1 BENJAMIN B. WAGNER United States Attorney 2 LYNN TRINKA ERNCE Assistant United States Attorney 3 501 I Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, CA 95814 4 Telephone: (916) 554-2720 5 Attorneys for United States 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10

Case No. 2:10-cv-02828 JAM DAD

ORDER GRANTING UNITED STATES OF AMERICA'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

APPROXIMATELY \$50,000 IN U.S. CURRENCY,

Defendant.

This is an action by plaintiff United States of America for the forfeiture of defendant \$50,000 in U.S. Currency. On December 1, 2010, claimant Nicholas Robert Woody filed a claim to the \$50,000 and an answer to the United States' civil forfeiture complaint. Docket 8. On April 14, 2011, the United States filed a summary judgment motion. Docket 15. The United States argues that: (1) Woody's claim and answer should be stricken because Woody lacks standing to contest forfeiture and because he did not respond to the United States' special interrogatories; and (2) the defendant \$50,000 is forfeitable pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)(6) because it constitutes moneys furnished or intended to be furnished in exchange for controlled substances and/or proceeds traceable to such exchange. Docket 15.

Claimant has not responded to the summary judgment motion and the Court took the motion under submission without oral argument.

Based on the argument and undisputed evidence submitted by the United States in support of the motion, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby GRANTS the United States' motion in its entirety.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- Nicholas Robert Woody's claim and answer shall be stricken 1. from the record because Woody lacks Article III standing. Woody has not come forward with any actual evidence to establish that he has a legitimate interest in the defendant \$50,000.
- Woody's claim and answer shall be stricken from the record pursuant to Rule G(8)(c) of the Supplemental Rules for Admiralty or Maritime Claims and Asset Forfeiture Actions because Woody did not respond to the United States' special interrogatories served pursuant to Supplemental Rule G(6); and
- Based on the aggregate of undisputed evidence, the United States has met its burden of proving that the \$50,000 is forfeitable pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)(6).
- Judgment will be entered in favor of the United States against the defendant \$50,000. The United States shall submit an appropriate form of final judgment of forfeiture within 5 court days of the date of entry of this order.

DATED: June 9, 2011 /s/ John A. Mendez JOHN A. MENDEZ United States District Judge

2.7

28