	Reproduced from the holdings of the National Archives at Riverside
1	Atty. Michael Avery LODGED
2	Atty. Michael Avery Avery & Friedman
3	Six Beacon St., Suite 520 JAN 2 5 1985
4	Boston, MA 02108
5	Atty. Maral Kirakosian 717 West Temple
6	Suite 222
7	Attorneys for DefendantENTERED ON COURTRAN
8	STEVEN DADAIAN JAN 28 1985 CERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
9	BY DEPUT
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) NO. CR. 82-917-MRP
14	Plaintiff, ) ORDER AUTHORIZING ) RELEASE OF DEFENDANT
15	v. ) DADAIAN DURING ) APPEAL
16	VIKEN HOVSEPIAN, ET AL.,
17	Defendants )
18	Upon application by the defendant Steven Dadaian, IT IS
19	ORDERED that the said defendant may be released from custody
20	during the pendency of his appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of
21	Appeals on the same terms and conditions as were imposed to
22	secure his appearance before this Court for the trial of this
23	action
24	This order is made upon the basis of the following facts
25	and circumstances:
26	1. The said defendant has been found guilty of an offense,
27	sentenced to a term of imprisonment and has filed a timely
28	270

2

3

4 5

6 7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

-2-

Notice of Appeal.

- 2. The Court has found by clear and convincing evidence that the said defendant is not likely to flee or pose a danger to the safety of any other person or the community if released pending apppeal.
- 3. The Court finds that the within appeal is not for the purpose of delay and does raise a substantial question of law or fact likely to result in reversal of the defendant's conviction or an order for a new trial. In this respect the Court finds that the defendant's motion to suppress evidence discovered as a result of the opening by Government agents of a suitcase at Logan Airport in Boston, without a warrant, raised substantial questions of law concerning both the obligation of the Government to employ the telephonic warrant procedure of rule 41(c)(2) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the Government's claimed justification of "exigent circumstances" for dispensing with the warrant requirement in this case. The Court further finds that in the event the Court of Appeals rules that the said evidence should have been suppressed, reversal and an order for a new trial would be necessary.

Date: January 25 , 1985

Mariana R. Pfaile

United States District Judge

Presented by:

-3-

Michael Avery, Attorney Defendant Steven Dadaian