MINUTE ORDER

CASE NUMBER: 1:21-cr-00061-LEK-1

CASE NAME: USA v. Martin Kao

JUDGE: Leslie E. Kobayashi DATE: 4/30/2026

COURT ACTION: EO: ORDER DIRECTING MOVANT TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION IN SUPPORT OF ITS RENEWED MOTION FOR RESTITUTION PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. § 3663A AND § 3664

On March 10, 2026, Movant PacMar Technologies LLC, formerly known as Martin Defense Group, LLC, formerly known as Navatek LLC ("PacMar"), filed its Renewed Motion for Restitution Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3663A and § 3664 ("3/10 Motion"). [Dkt. no. 190.] Plaintiff United States of America ("the Government") filed a response in support of the 3/10 Motion on March 26, 2026. [Dkt. no. 193.] Defendant Martin Kao ("Kao") filed his memorandum in opposition to the 3/10 Motion on April 8, 2026, and PacMar filed its reply on April 14, 2026. [Dkt. nos. 195, 196.]

Kao "generally agrees" that the Court retains jurisdiction to award PacMar delayed restitution. See Mem. in Opp. at 3; cf. Minute Order - EO: Order Denying Movant's Request for a Hearing and Ordering Movant to File its Renewed Request, filed 2/25/26 (dkt. no. 187) (ordering PacMar to file a memorandum explaining, at a minimum, "why the Court retains jurisdiction to order restitution after the conclusion of sentencing" (citation omitted)). Kao's memorandum in opposition, however, raises valid objections to PacMar's substantiation of its renewed request for restitution.

Accordingly, PacMar is ORDERED to file a supplemental memorandum with supporting documentation for its renewed request for restitution ("Supplement") by **May 14, 2026**. The Supplement should, at a minimum, address the concerns that the Court raised at the April 30, 2025 hearing when it denied PacMar's request for restitution without prejudice. See Minutes - EP: Hearing Re: to determine the amount owed to PacMar, f/k/a Navatek, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3664(d)(5), filed 4/30/25 (dkt. no. 180). Kao may file a response to the Supplement by **May 28, 2026** and, if Kao files a response, PacMar may file an optional reply by **June 4, 2026**. Once PacMar has filed its

Supplement and the applicable filing deadlines have passed, the Court will determine whether to hold a hearing. If the Court determines that a hearing is not necessary, it will take the matter under advisement and will issue a written order that resolves the 3/10 Motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Submitted by: Carla Cortez, Courtroom Manager