

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI**

IN RE:)
CASE OPERATIONS)
DUE TO COVID-19 RESPONSE)

ORDER

WHEREAS this Court continues to evaluate its response to the spread of the COVID-19 virus, and recognizes the need to accommodate extenuating circumstances to assist in the effective administration of justice during this period of national emergency; and

WHEREAS the Judicial Conference of the United States (JCUS) has found under the CARES Act, P.L. 116-136, 134 Stat. 281 (CARES Act), that emergency conditions due to the national emergency declared by the President under the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) with respect to COVID-19 have materially affected and will materially affect the functioning of the federal courts generally;

NOW THEREFORE, the Court hereby vacates all prior Orders of this Court relating to case administration during the COVID-19 pandemic, including its Orders dated [March 17, 2020](#), [March 18, 2020](#), [March 30, 2020](#), and [May 7, 2020](#), and adopts the following Order:

1. All civil and criminal jury trials scheduled to begin on or before July 5, 2020, are continued and shall be rescheduled by the presiding judge to a date after July 5, 2020. In criminal cases, the Court finds that the time period of any continuance entered from the date of this Order through July 5, 2020 as a result of this Order shall be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), as the Court finds that the ends of justice served by taking that action outweigh the interests of the parties and the public in a speedy trial, given the need to protect the health and safety of defendants, their counsel, prosecutors, court staff, and the public by reducing the number of in-person hearings to the fullest extent possible, and due to the inability of the Court to ensure that a fair cross-section of jurors is available during the specified time;

2. This Court recognizes that emergency conditions exist throughout this District, as found by the JCUS under the CARES Act;

3. This Court authorizes on its own motion the use of video conferencing, or telephone conferencing if video conferencing is not reasonably available, in the criminal procedures specifically enumerated in Section 15002(b)(1) of the CARES Act, to wit:

- a. Detention hearings under section 3142 of title 18, United States Code;
- b. Initial appearances under Rule 5 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;
- c. Preliminary hearings under Rule 5.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;
- d. Waivers of indictment under Rule 7(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;
- e. Arraignments under Rule 10 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;
- f. Probation and supervised release revocation proceedings under Rule 32.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;
- g. Pretrial release revocation proceedings under section 3148 of title 18, United States Code;
- h. Appearances under Rule 40 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;
- i. Misdemeanor pleas and sentencings as described in Rule 43(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; and
- j. Proceedings under chapter 403 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the “Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act”), except for contested transfer hearings and juvenile delinquency adjudication or trial proceedings;

4. This Court finds on its own motion, under Section 15002(b)(2) of the CARES Act, that felony pleas under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and felony

sentencings under Rule 32 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure cannot be conducted in person in this district without seriously jeopardizing public health and safety, and thus the use of video conferencing, or telephone conferencing if video conferencing is not reasonably available, is permitted in such cases;

5. Under Section 15002(b)(2)(A) of the CARES Act, any judge presiding in a particular case who authorizes the use of video conferencing or telephone conferencing if video conferencing is not reasonably available under paragraphs 3 or 4 of this Order, must find for specific reasons that the plea or sentencing in that case cannot be further delayed without serious harm to the interests of justice. Under Section 15002(b)(4) of the CARES Act, this authorization may occur only with the consent of the defendant, or the juvenile, after consultation with counsel. The presiding judge in the case may authorize remote means including but not limited to participation of defense counsel in the video or telephone conference to facilitate consent of the defendant;


6. This Court recognizes that it is required under Sections 15002(b)(3)(A) and (B) of the CARES Act to review the findings and authorizations made in this Order no later than ninety (90) days after its initial Order or any subsequent renewal. This Court hereby renews in this Order its initial findings and authorizations from its [March 30, 2020 Order](#) and will review these findings and authorizations under this Order no later than ninety (90) days from the date of this Order;

7. All proceedings shall be conducted by means other than in-person meetings wherever possible by law unless otherwise directed by the presiding judge in the proceeding;

8. This Court hereby suspends all requirements related to in-person participation in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) under Local Rule 6.02(C) in order to allow for ADR to take place by any remote means agreed upon by the parties; and

9. This Court recognizes that the current national response to COVID-19 may result in the need for parties to request continuances or other relief. Parties requesting relief must file a motion specifying the relief requested and the judge will rule promptly on that motion. Parties must consult with opposing parties before filing any motion for relief under this subsection, and such motions should be filed by consent wherever possible.

SO ORDERED this 29th day of May, 2020.



Rodney W. Sippel
Chief United States District Judge