



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  
27  
28

- a. Why, since she is still represented by Counsel, Respondent is claiming to be "In Pro Per" (page 1, line 18, Document 66);
- b. Why, since Respondent is still represented by Counsel, Document 66 should not be stricken from the record;
- c. Why Respondent believes it is appropriate to attempt to file an ex parte document with this Court, without giving notice to the Plaintiff-Government;
- d. Upon what authority an unnoticed motion pursuant to Rule 41(g) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure may be filed, let alone acted upon by this Court by ordering "property be returned immediately" to the Respondent. (page 3, line 23 of document 66).

**Failure to respond to this Order in a timely fashion will result in sanctions.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**Dated: February 27, 2012**

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE