



U.S. Department of Justice

United States Attorney
Southern District of New York

The Silvio J. Mollo Building
One Saint Andrew's Plaza
New York, New York 10007

June 4, 2019

Via ECF and Email

The Honorable Gregory H. Woods
United States District Judge
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007

**Re: United States v. Jeremy Reichberg,
S2 16 Cr. 468 (GHW)**

Dear Judge Woods:

The Government writes in response to defendant Jeremy Reichberg's June 4, 2019 letter (Dkt. 606), requesting an adjournment of his surrender date to September 24, 2018. Reichberg, who was recently sentenced to 48 months' imprisonment due to his participation in a years-long scheme to bribe executive-level members of the NYPD and his further attempt to obstruct justice through the deliberate concealment of evidence, also requested a later sentencing date at the sentencing proceeding. The Court denied that request. It should deny this request as well.

Reichberg's letter does not accurately state the Government's position. The Government opposes the request for an adjournment as made. The Government had earlier indicated to Reichberg's counsel that it would be open to reconsidering its position if, as the Government understood was seriously being considered, Reichberg's son's wedding were scheduled in August such that only an additional week or two was being sought. That has not happened.

The only relevant intervening events since the Court set the report date, above Reichberg's objection, are (1) Reichberg's son's marriage proposal shortly after that sentencing took place, and (2) the rapid scheduling of the wedding for late September prior to the submission of this adjournment request. The Government does not mean to suggest, as reasonable inferences very well might, that the timing of the proposal and Reichberg's on-the-record desire to delay his report date are related. The poet Emily Dickinson famously wrote that, "The heart wants what it wants – or else it does not care," and it may very well be that this applies to matters of precise proposal timing.

Nevertheless, the Court should deny this request for the same reasons it denied the earlier request. Reichberg was found guilty on January 2, 2019. Convicted defendants in this district cannot be – and are not – entitled to *nearly ten months* between verdict and surrender date for a significant sentence based on developments in their personal lives, particularly those that post-date the sentencing proceeding. One contemplates the many defendants who, facing imminent

surrender, do not have the temerity to make similar requests because, amidst the ongoing churn of other developments in life, they nevertheless recognize that reporting to prison as ordered is *itself* also a significant life event. It is a commitment and obligation that one should schedule other life events around. The Court's substantial sentence reflects, in part, the statutory requirement that the Court's sentence promote respect for the law. The Government respectfully submits that an adjournment here would not aid that cause.

The Government, as it noted at sentencing, is sympathetic to Reichberg's family, which as a result of his criminal actions will have to endure family events and holidays without him over the next few years. The Government agrees with the Court, which observed that Reichberg's family appears supportive and dedicated, and in a good position to be able to provide the support he needs once he re-emerges. That Reichberg's son is getting married is worthy of congratulations, and a thought that hopefully buoys the defendant's spirits during a difficult time – one that the defendant imposed upon himself through a years-long pattern of corrupting public officials. News that the families decide to schedule the wedding in August – as we understood was being considered despite the likely absence of some guests in a difficult month to schedule a wedding – would be most welcome.

But with respect to this adjournment request, the Government respectfully submits that the Court's response to this application should reflect one of the abiding lessons of this case – that before valued public institutions, Jeremy Reichberg is not entitled to special treatment than others similarly situated do not receive.¹

Respectfully submitted,

GEOFFREY S. BERMAN
United States Attorney for the
Southern District of New York

By: 

Martin S. Bell
Assistant United States Attorney
(212) 637-2463

cc: Defense Counsel (via ECF)

¹ Reichberg represents that if the Court grants his application, he will make no requests to further adjourn his surrender date. The Government, having reviewed the docket and the trial record, can only register a note of respectful skepticism.