IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	Case No. 26 CR 345
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
JOSUE PACHECO TORRES, KLEIVER MONASTERIO BRICENO, also known as "Goofy," and JULIAN PACHANO,	)	Chicago, Illinois
	)	July 9, 2026
Defendants.	)	9:59 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - IN-COURT HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LAURA K. McNALLY, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
BY: HON. ANDREW S. BOUTROS
MS. SUSHMA RAJU
MS. JULIA SCHWARTZ
219 S. Dearborn Street, 5th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Court Reporter: KELLY M. FITZGERALD, RPR, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
219 S. Dearborn Street, Room 1412
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 818-6626
kmftranscripts@gmail.com

* * * * *

PROCEEDINGS REPORTED BY STENOTYPE
TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED USING COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

(Proceedings heard in open court:)

THE CLERK: Case 26 CR 345, United States of America v. Josue Pachano Torres, et al.

MS. RAJU: Good morning, Your Honor. Sushma Raju, Andrew Boutros, Julia Schwartz on behalf of the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning. I see no one is here from the defense, and that was fine. It was put in the order they were not required to attend today.

All right. We are here on an order to come in and talk about compliance with the status report -- I mean, sorry, with the sealing order.

I'm sorry. The way you're standing, I cannot see Mr. Boutros.

MS. RAJU: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor. Would you prefer --

THE COURT: I want to make sure to be able to see him here today. Thank you.

MS. RAJU: Would you prefer I sit?

MR. BOUTROS: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Yeah. If you want to sit, that's fine.

Mr. Boutros, I would appreciate it if you would come up. Thank you.

All right. So I want to start with some preliminary thoughts first. Nothing I say today in any way addresses the validity of the underlying charges in this case. They don't

affect -- and certainly if they did, I would be sure to have the defendant here.

There was a complaint that was presented to me which I signed on a finding that the presentation showed probable cause to believe the charges, that those crimes did occur and that they did occur at the hands of the defendants. And that probable -- that case will proceed on its merits in the ordinary course, and nothing we talk about here today will -- should be understood to affect that case.

MR. BOUTROS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This -- the premise of today is to discuss compliance with the sealing order.

I'm going to put my cards on the table right at the beginning. I've read what you filed yesterday, sir, at Docket 22. I read it in detail and considered everything that you said. I appreciate you taking the time to do that so I understood your perspective.

Having read that, I conclude that last week the sealing order was not honored by the Department of Justice. But I also find and I conclude, thank God, no concrete harm came as a result of this violation in this instance.

And finally, I'm going to be today making no finding here that you acted with any nefarious purpose or that this was done in direct and open defiance of a court order. I'm going to not be making a finding as to that. You have submitted a

finding saying that you acted -- asserting that you acted in good faith, and I'm not going to make a finding about what was in your heart. You have stated those -- you have made those representations to the Court as an officer of the court, and I acknowledge that you've said those things.

My goal here is to emphasize the critical nature of sealing orders and to admonish the department and remind it of its leadership, including you, Mr. Boutros, that like all court orders, this -- sealing court orders must be scrupulously honored.

So I want to start with some fundamental principles that got me to my conclusion. I promise I'm going to let you talk, but I think it would be helpful if you could hear my thoughts before we get there.

MR. BOUTROS: Absolutely, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So public policy favors disclosure of all court records. That's the default. Things are disclosed. Press is permitted to attend and review our findings. It's critical to our system of justice that things happen in the daylight. That's the default. And for that reason, good cause must be shown before records are sealed. I don't need to tell you about that. So you understand where I'm coming from.

I want you to -- sealing is never done lightly, never. It is never done in a cavalier way. In a criminal case, it

only happens on a showing of the -- by the -- request by the government. Sealing will happen at the request of the government on a showing of good cause.

In this case, in what we see, and I see many of them coming from your office, presentations of good cause. It's important, for instance, that there's safety to the community in an imminent duress, safety of witnesses, safety of cooperators, safety of law enforcement. Law enforcement officers who might be going out into the community to do arrests, that the people they are going to pick up don't know they're coming; presented in here as -- as cited, preventing flight and the destruction of evidence, minimizing the risk of obstruction.

As a judge, I trust and I believe the representations of the members of the department that them sealing orders are necessary. I don't do any independent investigation of that. I trust what you say, as I should. And I take it to heart because when you tell me lives are -- may be at stake, I will believe you, and I do believe you. And that happened here. It was not a cavalier decision.

Those motions are almost always accompanied by a protective -- a draft order which I am not required to enter. There are -- the order when I sign it is my order. I am at that point the drafter. But here and almost always, I will use the proposed order from the department, and the order here was

the department's proposed order.

What happens, as you know, when a case is sealed, when an entire case is sealed, it is incredibly cumbersome. There is no -- the case name isn't available. The department and the defendants have no access, electronic access to the docket. Everything must be filed on paper. Even court staff, very limited access to this information because it is so secret and critical for safety. It's inconvenient, but it's worth it because you at the department have convinced the Court that this order is needed.

At that point, the parties and the counsel must comply with these court orders. This is my next principle. Just generally in this building, parties and their counsel must comply with court orders, and that happens even when the party that moved, filed the motion, decides, you know, on second thought, I wish I never asked for that. Or events come up that change the basis. There are second thoughts.

The court orders have effect until they expire by their terms or are modified, and there's no preclusion for a moving party to come back to the Court, as happened here eventually, and ask for modification.

Your submission talked about the separation of powers, and that's the separation of power I'm focused on today, that an order of this court from the independent judiciary has effect on all litigants, including the Executive Branch when it

is a litigant.

So those are some of the background principles I had in mind when I looked at this issue.

Going on a timeline of what happened here on Monday, I signed a complaint that there was probable cause to believe that a kidnapping resulting in death and a kidnapping conspiracy had occurred. Your office presented many facts in support of that, and I signed that compliant.

At the same time, there was a motion to seal. And the basis stated was -- I'm going to quote here: The public filing of the complaint and other documents in this matter before the arrest warrants can be executed could alert the defendants and result in their flight and the destruction of evidence. And for that reason, the government respectfully requests that the complaint, affidavit, arrest warrants, as well as this motion, be sealed until the time of arrest of all defendants of the case or further order of the Court, whichever occurs earlier. And that was respectfully submitted under your name, sir.

That -- that's really the entirety of the motion. There wasn't a lot of detail to it. But I took you, I took your department at its word that until all defendants were arrested, there was a risk of obstruction and flight. And your complaint had laid out how serious that could be for that to occur.

I signed your proposed order on Monday, so that was

Monday, without modification, found that there was good cause for the motion and ordered that the complaint and the other things would be sealed until the time of arrest of all defendants in this case or further order of the Court. And I further said, as your -- as your document highlighted, that it does not prohibit law enforcement personnel from disclosing the complaint and other documents as necessary -- necessary to facilitate the enforcement of criminal law, including the execution of the warrant or any other -- I'm sorry -- or any federal official to assist the official receiving information in the performance of that official's duties. That was on the 29th.

The next day on the 30th, as your statement lays out, you learned that there would be a press conference the next day in Washington. There was also a media alert at that time from the Department of Justice referring to developments and noting that you would be appearing that day.

So there was an announcement. This -- this announcement to the press went out around 1:30 on Tuesday. There wasn't any effort at that time to unseal anything. I didn't get -- nothing. The first effort to unseal that I learned of happened on Thursday morning -- I have the days wrong -- on July 1st.

MR. BOUTROS: Wednesday.

THE COURT: Wednesday, thank you, Wednesday morning.

Wednesday morning at 10:05, I got a call in chambers, my law clerk got a call requesting unseal -- a ruling to unseal very explicitly in the next 15 minutes. It's important in the next 15 minutes.

And soon after that, we received hand-delivered in chambers a proposed redacted complaint. I didn't receive any motion explaining the need to unseal these documents. I didn't ever get anything explaining why the justifications that had been previously offered were no longer applicable. I learned later as of that date there was still at least one person at large. There was not at least -- there was one person fully at large, and I didn't get any explanation as to why those concerns were no longer available.

The redactions that were proposed, which are on the docket, were very minimal. They were essentially the name and photo of the person who was still at large.

The allegations in the complaint, which are now public, show three individuals working together, alleged the three individuals working together, in photos together, create committing a crime together, that's the allegation.

So the idea that just eliminating the face and name of one of them would serve the interests identified by the government, that these -- these people can't know that they are named because they might flee or destroy evidence, in my view ultimately when I took it up later, was not satisfied by those

redactions because that person doesn't need to have his name or face seen to realize what's coming when he's in photos with two other people who are being publicly identified as being arrested for this thing they allegedly did together, like within touching distance of each other.

But at that time, I was given 15 minutes to consider the motion, or the anticipated motion. At that time I had other pressing matters, as your office was well aware. That was a full day of criminal work for me. At that point, from 10:00 a.m. until the end of the day, that is all I did was hearings involving the Department of Justice. I had two separate detention hearings, three initial appearances, and six -- and six arraignments, all of your office. I had a lot to do, pressing deadlines that were all individuals in lockup, prosecutors, defense lawyers, had much to do. So I wasn't able to take this issue up in the 15 minutes, especially not having a motion in front of me at the time.

So I went on the bench. I informed the assistant I wouldn't be able to get to it right then but I would take it up when I had a break which came later, around lunchtime.

At 10:30 central time, so that was shortly after the 15 minutes, a press conference proceeded in Washington, D.C., and you were there standing next to, among others, Acting Attorney General Mr. Blanche.

And at that press conference, which is available at

the department's website, Mr. Blanche -- Acting Attorney General Blanche, started by including so I'm going to read some words that caused me concern, started off by saying: This morning in Chicago, federal and local law enforcement charged three TdA members -- TdA being the name of the gang allegedly -- on a criminal complaint charging the brutal murder of another victim in the Chicago area. That's more than we allow on our docket here, that statement. He gave an overview.

And at approximately 12 minutes in, you spoke and you said: A criminal complaint was filed yesterday in the Northern District of Illinois charging three individuals. And you named the two who are -- who are in custody, and then you said: And a third individual, that was the individual still at large, with kidnapping and conspiracy and commit -- and committing a kidnapping that resulted in death; and let me just also describe the ruthless kidnapping and murder that occurred, that is the basis of this criminal complaint.

So you identified there was a complaint. You named two of the individuals. And then you gave details and asserted to the public, these are the public -- these are the details that form the basis of the complaint. I think in your statement, you said that you said some details that weren't in the complaint, but you asserted to the public essentially here's what's in the complaint.

And then at approximately 19 minutes in, Acting

Attorney General Blanche said: Just before we take questions, if you can note, we're putting some photos up from the complaint from the Chicago arrests. And you can see in one of the photos that's on the screen right now, and then he described what you could see in the photos. Thus, those photos were -- were lifted from this under-seal complaint and put up on a screen.

Ultimately I got my first written motion hours after that press conference, at 1:25, that was delivered to the proposed order inbox. And it asserted, we'd like to do these redactions that have been presented earlier, and it asserted that a third individual who has since been arrested named Mr. Pachano had not yet been located. And it continued to assert that he might flee or destroy evidence. There was no discussion of why those asserted risks would be -- didn't -- were -- would be mitigated by the very minimal redactions proposed, which ultimately is why I denied the motion. I denied the motion saying the modest redactions proposed in the motion are, in the Court's view, insufficient to achieve the protection sought by the government in their initial motion to entirely seal the complaint. So it was denied.

The next day, July -- so there was still nothing from me granting the motion.

The next day, there was a press release from the department, and the complaint then later was posted.

At 3:00 the next day, so now we're onto Thursday, the first arrested individual, Mr. Torres, came before me for an initial appearance. At that time we talked about the sealing issue. The assistant who was there, as well as the first assistant who was there, acknowledged there had not been any order unsealing; also acknowledged that by the terms of the order, this -- the case -- that a seal had not dissolved of its own merits because the order said it would -- it would dissolve upon the arrest -- upon the arrest of all individuals, and Individual 2 had been taken into custody on an unrelated immigration matter, had not been arrested.

I understand -- today I understand that you disagree as to whether the thing dissolved of its own language. I find that the language would say it did not dissolve of its own language, but I do acknowledge your position, which is not the position shared by your first assistant in court the other day.

All right. So finally it was all unsealed on July 2nd at 3:00. That's the timeline. That's pretty compressed.

In my view, and I am holding today it was a clear violation of the sealing order. The order was unambiguous. There was a recognition from your office that it applied as demonstrated by your request to unseal. I understand your position in your filing is that you thought it was already dissolved, but just, I don't know, out of a courtesy or to be safe, you filed a motion. I find that the motion was

ambiguous, it did apply, and it was not granted as of the time the press -- as of the press conference.

But at the same time, I am not making any findings that you acted in open defiance of a court order. I've read what you submitted, and I have some thoughts about it which I will discuss. But I -- as to was there a violation, I conclude that there was a violation.

So in your filing here, you said first that this release was permitted because there is a carveout in the order -- and I'm going to read it again -- that the order does not prohibit law enforcement personnel from disclosing the complaint as necessary to facilitate the enforcement of criminal law. And it is your argument that the things you were doing in that press conference were essentially necessary to facilitate the enforcement of criminal law.

I did not hear in that press conference any request, like, for the public, please assist, you know, we're looking for these guys, let us know if we can find them. I didn't see anything along that nature. It was described as a *fait accompli*, here are the charges we've made.

Your brief in summary says that it is still necessary to facilitate enforcement of criminal law because it's spreading the word and encouraging deterrence and recommending that people can come forward. I'm not doing justice to your argument, but that was your point, that it was necessary to

facilitate the enforcement of criminal law.

My position is I disagree with you. I disagree with you, and I hold that it -- that term is not intended to include any statement and -- I will say this. By the way your argument is made, any member of the Department of Justice or any law enforcement agency working with the Department of Justice, its law enforcement partners, would have their independent ability, as long as they're in the scope of their job, to just go out and announce things that are made -- that are asserted in the complaint.

That is not how I interpreted that language. And if that's what I understood you to be asking for, I would not have granted that motion. I understood "necessary" in the comment, understanding the term, as in required. And I would not have signed an order that permitted the full discretion of the entire law enforcement community to decide that at this point we think what we're doing here should not be sealed. I would not have granted that motion, and I did not intend it to have that meaning. You have asserted as an officer of the court that's what you thought it means. I want you to understand, I disagree with you.

Separately in your motion here -- or in your statement here, you said that before the press -- I'm going to read now: Before the press announcement, the United States Attorney requested that the Assistant United States Attorneys assigned

to this matter take steps to unseal the complaint, affidavit and arrest warrants, either as to all defendants or in redacted form. And then you say: Based on his interaction with his colleagues, the United States Attorney understood that the prosecution team was in communication with chambers, including one assistant U.S. attorney physically having gone to chambers regarding unsealing and believed that the matter would be promptly unsealed.

Mr. Boutros, to the extent that this portion of your brief is intended to place any responsibility at all on the feet of -- at the feet of your line assistants, I reject that position. I do not hold them to have violated the sealing order. I have no evidence at all that a line assistant violated the sealing order or they -- that they spoke as precluded by the sealing order. What I do know is that your statement acknowledges that you were aware when you went up there that there was a sealing order in place.

You go on to say that you believed in good faith that this -- that the case was being unsealed or had been unsealed in light of the government's communication with their presence in chambers which the government had described as time sensitive as well as past experience with the sealing -- unsealing of the complaints at the government's request. And then you say you did not know that the sealing order had not been lifted.

Sir, 15 minutes door to door is not a reasonable time to assume that a court will be able to receive a request without a motion, consider that request and issue a ruling. It is frankly not reasonable to assume that would happen. It might happen at times, but it is not reasonable to assume that it would happen, especially in the context of these kinds of filings which are done for the protection, oftentimes life protections of witnesses of law enforcement, of cooperators.

So I'm not doubting that you might have assumed that would have happened, but I am finding it was not reasonable for you to assume that would have happened.

And when there is an order, the assumption should be that the order will remain in place. That should be the assumption.

So in your -- we're not going to go through all the paragraphs of your motion -- of your statement. I want to just move past to a statement later where you say that the Court must consider the drafter's intent.

When I sign an order, I am the drafter. Even if I use the words you've suggested to me, I am the drafter. And my intent was that this matter would be sealed and remain sealed until everyone was arrested on this complaint, not necessarily picked up by somebody else on a different kind of a matter, arrested on this complaint, or the order was rescinded.

You talk about separation of powers. And I absolutely

agree with you it is entirely within your prerogative to seek a sealing order. I don't have any dispute with that at all. I disagree with you as to what that order -- the impact of that order. But I certainly disagree as to whether it is your prerogative to dissolve a court order without court permission.

You could have sought relief. You could have explained. You could have done that in a timely way. That didn't happen.

For instance, you could have said, and I don't know that this would apply, Mr. -- defendant No. 3 is still at large, but we no longer have concerns about flight or destruction because we have eyes -- we have our eyes on him. That would have been a good thing to know, but it wasn't presented to me. I didn't have any reason to doubt what had been presented just a day and a half earlier.

The orders of this court in this independent branch of government are effective until they terminate on their terms or are rescinded, and neither of those things happened here which is why I'm concluding there was a violation of the order.

But as I said, I'm not making a finding of deliberate defiance. Perhaps there was a misunderstanding in the meaning of the order. My goal here today is to clarify how I interpreted that -- that language and to minimize the risk if there's any confusion as to this going forward.

And my goal is to remind and instruct that orders of

the Court are to be treated as in effect until they are rescinded or expired and that sealing orders must be scrupulously honored.

I'm happy to hear your thoughts, but I want you to know that from my perspective that is the end of this. There will not be any further investigation, sanctions, consequence. This -- this hearing was to have -- for me to have that discussion and to -- to look you in the eye and deliver that straight to you as -- so that you hear it straight from me.

I said I would give you an opportunity to speak so feel free to say whatever you want. I've concluded my thoughts for right now.

MR. BOUTROS: First, thank you, Your Honor, for your very detailed sharing of your thoughts and your concerns. And I take them very seriously and appreciate you taking the time to actually walk me through them.

This is all very regrettable and very unfortunate because, like you, I take very seriously orders and orders of the Court; always have, always will. And I hope and, in fact, I'm comforted that you saw in my filing, which was very detailed, 14 pages and that I filed it under my name, that the intentions were to comply with the order and to start as early as possible to try to comply.

While recognizing all the exigent circumstances that, quite candidly, Your Honor, I sort of -- I didn't ask for. I

didn't ask for this press conference. I wasn't looking to go to D.C. I had a huge press conference the following day. And -- but I was headed to D.C. with virtually no notice.

And of course the stars did not align where Murphy's Law, usually we take everyone into custody at the same time and it's uneventful. We had two people in custody, one immigration custody, and then one person in custody the following morning at 6:30 a.m. the day of the press conference, but a third defendant who was not in custody, which was unfortunate and obviously not something that I knew or thought would be the case when I was in transit to Washington. The sincere hope was that by the time I landed in Washington, all three defendants were in custody, and it just didn't work out that way.

I will also tell Your Honor that the reason -- without going into interagency discussions with the FBI -- we didn't move to seal the order -- unseal the order the day prior, on Tuesday, because it was law enforcement's assessment that waiting until the morning would be the safest course to proceed with the execution of the arrest warrants. And so the operational plan that they had put in place was going to be for morning arrests as opposed to evening arrests, and that was driven largely by officer safety. And I don't want to go into the -- all the details, but that was the -- the principal reason that we waited.

And so this is now the scenario where I'm taking a

6:00 a.m. flight. I'm hopeful that by the time I land in Washington all three defendants are in custody. I learned two are in custody and one is still at large.

From that moment on, we're trying to figure out what to do, how to comply with the Court's order, how to address the conference that's about to happen, which I understand Your Honor's position, but which we believed was for purposes of facilitating the enforcement of law and the general deterrence and other things that were happening there and the Vulcan Task Force was there.

But -- and so we began. I began immediately once I learned of the information. And, again, I had to wait, Your Honor, until I landed because I was up in the air. And so when I landed is when I started going to my team and saying, we got to get this unsealed, we got to get this unsealed, let's get this unsealed.

And I agree with Your Honor, none of this -- you know, nothing in my filing should at all be interpreted as trying to suggest any blame on my assistants or anything else so I couldn't agree with you more. And to the extent that there was any suggestion of that or thought of that, that was not the -- not my intention at all in -- for purposes of the filing.

And I'll tell you, Your Honor, I was here as an assistant for, you know, almost eight years, between 2008 and the end of 2015. And things were different. It was not

unusual during that era to pick up the phone and call the courtroom deputy and say, you know, hey, can we get this unsealed, and a minute order pops up. And I'm not saying that happened every time, but it wasn't unusual.

And so when I had learned from my team, and without getting into any deliberative process communications, but I'm literally walking through airports. I'm walking into the building. I'm carrying my bag. I'm texting at the same time -- not texting but e-mailing. And they say, Andrew, we're up -- we're heading up to court to take care of this. And at some point, that was the last communication I saw, because at that point, I was in the green room, and I no longer had access to my phones.

So the last communication that I saw from my team was words to the effect of, we're -- we're going to chambers. We're heading up to chambers to take care of this. That's the last that I saw.

So when I literally entered into the stage, I was like, A, thank God I'm going to talk last so that if there is a delay for one reason or another, the additional 15 or 20 minutes hopefully will buy me some additional time so that the order can be entered.

But also that even without that, which would have been my preference, which is why I kept saying, go and get the order, because we want to follow and abide by the Court's

order, I also knew about the carveout, and I said, if for whatever reason they trip and fall on their way to court or the judge isn't there, we have the safe harbor, or we have the catchall provision that will serve as the catchall. But it wasn't my primary desire to rely on the catchall all along. It was literally this will be the safety net if things don't go according to plan.

I didn't learn -- but even then, even then, as Your Honor noted, I still didn't want to mention the third defendant in addition because I didn't want officer safety to be -- to be jeopardized so we didn't name him, which again goes to my intent of both officer safety and trying to comply with the order.

And it wasn't until at some point after the press conference -- and quite candidly, Your Honor, I get a lot of e-mails. So when I finally began to work through them now heading back to the airport and walking and looking through them, that I realized for the first time that the sealing order had not been lifted. That's the first time I learned of it.

And then my response was get it lifted, work on getting it lifted because, again, I wanted to get it lifted to be in compliance with the order and also didn't want to then push out the complaint with all the details without it first being lifted and did so, again, out of respect for the Court's orders.

And so at some point again I was in air and hoping that when I landed it would be unsealed, I would get some message to that effect, and only learned later that evening that Your Honor had denied the motion and the redactions.

My instructions were do not release the order -- do not release the complaint until we get either an order unsealing or all three defendants are now in custody.

And at some point the following morning, on July 2, I learned that the third defendant who was at large had been taken into custody, and then we proceeded to unseal because we viewed it as all three defendants were now in custody.

So my reason for going through all of that, even though I put it in the motion, or in the statement, is just to emphasize to the Court that my intentions were never to not be in compliance with the Court's order, but to the contrary, to always follow the Court's order and to do so at every stage. The carveout is what gave me the comfort that if, again, there's a slip and fall and something goes off that -- off the rails that we have the fallback position, or the fallback language, I should say. But it wasn't the primary way that I wanted to proceed.

To the extent there's any concern, Your Honor, there should never be any concern from you that we need to be reminded of the importance of court orders. Therefore, we -- we view the Court and the judiciary as a coequal branch of

government. We respect the Court. We respect the Court's orders. We seek the Court's orders on all sorts of things. We rely on the Court's orders. We enforce the Court's orders. We have a case where someone was fraudulently writing orders in the name of the court. We prosecuted that, and I take that as serious crime.

So there should be no question, Your Honor, if I may, for you to think, you know, does the U.S. Attorney's Office, does the Chicago U.S. Attorney's Office, take our orders seriously, the answer is absolutely yes. And we hold them in great respect. And we hold the bench in great respect.

I thank you for how you've handled it. I understand your position. I had the pleasure of attending your investiture not too long ago. And everyone sang your praises and spoke about your decency and your goodness and your genuineness, and I remember it.

I also had the pleasure of speaking with you some. You may recall we were going to do a swearing in of soon-to-be American citizens. I couldn't attend that date, but I had the pleasure to speak to you -- with you beforehand and to introduce myself for the first time in person.

And I want to thank you for how you've conducted the hearing today. I respect your findings. I respect your concerns. And we're going to go back and look at this from a root cause perspective to see how we can do better and how we

can try to avoid this. But it never fails sometimes. You're trying to thread the needle and trying to be -- trying to do all this stuff, and sometimes it's beyond your control.

But unless there's anything further, I would say that, you know, there's a wonderful decision, and it speaks about the cordial and mutual respect of -- and relations between bench and prosecutor that are vital to the administration of justice.

And so I thank you for the respectful hearing that was -- was here today, and I do believe it is in furtherance of the administration of justice. When I came in, I saw a lot of young people in this courtroom. I'm going to guess that this is maybe a high school or class or something that's here. And I think it's a lesson for them, to the extent my guess is right, about how the Constitution works. When different branches of government have potentially disagreements, it's the role of the Court to interpret and decide, but that there's a respectful way to do it that's in the interest of justice and the administration of justice. And I would submit, Your Honor, that I think that's what happened here today.

So thank you for that.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Unless there's anything else, I think we will be finished here today.

Thank you.

MR. BOUTROS: Thanks.

THE CLERK: This hearing is adjourned.

(Concluded at 10:39 a.m.)

* * * * *

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

/s/Kelly M. Fitzgerald *July 9, 2026*
Kelly M. Fitzgerald, RPR, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter