1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3	BEFORE HONORABLE CATHY ANN BENCIVENGO, JUDGE PRESIDING		
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)		
7	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. 18CR5260-CAB		
8	vs.)) SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA		
9	SALAM RAZUKI (1), SYLVIA) GONZALES (2), ELIZABETH JUAREZ (3),)		
10	OCTOBER 2, 2020 Defendants.		
11)		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17	STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS TELEPHONIC STATUS HEARING PAGES 1-23		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	Proceedings reported by stenography, transcript produced by CAT software		
23			
24	Mauralee Ramirez, RPR, CSR No. 11674 Federal Official Stenographic Reporter ordertranscript@gmail.com		
25			

1	COUNSEL APPEARING:	
2	For The Plaintiff:	United States Attorney's Office Southern District of California Fred Sheppard, AUSA 880 Front Street San Diego, CA 92101
3		
4		
5		
6	For The Defendant: Salam Razuki	
7		Thomas Warwick 101 W. Broadway, Suite 810 San Diego, CA 92101
8		Antonio Yoon Law Offices
9		Antonio Yoon
10		501 W. Broadway, Suite A-387 San Diego, CA 92101
11	December De Constants	Tara Office and Deliver Deliver
12	Sylvia Gonzales	
13		Brian Funk The Granger Building 964 Fifth Avenue, #214
14		San Diego, CA 92101
15	For The Defendant: Elizabeth Juarez	Allen Bloom Law Offices
16		Allen Bloom 550 W. C Street #1670
17		San Diego, CA 92101
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
1
        San Diego, California; Friday, October 2, 2020; 1:30 p.m.
 2
         (Case 18CR5260-CAB called)
 3
              MR. YOON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Antonio Yoon
 4
    and Tom Warwick on behalf of Mr. Razuki, who is present
 5
     telephonically.
 6
              MR. FUNK: Brian Funk on behalf of Ms. Gonzales, who
 7
     is present on video from CCA.
 8
              MR. BLOOM: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Allen Bloom
 9
     appearing telephonically on behalf of Ms. Juarez. Ms. Juarez
10
     is waiving appearance for this hearing today. She is aware of
11
     it and has waived her appearance.
12
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
13
              MR. SHEPPARD: Fred Sheppard on behalf of the United
14
     States.
15
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you, Mr. Sheppard.
16
              Good afternoon, Ms. Gonzales.
              THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon.
17
18
              THE COURT: This was schedule for motion hearing
     today. No motions were filed, so I just turned it into a
19
     status. I'd like to talk about setting a trial date for this
20
21
     case. But before we get into those dates, is there anything
22
     counsel wants to bring to the Court's attention?
23
              MR. YOON: Your Honor, for the record, this is Antonio
24
    Yoon on behalf of Mr. Razuki. To put some context into, I
25
     guess, what my potential issue is, on May 15th, Your Honor, we
```

had our last hearing. That hearing was brought up because, in our opinion, the government has failed to comply with the Court's order which is document 74. That was the January 21st, 2020, where the Court ordered the government to make a final disclosure of the name the witnesses and evidence it intends to use in its case in chief and provide any expert disclosures.

On April 3rd, the government did provide us with a

On April 3rd, the government did provide us with a list of 143 witnesses. That prompted the motion to compel compliance with the Court's order number 74. On May 15th, Your Honor, we were before the Court because the government claimed that given the pandemic, which was understandable, their investigation had sort of dropped off. People weren't being able to be interviewed. And so I thought that the Court asked the government at that point how long will it be before you can complete your investigation and give us an informed decision of where that is and what the list — the list of witnesses is.

To date, Your Honor, we have not received any status of that investigation, we have not received any additional reports, and we have not received any additional evidence. So, I think that's one of the issues that we need to resolve at this point.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Sheppard.

MR. SHEPPARD: I am ready to set it for trial. I told counsel that we'd be seeking a trial date. We're ready to set

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

25

a trial date and comply with whatever scheduling orders the Court sets, which prior to closure were taken off calendar. will provide discovery as it's coming through. Certainly, there will be additional discovery as far as interviews and reports. But I told counsel that when they emailed me a couple weeks ago. I said we would be prepared to set a trial date. THE COURT: Have you made any progress with cutting that list down? MR. SHEPPARD: Yes. I also told them that. THE COURT: Okay. MR. SHEPPARD: That I would be able to cut it down. told them that. And in full disclosure to the Court, I believe 13 that if it is still a -- if a witness that's four months out, that in light of that and, certainly, in light of these 15 circumstances and availability constantly shifting, I would --16 I am going to be seeking to call more than witnesses than I 17 normally would so I can make sure that I can prove up my case. 18 We will continue to call that down all the way. 19 THE COURT: Okay. I get your point. Although I can't 20 imagine that of 143 people, they're all equally fungible. That if you can't get number 12, you'd use number 122. There has 21 got to be some core group of people who are essential to your 22 23 case who you anticipate calling. And, yes, as we get to trial, 24 if they, for some reason, become unavailable, you may need to

substitute someone. But, again, there's got to be some subset

of that 142 people that you would identify in the first instance.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ SHEPPARD: Yes. I already told them that that that was the case.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes.

THE COURT: Then with regard to setting trial, this case is a little more complicated given that there are three defendants. And, I mean, as you look around in my courtroom, my ability to have a three-defendant trial and socially distance everybody is complicated. Now, if defense counsel feels like they're comfortable if we're still in a socially distancing environment, and April is the date I am proposing, that you would be okay to sit next to your client, that I could station you so you're not on top of each other, then we could potentially proceed here.

The jury would be sitting in the gallery, not in the jury box, so the whole case would be turned around and tried to the back of the room. That's the layout that they're using right now for the judges who have done criminal trials. Any observers would be able to potentially observe by having the proceedings be video monitored from another courtroom so that they could sit and watch, but there wouldn't be anybody in here but the jury, the witnesses, and the parties.

So I could try to get a larger courtroom, 4D, Judge

Sammartino's courtroom, which would give us a little more space. But if she's using it, obviously, she has priority for it.

So with that understanding and recognizing -- I don't know if any of you are familiar right now with the way we are doing trial scheduling, but we are using jury assembly for voir dire so that we bring in your panel and so that people can be distanced, we have to do the selection in a larger room than we would do it here. So only one judge a day can select a jury because there's only the one room available. And so we're on a kind of rotating calendar of when we have priority to use that room.

My priority date in April would be April 15th for jury selection date and proceed with trial, and to do it up here. So that's the date I want to propose for trial to begin. It's a Thursday, unfortunately, but that's my date for rotation. We would start on April 15th, pick a jury that Thursday, have openings, hopefully, the same day, have trial on Friday, and then proceed into the following week. And I would -- I believe we previously estimated six days would be sufficient for this case?

MR. SHEPPARD: Probably -- five to seven days is what I said. Whatever.

THE COURT: So we would continue the 19th through the 22nd of April, and if need be, go to the 23rd. And I'd vacate

my criminal calendar that day to finish the trial. 1 So those are the dates I want to reserve for you. 2 3 Does anybody offhand already know that that would not work for 4 Because if it's not April, I am looking out to June, 5 July. 6 MR. WARWICK: May I be heard? 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 MR. WARWICK: Your Honor, I am in a group that is high 9 risk, as is Mr. Bloom, and based upon current events today, I 10 have a concern about my health and also the co-counsel's 11 health, and I would hope that we would be able to maybe be in 12 period where there's some vaccine or something that could ease 13 us from those risks. I would do anything for my client, but I 14 don't want to do something that is expedient but not necessary. 15 Your Honor, I have a real concern that both Mr. Bloom and I 16 are--17 THE COURT: Counsel, you can't be that much older than Don't make me feel that bad. 18 me. 19 MR. WARWICK: But, Your Honor, I have a significant 20 concern about that. I have other concerns, but I don't know 21 whether you want me to express them. At least in speaking with state court, state court has looked at the possibility -- I 22 23 have spoken to judicial officers about the amount of people 24 that they're actually getting from jury subpoena. 25 THE COURT: We're doing surprisingly well here. I

thought the big roadblock was going to be because structure and procedure and all that and nobody would show up, but they're sending out summons and getting pretty much the same size panel we would get, and a representative panel of the community.

Very few people have actually said they are concerned to come because of COVID.

Now, I understand that is a constantly evolving situation, but currently people are coming in. It's a little surprising. I know everybody wants to go to their favorite restaurant and get their hair cut, and go to a football game. And, oh, jury duty? Maybe not so much. But they are actually willing to do that.

MR. WARWICK: Well, Your Honor, I appreciate the segment of the population that is willing to come in. I think it is applaudable for them. But, obviously, motions with regard to venire and whether it is encompassing as we normally expect to see in a jury situation, and assuming -- I appreciate -- I assume the Court appreciates the fact that given the fact that whether you're a COVID defender or a COVID deplorer, it has become somewhat of a political issue in our society, that potentially the jury venire might be steered one way or the other based upon -- I don't have any statistics to justify that, but I do have a gut reaction. And in speaking with a jury selection expert, at least, that information has been pointed out by some jury trials in state court. Obviously

different. Not federal. And I can't cite to things that have happened here. But I do have those concerns, and I haven't vetted them because it hasn't been ripe at this particular point, and we'll probably have some more experience before we get into next year.

THE COURT: Are you basically saying, to sum up on this, in light of your health concerns, which the Court appreciates, and they're legitimate, you want to just not set a trial date right now and set this for a status again in a few months to see where we are?

MR. WARWICK: Your Honor, Id like two things to happen. That, yes.

And number two is, when we first got here back in April, the Court made it clear before that to the government to do certain things. And the government basically gave us a list of 140-some people's names. And the Court said no, no, no, you're going to cut it down. And we came back later in May and there was no cutdown and there was no additional information.

Now, the Court, I specifically remember -- I don't have a transcript -- asking the U.S. attorney, How long do you think it would take you and the FBI to get out there and take your interviews, come back here and give us a definitive on limited -- it can be amended based upon additional information, but give us something that is the best estimate of where we are and the result of all your investigation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

We have not gotten one report of one person they've interviewed. And they have had four and a half months. We have not gotten one report of any additional -- no exculpatory or inculpatory evidence that has been generated. The U.S. attorney said this would be the date when I would be able to give you that information. MR. SHEPPARD: I didn't say --MR. WARWICK: And, unfortunately, we have -- and I recognize there would be problems with some people, some interviews. But nothing? MR. SHEPPARD: That's not true. THE COURT: I'll give you a chance to respond. You don't need to interrupt. MR. WARWICK: That seems, to me, to be inconsistent with the state facilitated court when we were given four and a half months --THE COURT: All right. All right. Thank you. Mr. Sheppard. MR. SHEPPARD: I don't know what it takes. We will comply with whatever scheduling orders this Court gives. It was a four-month thing. We have been doing and meeting with FBI agents. I have met with other witnesses. We have talked through and went through and tried to figure this out. still have some more to do. We will make that list. If Your

Honor wants to set it four months before trial, my suggestion

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

would be to set the trial date because it seems like if we're waiting several months, we're missing out on that date; whereas, if we at least reserve the date, we would have at least the hope to actually go forward and conclude this matter. But this -- what was said was to be done and be in a position to set a trial date and set this closure date accordingly. I agree, let's do that. Let's go. I told counsel we would do that. Yes, there will be some more discovery coming forward. Our office certainly is just now starting to come online a little bit. We had another episode in our office this week, so we're working through it. I will provide some discovery, but I am ready to set the date. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MR. WARWICK: Your Honor, I am taking the U.S. attorney at his word. I trust his word. He hasn't had -- but it sounds like he told us that he's got a bunch and he's got reports and they got interviews and they have spoken to people, and it seems to me that at some point, based upon the Court's prior request, we should get that. And we told the Court that once we get all this stuff, then we're in the position to make additional motions or argument. THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WARWICK: So the condition precedent --

THE COURT: I understand.

Mr. Funk, anything?

MR. FUNK: Your Honor, if I can be heard? My client is in custody, in custody close to two years now. I am all for getting a trail date sooner than later, though I am very concerned about the Court's statement that we're going to have to sit next to our client. I don't know, with her being in custody, that changes daily. And the MCC went on complete lockdown and had about a 95-percent positive rate. I don't know what her rate is going to be now that she's at CCA. That has positive cases. I am concerned about that. But I want to set a date and I want to have some hard deadlines so we can force the government to finally narrow things down.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. BLOOM: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Warwick has accurately characterized what has happened with regard to the 143 witnesses and if that has not been pared down, that would

Mr. Bloom, is there anything you would like to add?

be something approximately 125 witnesses -- a 124 witnesses to

18 date.

But I want to address the other issue that Mr. Warwick raised, which I think is a very valid one. That is, mainly, that we don't have very much experience of knowing of whether or not we're really getting the diverse cross-section of community that we normally get when we have regular jury trials. And as Mr. Warwick has said, I think, quite accurately that there has been a politicalization of those who are COVID

believers and COVID deniers and those who have a higher risk level and a lower risk level, and we don't have very much of a-- we have zero statistical confirmation that the panel that we would be getting in April would be representative of our community.

So it's my request that the Court set that as a status conference instead of setting a trial date. I understand -- in terms of what Mr. Sheppard has to do, I understand he's going through a process and so forth and we would eventually get a date and receive that information, but I don't want to even address that now. I am just concerned about the nature of our jury panel.

For example, I don't know if the Court knows the answer to this question, but how many jurors are responding to the summons that go out as compared to the number of summons that went out beforehand? Are we sending out three times as many summons and getting a sufficient number of people? We know that the jury panel created in the federal system in our district is deficient to meet constitutional grounds pre-COVID. I just don't believe we have any information that says that that's correct now.

And I simply think that more time will allow this

Court to kind of gain that information, there be enough

information to answer that. So I am concerned about having a

pre-skewed jury panel to respond to us.

I join in Counsel's confirmation of 143 witnesses. I don't have anything more to add to that. I have a passion about it, but I don't have any more information to tell the Court about that.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Yoon, you're not going to double team, but is there anything else you wanted to add?

MR. YOON: No, Your Honor. I do want to ask for some deadlines today.

THE COURT: And that's what I am going to do. I understand all the reservations. It is just a reserved date in April, and we will -- we will meet at least two or three more time before then, before we lock in to do that. And I understand it's a very fluid situation. Things could be way better if a vaccine actually materializes. It could be way worse. There's no way to know right now.

But I do think to give everybody some structure here and get some commitments on the page and move this case forward, I am going to give you some dates. So November 30th for the government, any outstanding discovery that you have at that point; Rule 16, any disclosures you have not yet made in accordance with Rule 16 regarding experts needs to be done; and the witness list needs to have a meaningful subset of who you think you will be calling in your case in chief for a trial that's going to be six days. So it cannot be 100 witnesses, it

can't be 50 witnesses, it has to be the people you think you're really going to call.

MR. SHEPPARD: And just to be clear, when I was trying cases in front Judge Benitez with five defendants, I was calling in the neighborhood of 10 to 17 witnesses a day, so.

And, in fact, I think --

THE COURT: Counsel, if you legitimately think you can do that and these people have such little soundbites that you're going to get through that many that day and that's your real honest estimate, then fine, I'll accept that. But just recognize that I find that a little surprising. But, again, that's fine. I just want it to be your real list.

MR. SHEPPARD: It will be.

been artificial. It's just been sort of a catchall to cover everybody. But by the end of November, I expect that you should have a list of the people that you planned that you would call in your case in chief, who they are, and whatever reports that you're required to give them under the rules based on the interviews with those witnesses, that you'll able to provide that. And it is not if they weren't on that list or on that subset list that you'll be precluded from calling them if you have good cause to have to substitute someone out, but I don't want the list to be everybody because you're trying to preserve that right. Do understand what I am saying?

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And, again, any other discovery that comes to your attention that has not been produced to counsel needs to be completed by November 30th, and the Rule 16 disclosures.

I will set a general motion date for February 11th at 10:00 a.m. So if there are any motions that flow from the final disclosures that the government gives you on November 30th, you need to file those motions by January 21st, oppositions will be due February 4th, and I'll hear those motions on February 11th. I am going to do a written order with all these dates, not just a minute order, just to make sure that they're clear.

I am going to tentatively, again, set motions in limine to be heard March 11th at 10:00 a.m. They would need to be filed by the 25th of February with oppositions by March 4th, and the trial dates will be reserved, as the Court said, for April 15th and 16th and then the 19th through the 22nd.

I am happy to hear argument either at the motion hearing date or the motion in limine regarding jury composition; not speculative, but actual evidence you might have regarding issues that would be why we can't sit a jury that reflects the community or any other issues regarding health and safety. I am happy to talk about them.

And, again, these are just dates because this case

needs some dates. It's really old. I have one defendant who is still in custody now, so we need to get things moving forward.

So anything else, Counsel?

MR. WARWICK: Your Honor, if I could be heard? Tom
Warwick on behalf of Mr. Razuki. Your Honor, we're
anticipating -- what I think will happen is that on
November 30th, we may get some discovery. What I would ask the
Court, if they have heard from people they plan to call or
people they are not going to call that they have interviewed,
give it to us now or as they get them rather than a dump on the
30th. We're standing here saying, Well, we don't know what's
in this. I would ask that the government provide us -- within
say a week, provide it to the defense and review what they've
got so that moving the case forward can be done efficiently,
rather than all --

THE COURT: All right. That's a reasonable request.

MR. SHEPPARD: I've never done a dump on defense counsel in this case or any other case. We're trying to process discovery. I am not going to wait to November 30th to hand it over. I've never done that in this case with any of these counsel with regard to it. So the implication that in some way I am going to sandbag them on November 30th is unfounded. Yes, we will provide discovery ahead of November 30th. I will continue to provide discovery as we

process it and get through it.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Your request is the same, keep it rolling. And counsel has agreed that he will do that. November is the last day, not the date to do it. I think you understand that and will follow that. And then have you approximately eight weeks from that last day of production until you have to file motions to address issues, which should be plenty of time, even if you get a substantial amount of information on the last day to be able to prepare for motions.

MR. WARWICK: I have a client who has never been through a proceeding. The Court has made the order now the third time, and not one scintilla has been produced.

THE COURT: All right. You know what? I've heard it all. I've given you dates. Again, there are going to be issued in an order in writing as explicitly and detailed as the Court can make it. And if there's another problem, I will hear it the next time you're here. Counsel, your client has not been through this, that's why he has you and Mr. Yoon, because you have.

What else?

MR. YOON: Your Honor --

MR. BLOOM: If it please the Court, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I am sorry. Mr. Yoon was about to address the Court go ahead.

MR. YOON: Your Honor, can we also just add the same

language that was adopted in document 74 which is: government will make a final disclosure of the name of witnesses and evidence that is to be used. The reason that's so important is that will shave a lot of motions to file in terms of what we want to exclude and what we don't, are there any hearsay relevance. We can also add a good faith estimate of what evidence they're going to use and what they're going to rely on. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bloom, I am sorry, you wanted to add something?

MR. BLOOM: It's a logistical issue, Your Honor, having do with the motions on the 11th. And I guess it's the 11th for both of them, February 11th and March 11th.

> THE COURT: Yes.

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

MR. BLOOM: At this stage, I would make the request the Court allow me to appear telephonically. I may decide I have to come in because of the nature of the motions and I need to address the Court in person, but my estimation at this point is probably --

THE COURT: Counsel, your request is premature. motions are filed, depending on the nature, I'll hear it when we get to February and March, but I am not going to deal with that right now. If I think I need to have you here, then I'll need to have you here. But we'll deal with that. That's months away. All right.

1 MR. YOON: Your Honor, the last housekeeping matter, I don't know if Mr. Funk wants to address the grand jury 2 3 transcripts. The only other thing on behalf of Mr. Razuki on 4 February 7th, the government was going to provide the Court for 5 an in-camera inspection the immigration file for the CI. 6 just want to know what the status of that is. 7 THE COURT: I thought I got that. 8 MR. SHEPPARD: Your Honor did review both of them 9 already. 10 THE COURT: Yes. And I wasn't ordering anything to be 11 produced. 12 MR. SHEPPARD: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 MR. FUNK: Your Honor, we did talk about the grand 14 jury way back when, and I don't know whether the government is 15 going to turn those over or not. There's an issue on --16 (Court reporter requesting attorney to slow down and to 17 speak into the microphone) 18 MR. FUNK: Brian Funk on behalf of Ms. Gonzales. 19 As to the grand jury transcripts, we had discussed that back in February, I believe, the government was going to 20 21 turn it over. I was just wondering about the status because there is an issue whether I need to file a motion regarding 22 23 instructions regarding entrapment defense and whether or not 24 the jury was instructed as to the truthfulness of the CI.

MR. SHEPPARD: There was no such order with regards to

25

the transcript, nor was the government, nor in any case, where witnesses testified and sworn testify at trial. So if there's a motion to be filed. And it's been months, but no motion was ever filed in that regard.

MR. FUNK: What I am hearing is the government is requiring me to file a motion before they'll turn them over?

THE COURT: I don't think the government is obligated to give you any grand jury unless they're going to call them as a witness. If they're going to call them as a witness, I don't think they should wait until they're on the witness stand.

MR. SHEPPARD: No.

THE COURT: You should give it to them ahead of time.

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes. And I certainly would. The grand jury transcripts, I was going to give closer around the motion in limine date. If they want it a date ahead of that, that's fine as well. Generally, that's when I give that, but I don't --

THE COURT: On the one hand, I appreciate that you feel like you're disclosing information. On the other hand, it's not a fishing expedition that they need to provide stuff so that you can paw through it to see if there's something there you can file a motion on. If the person is going to be a critical witness in the case and they testified, then provide the grand jury testimony when you identify them as a court witness in your case so that we don't have to have this ongoing

discussion.

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's it for today.

MR. WARWICK: Your Honor, last issue. My client recently had five stents put into the arteries surrounding the heart, and the activity was not as successful as hoped. It looks like he's going to have open heart surgery. I would ask the Court if we could have him appear telephonically in some of those hearings because of recovery.

I would also ask the Court if we could bifurcate him-(Court reporter interruption requesting counsel to speak
into the microphone)

MR. WARWICK: What I am saying is, I would like my client to be able to present telephonically with a counsel present with him so that counsel could receive information from him and act upon it if appropriate.

THE COURT: Again, as of Mr. Bloom's request, I consider it a little premature. I understand today because of his medical condition, and I understand he's scheduled for a serious medical procedure in December. So when we get to the dates, just not the night before, but certainly give us some notice if he's not competent or comfortable to come to court either for his own condition or for the general health conditions, then we'll work on arrangements so that he can be adequately represented, whether that involves one of you being

1 with him on a VTC proceeding so you can have conversations 2 privately and then phone each other. We can work that out. 3 But I appreciate you bringing it to the Court's attention. 4 I think that's it for today. Thank you, Counsel. 5 (Court in recess at 2:09 p.m.) *** End of requested transcript *** 6 7 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER 8 9 I, Mauralee Ramirez, Federal official stenographic 10 reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the 11 Southern District of California, do hereby certify that 12 pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code that the 13 foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the 14 stenographically reported proceedings held in the 15 above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in 16 conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of 17 the United States. 18 19 Dated this 23rd day of November 2020. 20 21 /S/ Mauralee Ramirez Mauralee Ramirez, CSR No. 11674, RPR 22 Federal Official Stenographic Reporter 23 2.4 25