

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRIMINAL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:20-cr-579-SVWDate: June 10, 2021Present: The Honorable: Stephen V. Wilson, U.S. District JudgeInterpreter NA

<u>Paul M. Cruz</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<i>Deputy Clerk</i>	<i>Court Reporter / Recorder</i>	<i>Assistant U.S. Attorney</i>

<u>U.S.A. v. Defendant(s)</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Cust</u>	<u>Bond</u>	<u>Attorneys for Defendants:</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>App</u>	<u>Ret</u>
Artur Ayvazyan			X	NA			
Tamara Dadyan			X	NA			
Vahe Dadyan			X	NA			

Proceedings: ORDER DENYING [474] EX PARTE APPLICATION TO CONTINUE TRIAL AND DENYING [489] EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR JOINDER AND CONTINUANCE OF TRIAL.

Before the Court is an ex parte application filed by defendants Artur Ayvazyan, Tamara Dadyan, and Vahe Dadyan (collectively “Defendants”) to continue the trial from June 15, 2021 to June 29, 2021.

The ex parte application is DENIED. The basis for the request is that counsel for Defendants do not have the resources or staff necessary to compile the underlying documents comprising each of the Government’s exhibits. Accordingly, Defendants argue, a continuance is necessary to allow counsel to complete that task and still have adequate time to prepare for trial.

The Court rejects this argument. First, the Government represents that it is in the process of producing electronic copies of the exhibits to counsel, and that said process is “nearly complete.” Dkt. 473 at 2.

Second, Defendants’ argument is a red herring. Counsel for Defendant Vahe Dadyan suggests that a review of the electronic exhibits is necessary to prepare for trial. See Dkt. 474 ¶ 17.

However, an electronic copy of each exhibit is not what allows an attorney to meaningfully prepare for trial; rather, it is the *documents underlying those exhibits* that allow meaningful preparation. And Defendants and their counsel have had ample time to review those documents. Indeed, as the Court explained in its prior order, see Dkt. 343 at 1, the vast majority of documents were produced before March 15. Although some documents were produced as late as April 15, see *id.*, that is still *two months before the trial date*—a date Defendants have been on notice of for two months, see Dkt. 284 (court’s scheduling order dated April 16, 2021 setting trial for June 15, 2021). Moreover, the documents were produced with a detailed index that provided

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRIMINAL MINUTES – GENERAL

sufficient information for counsel to identify which documents were relevant to their specific clients. *See* Dkts. 278-5, 281.

This Court rejected similar arguments about discovery on May 18, 2021. *See* Dkt. 343. If counsel felt that, due to that decision by the Court, they needed additional time to prepare for trial, counsel could have requested a continuance at that time. Instead, counsel waited over three weeks—until the eve of trial—to file such a request.

Accordingly, the ex parte application is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Deputy Clerk _____
