

JILBERT TAHMAZIAN; 143574
TAHMAZIAN LAW FIRM P.C.
1518 West Glenoaks Blvd.,
Glendale, CA 91201
Telephone: (818) 242-8201
Facsimile: (818) 242-8246
Attorney for Defendant,
ARMAN HAYRAPETYAN

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO.: CR 20-579(A)-SVW-6

vs.

ARMAN HAYRAPETYAN,
DEFENDANT.

**DEFENDANT'S UNOPPOSED REQUEST
FOR CLARIFICATION OR
CORRECTION OF THE JUDGEMENT
AND COMMITMENT/PROBATION
ORDER**

Defendant Arman Hayrapetyan, by and through his attorney, Jilbert Tahmazian, hereby requests that the Court clarify or correct the Judgement and Commitment/Probation Order ["Order"] issued against Defendant Arman Hayrapetyan, chiefly with respect to the monitoring condition first condition.¹ The Order currently requires that defendant participate in a home detention program, but does not specify its preference with regard to the type of monitoring imposed. However, during Defendant's sentencing hearing the Court sentenced Defendant to ten months of probation with a


¹ [See Dkt. 1075] Page 1, term and condition 1 reads as follows: "The defendant shall participate for a period of seven and a half months in a home detention program which may include electronic monitoring, GPS, Alcohol Continuing Unit or automated identification system and shall observe all rules of such program, as directed by the Probation Officer."

1 period of seven and a half months of home confinement to be monitored through **GPS monitoring**
2 as opposed to electronic monitoring. Accordingly, defendant respectfully requests clarification as
3 to the type of monitoring issued by this Court.
4

5 Defense Counsel caused an email to be sent to the Government seeking their position on this
6 request. The Government expressed that they do not object to defendant seeking clarification from
7 the Court as to its preference regarding the type of electronic monitoring imposed in connection
8 with the home confinement condition. They do not, however, take a position as to the language that
9 should be included in the judgment and defer to the Court and Probation as to what they believe is
10 appropriate.
11

12
13
14
15 Dated: October 28th, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

BY: 

JILBERT TAHMAZIAN,
Attorney for Defendant