1	JOHN D. KAUFMANN
2	Attorney At Law
2	Suite 905 Transamerica Bldg. 177 North Church Avenue
3	Tucson, Arizona 85701
	(520) 623-2016 Fax (520) 623-8715
4	
5	Arizona State Bar No. 004156
,	Pima County Computer No. 30436
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
8	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
_	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) NO. 4:10-cr-03019-DCB -CRP
9	Plaintiff,
10)
	s. MOTION TO DISMISS
11) PRE-INDICTMENT DELAY
12	RICARDO MENDEZ, JR.,
12	Defendant,
13	Defendant,
1.4	
14	COMES NOW Ricardo Mendez, by and through undersigned counsel of
15	CONTES NOW Recardo Mendez, by and unough undersigned counsel of
	record, John D. Kaufmann, and moves to dismiss the above captioned action for
16	record, somi D. Kadimann, and moves to dismiss the above captioned action for
17	violation of the Defendant's right to speedy trial as guaranteed and protected by the
	violation of the Defendant 3 fight to speedy that as guaranteed and protected by the
18	Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
19	That I monament to the officed states constitution.
17	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 8 th day of April, 2011.
20	RESI ECTI CEET SCOMMITTED and of April, 2011.
21	
21	s/ John D. Kaufmann
22	John D. Kaufmann
	John D. Raumani
23	
24	
_	
25	

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On March 20th, 2007, Defendant Mendez and co-defendant Celaya went to Mad Dog Global Marketing. Two transactions took place. The first transaction was the purchase of 21 firearms by Defendant Celaya. The second transaction was one firearm purchased by Ricardo Mendez. Co-Defendant Rodrigo Rodriguez-Contreras was present at the time of the transactions.

Although the Indictment contains multiple counts and extends through October of 2007, Mr. Mendez is not alleged to have been involved in other incidents identified in the indictment. Several weeks after the purchase, Mr. Mendez was with codefendant Rodriguez-Contreras at a night club. Rodriguez-Contreras was involved in a disturbance with a woman at the night club and police were called. The weapon Mr. Mendez purchased from Mad Dogs was discovered underneath the front seat of a vehicle owned by Rodriguez-Contreras' girlfriend, but driven by Ricardo Mendez as Rodriguez-Contreras license was suspended. At the scene of the arrest, Mr. Mendez indicated that the firearm was his. Rodriguez-Contreras told the same story. Mr. Mendez asked the Tucson Police Department and ATF for the return of his firearm. The last act of the conspiracy is alleged to occur in October of 2007. The

¹ Paragraph ii in Count one (conspiracy) alleges between February 2007 and August 2008 firearms were transported to Mexico. However, the last date documented in the Indictment for

investigation concerning this case was completed shortly thereafter. The Indictment is returned October 27th, 2010. ¹

For three years the government did not indict or pursue charges. During this time, co-defendant Rodriguez-Contreras was deported to Mexico and his current location and address are unknown. Secondly, the attorney for Rodriguez-Contreras, Burt Polis has passed away. Thirdly, the owner of the vehicle driven by Mr. Mendez cannot be located and is believed to be in Mexico with Rodriguez-Contreras. Rodriguez-Contreras would testify that the weapon belonged to Ricardo Mendez. Mr. Polis would have confirmed Mr. Rodriguez-Contreras' statements. Rodriguez-Contreras' girlfriend would have stated that she gave permission for Defendant Ricardo Mendez to drive the vehicle as Rodriguez-Contreras' license was suspended at the time of the gun seizure.

II. ISSUE

conduct is October 2007.

a. WHETHER THE PRE-ACCUSATORIAL DELAY VIOLATED THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT.

III. ARGUMENT

a. THE PRE-ACCUSATORIAL DELAY VIOLATED A DUE PROCESS CLAUSE RIGHT TO SPEEDY TRIAL OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT.

The Due Process Clause to the United States Constitution guarantees speedy trial by guarding against governmental delay that prejudices a defendant. On a Fifth Amendment motion for dismissal and the right to speedy trial, a Defendant must show that he has either suffered actual prejudice from the delay or that the prosecution intentionally or recklessly delayed the indictment for strategic advantage. See *United States v. Lovasco*, 431 U.S. 783(1977); *United States v. Loud Hawk*, 816 F.2d 1323(9th Cir. 1987); *United States v. Carruth*, 699 F.2d 1017(9th Cir. 1983).

In the case before the Court, Mr. Mendez is asserting that he has suffered both actual prejudice and that that prosecution intentionally or recklessly delayed the Indictment for strategic advantage. i.e. the deportation of the only eye witness. In the case before the Court, a key witness was deported by the government after it had knowledge that his testimony would favor Mr. Mendez. The eyewitness girlfriend followed him to Mexico. No forwarding address is known. They left or were deported after the completion of the investigation by the federal government

in the case. The Defendant shows actual prejudice and intentional prosecutorial conduct in delaying the indictment for a strategic advantage.

If actual prejudice is alleged, the Court adopts a two prong test. <u>United</u>

<u>States v. Ross</u>, 123 F.3d 1181(9th Cir. 1997). The first prong is actual prejudice. If the Court determines that <u>any</u> prejudice exists, the trier of fact balances the length of delay, (over three years) with the reasons for the delay in deciding whether the Defendant's rights are violated. Violating a defendant's Fifth Amendment right to due process requires dismissal of charges even if the statue of limitations has not expired. <u>United States v. Doe</u>, 149 F.3d 945(9th Cir. 1998). Mr. Mendez requests dismissal under the Fifth Amendment's due process right to speedy trial.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 8th day of April, 2011.

<u>s/ John D. Kaufmann</u> John D. Kaufmann