



**U.S. Department of Justice**

*United States Attorney  
Southern District of New York*

---

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

October 21, 2011

Gary P. Naftalis, Esq.  
David S. Frankel, Esq.  
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

Re: United States v. Drew K. Brownstein,  
11 Cr. \_\_\_ ( )

Dear Mr. Naftalis:

On the understandings specified below, the Office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York ("this Office") will accept a guilty plea from Drew K. Brownstein ("the defendant") to a one-count Information (the "Information").

Count One of the Information charges the defendant with committing securities fraud, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 78j(b) and 78ff, Title 17, Code of Federal Regulation, Sections 240.10b-5, and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2, in connection with a scheme to defraud by executing securities transactions based on material, nonpublic information. This charge carries a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum term of three years' supervised release, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$5 million, twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense, or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than the defendant resulting from the offense, and a mandatory \$100 special assessment.

In addition, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3663, 3663A, and 3664, the Court must impose an order of restitution to any victims of the offenses.

In consideration of his plea to the above offenses, the defendant will not be further prosecuted criminally by this Office and, with respect to tax offenses, the Tax Division, Department of Justice, for his participation in a scheme to commit insider trading, from in or about April 8, 2010 through in or about April 15, 2010, in connection with the execution of securities trades based on material, non-public information during that period of time, as charged in Count One of the Information, it being understood that this agreement does not bar the use of such conduct as a predicate act or as the basis for a sentencing enhancement in a subsequent prosecution including, but not limited to, a prosecution pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961 et seq. In addition, at the time of sentencing, the Government will move to dismiss any open Count(s)

against the defendant. This Agreement does not provide any protection against prosecution except as set forth above. The defendant agrees that with respect to any and all dismissed charges he is not a "prevailing party" within the meaning of the "Hyde Amendment," Section 617, P.L. 105-119 (Nov. 26, 1997), and will not file any claim under that law.

The defendant furthermore admits the forfeiture allegations with respect to Count One of the Information and agrees to forfeit to the United States, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461, a sum of money equal to all proceeds traceable to the commission of the offenses charged in the Information (the "Money Judgment"). It is further understood that any forfeiture of the defendant's assets shall not be treated as satisfaction of any fine, restitution, cost of imprisonment, or any other penalty the Court may impose upon him in addition to forfeiture.

In consideration of the foregoing and pursuant to United States Sentencing Guidelines ("U.S.S.G." or "Guidelines") Section 6B1.4, the parties hereby stipulate to the following:

A. Offense Level

1. The November 1, 2010 version of the Guidelines applies to this case.
2. U.S.S.G. § 2B1.4 applies to the offense charged in Count One. Pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 2B1.4(a), the base offense level is eight.
3. Because the gain resulting from the offense that was reasonably foreseeable to the defendant was more than \$1,000,000, but not more than \$2,500,000, 16 levels are added. See U.S.S.G. §§ 2B1.4(b) and 2B1.1(b)(1)(I).
4. Assuming the defendant clearly demonstrates acceptance of responsibility, to the satisfaction of the Government, through his allocution and subsequent conduct prior to the imposition of sentence, a two-level reduction will be warranted pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(a). Furthermore, assuming the defendant has accepted responsibility as described in the previous sentence, an additional one-level reduction is warranted, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(b), because the defendant gave timely notice of his intention to enter a plea of guilty, thereby permitting the Government to avoid preparing for trial and permitting the Court to allocate its resources efficiently.

In accordance with the above, the applicable Guidelines offense level is 21.

B. Criminal History Category

Based upon the information now available to this Office (including representations by the defense), the defendant has zero criminal history points and, accordingly, his criminal history category is I.

C. Sentencing Range

Based upon the calculations set forth above, the defendant's stipulated Guidelines range is 37 to 46 months' imprisonment (Zone D) (the "Stipulated Guidelines Range"). In addition, after determining the defendant's ability to pay, the Court may impose a fine pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 5E1.2. At Guidelines level 21, the applicable fine range is \$7,500 to \$75,000.

The parties agree that neither a downward nor an upward departure from the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months set forth above is warranted. Accordingly, neither party will seek any departure or adjustment pursuant to the Guidelines that is not set forth herein. Nor will either party suggest that the Probation Office consider such a departure or adjustment under the Guidelines, or suggest that the Court *sua sponte* consider any such departure or adjustment.

The parties agree that either party may seek a sentence outside of the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months, suggest that the Probation Office consider a sentence outside of the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months, and suggest that the Court *sua sponte* consider a sentence outside of the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months, based upon the factors to be considered in imposing a sentence pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a).

Except as provided in any written Proffer Agreement(s) that may have been entered into between this Office and the defendant, nothing in this Agreement limits the right of the parties (i) to present to the Probation Office or the Court any facts relevant to sentencing; (ii) to make any arguments regarding where within the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months (or such other range as the Court may determine) the defendant should be sentenced and regarding the factors to be considered in imposing a sentence pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a); (iii) to seek an appropriately adjusted Guidelines range if it is determined based upon new information that the defendant's criminal history category is different from that set forth above; and (iv) to seek an appropriately adjusted Guidelines range or mandatory minimum term of imprisonment if it is subsequently determined that the defendant qualifies as a career offender under U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1. Nothing in this Agreement limits the right of the Government to seek denial of the adjustment for acceptance of responsibility, *see* U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1, regardless of any stipulation set forth above, if the defendant fails clearly to demonstrate

Gary P. Naftalis, Esq.  
David S. Frankel, Esq.  
October 21, 2011  
Page 4

acceptance of responsibility, to the satisfaction of the Government, through his allocution and subsequent conduct prior to the imposition of sentence. Similarly, nothing in this Agreement limits the right of the Government to seek an enhancement for obstruction of justice, *see* U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1, regardless of any stipulation set forth above, should it be determined that the defendant has either (i) engaged in conduct, unknown to the Government at the time of the signing of this Agreement, that constitutes obstruction of justice or (ii) committed another crime after signing this Agreement.

It is understood that pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 6B1.4(d), neither the Probation Office nor the Court is bound by the above Guidelines stipulation, either as to questions of fact or as to the determination of the proper Guidelines to apply to the facts. In the event that the Probation Office or the Court contemplates any Guidelines adjustments, departures, or calculations different from those stipulated to above, or contemplates any sentence outside of the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months, the parties reserve the right to answer any inquiries and to make all appropriate arguments concerning the same.

It is understood that the sentence to be imposed upon the defendant is determined solely by the Court. It is further understood that the Guidelines are not binding on the Court. The defendant acknowledges that his entry of a guilty plea to the charged offenses authorizes the sentencing court to impose any sentence, up to and including the statutory maximum sentence. This Office cannot, and does not, make any promise or representation as to what sentence the defendant will receive. Moreover, it is understood that the defendant will have no right to withdraw his plea of guilty should the sentence imposed by the Court be outside the Guidelines range set forth above.

It is agreed (i) that the defendant will not file a direct appeal; nor bring a collateral challenge, including but not limited to an application under Title 28, United States Code, Section 2255 and/or Section 2241; nor seek a sentence modification pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3582(c), of any sentence within or below the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months, and (ii) that the Government will not appeal any sentence within or above the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 37 to 46 months. This provision is binding on the parties even if the Court employs a Guidelines analysis different from that stipulated to herein. Furthermore, it is agreed that any appeal as to the defendant's sentence that is not foreclosed by this provision will be limited to that portion of the sentencing calculation that is inconsistent with (or not addressed by) the above stipulation. The parties agree that this waiver applies regardless of whether the term of imprisonment is imposed to run consecutively to or concurrently with the undischarged portion of any other sentence of imprisonment that has been imposed on the defendant at the time of sentencing in this case. The defendant further agrees not to appeal any term of supervised release that is less than or equal to the statutory maximum.

Gary P. Naftalis, Esq.  
David S. Frankel, Esq.  
October 21, 2011  
Page 5

The defendant hereby acknowledges that he has accepted this Agreement and decided to plead guilty because he is in fact guilty. By entering this plea of guilty, the defendant waives any and all right to withdraw his plea or to attack his conviction, either on direct appeal or collaterally, on the ground that the Government has failed to produce any discovery material, *Jencks* Act material, exculpatory material pursuant to *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), other than information establishing the factual innocence of the defendant, and impeachment material pursuant to *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), that has not already been produced as of the date of the signing of this Agreement.

It is further agreed that should the conviction following the defendant's plea of guilty pursuant to this Agreement be vacated for any reason, then any prosecution that is not time-barred by the applicable statute of limitations on the date of the signing of this agreement (including any counts that the Government has agreed to dismiss at sentencing pursuant to this Agreement) may be commenced or reinstated against the defendant, notwithstanding the expiration of the statute of limitations between the signing of this Agreement and the commencement or reinstatement of such prosecution. It is the intent of this Agreement to waive all defenses based on the statute of limitations with respect to any prosecution that is not time-barred on the date that this Agreement is signed.


It is further understood that this Agreement does not bind any federal, state, or local prosecuting authority other than this Office.


Gary P. Naftalis, Esq.  
David S. Frankel, Esq.  
October 21, 2011  
Page 6

Apart from any written Proffer Agreement(s) that may have been entered into between this Office and defendant, this Agreement supersedes any prior understandings, promises, or conditions between this Office and the defendant. No additional understandings, promises, or conditions have been entered into other than those set forth in this Agreement, and none will be entered into unless in writing and signed by all parties.


Sincerely,

PREET BHARARA  
United States Attorney

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael A. Levy  
Antonia M. Apps  
Assistant United States Attorney  
(212) 637-2346/2198


APPROVED:  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher L. Garcia  
Chief, Securities and Commodities  
Fraud Task Force

AGREED AND CONSENTED TO:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Drew K. Brownstein

10/21/2011  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

APPROVED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary P. Naftalis, Esq.  
David S. Frankel, Esq.  
Attorneys for Drew K. Brownstein

10/21/11  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE