

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 2:10-CR-237-AMM-GMB
)	
JORAN VAN DER SLOOT)	

**UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL
AND PRETRIAL DEADLINES**

Joran van der Sloot, through undersigned counsel and without opposition from the United States, moves to continue the pretrial deadlines for 30 days and continue trial setting for at least 60 days pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(1)(G); (h)(1)(7)(A); and (h)(7)(B)(i) & (iv). In support, Mr. van der Sloot states:

1. A grand jury indicted Mr. van der Sloot on June 30, 2010, with extortion in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a) (Count 1) and wire fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Count 2). (Doc. 12).
2. Mr. van der Sloot was arraigned on these charges on June 9, 2023. (Minute Entry dated June 9, 2023).
3. The government has provided initial discovery and further discovery is forthcoming. Additionally, the defense has begun its investigation of this matter.
4. The deadline for pretrial motions is July 17, 2023. The deadline to inform the District Judge whether Mr. van der Sloot intends to plead guilty or go to trial is July 17, 2023. (Doc. 32).

5. Because undersigned counsel needs additional time to review the discovery, investigate this case, and prepare for trial, it is in the interest of justice to continue the motions deadline and the trial setting.
6. Accordingly, Mr. van der Sloot requests a 30-day continuance of all pretrial deadlines and a continuance of at least 60 days to prepare for trial.
7. The government does not oppose Mr. van der Sloot's request for a continuance, and Mr. van der Sloot's speedy trial waiver is attached.
8. Requests for a continuance are committed to the sound discretion of the trial court. *United States v. Darby*, 744 F.2d 1508, 1521 (11th Cir. 1984), *reh. denied* 749 F.2d 733, *cert. denied* 471 U.S. 1100 (1985). A continuance to allow defendant, "the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation" for trial is one factor considered significantly by the Speedy Trial Act. *United States v. Davenport*, 935 F.2d 1223, 1235 (11th Cir. 1991); 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The Eleventh Circuit has repeatedly recognized that a continuance to provide adequate preparation by counsel serves the ends of justice. *United States v. Goetz*, 826 F.2d 1025, 1028 (11th Cir. 1987); *United States v. Elkins*, 795 F.2d 919, 924 (11th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied* 479 U.S. 952 (1986); *United States v. Sarro*, 742 F.2d 1286, 1300 (11th Cir. 1984), *reh. denied* 751 F.2d 394 (1984).

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Kevin L. Butler

Federal Public Defender

Office of the Federal Public Defender

Northern District of Alabama
505 20th Street, North, Suite 1425
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
205-208-7170
Kevin_Butler@fd.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on June 26, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing via this Court's CM/ECF system, which will send notice of such filing to all counsel of record.

/s/ Kevin L. Butler