

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
WALTER LIEW,  
Defendant.

Case No. 11-cr-00573 JSW (NC)

**NOTICE OF TENTATIVE  
RULING GRANTING MOTION  
FOR PRETRIAL RELEASE**

Re: Dkt. No. 198

The Court has considered the extensive submissions on Walter Liew’s motion for a revocation of detention and a grant of release subject to a combination of conditions. The Court issues this tentative ruling to assist the parties and Pretrial Services in preparing for the hearing.

Considering the totality of the evidence presented, the Court is inclined to grant the defendant’s motion and to order Mr. Liew released on a combination of conditions that would reasonably assure his future court appearances. These conditions would include home detention, electronic monitoring, and a substantial secured bond, in addition to other standard conditions of release. If asked, the Court would stay the release order pending review by the District Court.

The government objects to Mr. Liew’s use of proceeds for a bond from a home owned in his wife’s name in Singapore. The government seeks an inquiry under 18

1 U.S.C. § 3142(g)(4) to establish the source of the funds for this home. Both parties  
2 should be prepared for the Court to conduct this inquiry.

3 Mr. Liew suggests that he might be supervised in his home by a private security  
4 service. He would pay for the cost of this service, which would be administered by  
5 Pretrial Services. The Court will solicit the parties' further views on this proposal. The  
6 Court wants to know what powers the security service would have to enforce the release  
7 order; the utility above electronic monitoring to a security service; and whether this  
8 arrangement would impose an undue burden on Pretrial Services.

9 Finally, each side will be permitted only one attorney to argue the motion. The  
10 parties have submitted a great weight of evidence, and the Court does not need to hear it  
11 repeated.

12  
13 DATED: December 20, 2012

  
NATHANAEL M. COUSINS  
United States Magistrate Judge

14  
15  
16 cc: Allen Lew, Pretrial Services  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28