

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

United States District Court
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
APPROXIMATELY \$214,225 IN UNITED STATES CURRENCY,
Defendant.

Case No. [17-cv-02891-DMR](#)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CLAIMANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS SHOULD NOT BE DENIED


Re: Dkt. No. 40

On November 17, 2017, Claimant Dejanique Blackwell (“Claimant”) filed a motion to suppress in this civil forfeiture action. [Docket No. 40]. In the motion, Claimant averred facts in support of the motion, but submitted no declaration attesting to those facts. Instead, Claimant asserted that the facts would be “amplified” by sworn testimony. Mot. at 3 (“Here it is further being contended that the facts (when amplified with sworn testimony which will envelop the averments made below) will show . . .”). Plaintiff United States of America (“Plaintiff”) filed a timely opposition in which it argued that the facts of the motion were undisputed due to the absence of sworn facts proffered by Claimant. [Docket No. 42]. Claimant did not file a reply.

In light of the above, the court orders Claimant to show cause in writing by no later than December 18, 2017 why the motion to suppress should not be denied for failure to provide sworn facts. Failure to respond to this order may result in denial of the motion to suppress.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 12, 2017


United States Magistrate Judge