1	,
2	Law Offices of James Phillip Vaughns 6114 LaSalle Avenue, Ste 289
3	Oakland, California 94611 Telephone: 510-583-9622
4	Facsimile: 510-735-8658 vaughnslaw@aol.com
5	Attorney for S. Darin KINION
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	OAKLAND DIVISION
10	OAKLAND DIVISION
11	
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) NO.: CR 16-0097 JSW
13	Plaintiff, REPLY TO GOVERNMENT's
14	vs.) RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S SENTENCING MEMORANDUM
15	S. DARIN KINION,
16	Defendant.
17	
18	The parties submitted Sentencing Memoranda for the Court's consideration. The
19	Government felt compelled to respond to the defendant's Memorandum. While this process of
20	point - counterpoint can continue ad infinitum, this reply will be brief.
21	The Government seeks to cast Dr. Kinion in an unflattering light by implying that he was
22	an elitist who felt that building and testing were tasks beneath his intelligence. There are a few
23	things that may be farther from the truth, but they are few in number. Dr. Kinion believed that
24	MIT-LL would fabricate components that he would design because MIT-LL was already set up
25	for fabrication at the time his project started. At that time, there was no suitable mechanism to do
26	the fabrication at LLNL.
27	
28	

To be clear, fabrication in this context refers to preparing polished sapphire wafers, etching a Niobium layer on top of them, wet etching with hydrofluoric acid, and depositing ion trap electrodes on the sacrificial wafers. This is highly technical work, but certainly mundane to those doing it all day, everyday, as personnel at MIT-LL were. Designing is an art, fabrication is a skill. Neither is inferior to the other.

The Government persists in characterizing every cent spent by IARPA and LLNL as part of the total loss that it wants the Court to believe Dr. Kinion's project was. It engages in a nifty bit of anaphora by describing why IARPA funded multiple researchers, why IARPA required them to put ideas into practice, why IARPA required validation, why IARPA had conditions on funding, and why IARPA cut off funding for non-performance.

If IARPA was so careful, and Dr. Kinion so completely worthless, why did IARPA continue funding the project for so long - as in from 2008 to 2012?

Dr. Kinion's 2011 publication was co-authored by a Los Alamos scientist, Gennady P. Berman, but the Government downplays its significance because it was published before "fraud was discovered." However, the article serves to validate Dr. Kinion's theory (during the period he was allegedly committing the fraud) and to support the position that there was scientific value to be had from the project. Unless Dr. Berman was a co-conspirator committing fraud along with Dr. Kinion, the scientific value of the publication cannot simply be ignored because of after-occurring acts. Questioned, maybe, but not ignored.

Contrary to the Government's supposition, it is not Dr. Kinion's position that "even more funds should be expended" to realize that value. To have had an exit interview with him to directly ascertain what of his work could be salvaged would have required only asking the right questions because, as the Government readily points out, Dr. Kinion was interviewed by investigators - albeit by at least one who didn't know the difference between liquid helium and Helium-3, a gas. See Supplemental Declaration of Investigator Geoffrey Guska,, filed November 3, 2016 with the Government's Response to Defendant's Sentencing Memorandum.

Case 4:16-cr-00097-JSW Document 22 Filed 11/04/16 Page 3 of 3

1	IARPA did not get all they bargained for. We wouldn't be in this posture if they had. The
2	argument here is that they got something, a fact the Government chooses to ignore.
3	
4	DATED: November 4, 2016
5	-S- James Phillip Vaughns
6	JAMES PHILLIP VAUGHNS.
7	Attorney for Defendant KINION
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	- 3 -