

1 GEORGE S. CARDONA  
Acting United States Attorney  
2 CHRISTINE C. EWELL  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 Chief, Criminal Division  
WESLEY L. HSU (Cal. Bar No. 188015)  
4 Assistant United States Attorneys  
Chief, Cyber and Intellectual  
5 Property Crimes Section  
1200 United States Courthouse  
6 312 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012  
7 Telephone: (213) 894-3045  
Facsimile: (213) 894-8601  
8 e-mail: wesley.hsu@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

10  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. CR 09-1215-R  
14 Plaintiff, )  
15 v. ) GOVERNMENT'S POSITION RE:  
16 ) SENTENCING; EXHIBITS  
MICHAEL DAVID BARRETT, ) Sent. Date: March 8, 2010  
17 aka "Mark Bennett," ) Time: 1:30 p.m.  
18 aka "handsfouryou," ) Ctrm: 8  
aka "GOBLAZERS1," ) Hon. Manuel L. Real  
19 Defendant. )  
20 \_\_\_\_\_ )

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
online.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. THE GOVERNMENT CONCURS IN THE ADVISORY GUIDELINES CALCULATIONS SET FORTH IN DEFENDANT'S PSR.....	2
B. A SENTENCE OF 27 MONTHS IMPRISONMENT IS SUFFICIENT, BUT NOT GREATER THAN NECESSARY, TO PUNISH DEFENDANT FOR HIS CONDUCT.....	2
1. <u>18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1)</u> .....	3
2. <u>18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)</u> .....	7
3. <u>THE REMAINING 3553(a) FACTORS ALSO SUPPORT THE             SENTENCE REQUESTED BY THE GOVERNMENT</u> .....	9
III. CONCLUSION.....	12



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

Page (s)

United States v. Battista,  
575 F.3d 226 (2d Cir. 2009) . . . . . 11, 12

United States v. Gonzalez,  
541 F.3d 1250 (11th Cir. 2008) . . . . . 4

United States v. Gordon,  
393 F.3d 1044 (9th Cir. 2004) . . . . . 11

United States v. Moon,  
513 F.3d 527 (6th Cir. 2008) . . . . . 4

United States v. Novak,  
476 F.3d 1041 (9th Cir. 2007) . . . . . 10

United States v. Treadwell,  
\_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, 2010 WL 309027 (9th Cir. Jan. 28, 2010) . . . . . 9

FEDERAL STATUTES

18 U.S.C. § 1801 . . . . . 8

18 U.S.C. § 2264(b) (1) . . . . . 10

18 U.S.C. § 2264(b) (3) . . . . . 10

18 U.S.C. § 2264(b) (4) . . . . . 10

18 U.S.C. § 2264(c) . . . . . 10

18 U.S.C. § 3143(b) (2) . . . . . 12

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) . . . . . 2

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (1) . . . . . 3

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2) . . . . . 7

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (3) . . . . . 9

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (4) . . . . . 9

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (6) . . . . . 9

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (7) . . . . . 10

18 U.S.C. § 3663A(a) (2) . . . . . 11

18 U.S.C. § 3663A(b) (4) . . . . . 11

18 U.S.C. § 3663A(c) (1) (B) . . . . . 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont'd)

STATE STATUTES

Page (s)

720 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/26-4	9
Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2907.08	8
Tenn. Code Ann. § 39-13-605	8
Wis. Stat. § 942.08	8



1 I.

2 INTRODUCTION

3 Between January and September 2008, defendant Michael David  
4 Barrett ("defendant") stalked ESPN sideline reporter Erin Andrews  
5 ("Victim Andrews") to at least three different hotel rooms in  
6 three states. Defendant violated Victim Andrews' privacy by  
7 removing the peephole device from her hotel room door without her  
8 knowledge and watching her through the peephole while she was in  
9 her room. Defendant used his cellphone to capture video of her  
10 naked in her room. Defendant then, over the course of weeks in  
11 2009, posted on the Internet ten videos of Victim Andrews naked,  
12 both identifying Victim Andrews as the woman in the videos and  
13 making them available for anyone with an Internet connection to  
14 download for years to come. Victim Andrews suffered, and  
15 continues to suffer, substantial emotional distress from  
16 defendant's unlawful conduct.

17 As a public figure, Victim Andrews' distress was magnified  
18 due to the fact that many thousands of persons are aware of the  
19 videos, and unknown numbers have viewed them knowing who she is.  
20 For many years, Victim Andrews is likely to come into contact  
21 with sports fans and other members of the public who are among  
22 those who have seen the videos or, at minimum, who are aware of  
23 them.

24 Defendant's criminal conduct toward Victim Andrews warrants  
25 significant punishment. The government respectfully requests  
26 that the Court impose a sentence of 27 months imprisonment, three  
27 years supervised release with terms and conditions as stipulated  
28 to by the parties in the plea agreement, restitution in the

1 amount of \$334,808.27, and a special assessment of \$100. The  
2 government also requests that the Court remand defendant to the  
3 custody of the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") at the conclusion of his  
4 sentencing hearing.

5 **II.**

6 **ARGUMENT**

7 A. THE GOVERNMENT CONCURS IN THE ADVISORY GUIDELINES  
8 CALCULATIONS SET FORTH IN DEFENDANT'S PSR

9 With respect to the presentence investigation report  
10 ("PSR"), the government requests that the Court adopt its  
11 advisory Sentencing Guidelines calculation. This calculation is  
12 as follows: a base offense level of 18 (U.S.S.G. § 2A6.2(a)); +2  
13 for a pattern of activity involving stalking, threatening,  
14 harassing or assaulting the same victim (U.S.S.G.  
15 § 2A6.2(b)(1)(D)); and -3 for acceptance of responsibility--for a  
16 total adjusted offense level of 17. The parties stipulated to  
17 this calculation in the plea agreement. (Plea Agt. ¶ 13.)

18 The government also respectfully submits that the PSR  
19 correctly calculated defendant's criminal history to be Category  
20 I and asks that the Court adopt that calculation. Thus, the  
21 government requests that the Court adopt an advisory Guidelines  
22 range of 24 to 30 months.

23 B. A SENTENCE OF 27 MONTHS IMPRISONMENT IS SUFFICIENT, BUT NOT  
24 GREATER THAN NECESSARY, TO PUNISH DEFENDANT FOR HIS CONDUCT

25 In addition to the advisory Guidelines range, of course, the  
26 Court must consider the factors set forth under 18 U.S.C.  
27 § 3553(a). The government respectfully submits that application  
28

1 of the facts of this case to the Section 3553(a) factors supports  
2 a sentence of 27 months in prison in this case.

3 1. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (1)

4 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (1) requires the Court to consider the  
5 nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and  
6 characteristics of defendant. The nature and circumstances of  
7 the offense are, to borrow the words of the United States  
8 Magistrate Judge in Chicago who initially set defendant's bail,  
9 "very horrific." See  
10 <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/news/story?id=4534293> (true and  
11 correct copy attached as Ex. 1.)

12 Over the course of nine months, the defendant tracked Victim  
13 Andrews across the country on at least three separate occasions.  
14 (PSR ¶¶ 11-18.) He called a number of different hotels to locate  
15 where she would be staying. (PSR ¶¶ 11, 15.) He deliberately  
16 requested a room next door to her. (PSR ¶ 17.) While she was in  
17 the privacy of her hotel rooms preparing for work by showering,  
18 blow-drying her hair, and getting dressed, defendant invaded  
19 Victim Andrews' privacy in a serious manner, removing the  
20 peephole device from her hotel room doors so that he could take  
21 digital videos of her naked. (PSR ¶¶ 13, 16, 18.)

22 Then, over the course of weeks in 2009, he posted the videos  
23 for the public to download, naming the first video "Erin Andrews  
24 Naked Butt," and other videos "Sexy and Hot Blonde Sports  
25 celebrity shows us her all," "Erin Andrews in a Pink Thong,"  
26 "Erin go WOW!!," "Erin Andrews," "Erin Andrews Spectacular Butt,"  
27 and "Erin Andrews Awesome." (Ex. 2 (list of videos posted and  
28 named by defendant on DailyMotion.com between February 17 and

1 June 19, 2009); PSR ¶¶ 21-22.) Defendant had attempted to sell  
2 the videos to TMZ.com<sup>1</sup> (PSR ¶ 19), so he knew there would be  
3 significant public interest in downloading the videos. In July  
4 2009, the videos reached the top of Google's "most searched  
5 items" list, so it is reasonable to infer that the videos were  
6 widely downloaded. See  
7 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ebwP5LTOe8o> (Good Morning America  
8 news report noting that the videos rose to the "top" of Google's  
9 search list) (a true and correct copy on CD-ROM attached as Ex.  
10 3.) The videos simply cannot be removed from the Internet, so no  
11 doubt downloads continue to this day.

12 The emotional distress caused to Victim Andrews is a  
13 necessary part of the evaluation of the nature and circumstances  
14 of defendant's offense. See, e.g., United States v. Moon, 513  
15 F.3d 527, 534 (6th Cir. 2008) (affirming sentence where district  
16 court permitted testimony of relatives of deceased patients as  
17 relevant to nature and circumstances of the fraud offense).<sup>2</sup>  
18 Defendant, of course, has admitted that he intended to cause  
19 Victim Andrews substantial emotional distress and that he in fact  
20 did cause her substantial emotional distress. Nevertheless, as  
21 her statement to the Court at defendant's guilty plea and her  
22 Victim Impact Statement both make clear, defendant's conduct has  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> TMZ.com is a website dedicated to celebrity news.

25 <sup>2</sup> Some courts have considered harm to the victim under  
26 Section 3553(a)(2) as well. See, e.g., United States v.  
27 Gonzalez, 541 F.3d 1250, 1254 (11th Cir. 2008) (noting district  
28 court's consideration of "desperation of the victims" when  
considering the nature and circumstances of offense and harm to  
victims when considering the need to reflect the seriousness of  
the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just  
punishment).

1 had a devastating impact on Victim Andrews' emotional state, and  
2 the emotional distress caused to her and her family cannot be  
3 overstated. She has lived in fear for her physical safety.  
4 (Victim Impact Statement at 1.) She has nightmares about  
5 defendant. (Id.) She also wakes up at least once a night  
6 fearing that defendant is breaking into her home. (Id.) Every  
7 time she turns on a computer, Victim Andrews is reminded that the  
8 videos cannot be removed from the Internet (id.), and she knows  
9 that her future husband and her future children will have to  
10 confront these videos (id. at 2). Whenever she goes to work, she  
11 must deal both with worries that she is not being taken seriously  
12 and with "fans" that say things about the videos to her. (Id. at  
13 1.) Also disturbing is the fact that many people, including some  
14 of Victim Andrews' peers in the media, wrongly believed that  
15 Victim Andrews had something to do with these videos, i.e., that  
16 she orchestrated them to boost her career. (Id. at 2.) Victim  
17 Andrews' father has also suffered significant emotional distress,  
18 with his daughter calling in tears and being "ravaged on the  
19 Internet." (Id. at 3.) Taken together, the nature and  
20 circumstances of defendant's conduct require significant  
21 punishment.

22 Defendant's history and characteristics also support a  
23 sentence of 27 months imprisonment. It is true that defendant's  
24 criminal history does not result in any criminal history points.  
25 (PSR ¶¶ 42-47.) It is also true that defendant has a history of  
26 stable employment. (PSR ¶¶ 64-65.) However, defendant's conduct  
27 toward Victim Andrews cannot be viewed as an "isolated" or  
28 "aberrant" act in an otherwise law-abiding life.

1 To the contrary, Victim Andrews was only one of defendant's  
2 many victims. After initially posting one of the videos of  
3 Victim Andrews to Google on February 12, 2009, defendant posted  
4 ten videos of Victim Andrews to DailyMotion.com under his  
5 username "GOBLAZERS1" between February 16 and March 11, 2009.  
6 (PSR ¶¶ 21-22.) Between February 16 and June 19, 2009, defendant  
7 also used the GOBLAZERS1 account at DailyMotion.com to post 32  
8 other "hotel peephole" videos. (See Ex. 2; Gov't Under Seal Ex.  
9 A (CD with copies of all videos received by the government from  
10 DailyMotion.com).)<sup>3</sup> Review of these other videos demonstrates  
11 that defendant victimized approximately 16 other women in almost  
12 precisely the same way that he victimized Victim Andrews. (Gov't  
13 Under Seal Ex. A). Thus, defendant's video scheme spanned at  
14 least 18 months, and involved over a dozen victims. (PSR ¶ 10.)  
15 Also, as he did with Victim Andrews (PSR ¶ 14), defendant ran  
16 "People Searches" (a type of Internet background check that can  
17 produce information such as date of birth and home address) on  
18 more than 30 other women between November 25, 2006, and July 2,  
19 2009. (See Gov't Under Seal Ex. B.)<sup>4</sup> These women included other  
20 female sports reporters, as well as other television  
21 personalities. (See *id.* at 18, 51, 54-55.)<sup>5</sup> Thus, defendant's  
22 criminal conduct toward Victim Andrews was neither aberrant or  
23

---

24 <sup>3</sup> The government is concurrently filing exhibits A and B  
25 under seal.

26 <sup>4</sup> It is worth noting that, in contrast, the only man that  
27 defendant ran a "People Search" on was himself.

28 <sup>5</sup> Based on the government's review of the videos, the  
government does not believe that celebrities other than Victim  
Andrews are portrayed in the other 32 videos posted by defendant.

1 isolated. Instead, it was a part of a long-term obsession and  
2 scheme involving Victim Andrews, as well as a significant number  
3 of other women.

4 For all of these foregoing reasons, this Section 3553(a) (1)  
5 factor strongly supports the imposition of a sentence of 27  
6 months imprisonment.

7 2. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2)

8 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2) requires the Court to consider the  
9 need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense,  
10 promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the  
11 offense, afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protect  
12 the public from further crimes of defendant, and provide  
13 defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical  
14 care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective  
15 manner. This factor also supports the government's request for a  
16 sentence of 27 months imprisonment because of the seriousness of  
17 the offense, the need to deter further criminal conduct by the  
18 defendant, and the need to promote respect for the law.

19 As discussed above, defendant's offense is serious.  
20 Defendant's punishment in this case must not only serve as a  
21 deterrent to him, but as a deterrent to other would-be video  
22 voyeurs who would post their videos on the Internet. The  
23 confluence of the widespread use of cellphone cameras, the  
24 popularity of reality television, and the availability of the  
25 Internet have combined to make video voyeurism a serious problem  
26 today. "The problem of voyeurism has become even more  
27 exacerbated since the introduction of cell phones equipped with  
28 digital cameras . . . . These portable devices enable a Peeping

1 Tom to secretly snap photographs of anyone at any time without  
2 notice, and easily upload these photographs to the Internet for  
3 anyone to view." Josh Blackman, Note, Omniveillance, Google,  
4 Privacy in Public, and the Right to Your Digital Identity: A Tort  
5 For Recording and Disseminating an Individual's Image Over the  
6 Internet, 49 Santa Clara L. Rev. 313, 360 (2009) (internal  
7 citation omitted) (true and correct copy attached as Ex. 4.) The  
8 combination of video voyeurism and the Internet poses an ever-  
9 growing and substantial danger to the right to privacy.

10 This danger has been noticed by legislatures across the  
11 country. In passing the Video Voyeurism Prevention Act of 2004,  
12 18 U.S.C. § 1801, Congress recognized the substantial harm of  
13 video voyeurism combined with the Internet:

14 In passing the Video Voyeurism Prevention Act of 2004,  
15 Congress addressed its concern with the Internet's  
16 ability to easily and instantly disseminate voyeuristic  
17 photographs to a global audience. The House Reports  
18 noted that violations of privacy are "compounded when  
19 the photographs find their way to the Internet . . .  
20 [and] the instantaneous distribution capabilities of  
21 the Internet, have combined to create a threat to . . .  
22 privacy." The Congressional Record reported that "the  
23 impact of video voyeurism on its victims is greatly  
24 exacerbated by the Internet. As a result of Internet  
25 technology, the photographs that a voyeur captures can  
26 be disseminated to a worldwide audience in a matter of  
27 seconds." Representative Jerse even commented that a  
28 victim's "privacy could be violated millions of times"  
if the image is posted on the Internet.

23 Blackman, supra, at 366-67. In addition to the federal  
24 government, nearly all of the states have passed laws prohibiting  
25 video voyeurism and/or the dissemination of such videos. See,  
26 e.g., Tenn. Code Ann. § 39-13-605 (prohibiting video voyeurism  
27 and dissemination); Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2907.08 (Voyeurism);  
28 Wis. Stat. § 942.08 (Invasion of Privacy); S.C. Code Ann. § 16-

1 17-470 (prohibiting recording and distribution); 720 Ill. Comp.  
2 Stat. 5/26-4 (same). Defendant's sentence should reflect the  
3 need to curb this significant problem.

4 In this time of diminishing personal privacy, a line must be  
5 drawn. Travelers must feel safe in the privacy of their hotel  
6 rooms, secure that they will not have embarrassing videos taken  
7 of them while showering or dressing and placed on the Internet  
8 for unlimited distribution forever. A 27-month sentence in this  
9 case would promote respect for the law and deter further criminal  
10 conduct by defendant and others.

11 3. THE REMAINING 3553(a) FACTORS ALSO SUPPORT THE SENTENCE  
12 REQUESTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

13 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(3) requires the Court to consider the  
14 kinds of sentences available. There is no doubt that  
15 incarceration is appropriate given the nature of defendant's  
16 offense.

17 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(4) and (5) now require the Court to  
18 consider the Sentencing Guidelines in determining the particular  
19 sentence to be imposed. As noted above, the advisory Guidelines  
20 recommend a sentence in the range of 24 to 30 months, which the  
21 government requests here.

22 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(6) requires the Court to minimize  
23 sentencing disparity among similarly situated defendants.  
24 Sentencing within the Guideline range of 24 to 30 months is  
25 sufficient to ensure that the sentence does not create an  
26 unwarranted disparity with other defendants. See United States  
27 v. Treadwell, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, 2010 WL 309027, at \*18 (9th Cir. Jan.  
28 28, 2010) ("Because the Guidelines range was correctly

1 calculated, the district court was entitled to rely on the  
2 Guidelines range in determining that there was no 'unwarranted  
3 disparity' between Treadwell and other offenders convicted of  
4 similar frauds."). The government is unaware of any "similarly  
5 situated" defendants.

6 Finally, 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(7) requires the Court to  
7 consider restitution. Restitution can include an order requiring  
8 defendant to liquidate retirement assets, to the extent that  
9 defendant is permitted under his plan, in order to meet  
10 restitution obligations. United States v. Novak, 476 F.3d 1041,  
11 1053 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc); (see PSR ¶ 67 (defendant  
12 possesses retirement assets).) Two separate restitution  
13 provisions apply here. Title 18, United States Code, Section  
14 2264 mandates that the Court order "the full amount of the  
15 victim's losses." 18 U.S.C. § 2264(b)(1), (4). This is defined  
16 as including the following:

- 17 (A) medical services relating to physical,  
18 psychiatric, or psychological care;
- 19 (B) physical and occupational therapy or  
20 rehabilitation;
- 21 (C) necessary transportation, temporary housing, and  
22 child care expenses;
- 23 (D) lost income;
- 24 (E) attorneys' fees, plus any costs incurred in  
25 obtaining a civil protection order; and
- 26 (F) any other losses suffered by the victim as a  
27 proximate result of the offense.

28 18 U.S.C. § 2264(b)(3). Under Section 2264, "victim" is defined  
in relevant part as the individual harmed as a result of a  
commission of a crime under Section 2261A. 18 U.S.C. § 2264(c).

1 Under the Mandatory Victims Restitution Act ("MVRA"),  
2 restitution is mandatory where "an identifiable victim or victims  
3 has suffered . . . pecuniary loss." 18 U.S.C. § 3663A(c)(1)(B).

4 For the purposes of this section, the term "victim"  
5 means a person directly and proximately harmed as a  
6 result of the commission of an offense for which  
7 restitution may be ordered including, in the case of an  
8 offense that involves as an element a scheme,  
9 conspiracy, or pattern of criminal activity, any person  
10 directly harmed by the defendant's criminal conduct in  
11 the course of the scheme, conspiracy, or pattern.

12 18 U.S.C. § 3663A(a)(2). The MVRA requires that restitution  
13 "reimburse the victim for lost income and necessary child care,  
14 transportation, and other expenses incurred during participation  
15 in the investigation or prosecution of the offense or attendance  
16 at proceedings related to the offense." 18 U.S.C. § 3663A(b)(4)  
17 (emphasis added). Investigation costs in aid of the criminal  
18 proceedings, including attorneys' fees, are recoverable. United  
19 States v. Gordon, 393 F.3d 1044, 1057 (9th Cir. 2004); see also  
20 United States v. Battista, 575 F.3d 226, 233-34 (2d Cir. 2009)  
21 (decided under "almost verbatim" language of the Victim Witness  
22 Protection Act ("VWPA")).

23 As set forth in the PSR and in her Victim Impact Statement,  
24 Victim Andrews seeks \$335,508.27 in restitution. The government  
25 respectfully submits that nearly all of the losses requested by  
26 Victim Andrews are recoverable under either Section 2664 or the  
27 MVRA. Certainly, all of the losses directly incurred by Victim  
28 Andrews are recoverable under Section 2664. ESPN's losses in  
assisting with the investigation are also recoverable because  
ESPN qualifies as a "victim" under the MVRA as Victim Andrews'  
employer and given that she was traveling for work when

1 victimized. See Battista, 575 F.3d at 231 ("Although [the  
2 defendant] did not defraud the NBA directly, we conclude that the  
3 district court properly characterized the NBA as a 'victim' under  
4 the VWPA because the NBA was harmed by the conduct committed  
5 during the course of the conspiracy to transmit wagering  
6 information . . . ."). The losses incurred to Victim Andrews'  
7 father for traveling with her to Los Angeles to provide support  
8 during the investigation and prosecution of this case are  
9 recoverable as her father also qualifies as a victim under the  
10 MVRA. Only the \$700 airfare for Victim Andrews' mother, which  
11 was neither incurred by Victim Andrews nor directly related to  
12 the investigation or prosecution of defendant, seems to fall  
13 outside the scope of both Section 2264 and the MVRA. Thus, the  
14 government conservatively requests a restitution order of  
15 \$334,808.27 (Victim Andrews' requested amount less \$700).

### 16 III.

#### 17 CONCLUSION

18 Defendant's criminal conduct against Victim Andrews cannot  
19 be sanctioned. A 27-month sentence is necessary to punish  
20 defendant for his violations of Victim Andrews' privacy and the  
21 resulting substantial emotional distress. The government also  
22 requests that the Court impose a three-year period of supervised  
23 release, restitution in the amount of \$334,808.27, and a special  
24 assessment of \$100. Finally, the government requests that  
25 defendant be remanded to the custody of the BOP at the conclusion  
26 of the sentencing hearing in this matter. See 18 U.S.C.  
27 § 3143(b) (2) ("The judicial officer shall order that a person who  
28 has been found guilty of an offense . . . and is awaiting

