```
THOMAS P. O'BRIEN
 1
   United States Attorney
   ROBB C. ADKINS
   Assistant United States Attorney
   Chief, Santa Ana Branch
 3
   LAWRENCE E. KOLE (Cal. Bar No. 141582)
   Assistant United States Attorney
 4
         411 West Fourth Street, Suite 8000
 5
         Santa Ana, California 92701
         Telephone: (714) 338-3594 Facsimile: (714) 338-3708
 6
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
 7
   United States of America
 8
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
                      CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
                             SOUTHERN DIVISION
11
12
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                    ) Case No. SA CR 08-180-DOC
13
               Plaintiff,
                                      STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE OF
                                    ) TRIAL DATE TO JUNE 8, 2010 AT
14
                  v.
                                    ) 8:30 A.M. AND EXCLUDABLE TIME
15
    MOSES ONCIU, BEATA GIZELLA
                                    ) New Trial Date:
                                                        June 8, 2010
    PRIORE, and IRENE PEMKOVA,
                                    ) Proposed New Time: 8:30 a.m.
16
                                    ) Place: Courtroom of the
               Defendants.
                                    ) Honorable David O. Carter
17
18
         Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its
19
   counsel of record, the United States Attorney for the Central
20
   District of California, and defendants, Moses Onciu, by and
2.1
   through his counsel of record, Gerald Werksman, Beata Gizella
22
   Priore, by and through her counsel of record, Joel Levine, and
23
   Irene Pemkova, by and through her counsel of record, Diane Bass,
2.4
   stipulate as follows.
25
              Defendants Onciu and Priore first appeared before a
26
```

judicial officer in the court in which this charge is pending on

August 4, 2008. The Indictment in this case was filed on July 2,

27

2008. The Speedy Trial Act of 1974, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 et seq., originally required that the trial as to defendants Onciu and Priore commence on or before October 13, 2008. Defendant Pemkova first appeared before a judicial officer in the court in which this charge is pending on August 18, 2008. The Speedy Trial Act of 1974, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 et seq., originally required that the trial as to defendant Pemkova commence on or before October 27, 2008.

- 2. On August 4, 2008, defendants Onciu and Priore were arraigned on the Indictment and the Court set a trial date of September 30, 2008. On August 18, 2008, defendant Pemkova was arraigned on the Indictment and the Court set the same trial date of September 30, 2008. On July 9, 2009, the court vacated the trial date, which had been continued pursuant to the parties' stipulation, and ordered that it would be reset at a status conference on August 4, 2009.
- 3. Defendants are released on bond pending trial. The parties estimate that the government's case-in-chief in the trial of this matter will last approximately 6 days.
- 4. By this stipulation, the parties jointly move the court to sign the contemporaneously filed proposed order to memorialize the order that the court made at the status conference conducted on August 4, 2009 that set the trial date in this matter on June 8, 2010 at 8:30 a.m. and to find the time from August 4, 2009 to July 27, 2010 to be excludable.
- 5. The parties request the continuance based upon the following facts, which the parties believe demonstrate good cause to support the appropriate findings under the Speedy Trial Act:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- a) Pursuant to defendants' requests, the government produced to defendants over 400 pages of discovery including search warrants and a written affidavit, voluminous email messages and attachments, memoranda of interviews, investigative reports, criminal history printouts, IP address printouts, and other documentation. The government subsequently produced to defendants many hours of audio recordings of dozens of telephone conversations and an in-person meeting. On July 13 and 21, 2009, the government produced to defendants draft transcripts of these recordings, which encompassed over 400 pages. On August 3, 2009, the government provided defendants with a notice of expert testimony.
- On July 16, 2009, the court granted the request of b) defendant Pemkova to travel to the Czech Republic for medical treatment for 60 days. Defendant Pemkova's treatment during that period will limit her ability to consult with her counsel to prepare for trial. In addition, counsel for defendant Pemkova has a multi-defendant federal trial that is expected to last for three to four weeks scheduled for September 28, 2009, counsel for defendant Priore has a federal trial that is set for September 2009 and is anticipated to be rescheduled in November 2009, counsel for defendants Pemkova and Priore are both scheduled to be in trial in a federal case with 13 defendants that is scheduled for December 1, 2009, counsel for defendant Pemkova has another federal trial that is expected to last 10-12 weeks and involves tens of thousands of pages of documentary evidence scheduled for January 13, 2010, and counsel for defendants Pemkova and Priore are scheduled to be in trial in a complex

federal case for approximately two months beginning in April 2010. As a result of the time needed to prepare for and conduct these trials, defendant Pemkova's counsel and defendant Priore's counsel are need of additional time to prepare for the instant case and are unavailable to try this case on a new date that is earlier than that stipulated to herein.

- c) Counsel for defendants represent that additional time is necessary to confer with defendants, conduct and complete an independent investigation of the case, conduct and complete additional legal research including for potential pre-trial motions, review the discovery and potential evidence in the case, including that recently produced by the government, to obtain additional discovery that defendants may seek from the government, to review that additional discovery after it is produced, and prepare for trial in the event that a pretrial resolution does not occur. Defense counsel represent that failure to grant the continuance would deny them reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
- d) Defendants' counsel have discussed this stipulation with defendants and defendants consent to the requested continuance. Defendants also stated that they consent to this continuance on the record during the August 4, 2009 status conference. The government does not object to the continuance.
- 6. For purposes of computing the date under the Speedy
 Trial Act by which defendants' trial must commence, the parties
 agree that the time period of August 4, 2009 to July 27, 2010,

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

inclusive, should be excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), (h)(7)(B)(i), and (B)(iv) because the delay results from a continuance granted by the court at defendants' request, without government objection, on the basis of the court's finding that: (i) the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and defendants in a speedy trial; (ii) failure to grant the continuance would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice, that it is unreasonable to expect preparation for pre-trial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by the Speedy Trial Act; (iii) failure to grant the continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence; and (iv) failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny defendants continuity of counsel and would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

- 7. In addition, the parties agree that the time period of August 4, 2009 to July 27, 2010, inclusive, should be excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(6), because it is a reasonable period of delay resulting from defendants' joinder for trial with each other, the time for trial of defendants has not run, and no motion for severance has been granted.
- 8. Nothing in this stipulation shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods be excluded from the period within which

trial must commence. Moreover, the same provisions and/or other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act may in the future authorize the exclusion of additional time periods from the period within which trial must commence. IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: August 6, 2009.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THOMAS P. O'BRIEN United States Attorney

ROBB C. ADKINS Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Santa Ana Branch

LAWRENCE E. KOLE Assistant United States Attorney

Attorneys for Plaintiff United States of America

I am Moses Onciu's attorney. I have carefully discussed this stipulation and the continuance of the trial date with my client. I have fully informed my client of his Speedy Trial rights. To my knowledge, my client understands those rights. believe that my client's decision to give up the right to be brought to trial earlier than July 27, 2010 is an informed and voluntary one.

Dated: August 6, 2009.

/s/* GERALD WERKSMAN

Attorney for Defendant Moses Onciu pursuant to 8/5/09 authorization

I am Beata Gizella Priore's attorney. I have carefully discussed this stipulation and the continuance of the trial date

6

with my client. I have fully informed my client of her Speedy Trial rights. To my knowledge, my client understands those rights. I believe that my client's decision to give up the right to be brought to trial earlier than July 27, 2010 is an informed and voluntary one.

Dated: August 6, 2009.

7

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

Attorney for Defendant Beata Gizella Priore pursuant to 8/4/09 authorization

11

12

13

14

15

16

10

I am Irene Pemkova's attorney. I have carefully discussed this stipulation and the continuance of the trial date with my client. I have fully informed my client of her Speedy Trial rights. To my knowledge, my client understands those rights. believe that my client's decision to give up the right to be brought to trial earlier than July 27, 2010 is an informed and voluntary one.

DIANE BASS

17 18

Dated: August 6, 2009.

19

21

20

Attorney for Defendant Irene Pemkova pursuant to 8/4/09 authorization

23

22

24

25

26

27

```
THOMAS P. O'BRIEN
 1
    United States Attorney
   ROBB C. ADKINS
   Assistant United States Attorney
   Chief, Santa Ana Branch
 3
   LAWRENCE E. KOLE (Cal. Bar No. 141582)
   Assistant United States Attorney
 4
         411 West Fourth Street, Suite 8000
 5
         Santa Ana, California 92701
         Telephone: (714) 338-3594 Facsimile: (714) 338-3708
 6
 7
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
    United States of America
 8
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
                       CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
                              SOUTHERN DIVISION
11
12
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                     ) Case No. SA CR 08-180-DOC
13
                                       [PROPOSED] ORDER SETTING TRIAL
               Plaintiff,
                                       ON JUNE 8, 2010 AT 8:30 A.M.
14
                   v.
                                       AND REGARDING EXCLUDABLE TIME
                                       PERIOD UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
15
    MOSES ONCIU, BEATA GIZELLA
    PRIORE, and IRENE PEMKOVA,
16
               Defendants.
17
         The Court has read and considered the Stipulation re
18
```

Excludable Time Period under Speedy Trial Act filed by the parties in this matter on August 6, 2009. The Court hereby finds that the Stipulation, which this Court incorporates by reference into this Order, demonstrates facts that provide good cause for a finding of excludable time pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

19

20

21

22

25

26

27

28

The Court further finds that: (1) the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and defendant in a speedy trial; (2) failure to grant the continuance would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding

impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice; (3) failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny defendants continuity of counsel and would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and (4) this continuance is a reasonable period of delay resulting from defendants' joinder with each other for trial, that the time for trial of defendants has not run, and that no motion for severance has been granted.

THEREFORE, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The trial in this matter shall be set for June 8, 2010 at 8:30 a.m.
- 2. The time period of August 4, 2009 to July 27, 2010, inclusive, is excluded in computing the time within which the trial must commence, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(6), (h)(7)(A), (h)(7)(B)(I), and (B)(iv).
- 3. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excluded from the period within which trial must commence. Moreover, the same provisions and/or other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act may in the future authorize the exclusion of additional time periods from the period within which trial must commence.

Dated:	

Honorable David O. Carter United States District Judge