

government's motion to detain the defendant without bond pending trial and released him.

4. An Assistant United States Attorney for the Central District of California orally moved to stay the defendant's release pending an appeal by the government. The magistrate judge denied that request.

5. The United States filed in this Court an Emergency Motion to Review the Court's Release Order on August 26, 2021.

6. On September 3, 2021, Acting Chief Judge Rudolph Contreras Issued an Order Granting the Government's Motion to Revoke Release Order (ECF 13). The Court ordered Defendant Brown to report to the federal courthouse in California by September 7, 2021.

7. On September 7, 2021, Defendant Brown turned himself in in California.

8. On September 9, 2021, the Court Ordered his transport from California to D.C. (ECF 17).

9. The government and counsel for the defendant have conferred. Due to Defendant being detained, he is in the process of retaining counsel to represent him when he arrives in D.C. The current counsel for defendant would like to confer with new counsel and continue proceedings once the defendant is in D.C. The newly retained counsel will also need time to review the discovery that has been produced thus far and confer with his client, in person in D.C. The parties agree that the complaint will remain in full force and effect through the new date of October 28, 2021. The parties agree that this stipulation and any order resulting therefrom shall not affect any previous order of pretrial detention or pretrial release.

10. The parties, therefore, would respectfully request that the preliminary hearing and the date by which an information or an indictment must be filed be continued until October 21, 2021. The parties agree that the failure to grant this continuance "would deny counsel for the

defendant . . . the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence,” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Therefore, “the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance [will] outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial,” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), and the parties request an order to that end. The parties agree that pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161, the time from August 26, 2021 to October 28, 2021 shall be excluded in computing the date for speedy trial in this case.

Wherefore, the parties respectfully request that the Court continue the Preliminary Hearing in this matter until October 28, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

CHANNING PHILLIPS
ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: /s/ Mitra Jafary-Hariri
MITRA JAFARY-HARIRI
Assistant United States Attorney
Detailee
MI Bar No. P74460
211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001
Detroit, MI 48226
mitra.jafary-hariri@usdoj.gov
(313) 226-9632

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the Consent Motion to Continue Complaint and Set Preliminary Hearing was served upon counsel of record through ECF on the date of filing.

By: /s/ Mitra Jafary-Hariri
MITRA JAFARY-HARIRI
Assistant United States Attorney
Detailee
MI Bar No. P74460
211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001
Detroit, MI 48226
mitra.jafary-hariri@usdoj.gov
(313) 226-9632

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:
	:
v.	:
	:
JEFFREY SCOTT BROWN,	:
	:
Defendant.	:

ORDER

This matter having come before the Court pursuant to a Motion to Continue, upon consent, it is therefore

ORDERED that, after taking into account the public interest in the prompt disposition of criminal cases, good cause exists to extend the Complaint and set a Preliminary Hearing on October 28, 2021; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the period from August 26, 2021 to October 28, 2021 be excluded from computing the time within which an information or indictment must be filed under the Speedy Trial Act because the ends of justice served by such a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7). The Court finds that COVID-19 has presented complications here that make it difficult for defense to meet with his client and prepare, and that delay is necessary for the parties to work on a potential resolution.

It Is So Ordered.

Zia M. Faruqui
United States Magistrate Judge

Entered: _____