```
ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
   United States Attorney
   DENNISE D. WILLETT
   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) 338-3564
 6
         Email: larry.kole@usdoj.gov
 7
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
   United States of America
 8
 9
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                      CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
                             SOUTHERN DIVISION
12
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                    ) Case No. SA CR 08-180-DOC
13
               Plaintiff,
                                      STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE OF
14
                                      TRIAL DATE TO APRIL 2, 2013 AT
                                      8:30 A.M. AND EXCLUDABLE TIME
15
    MOSES ONCIU, BEATA GIZELLA
                                    ) New Trial Date: April 2, 2013
16
    PRIORE, and IRENE PEMKOVA,
                                      Proposed New Time: 8:30 a.m.
                                      Place: Courtroom of the
17
               Defendants.
                                      Honorable David O. Carter
18
19
         Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its
20
    counsel of record, the United States Attorney for the Central
21
   District of California, and defendants, Moses Onciu, by and
22
```

counsel of record, the United States Attorney for the Central District of California, and defendants, Moses Onciu, by and through his counsel of record, Gerald Werksman, Beata Gizella Priore, by and through her counsel of record, Joel Levine, and Irene Pemkova, by and through her counsel of record, Diane Bass, stipulate as follows.

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

1. Defendants Onciu and Priore first appeared before a 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, 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.
- 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. The Court has previously continued the trial date in this case from September 30, 2008 to November 27, 2012 upon the parties' stipulations, and found the interim period, as well as the period to December 4, 2012, to be excluded in computing the time within which the trial must commence, pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act.
- 5. By this stipulation, the parties jointly move to continue the trial date from November 27, 2012 to April 2, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.
- 6. 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:

- a) Pursuant to defendants' requests, the government produced to defendants discovery including search warrants and a written affidavit, voluminous email messages and attachments, memoranda of interviews, investigative reports, digital files that include correspondence and investment documents, financial records, internet connection records, expert witness disclosures, and other documentation. In addition, the government produced to defendants audio recordings of telephone conversations and an inperson meeting, along with transcriptions of these conversations.
- b) Defendant Priore's car and property suffered significant damage in the hurricane that occurred at the end of October 2012 and she is continuing to be treated for cancer, as a result, she has been unable to engage in preparation for trial.
- c) Defendant Pemkova was injured in a car accident in October 2012 and is currently undergoing treatment to recover from her injuries; as a result, she has been unable to engage in preparation for trial. Defendant Pemkova anticipates calling two expert witnesses, Rudolf Klika and Rudolf Fak, however, these witnesses are unavailable on the current trial date.
- d) Counsel for defendants represent that additional time is necessary to confer with defendants, conduct and complete 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 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. 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.

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

- e) Defendants' counsel have discussed this stipulation with defendants and defendants consent to the requested continuance. The government does not object to the continuance.
- For purposes of computing the date under the Speedy 7. Trial Act by which defendants' trial must commence, the parties agree that the time period of November 27, 2012 to April 2, 2013, 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 deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the

exercise of due diligence.

- 8. In addition, the parties agree that the time period of November 27, 2012 to April 2, 2013, inclusive, should be excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(3)(A), because it results from the unavailability of essential witnesses.
- 9. The parties further agree that the time period of November 27, 2012 to April 2, 2013, 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.
- 10. 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: November 15, 2012.

ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR. United States Attorney

DENNISE D. WILLETT Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Santa Ana Branch

/S,

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 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 April 2, 2013 is an informed and voluntary one. Dated: November 15, 2012. GERALD WERKSMAN pursuant to 11/15/12 email authorization

Attorney for Defendant Moses Onciu

I am Beata Gizella Priore'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. I believe that my client's decision to give up the right to be brought to trial earlier than April 2, 2013 is an informed and voluntary one.

Dated: November 15, 2012.

/S/*
JOEL LEVINE
*pursuant to 11/15/12
email authorization

Attorney for Defendant Beata Gizella Priore

Case 8:08-cr-00180-DOC Document 128 Filed 11/15/12 Page 7 of 7 Page ID #:495

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. I believe that my client's decision to give up the right to be brought to trial earlier than April 2, 2013 is an informed and voluntary one.

Dated: November 15, 2012.

10 /S/*
DIANE BASS
11 *pursuant to 11/15/12

*pursuant to 11/15/12 email authorization

Attorney for Defendant Irene Pemkova

```
ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
   United States Attorney
   DENNISE D. WILLETT
   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) 338-3564
 6
         Email: larry.kole@usdoj.gov
 7
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
    United States of America
 8
 9
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                      CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
                             SOUTHERN DIVISION
12
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                     ) Case No. SA CR 08-180-DOC
13
               Plaintiff,
                                       [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING
14
                                      TRIAL DATE TO APRIL 2, 2013 AT
                                      8:30 A.M. AND REGARDING
15
                                      EXCLUDABLE TIME PERIOD UNDER
    MOSES ONCIU, BEATA GIZELLA
                                     ) SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
16
    PRIORE, and IRENE PEMKOVA,
17
               Defendants.
18
         The Court has read and considered the Stipulation re
19
   Excludable Time Period under Speedy Trial Act filed by the
20
```

Excludable Time Period under Speedy Trial Act filed by the parties in this matter on November 15, 2012. 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.

2.1

22

2.4

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 deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence; (4) this continuance results from the unavailability of an essential witness; (5) this continuance is a reasonable period of delay resulting from defendants' joinder with each other for trial, the time for trial of defendants has not run, and no motion for severance has been granted; and (6) this continuance results from the unavailability of essential witnesses.

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

- 1. The trial in this matter is continued from November 27, 2012 to April 2, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.
- 2. The time period of November 27, 2012 to April 2, 2013, inclusive, is excluded in computing the time within which the trial must commence, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(3)(A), (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

```
24 / / /
```

^{25 / / /}

^{26 / / /}

^{27 / / /}

^{28 | / / /}

	Case 8:08-cr-00180-DOC Document 128-1 Filed 11/15/12 Page 3 of 3 Page ID #:498
1	of additional time periods from the period within which trial
2	must commence.
3	Dated:
4	
5	
6	Honorable David O. Carter
7	United States District Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	