

1 **MAYRA LOPEZ**  
California State Bar No. 346091  
2 **FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF SAN DIEGO, INC.**  
225 Broadway, Suite 900  
3 San Diego, California 92101-5030  
Telephone: (619) 234-8467  
4 Facsimile: (619) 687-2666  
Mayra\_Lopez@fd.org  
5

6 Attorneys for Mr. Mario Puente  
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v.  
14 MARIO PUENTE,  
15 Defendant.  
16

CASE NO.: 15-cr-00449-RSH-2

Hon. Robert S. Huie  
Date: February 24, 2023  
Time: 2:00p.m.

**MR. MARIO PUENTE'S  
SENTENCING MEMORANDUM**

17 Mario Puente, by and through his counsel of record, Mayra Lopez and  
18 Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc. (hereinafter "Federal Defenders"), hereby  
19 files the following sentencing memorandum. Mr. Puente respectfully requests that  
20 this Court impose a sentence of time-served (72 days) with no supervised release  
21 to follow in his case.

22 **I. A Sentence of Time-Served is Appropriate.**

23 A sentence of time-served with no supervised release is consistent with the  
24 factors this Court must consider under 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e),<sup>1</sup> and it is the most  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to § 3583(e), the Court may consider the history and characteristics of the defendant; the  
27 need for the sentence imposed to afford adequate deterrence, protect the public, and provide the  
28 defendant with needed education or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment  
in the most effective manner; the kinds of sentences available; the sentencing range under the  
guidelines; any pertinent policy statement; the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparity; and  
the need to provide for restitution. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3552(a)(1), (a)(2)(B),  
(a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7)). Punishment is not an appropriate factor and  
cannot be considered by the Court.



1 appropriate sanction given the distressing events that occurred during Mr. Puente's  
 2 February 13, 2023, supervised release revocation hearing. Allowing Mr. Puente to  
 3 return to his family as soon as possible and begin healing from these events will  
 4 best remedy his breach of the Court's trust, as well as the Court's breach of trust.

5 **A. February 13, 2023 Final Revocation Hearing.**

6 On February 13, 2023, Mr. Puente admitted to violating the terms of his  
 7 supervised release. Although U.S. Probation originally recommended six months'  
 8 custody and 2 years of supervised release, at the hearing, the parties jointly  
 9 recommended 10 months' custody with no supervised release to follow. The  
 10 recommendation for no further supervision was based on Mr. Puente's desire to  
 11 leave San Diego, separate himself from negative peers, and start fresh. It was further  
 12 based on the fact that Mr. Puente has successfully completed two prior residential  
 13 drug treatment programs and knows how to access services in the community. As  
 14 indicated in the Petition, Mr. Puente entered New Connections, a residential drug  
 15 treatment program on May 31, 2022, *following* four of the five allegations in the  
 16 petition.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Puente successfully completed the program. The remaining violation  
 17 occurred after Mr. Puente shattered his ankle and was prescribed opiates for pain.

18 During this hearing, Mr. Puente's 13-year-old daughter was seated in the  
 19 gallery. As part of Mr. Puente's allocution, he expressed a desire to leave San Diego  
 20 because "everywhere and anywhere I turn, I know somebody."<sup>3</sup> He indicated that  
 21 "[t]he only way I can – I feel like I can do anything is leaving, leaving what I  
 22 know..."<sup>4</sup> He also expressed concern that his daughter was hanging out with the  
 23 wrong people, who might "lead her into the same path I went down." He expressed  
 24

25  
 26 <sup>2</sup> See ECF Doc. No 105 at pg. 3.

27 <sup>3</sup> See U.S. v. Puente, 15-cr-449-BEN, ECF Doc. No. 116 (Transcript of Revocation Proceedings held  
 28 on 2/13/23), at pgs. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*



1 his belief that “the only thing [he] could do for her is try to get her out, try to get  
2 her out.”<sup>5</sup>

3 Several minutes later, Judge Benitez asked a U.S. Marshal, “You got cuffs?”<sup>6</sup>  
4 The Marshal confirmed he did. Judge Benitez then ordered the 13-year-old girl to  
5 leave the spectator area, approach the front of the courtroom, and stand next to her  
6 father’s lawyer. He told the Marshal to “[p]ut cuffs on her.” The Marshal did so,  
7 cuffing the girl’s hands behind her back. As he did so, she was crying. Judge  
8 Benitez then instructed the Marshal to “put[ ] her over there in the jury box for me  
9 for just a minute.” The Marshal complied, placing the girl in the jury box in  
10 handcuffs. She continued to cry.

11 After a long pause, Judge Benitez released the girl. But he did not allow her  
12 to immediately return to her seat. Instead he told her, “don’t go away. Look at me.”<sup>7</sup>  
13 He asked her how she liked “sitting up there” and “the way those cuffs felt on you.”<sup>8</sup>  
14 Still in tears, she responded that she “didn’t like it.” He told her she was “an awfully  
15 cute young lady” but that if she didn’t stay away from drugs, she would “wind up  
16 in cuffs” and be “right back there where I put you a minute ago.”<sup>9</sup>

17 **B. The Harm Caused to Mr. Puente’s Daughter.**

18 Judge Benitez’s actions in this case were psychologically damaging and  
19 harmful. According to testimony from the Government Accountability Office  
20 (GAO), children can be “severely traumatized” by the use of handcuffs even when  
21 “no physical injury is sustained.”<sup>10</sup> Psychologists have found that shackling is  
22

23 <sup>5</sup> See U.S. v. Puente, 15-cr-449-BEN, ECF Doc. No. 116 (Transcript of Revocation Proceedings held  
24 on 2/13/23), at pg. 12.

25 <sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 13.

26 <sup>7</sup> *Id.*

27 <sup>8</sup> *Id.*

28 <sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 14.

<sup>10</sup> “Seclusions and Restraints: Selected Cases of Death and Abuse at Public and Private Schools and Treatment Centers,” Testimony of Gregory D. Kutz before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, May 19, 2009, *available at*: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-09-719t.pdf>.



1 “humiliating for young people” who are “more vulnerable to lasting harm from  
 2 feeling humiliation and shame than adults.”<sup>11</sup> While a child is “in the midst of their  
 3 identity and moral development, demeaning treatment by adults may solidify  
 4 adolescents’ alienation” and “send mixed messages about the purpose of the justice  
 5 system.”<sup>12</sup> The use of handcuffs is also “a stigmatizing experience for young  
 6 people” that “can cause severe stress reactions.”<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, restraining children  
 7 can “mirror past trauma experience, particularly the experience of physical and  
 8 emotional abuse” and involve “a sense of loss of control, powerlessness, betrayal,  
 9 fear, humiliation and pain,” which can “remain with these youths for a lifetime.”<sup>14</sup>  
 10 Thus, “shackling poses physical and psychological risk to young people.”<sup>15</sup>

11 Having a parent face criminal charges and potential incarceration is—  
 12 without more—highly traumatic for children. As child psychologists have  
 13 explained, children are “naturally egocentric” and assume they are “responsible”  
 14 for all that happens around them, including negative events.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, children of  
 15 defendants “often blame themselves for their parent’s incarceration.”<sup>17</sup> Thus, a  
 16 child who becomes enmeshed in their parent’s criminal case is even more likely to  
 17  
 18

19 <sup>11</sup> Affidavit of Dr. Marty Beyer, clinical psychologist, at 2, *available at*:  
 20 [http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Beyer-Affidavit-w-CV-Jan-2015-](http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Beyer-Affidavit-w-CV-Jan-2015-Final.pdf)  
 21 [Final.pdf](http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Beyer-Affidavit-w-CV-Jan-2015-Final.pdf).

22 <sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 4.

23 <sup>13</sup> Affidavit of Dr. Julian Ford, clinical psychologist, at 2, *available at*:  
 24 <http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Ford-Affidavit-Final-Dec-2014.pdf>.

25 <sup>14</sup> Affidavit of Dr. Robert Bidwell, board-certified pediatrician, at 3, *available at*:  
 26 <http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Bidwell-Affidavit-w-CV-2-18-15.pdf>.

27 <sup>15</sup> Affidavit of Dr. John F. Chapman, clinical child psychologist, at 2, *available at*:  
 28 [http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Chapman-Affidavit-Final-w-CV-](http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Chapman-Affidavit-Final-w-CV-Notarized-2-23-15.pdf)  
[Notarized-2-23-15.pdf](http://defendyouthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Chapman-Affidavit-Final-w-CV-Notarized-2-23-15.pdf).

<sup>16</sup> “For Children, the Default is ‘My Fault’ When Something Happens,” Diane Wagenhals, Institute  
 for Professional Education and Development, Lakeside Educational Network, *available at*:  
<https://lakesidelink.com/blog/for-children-the-default-is-my-fault-when-something-happens/>.

<sup>17</sup> “When a Child’s Parent Is Incarcerated,” Tanja Rothrauff, University of Missouri, *available at*:  
<https://extension.missouri.edu/publications/gh6202>.



1 feel that they have contributed to their parent's incarceration. Judge Benitez's  
2 actions caused psychological damage and harm to Mr. Puente's daughter.

3 **C. Neither a Further Custodial Sentence Nor Supervised Release is**  
4 **Necessary to Deter Mr. Puente.**

5 The pain and powerlessness Mr. Puente felt at being unable to protect his  
6 daughter from this senseless act were palpable to almost everyone in that  
7 courtroom. Mr. Puente blames himself for the hurt and pain he caused his daughter,  
8 who "he states frequently as someone who means the world to him."<sup>18</sup> February  
9 13<sup>th</sup> was the first time his daughter had attended any of his hearings, and he swears  
10 that it will be the last. Mr. Puente plans to do everything he can to avoid being in  
11 another courtroom.

12 Moreover, Mr. Puente has a plan. He intends to move out of California with  
13 his family and start anew. His plan shows insight into the criminogenic factors that  
14 have caused him to relapse and recidivate in the past. He understands that the  
15 biggest risk factor for him is the impact of negative peers, people he grew up with  
16 in San Diego that pop up "everywhere and anywhere [he] turn[s]."<sup>19</sup> His  
17 understanding of what is necessary to give him the best chance of a positive reentry  
18 outcome is consistent with social science research.<sup>20</sup> Further supervision will  
19 impede, rather than assist, Mr. Puente's reentry plan.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

---

23  
24 <sup>18</sup> ECF Doc. No. 105.

25 <sup>19</sup> ECF Doc. No. 116 at pg. 11.

26 <sup>20</sup> See e.g., Mowen TJ, Boman JH 4th. *The Duality of the Peer Effect: The Interplay Between Peer*  
27 *Support and Peer Criminality on Offending and Substance Use During Reentry*. Crime Delinq. 2018  
28 Jul;64(8):1094-1116. doi: 10.1177/0011128717740529. Epub 2017 Nov 8. PMID: 30976127;  
PMCID: PMC6453146 (finding that "peer criminality relates to significantly higher odds of substance  
use and criminal offending, whereas peer support relates to significantly lower odds of substance use  
and offending").



1     **II.     CONCLUSION**

2             A time-served sentence with no supervised release will allow Mr. Puente to  
 3 put the distressing events that occurred during his first revocation hearing behind  
 4 him and start fresh in a new city and state. Moreover, a time-served sentence with  
 5 no supervised release will ensure finality for everyone. *See United States v. King*,  
 6 891 F.3d 868 (9th Cir. 2018) (when an individual is released from custody after a  
 7 revocation with no further supervision, any appeal is moot and will be dismissed).  
 8 Mr. Puente has been adequately sanctioned for his breach of the Court's trust.  
 9 Allowing Mr. Puente to return to his family as soon as possible and begin healing  
 10 from these events will best remedy the Court's breach of trust. Importantly, this  
 11 will also help him and his family regain trust in the justice system.

12  
 13                                     Respectfully submitted,

14  
 15     Dated: February 23, 2023

*s/ Mayra Lopez*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.  
 Attorneys for Mr. Mario Puente  
 Email: Mayra\_Lopez@fd.org