SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

-against-

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Indictment No. 71543/2023

DONALD J. TRUMP,

Defendant.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that President Donald J. Trump hereby appeals to the First Department of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York from the judgment of conviction on 34 counts of falsifying business records in the 1st degree under PL § 175.10 and sentence of unconditional discharge, rendered in the Supreme Court, New York County (Merchan, J.) under Indictment No. 71543/2023 on January 10, 2025 (attached hereto as Exhibit A), and further appeals from each and every part thereof and every intermediate order made therein.

Dated: New York, New York January 29, 2025

FILED

JAN 2 9 2025

SUPREME COURT NY COUNTY APPEALS BUREAU

FIST MICT ATTORNEY

FO : OI A PS MAL CYBY

THIS SHELLOW

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Giuffra, Jr. Matthew A. Schwartz James M. McDonald

SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP

125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004 giuffrar@sullcrom.com Telephone: (212) 558-4000

-and-

Jeffrey B. Wall (pro hac vice pending) Morgan L. Ratner SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP 1700 New York Avenue NW Washington, DC 20006 Telephone: (202) 956-7500

Attorneys for President Donald J. Trump

TO: Clerk of the Court New York Supreme Court, Criminal Term, New York County 100 Centre Street, Room 1000 New York, New York 10013

Alvin L. Bragg, Jr.

District Attorney, New York County

New York County District Attorney's Office
One Hogan Place

New York, New York 10013

EXHIBIT A

	Sentencing	1
1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK	
2	COUNTY OF NEW YORK - CRIMINAL TERM - PART	
3	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,	- X Indict. No. 71543-2023
4	-against-	CHARGE
5	DONALD J. TRUMP,	
6	Bolland C. Thorn,	FALSIFYING BUSINESS RECORDS 1ST DEGREE
7	DEFENDANT.	SENTENCING
8		- X
9	100 Centre S New York, New	v York 10013
10	January 10, 3	
11	HONORABLE JUAN M. MERCHAN JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	
12	APPEARANCES:	
13	FOR THE PEOPLE: ALVIN BRAGG, JR., ESQ.	
14	DISTRICT ATTORNEY, NEW YORK COUNTY One Hogan Place	
15	New York, New York 10013 BY: JOSHUA STEINGLASS, ESQ.	
16	MATTHEW COLANGELO, ESQ. SUSAN HOFFINGER, ESQ.	
17	CHRISTOPHER CONROY, ESQ. BECKY MANGOLD, ESQ.	
18	KATHERINE ELLIS, ESQ.	
	Assistant District Attorneys	
19	BLANCHE LAW BY: TODD BLANCHE, ESQ. (Appeared virtual	lly with Defendant,
20	Donald J. Trump) EMIL BOVE, ESQ. (In person)	
21	Attorneys for the Defendant	
22		
23		CE-BATES, RPR, CSR, RSA Court Reporter
24		

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

1	SERGEANT: All rise.
2	Part 59 is now in session. The Honorable Juan
3	Merchan presiding.
4	THE COURT: Good morning.
5	Please be seated.
6	THE CLERK: Calling Part 59 calendar, calendar
7	number one, Donald Trump, indictment 71543 of '23.
8	THE COURT: Your appearances, please.
9	MR. STEINGLASS: Good morning.
10	For the People, ADAs Joshua Steinglass,
11	Christopher Conroy, Susan Hoffinger, Beckey Mangold,
12	Matthew Colangelo, and Katherine Ellis.
13	THE COURT: Good morning, People.
14	MR. BOVE: Emil Bove for President Trump who is
15	appearing via Teams. He is co-located with my partner,
16	Todd Blanche.
17	THE COURT: All right.
18	Good morning, Mr. Bove.
19	Good morning, Mr. Blanche.
20	Good morning, Mr. Trump.
21	MR. BLANCHE: Good morning.
22	THE COURT: Although Mr. Bove has already alluded
23	to it, just for the record, I want to make clear that Mr.
24	Blanche is appearing virtually with Mr. Trump.
25	And you are currently in Florida, is that
	Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

1	correct?
2	MR. BLANCHE: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Trump's other
4	attorney, Mr. Bove, is with us here in this courtroom.
5	Pursuant to this Court's Decision and Order dated
6	January 3rd, 2025, Mr. Trump was given the option of
7	appearing virtually, and subsequently counsel for Mr. Trump
8	informed this Court that Mr. Trump had elected to waive
9	personal appearance, and appear virtually.
10	The decision of sentence in this matter is
11	permitted in New York, and I direct your attention to the
12	Matter of People v. Reyes, 72 Misc. 3d 1133, 2021.
13	Before turning to the matter of sentencing, I
14	want to confirm that the People, and defense counsel have
15	both received copies of the probation report.
16	You have not?
17	(Probation report is handed out.)
18	THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the
19	People are being handed a copy now. Mr. Bove is being
20	handed a copy.
21	Why don't you take some time to look at it?
22	Okay.
23	MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: While the parties look at the
25	probation report, Mr. Blanche, I would like to confirm that
	Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

1	you received an E-copy of the report?
2	MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor. We received a
3	copy this morning, and I have it in front of me.
4	THE COURT: Is there anything about that report
5	that you would like to put on the record?
6	MR. BLANCHE: Nothing other than the fact that it
7	was that some of the facts, and procedural history,
8	especially involving other cases, are not up-to-date
9	because of what has happened since the date of the report,
10	and otherwise, given what we expect is happening today.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
12	People, is there anything about the probation
13	report that you would like to put on the record?
14	MR. STEINGLASS: No, Judge. I just need a couple
15	more minutes.
16	THE COURT: You need more time?
17	MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, if you don't mind.
18	THE COURT: Sure.
19	MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you, Judge.
20	I don't think there is anything that we need to
21	put on the record about it.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
23	Let's impose sentence, please.
24	THE CLERK: Donald Trump, you are before the
25	Court for sentence following your conviction by trial to 34
	Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

counts of falsifying business records in the first degree.

Before being sentenced the Court will allow you, your attorney, and the Assistant District Attorney an opportunity to address the Court with any matters relevant to sentence.

For the People.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.

Judge, where is the preferred place for me to stand?

THE COURT: Wherever you feel comfortable.

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay. The Defendant in this case, as you know, stands convicted of 34 counts of falsifying business records in the first degree, all Class E Felonies. Each carries a range of authorized sentencing options from — for as much as one—and—a—third to four years in state prison, to a variety of non—incarceratory sentences.

In this Court's January 3rd Decision on the defendant's Clayton Motion, Your Honor indicated an inclination to impose an unconditional discharge. Under all the circumstances of this case, its unique posture, and the Defendant's status as President Elect, the People recommend a sentence of an unconditional discharge.

In finding the Defendant guilty in this case, the jury necessarily found unanimously that the Defendant

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

falsified 34 separate entries in his business records with the intent to defraud, which included an intent to commit, or conceal a conspiracy to promote his own election by unlawful means.

Having presided over the trial, Your Honor is very familiar with the conduct, its seriousness, and the overwhelming evidence to support the jury's verdict. I am certainly not going to rehash that now.

In last week's decision on January 3rd, this

Court referred to the gravamen of the defendant's conduct,

his criminal conduct in this case, as constituting quote,

premeditated and continuous deception.

The verdict was delivered by a jury that was carefully chosen using an extensive questionnaire based on suggestions from both parties, and after thorough questioning of the prospective jurors by both sides. The verdict in this case was unanimous, and decisive, and it must be respected.

As this Court has observed, quote, the sanctity of a jury verdict, and the deference that must be accorded to it, is a bedrock principle in our nation's jurisprudence.

The defendant's conduct before, during, and after this trial, also merits consideration.

Instead of preserving, protecting, and defending
Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA
Principal Court Reporter

our constitutionally established system of criminal justice, the Defendant, the once, and future President of the United States, has engaged in a coordinated campaign to undermine its legitimacy.

Far from expressing any kind of remorse for his criminal conduct, the Defendant has purposefully bred disdain for our judicial institutions, and the rule of law. And he has done this to serve his own ends, and to encourage others to reject the jury verdict that he finds so distasteful.

He has characterized these proceedings as corrupt, rigged, witch hunt, or a sham too many times to tabulate. The defendant's rhetoric is ratcheted up since this Court's rulings on his Motions to Dismiss. He has been unrelenting in his unsubstantiated attacks upon this Court and its family, individual prosecutors and their families, the witnesses, the Grand Jury, the trial jury, and the Justice system as a whole.

The Defendant has not only been held in contempt by other Jurists in other matters, but this Court alone found the Defendant in contempt for 10 distinct violations of the Order restricting extrajudicial speech.

In his legal filings, the Defendant has used dangerous rhetoric in leveling accusations of intentionally unlawful, and unconstitutional conduct on the part of this

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

Court, and the prosecution.

As this Court has noted, the Defendant's conduct quote, constitutes a direct attack on the Rule of Law itself.

Moreover, the Defendant has publicly threatened to retaliate against the prosecutors who have sought to hold him accountable in this and other matters, and the Courts who have endeavored to fairly, and faithfully adjudicate these matters.

Such threats are designed to have a chilling effect to intimidate those who have the responsibility to enforce our laws in the hopes that they will ignore the defendant's transgressions because they fear that he is simply too powerful to be subjected to the same rule of law as the rest of us.

In this 2024 end-of-year report, the United States Supreme Court Chief Justice Roberts, warned of the dangers of such conduct.

Quote, public officials too regrettably have engaged in recent attempts to intimidate judges. For example, suggesting political bias in the Judge's adverse rulings without credible bias for such allegations, end quote.

Chief Justice Roberts continued quote, attempts to intimidate Judges for their ruling are inappropriate,

and should be vigorously opposed. Public officials
certainly have a right to criticize the work of the
judiciary, but they should be mindful that intemperance in
their statements when it comes to Judges may prompt
dangerous reactions by others.

Chief Justice Roberts also spoke of the dangers of disinformation, which are quote, magnified by social media which provides a ready channel to instantly spread rumor, and false information.

Put simply, this Defendant has caused enduring damage to public perception of the Criminal Justice System, and has placed officers of the court in harms away.

In the probation report, which we just received this morning, the author having interviewed the Defendant noted that the Defendant sees himself as above the law, and won't accept responsibility for his actions. And that is certainly consistent with everything else that we have seen.

Now, in a typical case, both the offense conduct, and these other exacerbating factors, would impact the appropriate sentence. But in this case we must be respectful of the Office of the Presidency, and mindful of the fact that the Defendant will be inaugurated as President in 10 days.

Any undischarged portion of a sentence has the Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA
Principal Court Reporter

potential to interfere with the Defendant's performance of the duties of his office.

As a practical matter, the most sensible sentence prior to his inauguration is an unconditional discharge.

The Court has expressed an inclination to do exactly that because in the Court's words, quote, the most viable solution to ensure finality, and allow the Defendant to pursue his Appellate options is to proceed to sentence.

Now, as you know, in New York a conditional discharge is authorized by Penal Law.

Quote, if the Court, having regard to the nature, and circumstances of the offense, and to the history, character, and condition of the Defendant, is of the opinion that neither the public interest, nor the ends of Justice would be served by a sentence of imprisonment, and that probation supervision is not appropriate.

An unconditional discharge is authorized if the conditional discharge is authorized, and quote, if the Court is of the opinion that no proper purpose would be served by imposing any condition upon the Defendant's Because these crimes are felonies, the Court must release. set forth in the record the reasons for its action.

The American public has the right to a presidency unencumbered by pending court proceedings, or ongoing sentence related obligations, but imposing this sentence

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

ensur

TO

ensures that finality.

Sentencing the Defendant permits this Court to enter judgment, to cement the defendant's status as a convicted felon while he pursues whatever Appeals he intends to pursue, and it gives full effect, and respect to the jury's verdict, while preserving the Defendant's ability to govern.

The People, therefore, recommend that this Court impose a sentence of an unconditional discharge.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Counsel.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I very, very much disagree with much of what the government just said about this case, about the legitimacy of what happened in this courtroom during the trial, and about President Trump's conduct fighting this case from before it was indicted, to while it was indicted, to the jury's verdict, and even to this day.

What the government just said presupposes something that we disagree with very much, which was that this was an appropriate case to be brought.

It was not.

This case, without a doubt, knowing everything we know about the timing of the investigation, the fact that

multiple prosecutors looked at the facts of this case, including prosecutors within the District Attorney's Office in New York County, and made a decision not to bring charges.

As the Court knows, shortly after President Trump announced his intention to run for re-election this case was started for what amounted to a third time, which brings us, ultimately, to where we are today.

A lot of what the government just said presupposes that this case is legally appropriate, and that the charges that were brought by the People were consistent with the laws of New York.

Again, we very much disagree with that, and as everybody has been noted because it's true, we certainly intend on appealing that. And it is not, by the way, just counsel and President Trump that feels that way. There is many, many, many legal experts that share the same views that I just said, which is that legally this case should not have been brought based on the facts that were established at trial, and also on the legal basis for which they were brought.

But it is also not just the legal experts, not just counsel, and not just President Trump, but the majority of the American people also agree that this case should not have been brought. I mean, the interesting

thing about the fact that there was a trial for the first time in our history, a criminal trial during an election season, is that the American voters got a chance to see, and decide for themselves whether this is the kind of case that should have been brought, and they decided. And that's why in 10 days President Trump is going to assume the Office of the Presidency of the United States.

And, certainly, we are here for the Court to sentence President Trump to an unconditional discharge, and for that it is a very sad day. It's a sad day for President Trump, and his family, and friends; but it's also, in counsel's view, a sad day for this country because this was a case, without a doubt, that was brought by a District Attorney who promised that he would go after President Trump if elected, and felt like he had to go through with that promise, and so, that's sad.

And I hope, and I know that President Trump shares this view, that this will never happen again in this country.

And so, we certainly understand where we are today. We very much intend on pursuing an Appeal of this verdict, and -- and what happened during this investigation. And we certainly believe that the only appropriate sentence, if one is to be imposed at all, which we very much believe it shouldn't be, and that the case

should be dismissed, is a sentence of an unconditional discharge.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Would your client like to be heard?

MR. TRUMP: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

This has been a very terrible experience. I think it has been a tremendous setback for New York, and the New York Court System.

This was a case that Alvin Bragg did not want to bring. And he thought it was, from what I read, and from what I hear, inappropriately handled before he got there.

And a gentleman from a law firm came in, and acted as a District Attorney. And that gentleman, from what I heard, was criminal, or almost criminal in what he did. It was very inappropriate. It was somebody involved with my political opponent.

Part of the records that we are talking about is saying, I just noticed, where he said I was falsifying business records. Well, the falsification of business records, as they say, it was calling a legal expense in the books where everybody could see them a legal expense.

In other words, that legal fees, or legal expense were put down as legal expense by accountants. They weren't put down by me. They were put down by accountants.

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

I didn't call them construction, concrete work. I didn't call them electrical work. I didn't call them anything. They called a legal fee, or a legal expense, a legal expense, and for this I got indicted. It's incredible actually.

Now, if you look, my attorney alluded to it, the top legal scholars, and legal pundits in this country, the ones that are quoted all the time on television that are making their views felt, and highly respected people, have said, every one, virtually every one that I know of, haven't seen any to the contrary, not one, and none of these people are not exactly friends of mine to put it mildly, but they all said this is a case that should have never been brought. It is an injustice of justice.

Very respected Jonathan Turley; Andy McCarthy; Judge David Reffner, a wonderful man who just passed away by the way; Gregg Jarrett; Elie Honig from CNN of all places, CNN said that; Paula Ingrassia; Alan Dershowitz, they all said this is not a case that should be brought. It's not.

Think about it. Legal expenses are down as legal expenses, and I get indicted for business records.

Everybody should be so accurate.

It's been a political witch hunt. It was done to damage my reputation so that I would lose the election,

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

and, obviously, that didn't work. And the people of our country got to see this firsthand because they watched the case in your courtroom. They got to see this firsthand, and then they voted. And I won it, and had the largest number of votes by far of any republican candidate in history, and won, as you know, all seven swing states.

Won conclusively all seven swing states, and won the popularity -- the popular vote by millions and millions of votes. And they have been watching your trial. So they understood it.

I wasn't allowed to use the lawyer/client privilege, or the reliance on counsel. I had a lawyer that made this deal, and he admitted that. And he was also a totally discredited person.

We weren't allowed to use the information from the Southern District that totally discredited him. That wasn't allowed to be put in, and that was terrible, unbelievable. And this is a man who has got no standing. He has been disbarred on other matters unrelated. And he was allowed to talk as though he was George Washington, but he is not George Washington. He shouldn't have been allowed.

The Southern District did a book of,
approximately, 28 pages where they -- I have never seen
anything like it. They excoriated him. You wouldn't let

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

it be put into evidence. So he was able to testify as a witness, and I think it's a disgrace to the system.

I was under a Gag Order. I am the first

President in history that was under a Gag Order where I

couldn't talk about aspects of the case that are very

important. I guess I am still under, so I won't do it now.

I assume I am still under a Gag Order, but the fact is that

I am totally innocent. I did nothing wrong.

They talked about business records, and the business records were extremely accurately accounted.

I had nothing to do with them anyway. That was done by an accountant, and bookkeeper who gave very credible testimony, and was corroborated by everybody that was asked.

And with all that's happening in our country today, with a city that's burning to the ground, one of our largest most important city is burning to the ground, with wars that are uncontrollably going on, with all of the problems of inflation, and attacks on countries, and all of the horrible things that are going on, I got indicted over calling a legal expense, a legal expense, which was called a legal expense.

I just want to say I think it's an embarrassment to New York, and New York has a lot of problems, but this is a great embarrassment. I believe that this, and other

cases that were brought, as you know, the DOJ is very much involved in this case. It's because that's the political opponent they are talking about.

The DOJ is very involved. You have a gentleman sitting right there from the DOJ, who was from the DOJ's Office who was also involved with the New York State's Attorney General's case and he went from there to here. He went around and did what he had to do. He got them to move on me.

But in the meantime, I won the election, and a massive landslide, and the people of this country understand what's going on. This has been a weaponization of government. They call it lawfare. It never happened to any extent like this. It never happened in our country before. And I just like to explain that I was treated very, very unfairly, and I thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Trump.

Mr. Trump, you appear before this Court today to conclude this criminal proceeding by the imposition of sentence.

Although I have taken the unusual step of informing you in advance of my inclinations, before imposing sentence I believe it is important for you, as well as those observing these proceedings, to understand my reason for the sentence I am about to impose.

The imposition of sentence is one of the most difficult and significant decisions that any Criminal Court Judge is called upon to make. Our legislature sets the parameters for an authorized sentence, but it is a Judge that must decide what constitutes a just conclusion to a verdict of guilty.

The Court is vested with broad discretion in determining what sources, or evidence it may consider to arrive at an appropriate sentence. In doing so, the Court must consider the facts of the case, along with any aggravating, or mitigating circumstances.

In my time on the bench I have been called upon to grapple with this weighty responsibility for countless defendants who have been found guilty after trial for an assortment of offenses, ranging from non-violent Class E Felonies to the most heinous crimes including homicides, sex trafficking, and child sexual abuse.

The task is always difficult, and deserving of careful consideration, whether the sentence be an unconditional discharge or incarceration of 25 years to life.

However, never before has this Court been presented with such a unique, and remarkable set of circumstances. Indeed, it can be viewed fairly that this has been a truly extraordinary case.

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

There was unprecedented media attention, public interest, and heightened security involving various agencies; and yet, the trial was a bit of a paradox because once the courtroom doors were closed the trial itself was no more special, unique, or extraordinary than the other 32 criminal trials that took place in this courthouse at the exact same time.

Jury selection was conducted; the same rules of evidence were followed; opening statements were made; witnesses called and cross-examined; evidence presented; summations delivered; the same burden of proof was supplied; and a jury made up of ordinary citizens delivered a verdict. And it was all conducted pursuant to the rules of procedure, and guided by the law.

Of course, part of what made it feel somewhat ordinary, was the outstanding work, preparation, and professionalism of the clerks, court officers, court reporters, security personnel, and the entire staff of this building who did their jobs as they would with any other criminal trial.

So, while one can argue that the trial itself was in many respects somewhat ordinary, the same cannot be said about the circumstances surrounding this sentencing, and that is because of the office that you once occupied, and which you will soon occupy again.

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

To be sure, it is the legal protections afforded to the office of the President of the United States that are extraordinary, not the occupant of the office.

The legal protections, especially within the context of a criminal prosecution, afforded to the Office of the President have been laid out by our founders, the Constitution, and most recently interpreted by the United States Supreme Court In The Matter Of Trump versus the United States, which was decided on July 1st, 2024.

As with every other Defendant in your position, it is my obligation to consider any, and all aggravating, and mitigating factors to inform my decision. Some of those aggravating factors have already been articulated in my Sandoval Ruling at the start of this trial, and by my recent written decisions on December 16th and January 3rd.

Thus, they need not be repeated at this time.

However, the considerable, indeed, extraordinary legal protections afforded by the Office of the Chief Executive is a factor that overrides all others.

To be clear, the protections afforded the Office of the President are not a mitigating factor. They do not reduce the seriousness of the crime, or justify its commission in any way.

The protections are, however, a legal mandate, which pursuant to the Rule of Law, this Court must respect,

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

23 24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and follow.

However, despite the extraordinary breath of those protections, one power they do not provide is the power to erase a jury verdict.

It is clear from legal precedence, which until July 1st was scarce, that Donald Trump, the ordinary citizen, Donald Trump, the criminal Defendant, would not be entitled to such considerable protections.

I am referring to protections that extend well beyond those afforded the average Defendant, who whines their way through the criminal justice system each day.

No, ordinary citizens do not receive those legal protections.

It is the Office of the President that bestows those far reaching protections to the office holder, and it was the citizenry of this nation that recently decided that you should once again receive the benefits of those protections, which include, among other things, the supremacy clause and Presidential immunity.

It is through that lens, and that reality that this Court must determine a lawful sentence.

After careful analysis, and obedience to governing mandates, and pursuant to the Rule of Law, this Court has determined that the only lawful sentence that permits entry of a Judgment of Conviction, without

1	encroaching upon the highest office in the land, is an
2	unconditional discharge, which the New York State
3	legislature has determined is a lawful and permissible
4	sentence for the crime of falsifying business records in
5	the first degree.
6	Therefore, at this time, I impose that sentence
7	to cover all 34 counts.

Sir, I wish you Godspeed as you assume your second term in office.

Thank you.

LIEUTENANT: Remain seated in the audience, please.

THE COURT: Did you give your client written Notice of his Right to Appeal?

MR. BOVE: We will, Judge.

(END OF SENTENCING.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

16

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

CERTIFICATE

I, SUSAN PEARCE-BATES, a Principal Court Reporter of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

23

24

SUSAN PEARCE-BATES 25 PRINCIPAL COURT REPORTER