

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

---

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Case No. 19-CR-151**

**STEPHANIE M. ORTIZ,**

**Defendant.**

---

**ORDER ON DEFENDANT ORTIZ'S PRETRIAL MOTIONS**

---

On September 10, 2019, a grand jury sitting in the Eastern District of Wisconsin returned an eleven-count superseding indictment against eleven defendants. (Docket # 13.) Stephanie M. Ortiz is charged in Count Two with money laundering in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i) and 2. Ortiz was arraigned on the charge and entered a plea of not guilty. This case has been designated as complex, and jury trial before the Honorable William C. Griesbach is currently scheduled for June 15, 2020.

Currently before me are two evidentiary requests and one pretrial motion. Ortiz requests that the government produce notice of crimes, wrongs, or other acts evidence pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 404(b)(2) thirty (30) days in advance of the May 29, 2020 final pretrial conference. (Docket # 107.) Ortiz also requests that the government provide an expert witness summary pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(G) fifteen (15) days in advance of the final pretrial conference. (Docket # 108.) The government agrees to submit any notice of intent to admit Rule 404(b) evidence thirty (30) days in advance of the pretrial conference. (Docket # 124.) The government further agrees to submit any expert witness

summary pursuant to Rule 16(A)(1)(G) in advance of the final pretrial conference. (Docket # 123.) For these reasons, Ortiz's evidentiary requests are granted.

Ortiz also seeks to sever her trial from that of each of her co-defendants other than Ruben Ortiz, Jr. (Docket # 115.) However, Ortiz argues that the court should hold in abeyance any decision on her motion until the parties know which of her co-defendants will proceed to trial. (Docket # 115 at 1.) She argues that this approach "makes particular sense because it is anticipated that Ruben Ortiz, Jr.,] with whom she is charged in Count Two[,] will not proceed to trial." (*Id.*) The government agrees that Ortiz's proposal to hold the motion in abeyance is "reasonable." (Docket # 125 at 1.) I agree that it would be prudent to hold Ortiz's motion to sever in abeyance, as her arguments regarding severance may change depending on which defendants decide to go to trial. For this reason, I will hold Ortiz's motion in abeyance until May 29, 2020.

### **ORDER**

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Ortiz's evidentiary requests (Docket # 107 and Docket # 108) are **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Ortiz's motion to sever (Docket # 115) is **HELD IN ABEYANCE** until May 29, 2020.

Your attention is directed to General L.R. 72(c), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 59(b), or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 72(b) if applicable, whereby written objections to any recommendation or order herein, or part thereof, may be filed within fourteen days of the date of service of this recommendation or order. Objections are to be filed in accordance with the Eastern District of Wisconsin's electronic case filing procedures. Courtesy paper copies of any objections shall be sent

directly to the chambers of the district judge assigned to the case. Failure to file a timely objection with the district court shall result in a waiver of a party's right to appeal. If no response or reply will be filed, please notify the Court in writing.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2020.

BY THE COURT

*s/Nancy Joseph*  
NANCY JOSEPH  
United States Magistrate Judge