

In evaluating these factors, the Court finds that the alleged foul play that occurred “approximately 24 hours” after defendant Singhal was sentenced sheds light upon the history and characteristics of the defendant and weighs strongly in favor of finding that termination of supervised release is unwarranted. Government’s Opp’n to Def. Shelly S. Singhal’s Mot. to Terminate Supervised Release ¶ 6. The government has provided ample evidence that defendant Singhal “provided false or misleading documents and statements to the bank in an attempt to gain access to the remaining balance” in the account central to the defendants conspiracy to impede the lawful function of the Internal Revenue Service. *Id.*

Although defendant Singal “has been compliant with the terms and conditions of his supervision, has maintained stable residence and employment, has not had any violations, and has not sustained any new arrests or convictions,” the inquiry does not end there. Reply to Government’s Opp’n to Defendant Shelly S. Singhal’s Mot. to Terminate Supervised Release 1. The Court must holistically review the factors set forth in § 3583(e)(1), and in doing so finds that termination of defendant Singhal’s term of supervised release is unwarranted.

For the reasons discussed above, it is hereby

ORDERED that the defendant’s motion is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED this 15th day of October 2015.


ROYCE C. LAMBERTH
United States District Court