



USA v. Daugherty

2019 | Cited 0 times | N.D. California | February 4, 2019

DAVID L. ANDERSON (CABN 149604) United States Attorney BARBARA J. VALLIERE (DCBN 439353) Chief, Criminal Division AJAY KRISHNAMURTHY (CABN 305533) Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102-3495 Telephone: (415) 436-7050
FAX: (415) 436-7027 Ajay.krishnamurthy@usdoj.gov Attorneys for United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff, v. RAIN OLSON DAUGHERTY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR 18-614 WHO STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXCLUDE TIME UNDER THE
SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

On January 24, 2019, the parties appeared before this Court for a status conference. At that time, defense counsel requested a continuance in order to complete her review of discovery. The matter was scheduled for a further status hearing on February 14, 2019. With the agreement of the parties as explained on the record during the hearing, the Court enters this order documenting the exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from January 24, 2019 to February 14, 2019, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. ' 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv). The parties agreed to the exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act to allow for effective preparation of defense counsel. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(iv). The parties agree that the ends of justice are served by granting the continuance and outweigh the interests of the public // // and the defendant in a speedy trial. SO STIPULATED:

DAVID L. ANDERSON United States Attorney

DATED: February 4, 2019 ____/s/_____



USA v. Daugherty

2019 | Cited 0 times | N.D. California | February 4, 2019

AJAY KRISHNAMURTHY Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: February 4, 2019 ____/s/_____ ELIZABETH FALK

Attorney for the Defendant

ORDER Based on the reasons stated on the record and in the stipulation of the parties above, the Court hereby FINDS that the exclusion of time from January 24, 2019 to February 14, 2019 (inclusive) is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defendant effective preparation of counsel. 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

DATED: February 4, 2019 _____

HON. WILLIAM H. ORRICK United States District Judge

