UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

File No. 3- 20184		
In the Matter of		
MUNISH SOOD,		
Respondent.		

INDEX OF ATTACHMENTS IN SUPPORT OF MUNISH SOOD'S RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND <u>AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT</u>

Attachment	<u>Description</u>
Exhibit 1	Sood Plea Transcript
Exhibit 2	Sood Sentencing Transcript
Exhibit 3	Kyle Kuzma Declaration
Exhibit 4	Davon Reed Declaration
Exhibit 5	Akin Ayodele Declaration

EXHIBIT 1

I8RAASOOP	Plea	
UNITED STATES DIST SOUTHERN DISTRICT		
UNITED STATES OF A	AMERICA,	
V.		18 SD 2439 (BCM)
MUNISH SOOD,		
De	fendant.	
	x	
		New York, N.Y. August 27, 2018
		11:00 a.m.
Before:		
perore:		MOCEC
	HON. BARBARA C	
		Magistrate Judge
	APPEARANC	CES
GEOFFREY S. BERMA		
Southern Dis	s Attorney for the trict of New York	
NOAH SOLOWIEJEZYK Assistant Un	ited States Attorn	ney
RICHARD ZACK		
	Defendant Sood	
FRANK WEBER Attorney for	Defendant Sood	

1	(Case called)
2	MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: Good morning, your Honor.
3	Noah Solowiejezyk, on behalf of the government.
4	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Solowiejezyk.
5	MR. ZACK: Good morning, your Honor.
6	Richard Zack, on behalf of defendant Munish Sood
7	MR. WEBER: Good morning, your Honor.
8	Francis Weber, for the defendant.
9	THE COURT: That makes you, Mr. Sood.
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. Gentlemen, welcome. Be
12	seated.
13	Mr. Sood, I have to ask for the record, are you able
14	to speak and understand English?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: You don't have to stand up until I tell
17	you to.
18	Counsel, I understand that we are here for a change of
19	plea. Mr. Sood wishes to plead guilty to Counts One through
20	Three of an information which has been issued in this case.
21	Is that correct?
22	MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: That is correct, your Honor.
23	MR. ZACK: Yes, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. So let me begin by asking the
25	courtroom deputy to take the defendant's waiver of indictment.

I8RAASOOP Plea COURTROOM DEPUTY: You are Munish Sood? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 3 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Have you signed a waiver of 4 indictment? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 6 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Before you signed it did you 7 discuss it with your attorney? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 9 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Did your attorney explain it to 10 you? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you understand what you're 13 doing? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you understand that you are under no obligation to waive indictment? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 18 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you understand that if you do 19 not waive indictment, if the government wants to prosecute you, 20 they would have to present this case to a grand jury which may 21 or may not indict you? 2.2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 23 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you understand that by signing 24 this waiver of indictment you have given up your right to have

to case presented to a grand jury?

25

I8RAASOOP Plea

	I8RAASOOP Plea	
1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you understand what a grand jury	
3	is?	
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
5	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Have you seen a copy of the	
6	information?	
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
8	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you waive its public reading?	
9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
10	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Snell.	
11	Mr. Sood, let me formally introduce myself. I am	
12	Magistrate Judge Moses.	
13	I have a form here entitled Consent to Proceed Before	
14	a United States Magistrate Judge on a Felony Plea Allocution	
15	that appears to bear your signature.	
16	Did you sign this form? I am holding it up.	
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
18	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Would that form says is that you	
19	now you have the right to have your plea taken by a United	
20	States district judge, but you are agreeing to have your plea	
21	taken by a United States magistrate judge which is what I am.	
22	As a magistrate judge I have the authority to take your plea	
23	with your consent and you are entitled to all of the same	
24	rights and protections as if you were before a district judge.	

If you are found guilty you will be sentenced by a United

1 | States district judge.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So let me ask you, did you sign the Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge voluntarily?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Before you signed the form did your lawyer explain it to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you wish to proceed with your plea this morning before me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well, I will accept your consent.

As I've previously discussed, counsel, I have been informed that you wish to enter a plea of guilty to Counts One, through Three of the information in this matter.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before deciding whether to accept your guilty plea I need to ask you certain questions. It is important that you answer these questions honestly and completely. The purpose of these proceedings is to make sure that you understand your rights to decide whether you are pleading guilty of your own free will and to make sure that you're pleading guilty because you are guilty and not for some other reason.

Do you understand what I'm saying?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: If you don't understand any question that
3	I ask you or if you just want time to consult with your lawyer,
4	please say so. It is important that you understand ever
5	question before you answer.
6	Are you ready?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: I will ask Mr. Snell to swear the
9	defendant.
10	(Defendant Munish Sood sworn)
11	THE COURT: You may be seated.
12	Do you understand, sir, that you are now under oath?
13	THE DEFENDANT: What that means is if you
14	intentionally answer any of my questions falsely you could be
15	prosecuted for perjury. I'll begin with an easy question.
16	Please state your full name.
17	THE DEFENDANT: Munish Sood.
18	THE COURT: Do you have a middle name?
19	THE DEFENDANT: No.
20	THE COURT: How old are you?
21	THE DEFENDANT: 46 years old.
22	THE COURT: Are you a United States citizen?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24	THE COURT: How far did you go in school?

THE DEFENDANT: College.

25

	I8RAASOOP Plea
1	THE COURT: Do you have a college degree?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Is that a bachelors?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
5	THE COURT: When did you get your bachelor's degree?
6	THE DEFENDANT: 1992.
7	THE COURT: OK. Are you now or have you recently been
8	under the care of a doctor, a psychiatrist or psychologist for
9	any reason?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Just with a therapist.
11	THE COURT: Is that a psychologist?
12	THE DEFENDANT: I believe that is correct.
13	THE COURT: Is that talk therapy.
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Any medication that affects your mental
16	processes?
17	THE DEFENDANT: No.
18	THE COURT: OK. Do you have any condition that
19	affects your ability to see or to hear?
20	THE DEFENDANT: No.
21	THE COURT: Any condition that affects your ability to
22	think or to understand or to make judgments or decisions on
23	your own behalf?
24	THE DEFENDANT: No.
25	THE COURT: In the last 24 hours have you taken any

	I8RAASOOP Plea		
1	drugs, medicine or pills whether or not prescribed by a doctor,		
2	that affect your mental processes?		
3	THE DEFENDANT: No.		
4	THE COURT: In the last 24 hours have you consumed any		
5	alcohol?		
6	THE DEFENDANT: Just one glass of beer last night.		
7	THE COURT: What time?		
8	THE DEFENDANT: Around six p.m.		
9	THE COURT: And it's now 11 o'clock in the morning.		
10	Is your mind clear?		
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.		
12	THE COURT: Do you understand what is happening in		
13	this proceeding?		
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.		
15	THE COURT: Does either counsel have any objection to		
16	this defendant's competence to plead at this time?		
17	MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: No, your Honor.		
18	MR. ZACK: No, your Honor.		
19	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sood, have you received a		
20	copy of the information? That's the document that contains the		
21	written charges against you.		
22	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.		
23	THE COURT: Have you read it?		
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.		
25	THE COURT: Do you want me to read it to you?		

1 THE DEFENDANT: No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you understand what it says you did.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you had time to talk with your counsel about these charges and how you wish to plead?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has your attorney explained the

consequences of pleading guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with your attorney's representations so far?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I am going to begin now to explain certain of your constitutional rights. These are rights that you will be giving up if you enter a guilty plea. So please listen carefully to what I am going to tell you. And again, if you don't understand something or just wish to speak with your counsel, stop me and either your attorney or I will explain the issue more fully.

Under the Constitution and laws of the United States you have a right to plead not guilty to all of the charges contained in the information.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you plead not guilty you'll be entitled

under the Constitution to a speedy and public trial by a jury of those charges. At trial you would be presumed innocent. The government would be required to prove you guilty beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be found guilty. You could not be convicted unless a jury of 12 people agreed unanimously that you are guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

and at every stage of the case you would have the right to be represented by an attorney. If you could not afford an attorney, an attorney would be appointed to represent you at the government's expense. Even if you began the case with private defense counsel, if you ran out of money, an attorney would be appointed to continue to represent you. You would be entitled to an attorney all the way through trial, not just for a guilty plea. So your decision to plead guilty should not depend on whether you can afford to hire a lawyer.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: During trial the witnesses for the prosecution would have to come to Court and testify in your presence where you could see them and hear them and a lawyer could cross them. If you wanted, your lawyer could offer evidence on your behalf as well. Your lawyer would be able to

use the Court's power known as "subpoena power" to compel witnesses to come to court to testify even if they didn't want to come.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At trial you would have the right to testify in your own defense if you wanted to. You would also have the right not to testify. If you chose not to testify that couldn't be used against you in any way. No inference or suggestion of guilt would be permitted from the fact that you did not testify.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you were convicted at trial you would have the right to appeal that verdict to a higher court.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And as I said before, you have the right to plead not guilty. Even today, although you came to court for the purpose of entering a guilty plea, you have a right to change your mind, to persist in your not guilty plea and to proceed toward trial. But if you do plead guilty and the Court accepts your plea, you will give up the right to a trial and the other rights I've just described that go with it.

If you plead guilty there will be no trial. All that

will be remain to be done will be to impose a sentence. Now you and the government will have a chance to make arguments about what that sentence should be but there will not be any trial to determine whether you are guilty or not guilty of the charges to which you plead guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that the decision as to the appropriate sentence in your case will be entirely up to the sentencing judge?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Not me, not the U.S. Attorney, not your attorney, the sentencing judge will be limited only by what the law requires. This means that even if you are surprised or disappointed by your sentence, you will still be bound by your guilty plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you do plead guilty you are also giving up the right not to incriminate yourself. I will ask you questions later this morning about what you did in order to satisfy myself that you are actually guilty and you will have to answer those questions truthfully. So by pleading guilty you will be admitting what lawyers call your factual guilt, as well as legal guilt.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Turning to, taking a look at the information itself, I see that in Count One you are charged with participating in a conspiracy from at least in or about 2016, up to and including in or about September 2017, to do the following things:

To commit bribery in violation of Title 18 of U.S.C. Section 666(A)(2).

Second, to commit honest services wire fraud in violation of Title 18 of the U.S.C. Sections 1343 and 1346.

And third, to travel in interstate commerce and use the mail and facilities in interstate and foreign commerce in order to offer bribes in violation of Title 18 of U.S.C. section 1952.

In Count Two of the information you are charged with paying bribes to an agent of a federally funded organization from at least 2016, up to and including in or about September 2017, in violation of Title 18 of U.S.C. Sections 666(A)(2) and 2.

And in Count Three you are charged with participating in a conspiracy to commit wire fraud from in or about 2016, up to and including in or about September 2017, in violation of Title 18 of the U.S.C. Section 1349.

I am now going to ask the Assistant U.S. Attorney to

state the elements of these crimes. The elements are the things that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt if you went to trial.

Mr. Solowiejezyk.

MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: Yes, your Honor.

Count One of the information charges conspiracy in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. Section 371. That offense has the following four elements:

First, that two or more persons entered into an unlawful agreement as charged in the information.

Second, that the defendant knowingly and willfully became a member of the conspiracy.

Third, that one of the members of the conspiracy knowingly committed at least one of the overt acts that is charged in the information or an overt act which is substantially similar to the overt act charged in the information and that the overt act which was committed by a member of the conspiracy furthered some objective of the conspiracy.

As your Honor noted, this first count contains three objects of the conspiracy. The first object is offering bribes to an agent of a federally funded organization in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. 666(A)(2). That offense has the following elements.

First, that the defendant gave an agent of a federally

funded organization a thing of value.

Second, that was with the corrupt intent to influence or reward the agent of the federally funned organization.

Third, that the payment was in connection with the organization's business or transactions.

And fourth, that this transaction or business involved anything of value greater than \$5,000.

The second object of conspiracy charged in Count One is the offense of honors services wire fraud in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. Sections 1343 and 1346. That offense has the following elements:

First, that there was a scheme or artifice to defraud an employer of the honors services of its employees. In this case to defraud universities that employed coaches of certain universities as to the right of their coaches honor services in connection with the payment and receipt of bribes or kickbacks.

Second, that the defendant knowingly and willfully participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with the specific intent to defraud or that he knowingly and intentionally aided and abetted others in the same scheme.

And third, that in the execution of the scheme the defendant used or caused the use of interstate foreign wires.

The third object of the conspiracy is violation of the Travel Act in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1952(A)(3).

That crime has three elements.

First, that the defendant traveled or caused someone else to travel in interstate commerce or used or caused someone else using interstate facility.

Second, that this travel or use of an interstate facility was done with the intent to promote, manage, establish or carry on an unlawful activity.

And third, after this interstate travel or use of an interstate facility, the defendant performed or attempted to perform an act in furtherance of or distributed the proceeds of the same unlawful activity.

As alleged in the information, the unlawful activity in this case is the violation of specific state commercial bribery statutes. In particular, South Carolina's Commercial Bribery Statute, South Carolina Code Section 16-17-540; Oklahoma's Commercial Bribery Statute, 21 Oklahoma Statute, Section 380; Arizona's Commercial Bribery Statute; Arizona's Statute, Section 132605 (A)(2) and finally California's Commercial Bribery Statute which is California Penal Code Section 641.3.

Turning to Count Two, your Honor, which charges violation of 18 U.S.C. 666(A)(2) offering bribes to an agent of a federally funded organization, that offense has the same elements that I described in the first object of the conspiracy charged in Count One.

Finally, Count Three charges a conspiracy to commit wire fraud in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. 1349. That offense has the following elements:

First, that there was an agreement to commit wire fraud.

Second, that the defendant knowingly and willfully joined the conspiracy to commit wire fraud.

The object of the conspiracy is the offense of wire fraud in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1343. That offense's elements are:

First, that there was a scheme or artifice to defraud or to obtain money or property by materially false and fraudulent pretenses representations and promises.

Second, that the defendant acted knowingly and willfully in participating in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and the specific intent to defraud.

Third, that in the execution of the scheme, the defendant used or caused the use of interstate or foreign wires.

With respect to the all of the counts that I just described, your Honor, the government would also have to prove venue in the Southern District of New York by a preponderance of the evidence.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Sood, I am now going to tell you the maximum possible penalty for the crimes which are charged in the information and which you just heard the Assistant United States Attorney describe in more detail.

The "maximum" means the most that could possibly be imposed. It does not mean that this is what you will necessarily receive. But by pleading guilty you are exposing yourself to the possibility of receiving a punishment or a combination of punishments up to the maximum that I am about to describe.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The maximum term of imprisonment for the crime charged in Count One of the information is five years. Five years in prison which could be followed by up to three years of supervised release.

If you do get supervised release that means you will be subject to supervision by the probation department after you're released from prison. If you violate any condition of that supervised release the Court could revoke the term of supervised release previously imposed and return you to prison without giving you credit for time previously served on supervised release.

In addition to those restrictions on your liberty, the maximum possible punishment for the crime charged in Count One

includes financial penalties, a maximum allowable fine is \$250,000 or twice the profits of the criminal activity or twice what someone other than yourself lost because of the criminal activity whichever is greater.

I am also required by law to tell you that there is an additional special assessment, an extra fine of \$100 which is required to be imposed on each count of conviction.

With regard to Count Two of the complaint, there is a maximum sentence of ten years in prison which could be followed by up to three years on supervised release. There is a maximum fine of the greater of \$250,000 or twice the profits of criminal activity or twice what someone other than yourself lost because of the criminal activity and a \$100 special assessment.

As for Count Three of the indictment, Count Three carries a maximum sentence of 20 years of imprisonment, a maximum term of three years of supervised release, a maximum fine of \$250,000 or twice the profits of the criminal activity or twice what someone other than yourself lost because of the criminal activity, whichever is greater and a mandatory \$100 special assessment.

If the prison terms on these charges ran consecutively, you would face a potential prison sentence of up to 35 years in prison.

You will also be required to pay restitution to any

2.2

victims of the crimes in an amount that the Court decides is required to compensate them for their injuries.

In addition, by pleading guilty you will admit to the forfeiture allegations in the information and agree to forfeit any property within the scope of 18 U.S.C. Section 981(A)(1)(c) and 28 U.S.C. Section 2461.

Now, you told me that you are a U.S. citizen, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The reason I ask that question is that if you were not a citizen your guilty plea would likely have adverse consequences or your ability to remain or return to the United States which I am required to outline for you even though you have told me that you are a citizen. Those consequences could include removal, deportation, denial of citizenship and denial of admission to the U.S. in the future. Your removal or deportation could be mandatory. And if that did happen you would still be bound by your guilty plea that is you would not be able to withdraw it regardless of any advice you received from your counsel or others regarding the immigration consequences of your plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: He your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Sood, has anyone threatened or coerced you in any way in an effort to get you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am told there is a written plea agreement between you and the government. There it is. I am holding it up for you to see. It is contained in a letter dated August 9th, addressed to your counsel and it appears to be signed on the back page which I am also holding up, by you.

Is that your signature, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Did you read the plea agreement before you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand its terms?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Has anyone promised you or offered anything other than what is in this written plea agreement in after effort to get you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I note that your plea agreement refers to the possibility that the government may advise the sentencing judge by letter that you have given the government substantial cooperation which could lead to a reduction in your potential prison sentence.

Do you understand that the agreement does not absolutely require the government to do this?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the government may choose not to submit such a letter based on its own assessment of your compliance with the plea agreement and the extent of your cooperation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that under the terms of your plea agreement even if you later learn that the government withheld from your counsel certain information that would have been helpful to you in defending yourself at trial you wouldn't be able to complain about that or withdraw your guilty plea on that basis?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You do understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: OK. Do you understand that the terms of the plea agreement including any recommendations that may be made by the government related to sentencing will not be binding on the sentencing judge?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The sentencing judge as we briefly discussed, may reject those recommendations and could impose a more severe sentence than you expect without permitting you to withdraw your plea of guilty. The sentencing judge will be required to make his or her own independent calculation of the

appropriate sentencing range for you under the sentencing guidelines and will also have the discretion to give you a sentence below or above that range up to the maximum that we discussed earlier.

In addition to the guidelines and possible departures from the guidelines, the sentencing judge will consider all of the factors set forth at 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(A). In other words, the sentencing judge will pronounce whatever sentence she or he believes is the appropriate sentence for you even if that sentence is different from the one recommended by the government as a result of your cooperation.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In addition, the Court will at the time of sentencing consider a presentence report. It will be prepared by the probation department in advance of your sentencing and both you and the government will have the opportunity to challenge the facts set forth in that report.

Mr. Sood, do you understand that there is no parole in the federal system?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you are sentenced to prison you will not be released early on parole.

Before I go on, let me ask both counsel if there are any other provisions of the plea agreement that you would like

1 | me to go over with Mr. Sood?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. ZACK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Sood, aside from what is in the plea agreement itself, have any promises been made to you to influence you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have any promises been made to you concerning the actual sentence you will ultimately receive?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now that you have been advised of the charges against you, the possible penalties you face and the rights that you are giving up, is it still your intention to plead guilty to Counts One through Three of the information in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is your plea voluntary and made of your own free will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please rise.

Mr. Sood, with respect to Count One how do you plead, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: With respect to the Count Two how do you plead?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: With respect to the Count Three, how do you plead?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: You may be seated.

Please tell me in your own words what you did that makes you guilty of those crimes. You can use notes. That's fine.

THE DEFENDANT: From 2016 to September 2017, in the Southern District of New York, I agreed with others to make payments to coaches at NCAA member universities and to families of then current and prospective NCAA student-athletes in exchange for the current and prospective student-athletes retaining me as a financial adviser. On one occasion I made a two thousand payment by check to a coach at an NCAA member university in exchange --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. You made a two thousand payment?

THE DEFENDANT: Two thousand dollars payment by check to a coach at the NCAA member university in exchange for the coach's recommending that players hire me as a financial adviser. The overt acts in the information accurately describe my conduct.

I believed that NCAA rules prohibited current or prospective NCAA student-athletes or their familiars from receiving these types of payments. I believed that the players would not disclose these payments to their universities and that receipt of those payments by the players and/or their families could make the players ineligible, causing harm to the university. Some of this conduct took place over the phone and by e-mail and by traveling interstate commerce.

THE COURT: At the time you engaged in this conduct, Mr. Sood, did you know that the acts were wrong?

THE DEFENDANT: I did not. (Pause) Sorry. Yes, yes, I did.

THE COURT: You knew what that you were doing was wrong?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Let me ask the government's counsel, do you believe that is a sufficient factual predicate for a guilty plea?

MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: Yes, your Honor. And the government would also proffer with respect to the venue that the government would prove that there were meetings that occurred in the Southern District of New York and telephone calls that were made to and from the Southern District of New York in furtherance of the crimes charged.

THE COURT: Mr. Sood, I do note that you were reading

from notes when you told me what conduct you engaged in. Did your attorney help prepare that statement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you adopt those words as your own?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is everything that you just told me true?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Does the government represent that it has sufficient evidence to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt at trial and would you like to make a proffer?

MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: Yes, your Honor.

The government will represent that and briefly, the evidence would consist of among other things, testimony from other witnesses, wiretapped recorded calls, consensually recorded calls and meetings and e-mail and other documentary evidence including financial records.

THE COURT: Mr. Sood, on the basis of your responses to my questions and my observation of your demeanor, I find that you are competent to enter a guilty plea. I am satisfied that you understand your rights including your right to have your case considered by a grand jury and your right to go to trial. I believe you are aware of the consequences of your plea, including the sentence that may be imposed and I conclude that you are voluntarily pleading guilty and that you have

2.2

admitted that you are guilty as charged in Counts One through Three of the information. For these reasons, I will recommend that the Court accept your plea.

I will ask the government to order a copy of the transcript in due course.

I will not schedule probation department interviews at this time.

Are there any objections to continuing the present bail and has it been modified in any way?

MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: There are no objections, your

Honor. I believe defense counsel wanted to note one

modification as was made on the record which is not reflected
in the plea agreement.

THE COURT: Counsel.

MR. ZACK: Your Honor, since bail was originally imposed bail's been modified to permit Mr. Sood to travel at his discretion with just notice to Pretrial Services rather than getting permission in advance.

THE COURT: And with that addendum you otherwise believe that the plea agreement accurately sets out the conditions of your client's bail?

MR. ZACK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sood, the conditions on which you have been released up until now including the modification that your attorney just advise the Court of,

	I8RAASOOP Plea
1	continue to apply. A violation those conditions could have
2	serious consequences including revocation of bail and
3	prosecution for bail jumping.
4	Do you understand that?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Anything further on this matter from the
7	government?
8	MR. SOLOWIEJEZYK: No, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: From defense?
10	MR. ZACK: No, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: We are adjourned.
12	Thank you, gentlemen.
13	(Adjourned)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

EXHIBIT 2

	J9cdsoos Sentence	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	x	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	V .	18 Cr. 0620(KMW)
5	MUNISH SOOD,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		Contombour 12 2010
9		September 12, 2019 12:10 p.m.
10	Before:	
11		M NOOD
12	HON. KIMBA	
13		District Judge
14	APPEARA	ANCES
15	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN	
16	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
17	BY: NOAH SOLOWIEJCZYK ROBERT BOONE	
18	ELI MARK Assistant United States	s Attorneys
19	PEPPER HAMILTON, LLP	
20	Attorneys for Defendant BY: RICHARD J. ZACK	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

J9cdsoos

Sentence At this point, I call U.S. v. Munish Sood, 1 THE COURT: and I'll ask counsel to identify themselves for the record. 2 3 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Good afternoon, your Honor. Noah 4 Zolowiejczyk on behalf of the government. I'm joined at 5 counsel table by A.U.S.A.s Robert Boone and Eli Mark. 6 MR. ZACK: Good afternoon, your Honor. Richard Zack 7 for Munish Sood. THE COURT: Good afternoon. 8 9 And good afternoon, Mr. Sued. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: We are here for the sentencing of 12 Mr. Sood. 13 And I'll begin by asking Mr. Zach, have you and your client had an adequate opportunity to review the presentence 14 15 report? MR. ZACK: We have, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: And do you wish any changes? MR. ZACK: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. Before I hear from counsel, 19 20 I'd like to note that Mr. Sood's assistance to the government 21 has been enormously helpful, to whom I note that he testified 22 at great length at two trials, one of them for three days of testimony, and he worked with the government for many, many 23 24 hours on the case. Particularly in light of that, but also in

light of the light sentences received by the codefendants who

25

J9cdsoos

Sentence

have been sentenced to date, I will not impose an incarceratory sentence on Mr. Sood. I am interested, however, in what was his impetus for the crime. Was it financial or nonfinancial?

In any event, I am now ready to hear from defense counsel and Mr. Sood, if he wishes to be heard.

MR. ZACK: Thank you, your Honor, and I'll speak briefly and then Mr. Sood does wish to be heard.

And to answer your Honor's question, certainly there was a financial motive for the crime here, but I would note that Mr. Sood accepts full responsibility for what he did.

THE COURT: I'm sorry to interrupt you.

You say there was a financial motive, and that's what puzzles me because he was earning 7 to \$8 million a year during the time of the conspiracy, as I read the documents.

Is that wrong?

MR. ZACK: Your Honor, that's what the PSR reflects. His income has significantly decreased since then.

THE COURT: Since the arrest.

MR. ZACK: And I have had many, many conversation with Mr. Sood over the last two years.

As your Honor knows, this case involved him providing services to very high-profile athletes and him being involved in many aspects of the NBA. And so, you know, part of the crime and part of the sort of seductiveness of the crime was being involved with such a high-profile lifestyle. And while

J9cdsoos

Sentence

Mr. Sood did not certainly need additional money to support his lifestyle, I think he was seduced by the fact that he would be in close proximity to some of the most high-profile, popular athletes on the planet.

And that's really borne out by the fact that the way the business was set up, Mr. Sood didn't stand to make any money at all for many, many years. He started the business in 2016. And the way the business works is until an athlete gets a second contract — and that's several years — at least four years into their NBA career — Mr. Sood didn't stand to really make any money on that. Now, there was a financial reward down the road for him, absolutely, and certainly Mr. Sood anticipated that, but I think, you know, his driving motive was to be a part of, you know, an enterprise that had, you know, literally tens of millions of people watching it during basketball season. And, you know, I think that is the overriding motive of him getting involved in this.

He was not -- the evidence showed he was not sort of the mastermind behind this. He was following instructions from others. That's not to diminish the fact that he's responsible for his own conduct, but as the evidence shows, he was certainly a person on the lower end of the culpability scale.

And, your Honor, if that answers your question, I am happy to just highlight just a couple of brief things. As I said --

Sentence

THE COURT: It does. Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. ZACK: Mr. Sood accepts full responsibility. As your Honor knows, he met with the government shortly after his arrest, and I know I was in talking to the government within a couple of days of his arrest to let them know that he was ready to cooperate.

As you know from our filings, he has lived an exemplary life otherwise other than this. He has built a business that has suffered significantly from, you know, his own conduct here, which he doesn't deny, and has raised a tremendous family. He has three kids and a wife that support him, and he maintains significant confidence from the business people that he has been working with over the years.

And we appreciate your Honor's advising us that sentence will not include incarceration. We agree that probation is certainly an appropriate sentence in this case.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Sood, there is no requirement for you to speak, but if you would like to speak, I would be glad to hear you now.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

Can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm just a bit nervous and I just put

Sentence

some notes on a piece of paper.

THE COURT: That is fine. Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to apologize to the Court and to the people that I hurt for the last few years. I've disappointed my friends, my family and myself. I have no one to blame but myself for these actions.

I fully accept responsibility for my actions. I will continue to do what is necessary to rebuild the trust of my friends, my family, my clients, and everyone else I've disappointed.

I am happy to answer any questions, but thank you again.

THE COURT: Thank you for that statement. I have no questions.

Before I turn to the government to see if they wish to speak, I would like to note that I find the calculation of restitution here to be to my mind conceptually problematic, and I'll explain that in a while, but I also note that the government has asked for three months. I think you have, or do you just not need it any more?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, as to restitution, we are asking for additional time. We have -- we notice at least as to one university, the amount of restitution they are seeking -- that is the University of Louisville -- it is going to be joint and several liability with the defendants who were

Sentence

before Judge Kaplan, but there are just two other universities that we are still waiting to get final word from and I hope to do that soon, and once we do, we will submit a proposed restitution order to your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Then I'll turn to you,

Mr. Zolowiejczyk, to tell me anything the government wishes to

add.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, I'll keep this quite brief in light of your Honor's informing us that a sentence of incarceration -- there will not be a sentence of incarceration.

I would just state very briefly, under the 5K factors, certainly Mr. Sood's sentencing — his cooperation was extremely timely. He indicated very early on that he intended to cooperate. He came in and proffered with us quickly, and he was proffering and working with us well before any of the trials that occurred here took place, well before any guilty pleas.

With respect to his truthfulness and reliability, he was forthcoming in the proffer sessions. He told us not only about conduct that we already knew about from the wiretap of his phone and the other evidence but also additional conduct that we were not aware of before he informed us of it, and he was forthcoming and truthful during all phases of both the proffers and the trial preparation.

With respect to significance and usefulness, which,

Sentence

you know, here it is a particularly important factor, Mr. Sood was the only cooperating witness that testified at both the Gatto trial in front of Judge Kaplan and the trial of Christian Dawkins and Merl Code in front of Judge Ramos. And he was an important witness in both trials, a crucial witness.

Particularly just focusing on the more recent trial of Christian Dawkins and Merl Code, he was the only witness at that trial who was a member of the conspiracy. And he was on the stand, as your Honor noted, for testimony that spanned three days, really covering all of the aspect of the scheme — each of the coaches they had worked with, hours and hours of recordings. At times these recordings were somewhat hard to understand, cryptic. He really, at bottom, acted as sort of the narrator of what had happened for the jury and was an incredibly important witness.

So, for all of those reasons, your Honor, at this time we would move under Section 5K1.1 for the appropriate reduction.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

I begin, as I must, by noting the sentencing guideline calculation. It's based on a total offense level of 21 and Criminal History Category of I. If I were sentencing Mr. Sood under the Sentencing Guidelines, I would depart downward based on his substantial assistance to the government.

Moving to the factors under Section 3553, the

Sentence

co-conspirators' conduct was quite serious in ways that are not measured by pecuniary loss, in particular, harm to the reputations of the universities and their athletic programs.

With respect to Mr. Sood, I agree with Mr. Zach that he was not an instigator, he was not a major participant.

With respect to Mr. Sood's character, everything in his background suggests an upstanding, honest man. I believe that his, as Mr. Zach put it, seduction by the prospect of having such high-profile clients was an aberration in an otherwise blameless life.

His very prompt, very painstaking assistance to the government, which included crimes as to which the government was not yet aware and which was enormously useful to the government in light of the fact that with respect to the trial of Mr. Dawkins and Mr. Code, he was the only member of the conspiracy who testified, and his use to the government was, as the government said, as narrator to what happened in light of the cryptic nature of a number of the wiretaps — wiretapped conversations.

In my view, as I said before, no incarceration is warranted.

Mr. Sood, could you please stand for sentencing.

With respect to all three counts, I sentence you to no incarceration, to no supervised release, because you have essentially been on such for the time you were cooperating.

Sentence

A fine of \$25,000 was recommended by Probation. Do defense counsel or defendant have a problem with that?

MR. ZACK: Your Honor, I think we certainly don't

disagree with the recommendation. Just for the record, I don't believe a \$25,000 fine is warranted, but that's all we have to say on that issue.

THE COURT: Would the government like to be heard on the fine?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, we don't really take a position as to the specific parameters of the sentence, but obviously Probation does take into account, among other things, the means to pay it and that sort of thing.

MR. ZACK: Your Honor, just given the prospect of restitution, you know, I would suggest not imposing a fine and --

THE COURT: With respect to the prospect of restitution, I'm not so sure we have that prospect, as I'll lay out in a few minutes.

MR. ZACK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will impose the fine of \$25,000 in light of Mr. Sood's financial ability to pay it and the purposes behind imposing a fine. I've taken into account all the statutory factors that the statute requires in determining the amount of the fine.

With respect to restitution, I'll deal with that in a

J9cdsoos Sentence 1 minute. I impose the special assessment of \$300, which is 2 3 mandatory. 4 You may sit down while I read to you the appeal 5 rights. 6 Are there any charges to be dismissed? 7 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We don't think there are, your 8 Honor, but in an abundance of caution, to the extent there were 9 any, they are dismissed. 10 THE COURT: I grant the motion. 11 Is there anything further before I read Mr. Sood his 12 appeal rights, once I get to restitution? 13 MR. ZACK: Not from the defendant, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: OK. 15 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Not from the government, your 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. I'll read your appeal rights after I discuss restitution. 18 In considering who was harmed by the conspiracy, I 19 20 note that it was spearheaded by Adidas, and Adidas, I take it, 21 was motivated by hoping to receive a competitive advantage over 22 competitors by having high-profile athletes involved in its 23 programs. 24 I think it's possible -- no, I have to back up a 25 moment.

Sentence

I think the universities benefited from these scholarship payments made to athletes because they got the benefit of a good bargain. They had the star athlete for about a year. So they had the benefit hoped for, a more brilliant team, which leads to greater alumni contributions. I mean, if you try to find something financial, you would have to go down that rather circuitous route.

I don't think Mr. Sood or any of the defendants intended to harm a university. As one of the university defendants described in a letter to the Court, the harm was reputation. I think the harm was that the university becomes publicized as a participant in corruption, corruption of college athletics.

The only harm I can see to a university would be by analogy to honest services fraud. A university was unaveraged coaches, not the other participants. The universities were deprived of the honest services of their coaches.

I don't think that is properly quantified by the amount of a bribe paid to a coach. But we have as precedent a decision by Judge Cote in which she found that Morgan Stanley, I think, or Morgan Guaranty had been deprived of the honest services of one of its corrupt employees, and she imposed as restitution the expenses and fees paid by Morgan Stanley in connection with the government investigation and prosecution. That's not what is charged here, but it strikes me as the only

Sentence

rationale I can conceive of for there being pecuniary harm to the universities.

I'm not asking anyone to respond right away on this because I don't think other courts have made a fuss about it, and so you need some time to think about it?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, I do think we probably are going to want to write something briefly on this.

I would note, obviously, we respect what your Honor is saying immensely. You know, a lot of the issues your Honor has teed up were issues that were argued -- and this really only relates to the Gatto case for trial.

THE COURT: Before Judge Kaplan.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: They were argued to the jury, and, you know, the jury ultimately concluded that when these university witnesses took the stand and said that, you know, that these representations were material to them, that the universities did suffer harm as a result of this, that's ultimately about something the jury has to consider.

I will also note just for your Honor's consideration -- we're going to brief this more fully -- that there are many, many talented student athletes out there, and when these universities choose -- they have a limited number of scholarships. There is sort of an opportunity cost to that, and in particular when they have decided to issue a scholarship to a student athlete who it turns out they later find is

Sentence

ineligible, they could have offered that scholarship to somebody else instead and they lose that opportunity.

THE COURT: I think that's a very good point, and what's lost is the ability to have the next best athlete for years two, three, four. It is not about the first year.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: One of the athletes never even played that first year because the scheme was uncovered and they had to send him out and, therefore -- and actually --

THE COURT: And he kept the money?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Well, yes.

THE COURT: He continued to go to school?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: And the way the University of Louisville calculated their number was it wasn't legal fees, it wasn't the full amount of scholarship, it was they actually did math on how much money they had spent up to that point on that particular student.

But as I said, your Honor, we're happy to put --

THE COURT: I mean, that's very understandable.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: -- something in on this.

As to the coach side of this, if any of those schools do seek restitution, what we had in mind is exactly consistent with what -- I don't remember the name of the decision but I know the decision you are talking about from Judge Cote, it would be consistent with that.

THE COURT: OK. With respect to what a jury found, I

Sentence

would need to hear how they were instructed. I doubt that I'll gain a lot of clarity from it, but I respect your view that it is something to think about.

All right. In terms of briefing, perhaps we could set a schedule, and I'll let the government go first on this.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, we would -- I'm just thinking in terms of timing. We want to find out whether the other two universities are going to even seek restitution, because that would be an issue we need to brief.

I wanted to check when the sentencings of the codefendants are.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Is it just Mr. Gassnola?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: No. Actually, Mr. Gassnola was sentenced on Tuesday, your Honor, to time served by Judge Kaplan. It is Mr. Code and Mr. Dawkins in the second trial.

If your Honor would give us 45 days, we would appreciate it, but if not, 30 days would be what we would ask for.

THE COURT: I don't need to decide this until 90 days from now, so 45 is fine.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Great. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. I ask you if you have the transcript of the argument before Judge Kaplan, I would like to read that, the one you referenced. You said these points were argued to

Sentence

Judge Kaplan. Perhaps they were argued in writing.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We can send you the sentencing transcript, and I was actually referring also to sort of the harm to the universities was an issue that was central to the trial as well, not as to a specific restitution number but it was sort of an essential component of the trial.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: But I'm not sure -- I hear what your Honor is saying in terms of -- you know, I'm not sure how useful that will ultimately be to your Honor, so that is something that we will consider.

THE COURT: All right. I was assuming that arguments by counsel in a high-profile criminal case would be carefully considered and that I should consider them, too.

MR. ZACK: Judge, just so the record is clear, we were not a party to that, you know. So whatever was argued in that case is not relevant to a restitution determination for this defendant in our view.

THE COURT: It merely might educate me generally rather than -- I understand it --

MR. ZACK: But we have no say in anything the Court determines.

THE COURT: I know that.

MR. ZACK: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, we'll provide you with

Sentence

anything we think would be relevant to your Honor's consideration of this question in our submission.

THE COURT: Good. All right. If there is nothing further, I'll read Mr. Sood his appeal rights.

Is there something further?

MR. ZACK: Nothing from the defendant.

THE COURT: Mr. Sood, it is my job -- you don't need to stand. Thank you. It is my job to read every defendant his appeal rights, and I'll read you yours now.

You can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow unlawful or involuntary or if there was some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that was not waived by your guilty plea. You also have the statutory right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances. You may have waived many of those rights.

With few exceptions, any Notice of Appeal must be filed within 14 days of judgment being entered in this case.

Judgment is likely to be entered next week.

I understand this doesn't apply to you but, again, it is my job to read it. If you are not able to pay the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If you request, the Clerk of the Court will prepare and file a Notice of Appeal on your behalf.

I think your assistance was truly commendable. We are adjourned.

EXHIBIT 3

Declaration of Kyle Kuzma

- I, Kyle A. Kuzma, hereby depose and say:
- 1. I am a professional basketball player for the Los Angeles Lakers.
- 2. In 2017, I was introduced to Munish Sood and the firm Rosedale Asset Management, LLC (formerly known as Princeton Wealth Management) through Christian Dawkins who was working at ASM Sports.
- 3. When I met Mr. Sood I was undrafted. Once I was drafted, I decided to engage Mr. Sood and Rosedale to help with business management and concierge services.
- 4. I agreed to pay Rosedale \$1,000 per month for their services, which did not include investment management.
- 5. Mr. Sood and Rosedale have helped me with the following:
 - a. They helped raise my credit score.
 - b. They helped to coordinate my family's relocation to Los Angeles.
 - c. They assisted with helping me setup up CDs and other investment vehicles.
 - d. They assisted me in financing a car when I first relocated to Los Angeles.
 - e. They have helped me deal with certain complicated family matters.
- 6. Mr. Sood has been instrumental to my career and I have benefitted greatly from his advice over the years. Mr. Sood has consistently shown that he is completely devoted to my interests, which I am truly grateful for.
- 7. Recently, Mr. Sood assisted me in setting up a trust, which will be very important to my financial future. I made Mr. Sood the Trustee of the trust, because he has been my most reliable advisor.
- 8. Mr. Sood also serves as an unpaid board member of my foundation that he helped setup.
- 9. My foundation has donated around \$150,000 to the YMCA in my hometown, Flint, Michigan, and other organizations in Flint, MI and Los Angeles, CA. We have provided financial support for single mothers in both cities and he lead our efforts to provide meal distribution efforts for senior citizens and families in need during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 10. Over the years, my relationship with Mr. Sood and Rosedale has remained consistent with paying nominal fees to them for their concierge services. However, recently I

- with paying nominal fees to them for their concierge services. However, recently I began paying \$5,000 per month due to increased needs for business management.
- 11. Given Mr. Sood's track record over the years, I fully trust Mr. Sood to handle my most sensitive matters. He has been a huge help during the beginning of my career and I plan to continue to turn to Mr. Sood to help me with my most sensitive and critical issues I will face as my career continues to develop.
- 12. At no point during the four years that I have engaged Mr. Sood and Rosedale have I been harmed as an investor or in any other way. Furthermore, I never felt pressure to retain Mr. Sood or continue to use Mr. Sood's help.
- 13. I engaged Mr. Sood before his legal issues began.
- 14. Had I learned about Mr. Sood's legal issues at the time I first engaged him, it would not have affected my desire to retain Mr. Sood.
- 15. Mr. Sood informed me in detail that he took responsibility for his actions and pled guilty to federal criminal charges. I understand that this was in relation to working together with Christian Dawkins, Adidas, and others to pay college coaches for introductions to potential NBA prospects, such as myself.
- After learning this information, I have decided to continue to engage Mr. Sood and Rosedale.

Kyle A. Kulma

Executed by me this 19 day of May, 2021.

EXHIBIT 4

Declaration of Davon Reed

- I, Davon Reed, hereby depose and say:
- 1. I am a currently professional basketball player.
- 2. In 2017, I was introduced to Munish Sood and the firm Rosedale Asset Management, LLC (formerly known as Princeton Wealth Management) through Steven Pina who was working at ASM Sports.
- 3. When I met Mr. Sood I was undrafted. Once I was drafted, I decided to engage Mr. Sood and Rosedale to help with business management and concierge services.
- 4. I agreed to pay Rosedale \$750.00 per month for their services, which did not include investment management.
- 5. Mr. Sood and Rosedale have helped me with the following:
 - a. He has helped me develop and increase my knowledge about business and various investments opportunities available to me.
 - b. They helped to create and manage my LLC.
 - c. They assisted with helping me setup up CDs and other investment vehicles.
 - d. They helped me create my Foundation and raise money for projects important to me.
 - e. They have helped me deal with certain complicated family matters.
- 6. Mr. Sood has been instrumental to my career and I have benefitted greatly from his advice over the years. Mr. Sood has consistently shown that he is completely devoted to my interests, which I am truly grateful for.
- 7. Mr. Sood also serves as an unpaid board member of my foundation that he helped setup.
- 8. Over the years, my relationship with Mr. Sood and Rosedale has remained consistent with paying nominal fees to them for their services. However, recently I was playing in a different country and with my reduction in income he volunteered to reduce my monthly fee to \$375.00.
- 9. Given Mr. Sood's track record over the years, I fully trust Mr. Sood to handle my most sensitive matters. He has been a huge help during the beginning of my career and I plan to continue to turn to Mr. Sood to help me with my most sensitive and critical issues I will face as my career continues to develop.
- 10. At no point during the four years that I have engaged Mr. Sood and Rosedale have I been

been harmed as an investor or in any other way. Furthermore, I never felt pressure to retain Mr. Sood or pressure to continue to use Mr. Sood's help.

- 11. I engaged Mr. Sood before his legal issues began.
- 12. Had I learned about Mr. Sood's legal issues at the time I engaged, it would not have affected my desire to retain Mr. Sood.
- 13. Mr. Sood informed me in detail that he took responsibility for his actions and pled guilty to federal criminal charges and only paid a fine of \$25,000. I understand that this was in relation to working together with Christian Dawkins, Adidas, and others to pay college coaches for introductions to potential NBA prospects, such as myself.
- 14. After learning this information, I have decided to continue to engage Mr. Sood and Rosedale. I also will refer him to other athletes that will benefit from his experience and commitment to helping others

Dan M. Re

Executed by me this 17 day of May, 2021.

EXHIBIT 5

Declaration of Akin Ayodele

- I, Akin Ayodele, hereby depose and say:
- 1. Retired after 9 years in the National Football League.
- 2. In 2008, I was introduced to Munish Sood (at that time by Marty Blazer) and the firm Rosedale Asset Management, LLC (formerly known as Princeton Wealth Management).
- 3. Mr. Sood and Rosedale have helped me with the following:
 - a. He started by managing my investment portfolios while I was an active NFL player in the NFL.
 - b. Provided me access to alternative investment opportunities such as real estate and direct investments where other advisors did not or refused to since they would potentially lose management fees.
 - c. Educated me on different types of investments and pro/cons of investments. Helped me understand the fee structures and different way advisors make money. Helped me budget my expenses and importance of savings.
 - d. Allow me to leverage his experience so I was not taken advantage by other advisors that were trying to sell me high risk and investments not appropriate for me and my family. Such as Insurance products that were not appropriate and very expensive.
 - e. After my playing career and receiving my MBA I decided to join him as a partner and help grow the athlete investment and business management business. Based on my experience he has always put his clients first and leveraged his experience to position them for success in the court or filed. I have and will continue to refer him Professional athletes and coaches as clients.
- 4. At no point during the eight years that I have engaged Mr. Sood and Rosedale have I been harmed as an investor or in any other way. Furthermore, I never felt pressure to retain Mr. Sood or pressure to continue to use Mr. Sood's help.
- 5. I engaged Mr. Sood before his legal issues began. Had I learned about Mr. Sood's legal issues at the time I engaged him, it would not have affected my desire to retain Mr. Sood.
- 6. Mr. Sood informed me in detail that he took responsibility for his actions and pled guilty

to federal criminal charges. I understand that this was in relation to working together with Christian Dawkins, Adidas, and others to pay college coaches for introductions to potential NBA prospects, such as myself.

AKIN Ayoddi

7. After learning this information, I have decided to continue to engage Mr. Sood and Rosedale.

Executed by me this 14 day of May, 2021.

OS Received 06/02/2021