

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 16-CR-64

**RONALD H. VAN DEN HEUVEL,
PAUL J. PIIKKILA, and
KELLY YESSMAN VAN DEN HEUVEL,**

Defendants.

REVISED PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER

On September 20, 2016, a grand jury sitting in the Eastern District of Wisconsin returned a nineteen-count superseding indictment against Ronald H. Van Den Heuvel, Paul J. Piikkila, and Kelly Yessman Van Den Heuvel. The matter is assigned to United States District Judge William C. Griesbach for trial and to this Court for pretrial motions.

On November 16, 2016, Chief Judge Griesbach set trial in this matter for July 31, 2017. At this Court's direction, the parties submitted a proposed pretrial motions schedule that would provide sufficient time to resolve any pretrial motions in advance of the July trial date. *See* Letter from the United States dated November 29, 2016, ECF No. 71. Counsel for Mr. and Mrs. Van Den Heuvel also separately filed letters indicating agreement to the proposed schedule but asking the Court to reconsider the trial date. *See* ECF Nos. 74 & 75.

It would be premature to reconsider the trial date at this time. The parties are directed to contact my courtroom deputy, Katina Hubacz (414-297-1200), to schedule a status conference for early March 2017 to assess the status of discovery and address any issues the parties may then have with the current schedule. Accordingly, the Court will adopt the proposed pretrial motions schedule submitted by the parties.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties shall proceed in accordance with the following pretrial motions schedule:

1. All pretrial motions are due on or before **April 17, 2017**.
2. Responses are due on or before **May 15, 2017**.
3. Replies are due on or before **May 30, 2017**.

Please consult the Court's initial Pretrial Order, ECF No. 17, for additional details concerning the filing of pretrial motions.

Furthermore, I am satisfied that this case is so unusual and so complex due to the nature of the charges being prosecuted that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings and for the trial itself within the time limits established by 18 U.S.C. § 3161. I am persuaded that, were this court not to grant a continuance of the time limits of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(c)(1), such would unreasonably deny counsel for the defendants and the attorneys for the United States the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, all pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii) and (iv). Accordingly, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), a continuance of the time limits

found in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(c)(1) is hereby granted on the grounds that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

Thus, the time between November 30, 2016, and April 17, 2017, is excluded from the speedy trial deadline under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 6th day of December, 2016.

BY THE COURT:

s/ David E. Jones _____
DAVID E. JONES
United States Magistrate Judge