UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

NO. 24-cr-10379-RGS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JASMINE MURPHY

FINAL STATUS REPORT AND ORDER OF EXCLUDABLE DELAY

Date: February 4, 2026

KELLEY, U.S.M.J.

The defendant had a final status conference scheduled for February 6, 2026. The parties filed a joint motion asking that the conference be cancelled as defendant intends to file a motion for a R. 11 hearing shortly. The hearing is cancelled and the case is transferred to the District Judge Stearns.

With the agreement of the parties, this court finds and concludes, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8) and Section 5(b)(7)(b) of the Plan for Prompt Disposition of Criminal Cases in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Statement of Time Limits Adopted by the Court and Procedures for Implementing Them, Effective December 2008), that the interests of justice, i.e., allowing the parties time to prepare for the R. 11 hearing, outweighs the best interests of the public and the defendant for a trial within seventy days of the return of an indictment. Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that, the Clerk of this Court enter excludable time for the period of February 6, 2026, to the date the parties appear before the district court.[1]

[1]The parties are advised that under the provisions of Rule 2(b) of the Rules for United States Magistrate Judges in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, any party may move for reconsideration by a district judge of the determination(s) and order(s) set forth here within fourteen (14) days after receipt of a copy of this order, unless a different time is prescribed by this court or the district judge. The party seeking reconsideration shall file with the Clerk of this

/ s / M. Page Kelley
M. PAGE KELLEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Court, and serve upon all parties, a written notice of the motion which shall specifically designate the order or part thereof to be reconsidered and the basis for the objection. The district judge, upon timely motion, shall reconsider the magistrate's order and set aside any portion found to be clearly erroneous in fact or contrary to law. The parties are further advised that the United States Court of Appeals for this Circuit has indicated that failure to comply with this rule shall preclude further appellate review. See Keating v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 848 F.2d 271 (1st Cir. March 31, 1988); United States v. Emiliano Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4 (1st Cir. 1986); Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 616 F.2d 603 (1st Cir. 1980); United States v. Vega, 678 F.2d 376, 378-379 (1st Cir. 1982); Scott v. Schweiker, 702 F.2d 13, 14 (1st Cir. 1983); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S. Ct. 466 (1985).