cultivation at the defendant property, Case Nos. 2:11-CR-00275-JAM and 2:11-CR-00276-JAM; but neither David Johns nor Mary Johns, the record owners of the defendant property, have been charged with any criminal offense by state, local, or federal authorities.

- 1. Each of the claimants has filed a claim to the defendant property. Claimants David Johns, Mary Johns, Major Amos Nilson, and Lucy H. Nilson have not yet filed their Answers and will not be required to do so until the stay contemplated by this stipulation expires.
- 2. The stay is requested pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(1), 981(g)(2), and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i). The United States contends that the defendant property was used to facilitate the cultivation of marijuana.
- 3. It is the United States' position that the statute of limitations has not expired on potential criminal charges relating to the marijuana grow at the defendant property. Nevertheless, the United States intends to depose claimants David and Mary Johns regarding their ownership of the defendant property, as well as their knowledge and participation in large scale marijuana cultivation, including the marijuana grow at the defendant property. If discovery proceeds at this time, claimants will be placed in the difficult position of either invoking their Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination and losing the ability to pursue their claims to the defendant property, or waiving their Fifth Amendment rights and submitting to a deposition and potentially incriminating themselves. If they invoke their Fifth Amendment rights, the United States will be deprived of the ability to explore the factual basis for the claims they filed with this court.
- 4. In addition, claimants intend to depose, among others, the agents involved with this investigation, including but not limited to the agents with the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Internal Revenue Service. Allowing depositions of the law enforcement officers at this time would adversely affect the ability of the federal authorities to investigate the alleged underlying criminal conduct.
- 5. The parties recognize that proceeding with these actions at this time has potential adverse effects on the investigation of the underlying criminal conduct and/or upon the claimants' ability to prove their claim to the property and to assert any defenses to forfeiture. For these reasons, the parties jointly request that the matter be stayed until November 28, 2016, in accordance with the terms of this stipulation.

1	At that time the parties will advise the court of the	status of the criminal investigation, if any, and will
2	advise the court whether a further stay is necessary.	
3	Dated: <u>8/26/16</u>	PHILLIP A. TALBERT Acting United States Attorney
4		Acting Office States Attorney
5	By:	<u>/s/ Kevin C. Khasigian</u> KEVIN C. KHASIGIAN
6		Assistant U.S. Attorney
7		
8	Dated: 8/24/16	/s/ Brenda Grantland BRENDA GRANTLAND
9		Attorney for claimants David Johns and Mary Johns
10		David Johns and Mary Johns
11	Dated: <u>8/25/16</u>	/s/ Douglas A. MacDonald DOUGLAS A. MACDONALD
12		Attorney for claimants Major Amos Nilson and Lucy H. Nilson
13		(Signatures authorized by email)
14		(Signatures audiorized by email)
15	ORDER	
	For the reasons set forth above, this matter is stayed pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(1), 981(g)(2),	
16	Tof the reasons set form above, this matter	15 stayed pursuant to 16 0.5.C. § 761(g)(1), 761(g)(2),
16 17	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016.	
		On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will
17	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will
17 18	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will
17 18 19	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary IT IS SO ORDERED.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will  //.  /s/ John A. Mendez JOHN A. MENDEZ
17 18 19 20	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary IT IS SO ORDERED.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will  /s/ John A. Mendez
17 18 19 20 21	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary IT IS SO ORDERED.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will  //.  /s/ John A. Mendez JOHN A. MENDEZ
17 18 19 20 21 22	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary IT IS SO ORDERED.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will  //.  /s/ John A. Mendez JOHN A. MENDEZ
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary IT IS SO ORDERED.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will  //.  /s/ John A. Mendez JOHN A. MENDEZ
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary IT IS SO ORDERED.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will  //.  /s/ John A. Mendez JOHN A. MENDEZ
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	and 21 U.S.C. § 881(i) until November 28, 2016. (advise the court whether a further stay is necessary IT IS SO ORDERED.	On or before November 28, 2016, the parties will  //  /s/ John A. Mendez JOHN A. MENDEZ