

1 Jeremy Lessem, Esq. SBN: 213406
2 Lessem, Newstat & Tooson, LLP
3 3450 Cahuenga Blvd. W. Suite 102
4 Los Angeles, CA 90068
5 Jeremy@LnLegal.com
6 Phone: (818) 392-4020
7 Facsimile: (818) 484-3087

8 Attorney for Defendant
9 Mahsa Parviz

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

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 MAHSA PARVIZ,

16 Defendant.

Case No: CR 2:21-00293-SB

**DEFENSE OBJECTIONS TO
PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION
REPORT**

17
18
19 Defendant Mahsa Parviz (hereinafter the “*Defendant*”), by and through
20 counsel of record, Jeremy I. Lessem, hereby files the following objection to the
21 Presentence Report (“PSR”) prepared by the United States Probation Office for
22 the Central District of California.

23 Dated: February 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

24
25 By: //s// Jeremy Lessem
26 JEREMY I. LESSEM
27 Attorney for Defendant

I.

INTRODUCTION

On January 26, 2022, United States Federal Probation Office Scott Shafer filed a Presentence Investigation Report in this matter (Dkt. #86). This report was filed subsequent to a guilty verdict on December 16, 2021. Officer Shafer did not interview Defendant Mahsa Parviz prior to the disclosure of this report. An interview was originally scheduled to be conducted via video conference but was cancelled as a result of coronavirus restrictions. To date, no follow-up interview has been scheduled.

Thus far, Defendant's only contact with Officer Shafer has come in the form of a written questionnaire, which Defendant attempted to complete in a single meeting with counsel. Defendant did not have prior notice of the meeting and did not have an opportunity to prepare or research full and complete responses. Furthermore, these written materials were never intended by Defendant as a replacement for an actual interview with probation.

As a result of the aforementioned lack of input, Defendant contends that several portions of the report are either incomplete, incorrect, or wrongfully suggest that the Defendant has provided probation with false, misleading, or incomplete information.

Further, as a result of coronavirus related restrictions in place at the Metropolitan Detention Center (where Defendant is currently housed), Defense counsel has not had the opportunity to discuss the Presentence report with Defendant. As a result, Defendant may object to additional portions of the report unknown to counsel at this time. The objections contained herein come from information provided by Defendant prior to the filing of the report, including

1 information at the time Defendant completed the presentence report questionnaire.
2 Defendant submits these objections at this time in order to comply with the
3 applicable statutory filing requirements.
4

5 **II.**
6 **OBJECTIONS**

7 Paragraphs 42-45: These paragraphs purport to provide a list of prior false
8 statements made by the Defendant to various law enforcement agencies.
9 Defendant objects to the allegations that she has filed false reports to law
10 enforcement. Defendant has not been provided the opportunity to discuss the
11 details of these incidents with probation and explain the reasons these reports were
12 made. Defendant denies that these reports are false and questions the basis for
13 probation to jump to such conclusions.
14

15
16 Paragraph 54: This paragraph accuses the Defendant of using her sister's identity
17 as her own. Defendant denies ever using her sister's name and identity as her own.
18

19 Paragraph 55: This paragraph calls into question whether Defendant is currently
20 married based on statements the Defendant made to "collateral sources."
21 Defendant is not married.
22

23 Paragraph 58: This paragraph describes a CPS claim from December of 2017,
24 wherein the allegation is made that Defendant's biological child was ejected from
25 her car seat and hit the windshield of Defendant's vehicle. This allegation is false.
26 Defendant is not aware that such an allegation ever being made. Defendant was
27

1 accused of not properly securing her biological child's car seat within her vehicle.
2 The child was never ejected from a car seat and never hit a windshield. Further,
3 Defendant's biological child never sustained any injuries as a result of an
4 automobile accident while in Defendant's care.

5
6 Paragraphs 62-69: These paragraphs describe medical issues disclosed by
7 Defendant in her probation questionnaire. Defendant was not given the
8 opportunity to provide probation with additional information regarding the
9 medical issues listed in these sections. Defendant has suffered from serious and
10 persistent medical conditions that have gone largely untreated while in custody.
11 Among other things, Defendant requires surgery to remove a leaking implant that
12 was implanted subsequent to a mastectomy.
13

14
15 Paragraphs 70-74: These paragraphs describe psychiatric issues the Defendant
16 listed in her probation questionnaire. Defendant was not given the opportunity to
17 provide probation with additional information regarding the mental health related
18 issues listed in these sections. Defendant did provide probation with a list of
19 facilities and doctors with whom she has received psychiatric treatment.
20 Defendant suffers from serious and persistent mental health issues for which she
21 has been hospitalized and sought treatment in the past.
22

23 Paragraph 83: This paragraphs questions whether the Defendant has graduated
24 high school or received a GED. Defendant has graduated from high school.
25

26 Paragraphs 88-103: These paragraphs relate to financial information pertaining to
27

1 the Defendant. Defendant has not been afforded an adequate opportunity to
2 provide detailed financial information to probation. As stated in the PSR,
3 Defendant has not completed a personal financial statement and has not had the
4 ability to obtain supporting records. Defendant concurs with the PSR with respect
5 to a lack of current financial ability to pay a fine but denies any implication by
6 probation that the information she has been provided thus far is untrue or
7 otherwise questionable.
8

9
10 Dated: February 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

11
12 By: //s// Jeremy Lessem
13 JEREMY I. LESSEM
14 Attorney for Defendant
15 Mahsa Parviz
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27