IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF LOWNDES COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

2

4

5

1

3 STATE OF MISSISSI

VERSUS

TERM, MAR 0 9 2021

NO. 2020-0223-CR1C

DEFENDANT

MILTON RAWLE, JR.

ARRAIGNMENT AND GUILTY PLEA

6 8

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the above-styled and numbered cause came on for hearing during the February Term of the Court aforesaid, and was heard on February 22, 2021, before the Honorable Lee S. Coleman, Circuit Judge, without a jury. The Defendant appeared in person and was represented by Honorable Daniel Waide, and the State was represented by Honorable Scott Colom, District Attorney, and Collen Hudson, Assistant District Attorney.

> BY MS. HUDSON; Your Honor, if it pleases the Court, the next matter that we have on the docket is cause number 2020-0223-CR1C. the State of Mississippi versus Milton Rawle, Your Honor, Mr. Rawle was indicted by the grand jury of Lowndes County in a one-count indictment on a charge of embezzlement in an amount greater than \$25,000. Mr. Rawle is present in the courtroom with his attorney, Mr. Daniel Waide, to enter a plea of guilty to that charge. May I proceed?

> > BY THE COURT: Please do.

EXAMINATION BY MS. HUDSON:

Q. Are you Milton Rawle, Jr.?

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

22 23

21

24

25

26

27

- 1 A. Yes. 2 Mr. Rawle, you're here with your attorney, Q. Mr. Daniel Waide; is that correct? 3 4 A. Yes. 5 Mr. Rawle, on a previous day, you had entered Q. a plea of not guilty to a charge of embezzlement in an 6 amount greater than \$25,000. 7 8 A. Yes. 9 Today, do you wish to withdraw that plea of Q. not guilty and instead, plead guilty to that charge? 10 11 A. Yes. 12 Filed in the court file is a petition to enter Q. a guilty plea. Did you go over this petition with your 13 14 attorney? 15 A. Yes. 16 When you went over this petition with your 0. attorney, did he ask you questions and in return, did 17 18 you give him truthful answers? 19 A. Yes. 20 Is this your signature on page four of the Q. 21 petition? 22 A. Yes. 23 To the charge of embezzlement in an amount 0. greater than \$25,000, how do you plead? 24 25 A. Guilty. 26 BY THE COURT: Thank you. Please swear 27 the Defendant.
- 29 After having first been duly sworn by the Deputy Clerk,

MILTON RAWLE, JR.,

1 testified as follows:

2 EXAMINATION BY THE COURT:

- Q. Mr. Rawle, you've indicated that you desire to enter a plea of guilty to the charge of embezzlement greater than \$25,000 in cause number 2020-0223-CR1C, Circuit Court of Lowndes County, Mississippi. Before I can accept your plea of guilty, the law requires that I ask you some questions to make sure that your plea of guilty is knowingly, voluntarily and freely made. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. When you enter a plea of guilty, you're giving up your constitutional right to a jury trial. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You further give up your right to a speedy trial and the right to be present at said trial. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You're also giving up the right that you have that protects you against self-incrimination. In other words, you have to say you did it if you plead guilty. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Also you're giving up the right that you have to confront and question the witnesses. They don't have to come to court to testify if you plead guilty. Do you understand that?
- 29 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. You have the right to call witnesses in your own behalf and to subpoen defense witnesses and compel them to attend trial and you give up that right. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And you give up the right to decide whether you would be a witness or not during your own trial. We're not going to have a trial if you plead guilty. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Under our law, before a jury could find you guilty of this charge, the State would have to come to court and prove to a jury that you were guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, but if you plead guilty in this case, the State is not required to prove anything to a jury because you're admitting that you're guilty. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You have the right to have the Court instruct the jury on the presumption of innocence and you give up that right. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You have the right to have the Court instruct the jury that any verdict against you would be required to be unanimous and you give up that right. Do you understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You have the right to have an attorney both at trial and on appeal and if you could not afford one,

one would be appointed for you. Do you understand 1 2 that?

> Α. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

26

27

- Q. There's no direct appeal to the Mississippi Supreme Court if you plead guilty in this case. understand that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- There's a petition to enter a plea of guilty Q. filed in this case. Your attorney, Mr. Daniel Waide, helped you fill that out; did he not?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Did Mr. Waide go over the petition with you Q. and explain everything to you?
- A. Yes.
- Are you satisfied with the services of your Q. attorney?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Do you have any questions about anything in Q. the petition that you want to ask me about?
  - A. No, sir.
- 21 You are 49 years old and you have a bachelor's 0. degree, I believe, in accountancy; is that correct? 22 23
  - Α. Yes, sir.
  - So, obviously, you can read, write and Q. understand the English language, correct?
    - Α. Yes, sir.
  - Your petition states that you have no prior Q. felonies; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.

1 Do you understand that for the current offense Q. of embezzlement greater than \$25,000 that the minimum 2 sentence is zero years in custody of the Mississippi 3 Department of Corrections; maximum, 20 years in custody 4 of the Mississippi Department of Corrections; minimum 5 fine, zero dollars; maximum fine, \$25,000. Did you 6 7 understand all of that? 8 A. Yes, sir. 9 BY THE COURT: Mr. Waide, did you advise 10 the Defendant of his constitutional rights? 11 BY MR. WAIDE: Yes, Your Honor. 12 BY THE COURT: Did you further advise him 13 that his plea of guilty waives certain of 14 those rights? 15 BY MR. WAIDE: Yes, Your Honor. 16 BY THE COURT: Did you also advise him 17 concerning the elements of the offense? 18 BY MR. WAIDE: Yes, Your Honor. 19 BY THE COURT: Did he give you any 20 indication or reason to believe that he did 21 not understand either his rights or the 22 elements of the offense? 23 BY MR. WAIDE: No, Your Honor, he did 24 not. 25 0.

Q. (The Court) Mr. Rawle, did your lawyer, police officers or anybody else promise you anything or threaten you to get you to sign the petition or enter your plea of guilty?

A. No, Your Honor.

26

27

28

In cause number 2020-0223-CR1C, Circuit Court Q. of Lowndes County, Mississippi, the indictment charges that on or about or between the 1st day of December, 2016, and the 1st day of December, 2018, in Lowndes County, Mississippi, that you did unlawfully, willfully and feloniously being then and there the agent, servant or employee of the City of Columbus, Mississippi, a municipal government, did then and there by virtue of employment as such agent, servant or employee have under your care and possession the property of the City of Columbus, Mississippi, to wit, money, while employed as the City of Columbus Chief Financial Officer and that you embezzled said funds and made unauthorized ACH transfers from the city -- from the city's bank account to your personal bank accounts and did then and there feloniously convert to your own use the said money -monetary funds in an amount greater than \$25,000 in violation of Mississippi Code Annotated Section 97-23-19, contrary to the form of the statutes in such cases made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the State of Mississippi. Are you guilty of doing that?

A. Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: The Court finds that Mr. Rawle is competent to understand the nature of the charges against him. He understands the consequences of his plea of guilty, as well as the maximum and minimum sentences required by law. What is the

262728

29

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

factual basis to support the charge in the indictment?

BY MS. HUDSON: Your Honor, in the event of a trial, the State would show that from March 2013 until February 2019, this Defendant was the Chief Financial Officer for the City of Columbus and part of his responsibilities with the City of Columbus was that he monitored and reconciled bank accounts and made transfers that were approved by the city council, and so, several funds belonging to the City of Columbus were entrusted to the Defendant.

Your Honor, on or about the dates alleged in the indictment, Wanda Holly, a CPA with Watkins, Ward and Stafford, was doing a yearly audit on the City of Columbus and in doing so, she had noticed that there were several transfers that were initiated by this Defendant from the City of Columbus bank accounts to unknown bank accounts. Your Honor, these unknown bank accounts had business transaction identifiers such as payroll, reimbursement or C-O-C, a common acronym for the City of Columbus that's used within their government.

Your Honor, in an investigation into those unknown bank accounts, it was determined that the funds were being transferred to an account

with the USAA Federal Savings Bank, Bank First Financial Services and also the Triangle Federal Credit Union. The investigation showed that these were personal accounts owned by the Defendant and that by transferring the city's money into his own personal accounts, he embezzled the funds and converted them to his personal use.

Your Honor, the amount -- total amount that was discovered was \$288,893.03, that being in excess of \$25,000.

BY THE COURT: The Court finds that there is sufficient factual basis to sustain the charge in the indictment. The Court further finds the plea of guilty is freely, voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently entered. I am going to accept the plea of guilty. I understand this is an open plea; is that correct?

BY MS. HUDSON: That's the State's understanding, yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: All right. Is that correct, Mr. Waide?

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{BY}}\xspace$  MR. WAIDE: That is correct, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: All right. Does either side have anything to say before the Court passes sentence?

BY MR. COLOM: Yes, Your Honor. The

2

4

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26 27

28

29

State has aggravation. Does the Court prefer the State does aggravation or the Defendant does mitigation first?

BY THE COURT: It doesn't matter. You can do your -- let's let them have their chance first.

BY MR. COLOM: Okay.

BY MR. WAIDE: Your Honor, regarding mitigation, I'd like to point out that Mr. Rawle has from the get-go admitted his fault and his actions here. He signed a confession early on in this. In addition, Your Honor, Mr. Rawle has attempted to find work and is trying to progress, Your Honor, so that he can make whatever payments are remaining. I know that the bond and insurance has paid a dramatic amount of what was owed to the City of Columbus, and so, Mr. Rawle, on my counsel, has sought out employment and has sought to advance in that employment in an attempt to go on (inaudible) employment where he could eventually pay back his debt to the city and society here, Your Honor.

Your Honor, as far as other mitigating factors, I'd like Your Honor to consider

Mr. Rawle has several medications that he's on

-- diabetic and several cholesterol

medications, Your Honor. That's all I have,

Your Honor.

1 BY THE COURT: Thank you. Aggravation? 2 BY MR. COLOM: State would call David 3 Armstrong. 4 DAVID ARMSTRONG, After having first been duly sworn by the Deputy Clerk, 5 6 testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COLOM: 7 8 State your name for the record, please. Q. 9 A. David Armstrong. 10 Mr. Armstrong, where do you work? Q. 11 City of Columbus. A. 12 Q. What position do you have? 13 I'm the Chief Operating Officer for the City A. 14 of Columbus. How long have you had that position? 15 Q. 16 I've been there since October 1st of 2006. A. 17 In your employment, did you have the Q. opportunity to meet and work with the Defendant? 18 19 Every day that I was there and every day that A. 20 he was there. 21 Do you recall when he was employed by the City Q. of Columbus? 22 23 Exactly when he was employed, Scott, I don't Α. 2013? But I was involved in the interview 24 remember. process, and so, I was one of the ones that was 25 responsible for hiring Milton. I don't remember how 26 many other people we interviewed, but we decided on 27 I also was involved in vetting Mr. Rawle and 28 him. making some calls -- I'll be happy to go into that if 29

you want me to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

Q. Sure.

- A. I was -- most of my law career, I've been a prosecutor. I've been an assistant DA; assistant AG assigned to the gaming commission, criminal division; also city prosecutor and I'd known -- or been told by Milton that he had worked for one of the casinos over in one of the counties in the Delta. I can't remember which specifically, may have been Splash, but I'm not sure. And when I was with the gaming -- assigned to the gaming commission with the AG's office, I made a good friend, a guy by the name of John Gorman, who was one of the agents, and he --
  - Q. Spell his last name for the record, please.
- G-O-R-M-A-N, John Gorman. John and I were A. good buddies and he was -- he was a darn good agent. He rose to the head -- he became the top investigative agent for the gaming commission and John was over the Delta area and those casinos there, and so, I called John up and I said, John, we're looking at interviewing this guy named Milton Rawle. I remember he said, Milton Rawle? I mean, just like that. And, you know, I should have pursued it further, but it just didn't -even though being a former prosecutor, it just didn't register with me that there -- I don't know that there were any shenanigans, but I remember how John reacted and sadly, John was killed in a training accident later and we'll never --
  - Q. Let me interrupt you if you don't mind.

A. Sure.

- Q. I think you've indicated in hindsight how you wish you would have pursued getting more information before Mr. Rawle was hired.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. How closely did you work with Mr. Rawle while he was employed with the City of Columbus?
- A. Very closely. Milton and I ate breakfast together every day. I mean, we started out -- you know, Milton and I were friends, good friends. We were very, very close, you know, at least I thought we were and I think he'd probably agree with that. You know, I didn't work with him in terms of overseeing what he did on a day-to-day basis. I frankly wouldn't have known what he was doing on a day-to-day basis, but I worked with him very closely during the budget. We -- we'd do the budget together. I'm still involved in that.
  - Q. How --
- A. I was going to say, but I wasn't up there in his office, like, hey, what are you doing? Why aren't you doing this? I mean, Milton didn't report to me.
- Q. Right. I think he reported directly to the council and the mayor.
  - A. He reported directly to the mayor.
- Q. Now how much did the City of Columbus rely on Mr. Rawle as the -- basically the chief accountant for the city?
  - A. Totally. I mean, he -- we totally relied on him, totally trusted him. You know, there was some

things that started happening that I got -- got really suspicious, but I didn't -- just probably gut feeling being an ex-prosecutor, but I didn't -- you know, I didn't have any evidence of it, but I'll be honest about it, it wasn't just me. Everybody at City Hall did. It's just that nobody had any evidence. It was just so many red flags -- or several red flags we should have seen, but, you know -- you know, you don't want to think anything bad of someone. I mean, you know, you want to give people -- I think most of us do -- give them the benefit of the doubt, but, you know, I just -- I got to the point before this was ever discovered -- there was no doubt in my mind Milton was stealing money. I knew he was. I just --

- Q. Describe to the Court what those red flags were.
- A. Well, I mean, I'll be honest about it, the first red flag for me -- as silly as this may sound -- with all due respect, Your Honor -- he started bringing me breakfast for free in the morning. And I said, Milton, why are you -- you know, first two or three days, all right, you've been nice. I said, whoa, whoa, man, I'll tell you, if you want to bring me breakfast, that's great, but I'm going to pay for it. You're not going to bring me free -- and I just thought that was -- you know, I thought that just -- something's wrong. That's just not normal. You just don't do that.

The next red flag was I remember Milton -- I remember when Milton -- frankly, when he came there, he

just -- he was always short of cash. He just didn't have anything. You know, he was kind of strapped and then all of a sudden, he went from driving this ratty old truck to going out and buying this really nice I mean, it wasn't brand new, but it was, like, wow. I remember it looked brand new to me, but it was probably three or four years old. I asked him, I said, where'd you get that money from? And it seems like -and I may be wrong on this, but to the best of my memory it was, like, oh, I had an aunt died, or something like that, but that wasn't it. What he said to me was, now, look -- and this is hearsay, I know. He said -- I'm just going to tell you, said the same thing to the mayor. What he said to me, he said, now I don't want anybody to think I'm stealing money or anything. It just clicked. I said, why would you even think of something like that?

I mean, I didn't think that, but when he said that, it just -- I think that's when I really started just trusting my instincts. I mean, Milton was never in city -- he was always gone. He was gone and it was kind of a joke at City Hall. Where's Milton? I don't know. And that kind of a job -- I've been in this business off and on since 1988. I've been on the city side, been on the county side in the kind of work I do now.

Q. Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

A. And, you know. I know enough ... I'm not a number cruncher, but I know

enough about, particularly, budgets and just general finances, you've gotta be there. Our former COO, he never left. I mean, he was there. He never left for lunch. It just -- everybody that was suspective, it was, like, what's -- what's going on? How is anything getting -- it's just not --

It's not just the money that Milton stole. It's that our finances were so screwed up, I mean, just so -- and we didn't have a clue. Should we have had a clue? Maybe. Maybe not. I mean, the mayor's not an accountant. I'm not an accountant. You know, you hire someone to do a job --

Q. Right.

- A. -- and you trust them to do that job and --
- Q. You had a personal relationship with him, so --
  - A. I had a very personal relationship.
  - Q. You felt like he was somebody you could trust?
- A. Yeah. Let me say my personal relationship was at work. I mean, we didn't, like, hang out together or anything like that, but, yeah, we were friends. We were tight, no doubt about that.
- Q. Let's talk about when the city discovered the financial mismanagement and then the embezzlement. How -- remind the Court how that was discovered.
- A. I'm going to have to think about that, Scott, but I think the mayor and I had several conversations about it and we just kind of -- of course, after Milton admitted -- or came before the council and said, hey,

we're \$800,000 short, you know, under -- we were \$800,000-something short. I believe that happened two years in a row and we just got to talking and -- and I think Robert had the same suspicions I did, and so, we -- after Milton quit -- I mean, he was terminated for, I want to say, 16 days. I don't remember the exact amount, but he -- he -- you know, he did his time, so to speak. He was off and then he came back and it was -- everything was in such a bad ray, we just -- I think the mayor -- and I might have been in on the meeting, I'm not sure -- said, look, you either quit or you're going to be fired and --

And after that, when we went up to his office, we -- it was just like a tornado had come in that office. Things were just -- papers and stacks and piles everywhere and said, you know, we don't have a CFO. We've got to get somebody on board, so we hired a local accountant, Mike Crowder, who came in. Mike spent most of his time trying to keep the ship afloat. I mean, he was trying to figure out what this was, what this wasn't, was -- has this bill been paid, has that -- I mean, he spent a lot of long hours up there.

Mike didn't find the embezzlement. That was Wanda Holly who found it, but in fairness to Mike, Mike never had time to really look. He never had time to reconcile the bank statements because he was too -- he was going to do it, but he finally just got to the point, I can't deal with this anymore. I -- and the mayor and myself had two or three heated conversations

with Mike because it just -- it really stressed Mike out so much that he was spending long hours trying to, like, what in the -- this mess, what is going on? I think the reason it was so messed up because I don't think Milton wanted anybody to find out what he was doing. And I can say some more to that later if the Court allows, but --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

So Mike left and then Mike had gotten us on, you know, where we're getting things taken care of, but we had to find out if -- and we suspected -- and Mike suspected there was money missing, so we brought in Wanda Holly with Watkins, Ward and Stafford. didn't have to worry about keeping the boat afloat because at that time, we had hired another CFO who's still there. She started reconciling the bank statements and she found out that one year -- and I'm not exactly sure about the year. I think it was '16/'17 bank statements, they were gone. weren't there. I don't know what he did with them. suspect he probably threw them away because -- now, he -- Milton admitted to Wanda that he was plugging numbers. When she -- when she encountered it, he said, yeah, I've been plugging numbers, you know.

- Q. Explain just, you know, for the record -- I know the Court probably understands this, but for the audience, what do you mean by "plugging numbers"?
- A. He was making up numbers. You know, just putting numbers in, just making it fit and making sure it seemed -- you know, I don't know to what extent he

did that, but he did admit on one particular occasion to Wanda.

- Q. And that -- those are the numbers specifically that were relied on --
  - A. Right.

- Q. -- when budgeting and auditing the budget. They would have been relying on the numbers they were given, so --
- A. Right. You know, I regret that we didn't know, have a better understanding that Milton was doing this, but let me tell you, my experience just from practicing law, being a prosecutor, having a couple of businesses, if somebody's going to steal from you, they're going to steal from you. I mean, unless you're standing over their head every day looking, you know, if they want to steal from you, they're going to steal from you.
  - Q. Yeah.
- A. That's just the way that -- that's been my personal experience and he was real good at it. Milton was a good con artist. I'll admit -- I'll hand that to him. He's one of the best con artists I've ever seen and I've seen a lot and he -- he totally fooled me and he fooled everybody, but then, you know, just gets to the point, like, something ain't right here.

  Something's just -- something's not right, but -- so we didn't find -- we couldn't find those bank statements.

  Wanda Holly actually had to get them from the bank, from Community Bank and -- I think that's correct.

- 1 2
- 3
- 4 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25 26
- 27
- 28
- 29

- Let's move on to the damage you think Mr. Rawle's crime caused the City of Columbus.
- Well, it's a good bit, a good bit. First of A. all, the financial damage. You know, he just put us in really, really bad financial shape and I'm not just talking about stealing the money. I'm talking about not keeping accurate records and letting us go through worrying and not doing budgeting numbers, not giving accurate reports to the council. So he just didn't -he wasn't doing his job. I don't know what he was up there doing. I have a hunch, but it's probably not worth going into, but I'll tell you one thing, he wasn't doing what we were paying him to do. So that, in and of itself -- the money that he -- that we can account for that he embezzled -- I personally think it's more than that -- it was almost \$289,000.
  - Q. Right.
- I think there's some other areas that some A. things happened that's neither here nor there. There's money that hasn't even been talked about. We've spent -- the City of Columbus has spent probably close to \$100,000 between two different CPAs trying to figure out what's going on -- and this is money that the state audit department never made a request for. We'll never be -- we've got, like, \$243,000 back from Western Surety Bond Company. We'll never get the rest of it I mean, you know, they -- they can -- they're back. going to sue Milton, but we know that money's not coming, but approximately \$100,000 -- I'm going to say

90 to 100,000, we spent investigating two different (inaudible) ---

But I want to talk about something else too and that is the -- this effected me emotionally greatly. It effected the mayor emotionally greatly. mean, I -- Milton, I'll look Milton in the eye and tell him, you betrayed me, Milton. I mean, you really did. You betrayed our friendship, no doubt about it and that hurt me personally, very much so. I considered you a I don't anymore, but I did at the time. friend. effected the mayor emotionally also. We were both very, very stressed out about this and the extra time that we had to spend getting a new CFO on board and trying to figure out this horrible mess that he left us in, but in addition to that, it's the bad rep that the city got.

People said, why didn't y'all know this? Why didn't you realize sooner this was going on? You should have known. Well, you know, that's like being an armchair quarterback. Those are easy criticisms to make. We couldn't have known. We trusted the guy. We couldn't have known. You know, and, again, if somebody wants to steal from you, they're going to steal from you. You know, it's easy to say, y'all should have found that out, but I'm telling you, having been in this business since 1988, off and on, that's just not the way it works. It just -- you know, you hire somebody you trust and we hired -- we hired a crook, quite frankly. Hired a con artist.

Q. I think it's important to point out -- since you brought that up and as Ms. Hudson indicated, part of the ability -- part of the way he was able to embezzle the money, he named a fictional account he was using to steal -- he identified it in a way that you would think were legitimate city --

A. And it looked like that and -- and I realize this is hearsay, but I'm just going to tell you what I was told by a gentleman who I respect who Milton played golf with and Milton made the statement, he said, they ain't never going to be able to figure out what I did. And we almost didn't. I really thought I would go to my grave knowing full well Milton stole money from us, but it'd never -- never be figured --

I remember a personal instance -- Milton had already left the job. He had come back to say hello or something and he was standing in my office and I said, Milton, what are you doing? He said, aww, I'm not doing anything. I said, you're not working? Naw. I said, well, I hope you have some money stashed away. And I said that intentionally because I wanted to see how he would react and his answer to me was, like, yeah, I do. I said it for intentional reasons. I knew he had the money stashed away. I couldn't prove it, but I knew he did.

Q. Let me ask you -- and this may just be one question. You talked about the impact this had on you, on the city's reputation, but you talked about the impact it had on the mayor. Describe to the Court

basically your observations, what impact this had on the mayor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

He was very stressed out about it. You know, A. we had numerous conversations about it, but I've worked with Robert for 14 years and four months and I know him. I know how he thinks. I know -- we've, like, almost said the same thing at the same time. He knows me just as well and I knew him well enough, and still do, that he was -- he was very -- I don't want to say traumatized because Robert's just not the kind of guy to be traumatized, but he was -- he was very upset about that. You know, he's not the type that's going to share his feelings outright compared to someone like me that's more open about such things, but I knew him well enough to know that he took it hard. I mean, he trusted Milton and, you know, it caused a great deal of shame to the city.

I mean, you know, we had -- people had been saying since -- and I'm not from here originally. When I came here 14 years and five months ago, people were saying, oh, the city's broke. They don't have any money. They can't pay -- all nonsense. All not true. It's just -- Facebook, for want of a better word, scum that's out there. So, you know, people were already saying that. I knew that wasn't true, but when this came out, it just really -- it really put a serious -- serious mark on the City of Columbus and it's still there.

BY MR. COLOM: No further questions for

this witness, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: All right. Any cross-examination?

BY MR. WAIDE: Just a couple, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WAIDE:

- Q. Good afternoon.
- A. Good afternoon, Jim. I apologize.
- Q. That's fine. I just have a couple of things for you. Now I know you mentioned -- you talked about -- you said Milton's one of the greatest con artists you'd ever seen, but it is true that every account -- Milton didn't use any kind of shell accounts or fake accounts. They were all personal accounts that he sent the money directly to, right?
- A. I mean con artist by the fact he conned everybody up there thinking he was doing his job, thinking he was honest, but what you're talking about specifically, what we -- what we originally thought -- maybe it was just me, but I -- no, it wasn't just me. Mike Crowder thought. We thought he had setup a bogus account, a bogus vendor and was, you know, funneling money into that. I mean, that was, to me, the most obvious thing. From my prosecuting days, that's what I'd say, but how he -- how he set these accounts up, I mean, just to look at it, you would have thought that was just a normal city -- city account.
- Q. I understand that on the books. I'm just talking about the accounts that were at the banks weren't shell companies. It wasn't some criminal

- mastermind. These were just his personal accounts, right? No shell companies, no multiple stops along the way.
  - A. Well, when you say bank -- you know, you're talking about bank transfers against -- against -- bank transfers across states. I mean, you know, that's pretty elaborate accounting. I mean, he was the only one that was -- elaborate deal, what he did. I mean, he was the only one involved, but, you know, when you're fraudulently wiring money to out-of-state bank accounts, that's a federal crime. That's wire fraud. You know, he hasn't been charged with that, but it's obvious it's pretty elaborate.
  - Q. And I understand that, but that's not my question.
    - A. Okay.

- Q. My question is simply: This isn't some use of shell companies. We're just talking about --
  - A. No. It wasn't any use of shell -- no.
- Q. Milton wired it directly from the city accounts to --
  - A. To his personal accounts, right.
- Q. Not talking about some elaborate international web.
  - A. No. Of course not.
- Q. And when he was confronted with it, Milton owned up to it.
- A. He did own up to it. I'll say that for him. I wasn't there, but I was told by the audit guys I was

working with that he owned up to it, correct.

- And a lot of what you've talked about, I 0. think, sounds more like you -- you complained a lot about Milton just wasn't very good at his job as CFO; is that --
- No, not at all. No. I've never complained Α. about that. I think Milton -- Milton wasn't doing his job, but as far as being -- Milton's very sharp. He was very astute. I think Milton has a whole lot more ability -- and it's kind of like he didn't really want anybody to know how much ability he had and Milton --Milton knew what he was doing. I mean, he had -there's no issue that he wasn't competent. Not at all.
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. Never was.
- And you talked a lot too about budget issues. Q. Those deficits predate Mr. Rawle, correct?
- No. He was there because -- he was there when A. those deficits were presented.
- I know when they were presented, but the Q. deficits were created before he became CFO, correct?
- I'm not sure. I don't think they were, but Α. I'm not positive about that.

BY MR. WAIDE: That's all I have, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. COLOM: No further questions for this witness, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: You may step down.

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

4

5 6

3

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

29

BY MR. COLOM: Your Honor, I have a statement from the mayor I would like to read to the Court.

BY THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. COLOM: He wanted me to announce that he's resting at home following a brief hospitalization. On Sunday, February 21st, 2021, he was admitted to the hospital for approximately 12 hours for observation and testing and he had planned to be here to testify, but because of that, wanted to send in this statement.

Mr. Rawle's embezzlement violated his fiduciary obligations as CFO of Columbus. effected the city not only financially, but was a great betrayal and caused the mayor great stress and anxiety and cast the mayor and city council in a negative light. actions embarrassed the mayor and city council. They trusted Mr. Rawle to be honest in the handling of the city's finances. Sadly, Mr. Rawle was not honest and went to great lengths to hide his criminal conduct. Although the City of Columbus has recovered some of the money through fidelity bonds, the city has not been made whole financially. hope justice will prevail.

Your Honor, at this time, the State -- if the Court permits -- would like to call Mr. Rawle

in aggravation. I know that's an unusual request, but it's permitted in sentencing. He's waived his right against self-incrimination. I think it's important because of the public interest in the case and in regards to the money that was stolen and other people's potential involvement. I think — you know, I've heard several people make a request of whether Mr. Rawle was acting alone or acting in concert with other people. The State investigated that with Mr. Rawle and I would like — I think that needs to be known publicly. The State — I don't know if the Defendant objects to it.

BY MR. WAIDE: Your Honor, at this time, we would object. One thing -- one of the witnesses just testified a potential for federal charges, so I will, of course, object at this point in time.

BY MR. COLOM: I don't plan to go into any of his -- any of the other criminal potential liability. The only point I wanted to make clear is that -- and I can just say it if the Court feels that's better. You know, the State interviewed Mr. Rawle, asked Mr. Rawle whether this was criminal behavior that he acted upon solely or criminal behavior that he acted upon jointly with other people with the understanding that if he acted

jointly, if he could corroborate that, that could be beneficial to him as far as prosecution.

Mr. Rawle indicated to the State that he was not in concert with anyone working with the city or that is an elected official. He indicated knowing that this was in his benefit if he could corroborate allegations against someone that all the money taken was done solely by himself and without anyone else's knowledge. That's what he told me, and so, based on that, the State proceeded with the prosecution of him. Other than that — and the State is going to have an argument — I think — the Defense want to argue too or just rely on your previous statement.

BY MR. WAIDE: Your Honor, we will rely on our previous statement. That will be our argument.

BY THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. COLOM: I want to make the argument that -- Your Honor, I know the Court is well aware of the public interest in the case. The Court is an avid reader of the newspaper, avid reader in general. The Court knows the negative impact this had on the city's reputation. You know, one of the things that I've learned about government is that typically, the people that are the

1 victims of the embezzlement feel very violated 2 because of the trust that was betrayed. 3 has a lasting emotional and financial impact because that impacts their ability in business 5

for future dealings. I think the CFO did a great job testifying to the emotional and mental harm the Defendant's actions caused the mayor, himself, other people that worked with and trusted the Defendant, but this is unique in the sense that not only was there a personal harm to individuals, there was also a public harm to the taxpayers and the City of Columbus of money that, at best, is going to take a significant time period for us to be -- the city to be made whole and a significant reputation (inaudible) to the taxpayers and to the city because our ability to attract businesses, our ability to function and the city is negatively impacted when you have actions like this which play into negative stereotypes about the City of Columbus. So that's another element of this embezzlement that is unique that I think requires the Court to give Mr. Rawle a significant prison sentence so the public knows that our district is not going to tolerate public officials entrusted with taxpayer dollars embezzling in a way that can

29

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

29

be difficult to trace and catch.

The State would also point out that this is a 25 percent sentence, so whatever sentence Mr. Rawle gets, if he does receive a prison sentence, he'll be eligible to be released at 25 percent of the sentence.

So I think those are aggravating factors. It is true that he did confess to the state auditor after he was caught red-handed, but -- and he is pleading guilty, so I'm sure the Court will give him some mitigation for taking responsibility. Anyway, that's what I was going to say in aggravation. Thank you, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: All right. This is the worst case of embezzlement that I've ever seen since I've been on the bench, a person entrusted with public funds taking those funds for his own personal use. I can't imagine giving the Defendant anything but the maximum sentence, which is 20 years in custody of the Mississippi Department of Corrections. Court is not -- maximum fine is \$25,000, but the Court is not going to assess a fine because it wants every penny that he can make and pay out to be paid back in restitution to the people that he stole from. The amount of restitution that I was given was \$354,896.27.

BY MR. COLOM: Your Honor, that's going

1 to be incorrect because the surety bond paid 2 \$242,951.13. The restitution that he owes to 3 the city now that the State would request is 4 \$111,945.11. 5 BY THE COURT: 111,000 --6 BY MR. COLOM: I'm going to let Ms. 7 Hudson give you the right number. 8 BY MS. HUDSON: Your Honor, after the 9 surety bond had been paid, the balance that 10 remains is \$108,383.20. 11 1-0-8-3-8-3-point-2-0. 12 BY THE COURT: All right. I assume the 13 amount of restitution I give will have no 14 effect on the rights of the bonding company to 15 pursue a case against him. 16 BY MR. COLOM: No, Your Honor. 17 BY THE COURT: All right. Nevertheless, 18 the Court is going to impose restitution in 19 the amount of \$108,383.20. Is there anything 20 else that the Court needs to address then? 21 BY MR. COLOM: Not for the State, Your 22 Honor. 23 BY THE COURT: Anything for the defense? 24 BY MR. WAIDE: No, Your Honor. 25 BY THE COURT: All right. He needs to be 26 taken into custody. 27 BY MR. WAIDE: Your Honor, might I make 28 -- I'm sorry, I didn't realize Your Honor --29 is it going to be 20 years in custody?

1 BY THE COURT: Yes. 2 BY MR. WAIDE: Your Honor, I would 3 request that Mr. Rawle have an opportunity to 4 get his affairs in order. He can report -- he 5 has a job that he needs to report to to let 6 them make accommodations for him. He also has 7 a wife. He has a vehicle up here. He would need time to get his affairs in order, such as 8 9 getting his car back and getting everything in 10 order. 11 BY THE COURT: Why didn't he get them in 12 order before today? Surely he knew he was 13 going to get some time. 14 BY MR. WAIDE: Yes, Your Honor. We knew 15 there was that possibility. I didn't know --16 BY THE COURT: Possibility? 17 BY MR. WAIDE: I did not know he was 18 coming alone today, Your Honor. 19 BY THE COURT: All right. What says the 20 State? 21 BY MR. COLOM: I would be concerned --22 with that prison sentence, Your Honor, I would 23 be concerned with --24 BY THE COURT: I don't see why he can't 25 have people come up and visit him. I assume 26 he'll be in the Lowndes County --27 BY MR. COLOM: He'll be in the Lowndes 28 County Jail --29 BY THE COURT: -- for some time and I

1	don't see why he can't get his affairs in
2	order from the jail.
3	BY MR, WAIDE: Yes, Your Honor.
4	(End of proceedings on February 22, 2021)
5	J 100 2 daly 22, 2021)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
L	

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI COUNTY OF LOWNDES

I, Kathryn H. Boyer, Official Court Reporter for the Sixteenth Circuit Court District of the State of Mississippi, do hereby certify that the foregoing styled and numbered cause came on for hearing on the day and year therein mentioned, and that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcript of the proceedings held therein to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Witness my signature this the 8th day of March, 2021.