

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
26
27
28

Atty. Barrett S. Litt
Litt & Stormer
3550 Wilshire Blvd.
Suite 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Atty. Jacob Adajian
16055 Ventura Blvd.
Suite 900
Encino, CA 91436

Attorneys for Defendant
VIKEN HOVSEPIAN



ENTERED ON COPIES
JAN 28 1985

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	NO. CR. 82-917-MRP
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER AUTHORIZING
)	RELEASE OF DEFENDANT
v.)	HOVSEPIAN DURING
)	APPEAL
VIKEN HOVSEPIAN, ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants)	

Upon application by the defendant Viken Hovsepien, IT IS ORDERED that the said defendant may be released from custody during the pendency of his appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on the same terms and conditions as were imposed to secure his appearance before this Court for the trial of this action.

This order is made upon the basis of the following facts and circumstances:

1. The said defendant has been found guilty of an offense, sentenced to a term of imprisonment and has filed a timely

271

-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 appeal.

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



United States District
Judge

-3-

Presented by:

Barrett S. Litt, Attorney for
Defendant Viken Hovsepian