```
TRACY L. WILKISON
1
   Acting United States Attorney
   SCOTT M. GARRINGER
   Assistant United States Attorney
 3
   Chief, Criminal Division
   VIBHAV MITTAL (Cal. Bar No. 257874)
   Assistant United States Attorney
 4
   Deputy Chief, Santa Ana Branch Office
         8000 United States Courthouse
 5
         411 West Fourth Street
        Santa Ana, California 92701
 6
        Telephone: (714) 338-3534
 7
        Facsimile:
                     (714) 338-3708
        E-mail:
                     vibhav.mittal@usdoj.gov
8
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
9
10
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
                   FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                       No. SA CR 16-36-CJC
13
             Plaintiff,
                                       STIPULATION REGARDING DEFENDANT'S
                                       MOTION TO SUPRESS
14
                  v.
15
   NIKISHNA POLEQUAPTEWA,
16
        Defendant.
17
18
         Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel
19
   of record, the United States Attorney for the Central District of
20
   California and Assistant United States Attorney Vibhav Mittal,
21
```

of record, the United States Attorney for the Central District of California and Assistant United States Attorney Vibhav Mittal, ("USAO") and defendant NIKISHNA POLEQUAPTEWA, by and through his counsel of record, Deputy Federal Public Defender Jonathan K. Ogata, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. On February 2, 2018, defendant filed a motion to suppress the search of a laptop. (CR 33.) On May 4, 2018, the Court denied the motion to suppress. (CR 39.) On November 13, 2018, defendant

28

22

23

24

25

26

- was convicted at trial. (CR 144.) On July 8, 2019, defendant was sentenced to 27 months of imprisonment followed by two years of supervised release. (CR 189.) He was also ordered to pay \$53,305.03 in restitution and a \$100 special assessment. (Id.) He self-surrendered on September 3, 2019. (Id.)
- 2. Defendant has completed service of his term of imprisonment and began his term of supervised release on or about August 9, 2021. Defendant is currently paying his restitution and special assessment obligations with a goal of full payment by August 9, 2022.
- 3. Following sentencing, defendant appealed his conviction, including the denial of the motion to suppress. On May 26, 2021, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ("Ninth Circuit") issued a memorandum, vacating the Court's denial of the motion to suppress and remanding the matter with instructions to conduct a new trial only if the Court grants the suppression motion on remand. On June 17, 2021, the Ninth Circuit issued its formal mandate.
- 4. Pursuant to the terms of this agreement, defendant is withdrawing his motion to suppress (CR 33) and not seeking any further review of the issue on remand.
- 5. The USAO agrees to recommend early termination of defendant's supervised release after the expiration of one year of supervised release, consistent with 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1), provided: (1) the Court does not find defendant in violation of the terms and conditions of his supervised release for his conduct in the first year of his supervised release, (2) the United States

2.1

Probation and Pretrial Services Office (including defendant's probation officer) supports or does not object to early termination after defendant completes one year of supervised release, and (3) defendant has made continuous payments of his restitution and special assessment obligations without any unauthorized missed payments, including being compliant with the payment plan for the first 12 months of defendant's supervised release term.

- 6. In light of defendant's withdrawal of his motion to suppress (CR 33), the parties agree that no new trial should be ordered and the conviction and sentence should be considered final.
- 7. Defendant understands that the Court and the United States
 Probation and Pretrial Services Office are not parties to this
 agreement and need not accept any of the USAO's recommendations or
 the parties' agreements to early termination.
- 8. Defendant understands that even if the Court ignores any recommendation by defendant or the USAO as to early termination or the United States Probation and Pretrial Services Office does not support or opposes early termination, defendant cannot then seek to pursue his motion to suppress. Defendant understands that no one —not the prosecutor, defendant's attorney, or the Court can make a binding prediction or promise regarding whether defendant will receive early termination.

23 //

2.1

24 //

25 //

9. Defendant understands that, except as set forth herein, 1 there are no promises, understandings, or agreements between the 2 USAO and defendant or defendant's attorney, and that no additional 3 promise, understanding, or agreement may be entered into unless in a 4 writing signed by all parties or on the record in court. 5 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 6 TRACY L. WILKISON 7 Dated: August 27, 2021 Acting United States Attorney 8 SCOTT M. GARRINGER Assistant United States Attorney 9 Chief, Criminal Division 10 /s/ Vibhav Mittal 11 VIBHAV MITTAL Assistant United States Attorney 12 Deputy Chief, Santa Ana Branch Office 13 Attorneys for Plaintiff 14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 15 16 17 18 19 20 2.1 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

CERTIFICATION OF DEFENDANT

I have read this stipulation in its entirety. I have had enough time to review and consider this stipulation, and I have carefully and thoroughly discussed every part of it with my attorney. I understand the terms of this stipulation, and I voluntarily agree to those terms. I have discussed the evidence with my attorney, and my attorney has advised me of my rights, of possible pretrial motions that might be filed, of possible defenses that might be asserted either prior to or at trial, of the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), of relevant Sentencing Guidelines provisions, and of the consequences of entering into this stipulation. No promises, inducements, or representations of any kind have been made to me other than those contained in this stipulation. No one has threatened or forced me in any way to enter into this stipulation. I am satisfied with the representation of my attorney in this matter, and I am withdrawing the motion to suppress because I am guilty of the charge and wish to take advantage of the promises set forth in this stipulation, and not for, any other reason. 8/27/21 Date

POLEQUAPTEWA

Defendant

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

CERTIFICATION OF DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY

I am NIKISHNA POLEQUAPTEWA's attorney. I have carefully and thoroughly discussed every part of this stipulation with my client. Further, I have fully advised my client of his rights, of possible pretrial motions that might be filed, of possible defenses that might be asserted either prior to or at trial, of the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), of relevant Sentencing Guidelines provisions, and of the consequences of entering into this stipulation. To my knowledge: no promises, inducements, or representations of any kind have been made to my client other than those contained in this stipulation; no one has threatened or forced my client in any way to enter into this stipulation; and my client's decision to enter into this stipulation (including his decision to withdraw his motion to suppress) is an informed and voluntary one.

/s/ per email authorization August 27, 2021

JONATHAN OGATA Date

Attorney for Defendant NIKISHNA POLEQUAPTEWA

```
TRACY L. WILKISON
 1
   Acting United States Attorney
   SCOTT M. GARRINGER
   Assistant United States Attorney
 3
   Chief, Criminal Division
   VIBHAV MITTAL (Cal. Bar No. 257874)
   Assistant United States Attorney
 4
   Deputy Chief, Santa Ana Branch Office
         8000 United States Courthouse
 5
         411 West Fourth Street
         Santa Ana, California 92701
 6
         Telephone: (714) 338-3534
 7
         Facsimile: (714) 338-3708
        E-mail:
                     vibhav.mittal@usdoj.gov
 8
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 9
10
                         UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
                   FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                       No. SA CR 16-36-CJC
13
             Plaintiff,
                                       [PROPOSED] ORDER RE: DEFENDANT'S
                                       MOTION TO SUPPRESS
14
                  V.
15
   NIKISHNA POLEQUAPTEWA,
16
             Defendant.
17
18
         The Court has read and considered the Stipulation Regarding
19
   Defendant's Motion to Suppress, filed by the parties in this matter
20
   on August 27, 2021. The Court hereby finds that the Stipulation,
21
   which this Court incorporates by reference into this Order,
22
   demonstrates facts that support withdrawal of defendant's motion to
23
   suppress (CR 33).
24
25
26
27
28
```

THEREFORE, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN: Defendant's motion to suppress (CR 33) is withdrawn. In light of defendant's withdrawal of his motion to suppress (CR 33), no new trial shall be ordered and defendant's conviction and sentence in this matter should be considered final. IT IS SO ORDERED. HONORABLE CORMAC J. CARNEY DATE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Presented by: /s/ VIBHAV MITTAL Assistant United States Attorney

Case 8:16-cr-00036-CJC Document 234-1 Filed 08/27/21 Page 2 of 2 Page ID #:4280