hospital.

While Probation was still doing its work -- and, again, I don't know that this is in the report, but I think it's very likely that if Mr. Bardell had not been released, Probation would have approved a release plan by the next day, by February 9th. They were working hard. They knew it was urgent. They really wanted to get it done.

They were expecting to get something from BOP because, typically, as we've explained in our report, when a prisoner is released by BOP, there is a report -- it's also called a supervised release report that comes from the prison with a number of -- with information about where the prisoner intends to live, what job he intends to have. Those are the kind of things that are usually in the report.

Most of those weren't going to apply to

Mr. Bardell because he was terminally ill and was going to
be released to a hospital.

But, typically, BOP, just in a run-of-the-mill case, when a prisoner is going to be released, they send something to BOP -- I'm sorry, to Probation. Probation hadn't received that yet.

And I believe it's clear that once they were ready

to finalize the report, they would have reached out to BOP, but they didn't have a chance to do so because Ms. Copeland found out on February 8th that Mr. Bardell had already been released and that he was going to be flying by commercial aircraft.

So at that point in time, the report by Probation, it was never -- it was ordered by the Court as a condition for the release -- was never finalized. It was dropped.

Exigent circumstances meant that, you know,

Mr. Bardell was going to be flying to Jacksonville, go to

the Baptist Emergency Room and then on to the hospital.

The probation officer, Joseph Pinto, went to visit Mr. Bardell at the hospital on February 9th, observed the condition he was in, how sick that he was, and decided, you know, among other things that he didn't need to wear an ankle monitor.

And I think Mr. Pinto's view was he didn't want to get too bogged down in a lot of formalities and putting
Mr. Bardell through a lot of -- making him jump through a lot of hoops because he realized at that time that
Mr. Bardell was most likely going to die in the hospital.
But he showed quite a bit of compassion toward Mr. Bardell, and that came through in our interview with the probation officer.

In the meantime, while the probation officer was,

you know, very busy working with Ms. Copeland to try to satisfy that first condition and get the report, the supervised release plan the Court had ordered, you know, the email -- you know, BOP in Seagoville was informed by email about this Court's order.

Initially, Emily Chang from the U.S. Attorney's Office sent the order to BOP officials in Ocala -- we're not in Ocala. To FCC Coleman. And the FCC Coleman folks transmitted the order to FCC Seagoville.

FCC Seagoville transmitted it to what's called the DSCC, the designated sentencing -- or Designation and Sentence Computation Center, which is in, I think, Grandview, Texas.

And it first looks at every order that comes through just to determine whether it's authentic. And as far as I can tell, the DSCC, primarily when it gets an order like that, doesn't do much other than go on Pacer and make sure that what's been transmitted to the prison is an authentic order of the Court in this type of situation.

So DSCC did that quickly, sent it back to FCC Seagoville. All this is on February 8th, the day of the release. And it went to at least 11 different people at FCC Seagoville with this Court's order attached.

And Ms. Nwokolo and I deposed most of the individuals who received that, the Court's order. And most

of them acknowledged they didn't bother reading the order and opening the attachment. A few said they opened it, said they glanced at it, and didn't fully appreciate what was required, didn't heed it.

And there was no real mechanism set in place that required, specifically required, a single individual to be responsible for reading all judicial orders regarding release and making sure all the conditions were satisfied.

And according to the individual employees at Seagoville, they all said that -- or many of them said they just saw the words "immediate release" and "time served" and thought they needed to get him out of the prison that day with no further explanation.

And I submit to the Court, you know, the line in the Court's order that spoke of immediate release was the very same sentence in which the Court said "upon receiving an approved release plan from U.S. Probation." There was really no excuse for BOP to disregard that condition and to release Mr. Bardell prior to receiving, you know, the approved release plan from U.S. Probation.

But they were moving quickly. They, you know, spoke to Mr. Bardell's counsel. They spoke to Ms. Bardell, Fred's mother, and told her that she was going to need to pay for an airline ticket on a commercial airline to fly from Dallas to Jacksonville via Atlanta for a flight that

same day. And they got him on that flight.

When he presented to the folks who were conducting the release, he was in a wheelchair. He was too weak to walk. And the arrangements that were made to take him to the airport was with a trustee who was an inmate in the attached camp who was going to drive him to the airport.

And according to the people we interviewed, the trustees did not have permission to get out of their vehicle. We could not find anything in writing that said that was the case, but we were told orally in depositions and interviews that the trustee who took Mr. Bardell to the Dallas/Fort Worth Airport couldn't leave his vehicle.

So he was taken to the vehicle in a wheelchair, put into the vehicle, driven to the airport, and just dumped at the curb. The trustee said, Here you go. And Mr. Bardell, somehow, made his way through DFW airport, which many of us in this courtroom have been to. It's not an easy airport to navigate when you're in the best of health and you've been flying regularly. And Mr. Bardell, who had been in prison since before 2012 and who was terminally ill with stage IV colon cancer, is dropped at this airport.

Somehow he found his way. He had no luggage to check, but somehow he found his way to the gate, got to Atlanta. We have no idea how he was able to maneuver

through the Atlanta airport and make his connecting flight to Jacksonville.

What we do know is when he got to Jacksonville, somebody, a good Samaritan found a wheelchair for him and wheeled him outside. It wasn't an airline employee, but just a good Samaritan in the airport found a wheelchair, wheels him out.

His parents were there. His parents didn't recognize him because of his emaciated condition and because of how much he'd aged, and he didn't recognize his parents. He was so ill. He did recognize Ms. Copeland, who had been in regular contact with him. Of course, Ms. Copeland was there with the parents.

Ms. Copeland said that she would take Mr. Bardell in her car. Although we don't really know much about the adventure or misadventure that Mr. Bardell endured getting from DFW to the Jacksonville airport, we do know that when he arrived in Jacksonville he was very weak. He could barely walk.

He had -- he had soiled his pants. And because his pants were in such bad shape because he couldn't control his bowels, Mr. Bardell's father took off his shirt and laid it down in the seat of Ms. Copeland's car so that he wouldn't soil the seats, so that Fred wouldn't soil the seats of Ms. Copeland's car. And it was Ms. Copeland who

drove him to the emergency room at Baptist Hospital there in Jacksonville.

Again, the inhumanity and the indifference, as the Court expressed, it is really hard to fathom how anybody could put Mr. Bardell in that situation where he's dropped at the curb and left to fend for himself.

But that, Your Honor, in summary -- a lot of this is spelled out in more detail in the report that was filed with the Court.

But I'd like to say we make several recommendations here.

First, we're recommending that this Court adopt the factual findings in the report. And we're also asking that the Court find both the Bureau of Prisons and Warden Zook in her official capacity in civil contempt.

And as the Court knows, for a finding of civil contempt, all that is required is that there be a valid and lawful order, and the terms of the order, in this case that condition we discussed, be clear and unambiguous and that the party against whom — the party to be found in contempt had the ability to comply with the order. And here there's no question that all three of those elements are met.

I think the Court's order was lawful. There's no dispute about that. There's no dispute from BOP or Warden Zook.

It was clear and unambiguous. It really couldn't have been more clear. And there's no dispute about that.

And also, Bureau of Prisons clearly -- and Warden Zook in her official capacity -- had the ability to comply with the order. What was required of them by the order was to simply wait until they received a release plan that was approved by U.S. Probation.

Now, in order to impose sanctions for civil contempt, there is a good argument to be made that there must be a finding of willfulness. But as the Eleventh Circuit found in Rum -- and there's other authorities cited in the brief -- a finding of willfulness in this context, for the imposition of civil -- for sanctions, compensatory sanctions for civil contempt just requires recklessness.

And I submit to the Court that there's no question that BOP and Warden Zook in her official capacity were reckless in their disregard of the Court's order. And, in fact, there's really no dispute — or there is no dispute from BOP or Warden Zook that they were reckless in disregarding the Court's order. So compensatory sanctions are appropriate, and we ask that the Court impose those sanctions.

The sanctions that we recommended are that, first of all, BOP reimburse Charlotte Bardell for the cost of the airplane ticket from Dallas to Jacksonville, which was

\$494.20. And also that BOP be required to pay the attorneys' fees that were incurred by me and Ms. Nwokolo investigating this matter and writing up the report. And there's no dispute from the other parties here, BOP and Warden Zook, that they should be required to pay that.

I want to -- I want to address why, you know, I did not recommend sanctions in connection with sending Mr. Bardell by commercial airline as opposed to air ambulance. There are really a couple of primary reasons.

One is there was a recorded phone call between Ms. Copeland and Fred Bardell. At the time, Ms. Copeland also had Mr. Bardell's parents on a separate line. I think she was unable to merge the calls, as I'm frequently unable to do, so she had them both on the line at the same time.

And Fred Bardell said that he was going to be flying by a commercial airline, and Ms. Copeland initially expressed some surprise by that but she very quickly agreed that that could be done and that would be a cost savings.

And so it's not -- in fairness to Ms. Copeland, she was talking to Mr. Bardell, but she did not appreciate how weak Mr. Bardell was during that phone call or she probably wouldn't have acquiesced. But the fact that she did, albeit without a full understanding of what happened, acquiesced in the commercial flight, I think, militates to some extent against the imposition of sanctions for failure

to get Mr. Bardell into an air ambulance.

You know, other -- there are some other factors, but the other primary reason that I did not recommend to the Court that it try to fashion some type of compensatory sanctions for putting Mr. Bardell on the commercial flight is those damages would be extremely difficult to quantify and the damages would relate to primarily a period from -- maybe a six-hour period, from the time he was dropped at the curb until he was admitted into the emergency room at Baptist Hospital in Jacksonville.

And I know that that six-hour period had to have been extremely difficult for Mr. Bardell, and I don't have a doubt in my mind that he was much more uncomfortable and potentially in more pain than he would have been had he been in an air ambulance.

But the damages, nevertheless, for that six-hour period would be difficult in my estimation to quantify. And because there's some question about the causation because of that phone call and because of the fact that Ms. Copeland did not on February the 8th mention to Probation the fact that, you know, that she wanted Mr. Bardell to be transferred by air ambulance, the causation is not crystal clear.

So for those reasons, I did not recommend imposing sanctions for that problem, which I think is really very

difficult, again, to wrap your mind around, the indifference shown by BOP. But I submit if the Court is interested in imposing sanctions for that, it could fashion that type of relief.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bentley.

MR. BENTLEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And before I hear from Ms. Posteraro,
I want to take a minute to, again, thank you and to thank
Ms. Nwokolo for your efforts.

I did carefully go through and read the transcripts of the depositions that were taken in this case in order to fully inform myself about the factual background in addition to the very excellent summary that you provided in your report.

And I know that much of that work was done by

Ms. Nwokolo under your supervision and at your direction.

I know that she's had to withdraw from the case as a result of accepting a position with the United States Attorney's

Office in Tampa, for which I congratulate her and congratulate the office because it made an excellent hire in my estimation.

I do think that the record ought to reflect that the Court is very appreciative of her efforts and her work and recognizes her in that respect and appreciates your work as well, Mr. Bentley.

MR. BENTLEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

And I can't tell you -- if you went through the deposition transcripts, you're well aware. I was with Ms. Nwokolo in most of those depositions but she took the lead in most of them, and she did an outstanding job.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Posteraro.

MS. POSTERARO: Before I begin, Your Honor, I will state also that it was a pleasure to work with Soma and Mr. Bentley. Soma did a fantastic job in the depositions that I was in with her, and it really was a pleasure to work with her.

And Mr. Bentley's findings of fact as detailed in his very comprehensive report and as presented here today are troubling, to say the least. I don't think there's a person here today that is without regret and remorse as to the circumstances of Mr. Bardell's release from the Bureau of Prisons' custody.

As indicated in its response to Mr. Bentley's report, the Bureau of Prisons does not materially object to his findings of fact nor does the Bureau of Prisons take issue with his recommendations, including his recommendation of holding BOP and Warden Zook in her official capacity in civil contempt and his recommendations for sanctions.

I understand and appreciate the Court's concerns 1 2 regarding Mr. Bardell's medical care while he was in the 3 custody of the Bureau of Prisons. To address any claims of medical negligence, 4 5 Ms. Copeland on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Bardell have filed an administrative tort claim with the Bureau of Prisons 6 7 which remains pending today. If that claim is not resolved 8 in a way that is satisfactory to Mr. and Mrs. Bardell, they 9 have the opportunity or option of filing a civil lawsuit to 10 address any of those concerns. 11 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Posteraro. 12 MS. POSTERARO: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Boynton. 14 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. GREENE: 15 Glenn Greene representing Warden Zook in her 16 individual capacity. 17 THE COURT: I didn't mean to call you by the wrong 18 My apologies. name. 19 MR. GREENE: No problem. 20 THE COURT: I made myself a note, and I looked at 21 the wrong one. So my apologies, Mr. Greene. 22 MR. GREENE: No problem, Your Honor. 23 Just with respect to the we, in Warden Zook's

individual capacity, we do not take issue with the special

master's comprehensive findings and in particular note that

24

25

to the extent that any finding is likely that it would be against Warden Zook in her official capacity given that all of the actions here involved the performance of her official government job.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Greene.

Well, let me make a couple of observations.

As I've said before, both in my orders and in my opening remarks for the proceeding here this morning, that I am deeply distressed by the actions of the Bureau of Prisons in connection with the -- not only the release circumstances of Mr. Bardell, but also his care and treatment while he was confined, especially during the latter stages of his confinement and incarceration.

And I want to take a minute and talk to you directly, Warden Zook, about some of my -- I don't really know how to properly characterize it. I started to say discomfort, which is a totally inadequate word for my reaction to the treatment of Mr. Bardell.

I will tell you that the Bureau of Prisons should be deeply ashamed of its conduct in connection with Mr. Bardell's last stages of his incarceration and with the circumstances surrounding his release.

 degree, that as long as I have the ability to have some input into the situation, that no individual who's incarcerated by my order or an order of one of my colleagues is going to be allowed to be stripped of his right to claims for simple human dignity as a consequence of having committed a federal offense and being incarcerated.

The purposes of incarceration, as I know you're well aware from your training, do not include depriving an individual of his or her human dignity and the right to be treated as a living human being. That's what happened in this case. Mr. Bardell was stripped of his human dignity during the last stages of his incarceration.

The other thing that troubles me deeply about this is that it's my opinion -- I don't know that I could support it empirically, but it's my opinion -- that had the Bureau of Prisons responded truthfully with respect to Mr. Bardell's condition at the time of his original motion for compassionate release three months prior to the date of my order when he was initially denied release, based on the representations of the Bureau of Prisons, which were directly contrary to the truth, that Mr. Bardell was not suffering from any terminal illness, that Mr. Bardell's medical care was adequate, that he could be managed comfortably in his current state of confinement at

Seagoville, none of those things were true and none of them were accurate when the Bureau of Prisons made those representations to Assistant United States Attorney Emily Chang.

And I want to tell you, Ms. Chang practices before me all the time. And the Bureau of Prisons, as a result of this, has damaged her reputation and her credibility. And that's something that is very difficult to recover.

So I don't know whether or not I should be unhappy with Ms. Chang for not being more diligent in terms of inquiring as to what Mr. Bardell's actual circumstances were. Perhaps. But I know that I should be unhappy with the Bureau of Prisons' representation from Seagoville that Mr. Bardell's motion for compassionate release had no merit, that his medical situation was not severe, that he was not suffering from cancer, that he had some as yet undiagnosed or undetermined malady that was not colorectal cancer.

Because even a cursory examination by any medical practitioner, based on what we know of Mr. Bardell's circumstances at the time of his expiration nine days after my order, his death nine days after my order, would have demonstrated that he was in extremis and that he was suffering from terminal colorectal cancer and that he was in desperate need of medical care.

And I find the Bureau of Prisons' conduct in this case to be reprehensible, and I desperately wish that there was more that I could do in terms of imposition of sanctions.

But I'm going to adopt the findings that were recommended by the special master and incorporate those into a written order. I am going to find both the Bureau of Prisons and Warden Zook in her official capacity to be in civil contempt of the Court.

I'm going to reduce those findings to writing. I am going to require that the Bureau of Prisons pay the airfare amount, which is reflected in the special master's report as well as pay the attorney fees and costs incurred by the special master, not only the amount submitted in the report but also, Mr. Bentley, if you would amend your application or make an application with an up-to-date description of your costs and fees including but not limited to your participation in this hearing here today. And I'm going to require the Bureau of Prisons to make — to pay that amount.

I'm also going to include in my order a recommendation that the attorney general of the United States undertake through the Inspector General or other investigative offices an examination into Mr. Bardell's circumstances during the course of his

incarceration, the failure of the Bureau of Prisons to adequately tend to him and to respond to his medical needs, the misrepresentations, in my view, again, of the situation surrounding Mr. Bardell's medical condition at the time that they responded in a formal response to an order of this Court as to the veracity of his claims of medical emergency that warranted his compassionate release.

I don't know whether or not the attorney general is going to undertake that investigation. I'm going to recommend that it be done. I intend to post my order on the Court's website in the hope that it gets as much exposure as is possible.

And I'm going to direct Ms. Posteraro and Mr. Greene to file a certification with the Court within 10 days after my order is entered that you have also provided a copy of it to the head of the Bureau of Prisons as well as a copy to the attorney general and the deputy attorney general of the United States so that I can -- so that there can be no question that the message has been delivered.

I intend to do it myself, but I'm going to require Mr. Greene to do it on behalf of the warden and Ms. Posteraro to do it on behalf of the Bureau of Prisons.

I want to take a minute, Ms. Copeland, and to commend you for your efforts on behalf of Mr. Bardell.

Oftentimes, I know that the efforts of defense counsel are -- it's a tough -- it's a tough job representing an individual like Mr. Bardell who's charged with such a despicable crime.

I certainly am not intending in any way to make any comment about Mr. Bardell's criminal offense which I sentenced him for, and I sentenced him appropriately. And I made findings at that time about the 3553 factors, the need to protect the community, and the seriousness of the offense that was committed by Mr. Bardell.

But as I said before, the purpose of incarceration for both rehabilitation, deterrence, and punishment does not include depriving a human being of a fundamental right to live a life that has some semblance of dignity. And that's what happened to Mr. Bardell here.

In addition to -- and I would be remiss if I didn't mention what I perceive to be on the part of the Bureau of Prisons a level of arrogance with respect to not only the orders imposed by the Court, but what I would call their perceived insularity to any further repercussions once individuals are delivered to them for their care and custody.

It may be -- it may be difficult to communicate to both the lawyers, all of the lawyers and to the representatives of the Bureau of Prisons and to you,

Warden Zook, how much angst an individual who serves as a United States district judge suffers in connection with the sentencing process, how heavily it weighs on our minds to deprive an individual of their liberty for whatever period of time to commit them over to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

And to have our concern about stripping someone of their rights and their freedom by delivering them to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to then have considerable — and I underscore considerable — doubts and concerns about whether or not the Bureau of Prisons is going to give the slightest thought to treating those individuals with even a small smattering of dignity while they're in their custody troubles me greatly. It adds to my burden more than you can possibly imagine.

So I don't know where you are currently. I know it's in the report, Warden Zook. But I hope you take some measure of this message back with you and spread it amongst your colleagues that this notion that the Bureau of Prisons is beyond reproach, beyond touch, beyond the scope and effect of the orders of a United States District Court is misplaced. I, for one, am going to do everything I can to make sure that the Bureau of Prisons is held to account for its failure to do what the court orders be done.

And I will tell you that I think that your conduct

not only reflects very poorly on yourself, it reflects very poorly on your leadership, it reflects very poorly on the people that were involved in Mr. Bardell's situation.

America because the Bureau of Prisons is an agency that operates under the umbrella of the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice is supposed to stand for something. It's supposed to mean something in this country. It's supposed to stand for human rights and for integrity and for vigilance and adherence to the rule of law.

And encompassed within that is the responsibility to recognize that each and every one of us, there but for the grace of God go we, that each and every one of us is entitled to not only all the unalienable rights that are included in our founding papers, but most certainly to be treated like a human being, to be afforded at least some semblance of dignity.

You stripped Mr. Bardell of that and you should be ashamed, and the people that work for you should be ashamed. And I wish there was more that I could do.

But I want to thank you, Ms. Posteraro, for representing the United States as well and ably as you have done and appreciate your service.

And, again, my thanks to you, Mr. Bentley and

Ms. Nwokolo. And I don't know if there's anything further that I can do. I'm going to enter a written order, which will be issued shortly. And I look forward to receiving your certification that it's been delivered to the attorney general and the deputy attorney general, and we'll see whether or not any subsequent investigation is undertaken. I thank you all. We'll be in recess. MR. BENTLEY: Thank you. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:58 a.m.) ****

<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. August 5, 2022 s\ Amie R. First Amie R. First, RDR, CRR, CRC, CPE Federal Official Court Reporter United States District Court Middle District of Florida