

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**v.**

**Criminal Action No. 2:14-cr-42-3**

**GREGORY STEPHEN SCOTT,  
Defendant.**

**OPINION/ REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
CONCERNING PLEA OF GUILTY IN FELONY CASE**

This matter has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge by the District Court for purposes of conducting proceedings pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11. Defendant, Gregory Stephen Scott, in person and by counsel, Brian Kornbrath, appeared before me on February 10, 2015. The Government appeared by Assistant United States Attorney Stephen Warner. The Court determined that Defendant was prepared to enter a plea of “Guilty” to Count Six of the Superseding Indictment.

The Court proceeded with the Rule 11 proceeding by first placing Defendant under oath.

The Court inquired of Defendant whether he was a citizen of the United States. Defendant responded that he is a citizen. The undersigned asked Defendant whether he understood that if he were not a citizen of the United States, by pleading guilty to a felony charge he would be subject to deportation at the conclusion of any sentence; that he would be denied future entry into the United States; and that he would be denied citizenship if he ever applied for it. Defendant stated that he understood.

The Court determined that Defendant’s plea was pursuant to a written plea agreement, and asked the Government to tender the original to the Court. The Court asked if the agreement was the sole agreement offered to Defendant. Counsel for Defendant stated that a prior agreement had been offered to Defendant in which the parties stipulated that the base offense level was 26, and that the

instant agreement was more favorable to Defendant. Counsel for Defendant proffered that he had discussed both agreements with Defendant. The Court asked counsel for the Government to summarize the written plea agreement. Defendant stated that the agreement as summarized by counsel for the Government was correct and complied with his understanding of the agreement. The Court **ORDERED** the written plea agreement filed and found the requirements of Missouri v. Frye, 132 S. Ct. 1399 (2012), to be satisfied.

The Court next inquired of Defendant concerning his understanding of his right to have an Article III Judge hear the entry of his guilty plea and his understanding of the difference between an Article III Judge and a Magistrate Judge. Defendant thereafter stated in open court that he voluntarily waived his right to have an Article III Judge hear and accept his plea and voluntarily consented to the undersigned Magistrate Judge hearing his plea, and tendered to the Court a written Waiver of Article III Judge and Consent To Enter Guilty Plea Before Magistrate Judge, which waiver and consent was signed by Defendant and countersigned by Defendant's counsel and was concurred in by the signature of the Assistant United States Attorney appearing.

Upon consideration of the sworn testimony of Defendant, as well as the representations of his counsel and the representations of the Government, the Court finds that the oral and written waiver of Article III Judge and consent to enter guilty plea before a Magistrate Judge was freely and voluntarily given and the written waiver and consent was freely and voluntarily executed by Defendant, Gregory Stephen Scott, only after having had his rights fully explained to him and having a full understanding of those rights through consultation with his counsel, as well as through questioning by the Court. The Court **ORDERED** the written Waiver and Consent to Enter Guilty Plea before a Magistrate Judge filed and made part of the record.

The undersigned then reviewed with Defendant Count Six of the Superseding Indictment and the elements the Government would have to prove, charging him with aiding and abetting the distribution of oxycodone, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(C), and 18 U.S.C. § 2. The undersigned then reviewed with Defendant the statutory penalties applicable to an individual adjudicated guilty of the felony charges contained in Count Six of the Superseding Indictment, the impact of the sentencing guidelines on sentencing in general, and inquired of Defendant as to his competency to proceed with the plea hearing. From said review the undersigned Magistrate Judge determined Defendant understood the nature of the charges pending against him and understood the possible statutory maximum sentence which could be imposed upon his conviction or adjudication of guilty on Count Six was imprisonment for a term of not more than twenty (20) years; understood that a fine of not more than \$1,000,000.00 could be imposed; understood that both fine and imprisonment could be imposed; understood he would be subject to a period of at least three (3) years of supervised release; and understood the Court would impose a special mandatory assessment of \$100.00 for the felony conviction payable on or before the date of sentencing. Defendant also understood that if he had a prior felony drug conviction, the possible statutory maximum sentence which could be imposed was imprisonment for a term of not more than thirty (30) years; a fine of \$2,000,000.00; a term of at least six (6) years of supervised release; and a special mandatory assessment of \$100.00. Defendant also understood that his sentence could be increased if he had a prior firearm offense, violent felony conviction, or prior drug conviction. He also understood he might be required by the Court to pay the costs of his incarceration and supervised release.

The undersigned also reviewed with Defendant his waiver of appellate rights as follows:

Ct. Did you discuss with your lawyer that you have a right to appeal your conviction and your sentence to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, which is located in Richmond, Virginia?

Def. Yes, Your Honor.

Ct. Did you also discuss with your lawyer that you may be able to file what is commonly called a writ of habeas corpus motion under one of the statutes that relate to habeas corpus, including, but not limited to, 28 U.S.C. § 2255?

Def. Yes, Your Honor.

Ct. Now, Mr. Scott, yours is a little different. Under yours, you give up your right to directly appeal to the Fourth Circuit and you give up your right to collaterally attack by filing a writ of habeas corpus motion under various habeas statutes, particularly 28 U.S.C. § 2255, if your actual sentence is consistent with a Guideline level, that's after adjustments upward or downward, of 23 or lower, is that correct?

Def. Yes, Your Honor.

Ct. Mr. Scott, did you intend to give up your right to directly appeal and collaterally attack your sentence and how it's being carried out under paragraph 15 of your agreement?

Def. Yes, Your Honor.

Ct. Do you each understand that the only thing you're reserving to yourself is the right to file a collateral attack claiming that there was ineffective assistance of counsel or prosecutorial misconduct that you discovered after today?

Def. Yes, Your Honor.

Ct. Do you know of any prosecutorial misconduct or ineffective assistance of your counsel as you sit here today, Mr. Scott?

Def. No, Your Honor.

From the foregoing colloquy the undersigned determined that Defendant understood his appellate rights and knowingly gave up those rights pursuant to the conditions contained in the written plea agreement.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge further examined Defendant relative to his knowledgeable and voluntary execution of the written plea bargain agreement, and determined the entry into said written plea bargain agreement was both knowledgeable and voluntary on the part of Defendant. The undersigned then inquired of Defendant regarding his understanding of the written plea agreement. Defendant stated he understood the terms of the written plea agreement and also stated that it contained the whole of his agreement with the Government and no promises or representations were made to him by the Government other than those terms contained in the written plea agreement.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge further inquired of Defendant, his counsel, and the Government as to the non-binding recommendations and stipulation contained in the written plea bargain agreement and determined that Defendant understood, with respect to the plea bargain agreement and to Defendant's entry of a plea of guilty to the felony charge contained in Count Six of the Superseding Indictment, the undersigned Magistrate Judge would write the subject Report and Recommendation and would further order a pre-sentence investigation report be prepared by the probation officer attending the District Court. The undersigned advised the Defendant that the District Judge would adjudicate the Defendant guilty of the felony charged under Count Six of the Superseding Indictment. Only after the District Court had an opportunity to review the pre-sentence investigation report, would the District Court make a determination as to whether to accept or reject any recommendation or stipulation contained within the plea agreement or pre-sentence report. The

undersigned reiterated to the Defendant that the District Judge may not agree with the recommendations or stipulation contained in the written agreement. The undersigned Magistrate Judge further advised Defendant, in accord with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11, that in the event the District Court Judge refused to follow the non-binding recommendations or stipulation contained in the written plea agreement and/or sentenced him to a sentence which was different from that which he expected, he would not be permitted to withdraw his guilty plea. Defendant and his counsel each acknowledged their understanding and Defendant maintained his desire to have his plea of guilty accepted.

Defendant also understood that pursuant to paragraph two (2) of his written plea agreement, he would admit to each of the four (4) violations contained in the Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision filed in Criminal Case No. 2:11-cr-24 on November 20, 2014. Defendant further understood that the maximum penalty to which he would be exposed as a result of his admission to these violations was twenty-one (21) months.

Defendant also understood that his actual sentence could not be calculated until after a pre-sentence report was prepared and a sentencing hearing conducted. The undersigned also advised, and Defendant stated that he understood, that the Sentencing Guidelines are no longer mandatory, and that, even if the District Judge did not follow the Sentencing Guidelines or sentenced him to a higher sentence than he expected, he would not have a right to withdraw his guilty plea. Defendant further stated his attorney showed him how the advisory guideline chart worked but did not promise him any specific sentence at the time of sentencing. Defendant stated that he understood his attorney could not predict or promise him what actual sentence he would receive from the sentencing judge at the sentencing hearing. Defendant further understood there was no parole in the federal system,

although he may be able to earn institutional good time, and that good time was not controlled by the Court, but by the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

The parties agreed that the Government would provide a proffer to provide an independent basis in fact for Defendant's plea. The Government proffered that on June 6, 2013, during the controlled buy described in Count Five of the Superseding Indictment, co-defendant Stevie Sharp told the confidential informant ("CI") that she would need to "re up" before she could sell more oxycodone. She and the CI agreed that they would meet later that day in the parking lot of the Wal-Mart in Elkins, West Virginia, within the Northern District of West Virginia. Prior to the buy, two West Virginia State Police sergeants searched the CI and provided the CI with currency. The CI then met Ms. Sharp in the Wal-Mart parking lot. Ms. Sharp was driving Defendant's Jeep, and Defendant was in the vehicle with her. Inside the Jeep, Ms. Sharp sold the CI four (4) 30 mg oxycodone pills for \$160.00.

Defendant stated he heard, understood, and did not disagree with the Government's proffer. The undersigned United States Magistrate Judge concludes the offense charged in Count Six of the Superseding Indictment are supported by an independent basis in fact concerning each of the essential elements of such offense. That independent basis is provided by the Government's proffer.

Thereupon, Defendant, Gregory Stephen Scott, with the consent of his counsel, Brian Kornbrath, proceeded to enter a verbal plea of **GUILTY** to the felony charge in Count Six of the Superseding Indictment.

Upon consideration of all of the above, the undersigned Magistrate Judge finds that Defendant is fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea; Defendant is aware of and understood his right to have an Article III Judge hear and accept his plea and elected to voluntarily

consent to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge hearing his plea; Defendant understood the charges against him, not only as to the Superseding Indictment as a whole, but in particular as to Count Six of the Superseding Indictment; Defendant understood the consequences of his plea of guilty, in particular the maximum statutory penalty to which he would be exposed for Count Six; Defendant made a knowing and voluntary plea of guilty to Count Six of the Superseding Indictment; and Defendant's plea is independently supported by the Government's proffer which provides, beyond a reasonable doubt, proof of each of the essential elements of the charges to which Defendant has pled guilty.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge therefore recommends Defendant's plea of guilty to Count Six of the Superseding Indictment herein be accepted conditioned upon the Court's receipt and review of this Report and Recommendation.

The undersigned further directs that a pre-sentence investigation report be prepared by the adult probation officer assigned to this case.

Defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal Service pending further proceedings in this matter.

Any party may, within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of this Report and Recommendation, file with the Clerk of the Court written objections identifying the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection is made, and the basis for such objection. A copy of such objections should also be submitted to the Honorable John Preston Bailey, Chief United States District Judge. Failure to timely file objections to the Report and Recommendation set forth above will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of this Court based upon such report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir.

1984), cert. denied, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

The Clerk of the Court is directed to send a copy of this Report and Recommendation to counsel of record.

Respectfully submitted this 12<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2015.

*John S. Kaul*  
JOHN S. KAULL  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE