1	MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612) United States Attorney		
2	J. DOUGLAS WILSON (DCBN 412811) Chief, Criminal Division		
4 5	JOHN H. HEMANN (CSBN 165823) PETER B. AXELROD (CSBN 190843) Assistant United States Attorneys		
6	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055		
7	San Francisco, California 94102-3495 Telephone: (415) 436-7200 FAX: (415) 436-7234 john.hemann@usdoj.gov		
8			
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11			
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO. CR-11-0573-JSW	
15	Plaintiff,	GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO	
16	v. )	<ul><li>DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SET BRADY/GIGLIO DISCLOSURE DEADLINE</li></ul>	
17	WALTER LIEW, ET AL.,		
18	Defendants.		
19	)		
20			
21	The United States agreed to an October 25, 2013, deadline by which the government will		
22	produce materials in its possession that the prosecutors believe are subject to disclosure under <i>Brady</i> and		
23	Giglio. See Agnolucci Decl., Ex. B (Oct. 7, 2013, email from Hemann to Agnolucci).		
24	A court order is not necessary, given the constitutional nature of the government's obligation.		
25	Moreover, as is common and for myriad different reasons, information that is subject to <i>Brady</i> or <i>Giglio</i>		
26	disclosure may come to light after a deadline but prior to the conclusion of trial. Accordingly, the		
27	government understands its continuing obligation to notify the defense of exculpatory evidence.		
28	The procedural vehicle being used by defendants – an administrative motion under Civil Local		
	RESPONSE TO DEFS' BRADY MOTION CASE NO. CR-11-0573-JSW 1		

## Case3:11-cr-00573-JSW Document474 Filed10/10/13 Page2 of 2

1	Rule 7-11 – is not appropriate. First, the proposed order submitted by defendants does not conform to		
2	the language to which the government agreed after meeting and conferring with defense counsel, as se		
3	forth in the October 7 email attached to counsel's declaration. Second, there is a dispute as to the		
4	necessity of a court order given the independent constitutional obligation to produce exculpatory		
5	information. Accordingly, an administrative motion does not appear to be appropriate.		
6	5 Re	spectfully submitted,	
7	171.	ELINDA HAAG	
8	B Ur	ited States Attorney	
9		hn H. Hemann	
10	Dated: October 10, 2013 $\overline{\text{JC}}$	HN H. HEMANN	
11		TER B. AXELROD sistant United States Attorneys	
12			
13	3		
14	L		
15	5		
16	<b>5</b>		
17	7		
18	3		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23	3		
24	1		
25			
26			
27			
28			