UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v. Case No. 6:21-cr-141-RBD-NWH

EMMET BOWENS

ORDER

Before the Court in this wire fraud and money laundering case is the *pro se* Defendant's two-page omnibus motion to suppress evidence and to dismiss the indictment, and seeking release on bond. (Doc. 209; *see* Doc. 215.)

As to suppression, Defendant does not describe with particularity any evidence obtained through unlawful search or seizure, any statements he made while being interrogated,[1] or any specific government misconduct,[2] so the motion to suppress based on purported Fourth and Fifth Amendment[3] violations is due to be denied. (*See* Doc. 209); *United States v. Richardson*, 764 F.2d 1514, 1527

---

[1] To the extent Defendant made any post-arrest statements (*see* Doc. 44), the Government previously indicated it did not intend to use them in its case-in-chief (Doc. 61), so the Court will only take up the Government's latest argument that no custodial interrogation occurred (Doc. 215, p. 14) if it becomes necessary at trial.

[2] Defendant appears to take issue with "compelled financial certifications" (Doc. 209, p. 2), but to the extent that means he challenges the Government's use of subpoenas to obtain bank records, Defendant has no reasonable expectation of privacy in most information voluntarily disclosed to third parties. *See Carpenter v. United States*, 585 U.S. 296, 308 (2018).

[3] The Court has already rejected Defendant's speedy trial arguments (Doc. 209, pp. 2–3). (*See* Doc. 193.)

(11th Cir. 1985) (motion to suppress must identify with particularity evidence to be suppressed and basis for relief). And because Defendant has not established any violation, let alone any prejudice, the motion to dismiss is also due to be denied. *See United States v. O'Keefe*, 825 F.2d 314, 318 (11th Cir. 1987) (motion to dismiss for constitutional violations must show prejudice). Defendant's argument that he should be released on bond (Doc. 209, p. 3) is likewise a nonstarter because he is a flight risk—having evaded capture (Doc. 116) and refused to recognize the authority of the Court (*see* Doc. 207).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Defendant's motion (Doc. 209) is **DENIED**.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers in Orlando, Florida, on January 22, 2026.

ROY B. DALTON, JR.
United States District Judge