	STATE OF	MICHIGAN	N
IN THE 77 th DI	ISTRICT COURT	FOR THE	COUNTY OF MECOSTA
PEOPLE OF THE STATE	OF MICHIGAN,		
V			File No. 15-45978-FY
KEITH ERIC WOOD,			
	Defendant.		
		/	

SENTENCING

AND MOTION FOR STAY OF SENTENCE PENDING APPEAL

BEFORE THE HONORABLE KIMBERLY L. BOOHER, ACTING DISTRICT JUDGE

Big Rapids, Michigan - Friday, July 21, 2017

APPEARANCES:

For the People: Nathan L. Hull (P-72265)

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney

400 Elm Street

Big Rapids, Michigan, 49307

(231) 592-0141

For the Department: Probation Officer Jacob Buse

District Court Probation

400 Elm Street

Big Rapids, Michigan, 49307

(231) 592-0190

For the Defendant: David A. Kallman (P-34200)

KALLMAN LEGAL GROUP, PLLC 5600 West Mount Hope Highway

Lansing, Michigan, 48917

(517) 322-3207

RECORDED BY: Sabrina M. Marlette, CER 8103

Certified Electronic Reporter

(231) 592-8303

	TABLE	OF	CONTENTS		
WITNESSES:				P <i>A</i>	.GE
NONE CALLED					
EXHIBITS:			OFFER	ED	ADMITTED
NONE OFFERED					

1	Big Rapids, Michigan
2	Friday, July 21, 2017 - 10:00 a.m.
3	THE COURT: The next matter before the Court is
4	the People of the State of Michigan versus Keith Wood,
5	being file number 1545978FY.
6	Appearing for the prosecutor's office.
7	MR. HULL: Thank you, your Honor. Nathan Hull,
8	on behalf of the People.
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
10	And for the defendant.
11	MR. KALLMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Dave
12	Kallman, appearing on behalf of Mr. Wood. He is here,
13	seated to my right.
14	THE COURT: Thank you.
15	Today is the time and date set for sentencing in
16	this matter.
17	Mr. Hull, is there any reason we should not
18	proceed with sentence?
19	MR. HULL: None, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Mr. Kallman, is there any reason we
21	should not proceed with sentence?
22	MR. KALLMAN: No, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Wood, is there any reason I
24	should not sentence you here today?
25	THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Hull, have you reviewed the report and recommendation; do you have any additions or corrections?

MR. HULL: Your Honor, I have had an opportunity to review the report. I have no additions, deletions, or corrections to make.

THE COURT: Thank you.

change.

And, Mr. Kallman, any additions or corrections?

MR. KALLMAN: No, your Honor. Obviously, we
disagree with it, but we have nothing to correct or

THE COURT: All right.

Allocution, Mr. Hull.

MR. HULL: Thank you, your Honor.

In this case, your Honor, on the -- on the one side, we have a defendant, Mr. -- Mr. Wood, who is 41 years old. He has never been in any trouble with the law before. This is his only criminal conviction; the only entanglement he has had with the law. And since the incident involving the Yoder trial, he hasn't been in any more trouble with the law. On -- on the other side, we do have a conviction for a very serious misdemeanor; Attempting to Influence the Decision of a Juror, which doesn't just -- which goes into the idea that he's attempting to subvert the entire judicial process, which

makes the misdemeanor, in and of itself, very serious. And the legislature has decided to provide a maximum of one-year jail time for this type of misdemeanor. So those are obviously the -- the competing ideas that the Court has to consider in making her recommend -- or -- in making her judgment in this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I see that the Probation Department has recommended, I believe, 45 days, with credit for one day served; a total of 44 days, as well as 120 hours of community service. One of the things I would ask this Court to consider, outside of those two contrasting considerations, is the fact that defendant's testimony during the trial seems to indicate that he's a person that might not necessarily be amenable to rehabilitative services. What I mean by that is the defendant took the stand, he swore an oath in front of this Judge and in front of the jury, and he admitted that yes, he is -- he was a person who knew about the Yoder trial; yes, he was very upset about what was going on with the Yoder trial; yes, he appeared for the final pretrial in that case; yes, he called the local media because -- or -- the local newspaper because he was very upset by what was going on; yes, he was so upset by what was going on, he immediately went home and started ordering these flyers entitled, "Your Jury Rights: True or False?" from the FIJA website;

yes, he had a specific interest in this trial in that he did not think that what the government was doing was correct and, yes, he appeared for the date and time of the trial, at this courthouse, before the trial was to begin, and began handing out those pamphlets that are directed towards jurors. He then veered off into the ditch when he said to this Court; under oath, no, I had absolutely no intention whatsoever of influencing the decision of a jury. And if the absurdity of that statement isn't obvious on its face, he then doubled down on that by trying to say that your -- Your Honor, the reason why I chose -- or -- he tried to tell the jury the reason that he chose the date and time for that particular trial was because he didn't think there would be a trial. of statement, your Honor, shows that the defendant not only realized that what he was doing was wrong, but then tried to -- he -- he compounded the fallacy by making this absurd argument that he chose the date and time for a jury trial, because he didn't think there would be a trial, and he chose to hand out these pamphlets saying, Your Jury Rights; True or False, to a bunch of people headed into the courtroom -- or -- walking into a courtroom for a trial because he did not think that jurors would be influenced by it.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, obviously, the jury did not buy

that. It took them about 20 minutes to come back with a guilty verdict. And I think that that demonstrates that this was not a person who made a one-time mistake. And then -- he -- he hasn't demonstrated that he's -- he's kind of shown that he realizes now the significance of what he's done. In fact, the testimony shows the contrary. It's for that reason, your Honor, I believe that the recommendation as provided by the Probation Department would be appropriate in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Kallman.

MR. KALLMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

Well, obviously, we disagree. I think the Court obviously knows and has to look at a lot of different factors; protection of the community, prior record, all those sorts of things. I'm not going to repeat all that. I know the Court is fully familiar with all of those things. But, I think the lack of history here and it is a misdemeanor. I have had numerous clients for all sorts of misdemeanor crimes over the years I've been in practice. Many for violent type crimes; assaults, drunk driving, all sorts of things. With a record like my client has, and on a first offense, absolutely a probation -- and I think that the -- and, frankly, in some cases even no probation; just fines and costs, and whatever the Court imposes for a

first-time offender. I don't think that the Court should be -- essentially, the Prosecutor is arguing retaliate against Mr. Wood because he disagreed with the jury process or general jury rights and things like that. He exercised his, what he believes are his, free speech rights; did it out on the -- the sidewalk before this court. And that, because of that, that deserves 45 days in jail, let alone one day in jail? I totally disagree with that. And I don't think in the interest of proportionality, and the way other folks are sentenced, and all sorts of things, that there is any rhyme or reason to that.

To argue that my client -- well, he didn't want to influence the jurors, but he didn't think there was going to be a trial; that those are inconsistent. I don't see how that's inconsistent whatsoever. He said very clearly, when Mr. Wood testified, he said, I wanted to get information out. I knew a lot of people were called that day to be a juror -- you know -- for this -- for the jury. I wanted to get information into people's hands; that he was handing it out to people who were not jurors. He was handing out the information. That was his purpose. There was nothing in that flyer that said anything about the Yoder case. I know the Court is aware of all this background. But to say that's inconsistent; I don't think

that's inconsistent at all. The fact that he thought, I really don't think there's probably going to be a trial that day, but I know a lot of people are going to be there, I'm handing this out. I think that's totally consistent and, if anything, goes to whether or not he should get jail time or not because he honestly believed there would not be a trial. He was trying to educate the public; he knew a lot of people would be there, including prospective jurors, and he was handing out the information. So I don't think that that warrants such, frankly, a stiff penalty for a first-time offender.

Beyond that, your Honor, I think you need to consider a number of other factors here; my client has maintained his employment through his adult life, he's self-employed in the insurance field and is a broker, he is an entrepreneur; has done a lot of very positive things in the communities where he has lived, and through his church, and other things. He has never had any problems, as Mr. Hull said, since this whole thing started now almost two years ago. There have not been any repeat offenses or anything going on. My client is married and now has eight children. They just recently had a baby who is, I think, four or five months old, and he is the sole support for his family. The sole support that provides health insurance and care, as well as putting food on the

He's it. And if this Court were to put my client table. in jail for something like this, for 45 days, you're essentially sentencing him to losing his business, losing his source of income, and ability to care for his family over handing out a flyer. Now, I understand the Prosecutor is upset; he brought this case, the jury has ruled. I'm not saying any -- I understand all of that. But, I think you need to look at the totality of the circumstances here, Judge. And is that really what we want is essentially the potentiality of putting his family on the welfare rolls of this state, and lose their health insurance, and lose his ability to care for his children and his family? I would say that is so far out of proportion to what's occurred here that it's not even a close call. He's been free on bond since this incident occurred. He has complied with all terms of the bond conditions that the Court has put in place. He's no risk to flee or take off or do anything like that. So I think the Court needs to look at all those sorts of things. He's not a violent person, this is not a violent offense, he does not pose a danger to anybody and I don't think the Prosecutor would argue that.

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So given all those things, Judge, I would argue that jailtime in this case is not warranted. If the Court wants to send a message or do something, it could set a

probation term and put jail at the end of probation and have my client -- see how he performs on probation, and if he doesn't comply, then a sentence could be carried out.

But it gives an opportunity for my client to continue to show the Court he's not a danger to anybody and he's not doing anything more beyond what's occurred in this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Finally, Judge -- and I think we all know this and I mean no disrespect to the Court; I hope the Court understands, I think I've tried to be respectful through all of these proceedings. I think I have been. because I feel that way -- but, obviously, we're going to appeal. And there are constitutional issues here. there are lots of things that the higher courts are going to have to decide that have been raised and properly preserved in the record of this case. And we all know that that's going up. So to impose a sentence like this given the certainty of appeal here. And I think, frankly, a lot of these issues will be a first impression with the Court; using the jury tampering statute in this way against a person exercising their speech rights. I could find no case law on it. I think this is going to be a case of first impression. So, you know, to impose this and then potentially have it carried out, and then if we subsequently win on appeal, I think you can see the unfairness of that. And even if -- and, obviously, we

1 would pursue that appeal all the way through, my client would continue to obey all Court directives, and if -- if 2 at the end he loses his appeal, he could serve whatever 3 time at that point and that's not harming the State at 4 all. 5 And so, I don't know -- I'll -- I'll reserve my 6 further motion depending on how -- you know -- what the 7 Court intends to do. But, I just think given the lack of 9 record, my client's family situation, he's self-employed with his business, and all the things I've said, jail is 10 not appropriate here, Judge. 11 Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 13 Mr. Wood, is there anything that you would like 14 15 me to know before I impose sentence? THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 16 Thank you. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 I'd ask that you and Mr. Kallman stand at the 19 podium, please. 20 21 MR. KALLMAN: Okay. This Court would note that I have 22 THE COURT: been involved with this case since the beginning of this 23 case --24

25

(At 10:11 a.m., baby fussing in the gallery)

I'm going to have to ask that that child be -- either has to be quite or has to be removed, please. We -- obviously, Mr. Kallman has indicated there will be a -- an appeal and we cannot make a transcript with a baby crying.

THE DEFENDANT: Sorry.

THE COURT: As I indicated, this Court has been involved from the beginning of this case, presiding over not only a preliminary examination, various motions in this case, and then, ultimately, a trial in this case. A trial that was, as we all know, based on the concept that everyone has a right to a trial by your peers. Your peers have decided, Mr. Wood, that you are guilty of what you've been charged with; the Attempting to Influence Jurors. After being provided with all of the information that you were handing out, all of the facts and circumstances of this case, they have determined -- and in a very short period of time -- that you were guilty of the charge that you were -- the charge that was brought against you.

This Court has thought long and hard in regards to an appropriate sentence in this case. And I have taken into account all of the testimony from the trial, all of the arguments that have been made in the various motions that were brought before me, and all of the arguments that were made on the record today, and I have reviewed the sentence recommendation in this case. In considering

everything that has been provided to me and everything that I have heard, I think that I'm going to -- I'm going to deviate from the recommendation. However, based on what I believe is appropriate -- in my experience in dealing with appropriate sentences -- under the circumstances, this is a one-year misdemeanor. I don't believe that the -- serving 45 days in jail; a straight 45 days in jail, is what is appropriate under the circumstances. But, I don't feel that no jail is appropriate either. So what your sentence is going to be is going to be as follows; I am going to place you on probation for a period of six months.

I do need to ask because there is not an oversight fee in this; what is your normal probation fee?

MR. BUSE: Your Honor, for six months it would be \$120.

THE COURT: A hundred and twenty dollars. All right.

Thank you.

You will be placed on six months' probation. I am going to impose the 45 days as recommended, but it will be served as follows; I am going to require you to serve eight full weekends in jail. Those weekends; except for today -- I am going to require that you go immediately to jail today to start your first weekend. You will be

released on Sunday at 6:00 o'clock p.m. -- every weekend 1 after that, for the next seven weekends, will be Friday at 2 6:00 p.m. to Sunday at 6:00 p.m. Any additional time will 3 be suspended. That time will be suspended for 120 hours of community service. I will be assessing the following 5 costs; a fine of \$150, costs of \$150, state cost in the amount of \$50, crime victims' assessment in the amount of 7 \$75, the oversight fee of \$120, making the total assessments in this case \$545. 9 I am also assessing a \$75 community service fee for the community service that will 10 11 be in -- imposed. Mr. Hull, do you have any guestions regarding 12 that recommendation? 13 MR. HULL: None, your Honor. 14 15 Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Kallman. 16 MR. KALLMAN: Your Honor, I would assume that 17 the \$620 -- if my math is right -- that you've just set 18 for fines and costs, can be paid over probation? 19 That can be, yes. He initially had THE COURT: 20 a bond amount, but that was all returned; is that --21 22 MR. KALLMAN: Right. THE COURT: -- correct? 23 MR. KALLMAN: Yes. 24 THE COURT: So he's on personal recognizance? 25

MR. KALLMAN: 1 Yes. THE COURT: So we don't have any bond to apply. 2 So, yes, that can be paid over his -- I will allow him to 3 pay that over his probation period due to the fact -normally, it's required upfront -- however, because he is 5 going straight to jail today, I will allow that to be paid over the probation --7 MR. KALLMAN: Okay. Thank --9 THE COURT: -- period. MR. KALLMAN: -- you, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: From the Probation Department; any 11 questions regarding the recommendation so you can do the 12 appropriate paperwork? 13 MR. BUSE: No, your Honor. I'll prepare the 14 15 judgment and orders. THE COURT: All right. 16 This is a final sentence of the Court and you do 17 have appeal rights. I would presume that you know that, 18 Mr. Kallman. 19 MR. KALLMAN: Of course. 20 21 Can I have one moment to chat with my client 22 then, I may have a motion? THE COURT: That --23 If we could just have a moment? 24 MR. KALLMAN: 25 THE COURT: Yes, that would be fine.

MR. KALLMAN: Okay.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(At 10:17 a.m., off record discussion between

Mr. Kallman and his client)

(At 10:18 a.m., court reconvenes)

MR. KALLMAN: Your Honor, given the Court's sentence -- and I understand that and I have no question on that -- I would make a Motion to Stay the Sentence pending our appeal. And under People versus Giacalone, 16 Mich App 352, it sets out the standards for the granting of a Stay of a Sentence Pending an Appeal. And I'm not going to repeat all -- I under -- the Court understands our basis for the appeal -- but the *Giacalone* Standards say -- there are four of them -- the first is the likelihood that Mr. Wood would appear when required to appear; he has always appeared for everything. potential harm to the community from him being out and not serving any jail time; again, I don't think there's any evidence that there's any harm to anybody in the community from him being out. He's been out now almost two years. Third, the substantiality of the grounds for appeal; I -you're fully aware of all of the issues, and the First Amendment and constitutional issues, and things here. I think they are substantial. We can all respectfully agree to disagree. But they are substantial. And then finally,

1 fourth, what's the risk to the administration of justice 2 if the Stay is not granted; again, I would argue there is no risk to the administration of justice because we would 3 vigorously pursue the appeals, and once they're completed -- depending on the outcome -- if it goes against Mr. 5 Wood, he'll report and still do the time that the Court's 7 imposed without any problem. However, if he wins, then, of course, that changes that outcome. So I would arque 9 that weighs toward my client's side of the equation here. Those are the four factors, Judge. So I think we meet all 10 of those. We would ask the Court to consider a Stay of 11 his Sentence pending the appeal. 12 I do have a proposed order. I can share it with 13 And there's a spot on here, your Honor, to 14 Mr. Hull. 15 either grant or deny it. THE COURT: Thank you. 16 MR. KALLMAN: If I may approach? 17 THE COURT: You may. 18 Mr. -- did you have anything further? 19 20 MR. KALLMAN: Nope. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Hull --22 Thank you. 23 MR. KALLMAN: THE COURT: -- your response to the Motion to 24 25 Stay.

MR. HULL: Thank you, your Honor.

any differently than you would any other criminal conviction. It -- it is a misdemeanor; it's a one-year. He has been tried and he's been convicted based on this. Any criminal conviction will -- could potentially result in a constitutional challenge by a defendant, whether it be a First Amendment, Fourth Amendment, Sixth Amendment, most criminal convictions can have a challenge by a defendant. I don't see how this is any different from any other conviction. So I would ask the Court to deny the motion.

THE COURT: Mr. Kallman, it is your motion, anything further?

MR. KALLMAN: No, your Honor. Again, I think this case is unique. As I said before, I could find no prior precedent on this sort of -- applying this statute in this manner as it's been done in this case. And I think with -- given the First Amendment issues -- you know -- this is a very unique case.

So, thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. HULL: Your Honor, very briefly. I apologize. If the Court is considering, I would ask for an opportunity to brief the issue because I have not been

provided any kind of notice that this would be coming, except Mr. Kallman did inform us right before the hearing today.

This Court actually did anticipate that that request would be made if a -- obviously -- if a jail sentence was imposed. Therefore, I don't feel that there is any reason to treat Mr. Kallman -- or I'm sorry -- Mr. Wood any different, Mr. Kallman, then any other criminal defendant that I sentence. Therefore, the -- your motion will be denied. I will provide this to the court clerk and she can provide you copies then.

MR. KALLMAN: Your Honor, if I could inquire then, will the Judgment of Sentence be entered immediately, because I brought the appellate paperwork along and I have paperwork that I would like to file upstairs to have this issue heard by Judge Hill-Kennedy. So how soon would I be able to -- I mean, will this be going right to the clerk's office so I can proceed ahead?

THE COURT: I -- I will, however, the Judgment of Sentence will have to be prepared. So I don't know how long that that will take.

MR. BUSE: An hour at most.

MR. KALLMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: Yeah.

ı	
1	MR. KALLMAN: Okay. Great.
2	THE COURT: I'm here all day so.
3	MR. KALLMAN: All right.
4	Thank you.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6	Thank you.
7	Take Mr. Wood into custody, please.
8	We'll be off the record.
9	(At 10:22 a.m., proceedings concluded)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
    STATE OF MICHIGAN
2
                          )
    COUNTY OF MECOSTA
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
         I certify that this transcript, consisting of 23
10
    pages, is a complete, true, and correct transcript, to the best
11
    of my ability, of the proceedings and testimony taken in
12
    this case on Friday, July 21, 2017.
13
14
15
16
17
18
    July 21, 2017
19
                                     Sabrina M. Marlette, CER 8103
20
                                     49<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court
21
                                     400 Elm Street
22
23
                                     Big Rapids, Michigan 49307
24
                                     (231) 592-8303
25
```