

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	CR. NO. 2:10cr186-MHT
)	
HARRI ANNE SMITH)	

ORDER

Pending before the court is Defendant Smith's Specific Motion for Disclosure of Exculpatory Material (Doc. #416). In the Motion, Smith requests this court issue an Order "directing the Government to disclose any exculpatory material now in its possession or should come into its possession during the instant matter." Motion (Doc. #416) at 3.

At the pretrial conference hearing, the court informed the parties that it would not entertain general requests for exculpatory material. In fairness to Smith, the instant motion was filed prior to the hearing. The court presumes that this motion, which is exactly the type of motion to which the court was referring, would not have been filed after the hearing. Without reciting the motion, it generally seeks all *Brady*,¹ *Giglio*,² and Jenks Act³ material in the Government's possession. The Government's responsibilities with regard to those types of materials are known to the Government and the court expects they will abide by them. The general and specific orders of this court set forth the obligations and their time-

¹ *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963).

² *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150, 153-154 (1972).

³ See 18 U.S.C. § 3500.

frames. However, “[t]his Court declines to instruct the Government on the manner in which to discharge its obligations under the Standing Discovery Order.” *United States v. Quinn*, 123 F.3d 1415, 1422 (11th Cir. 1997). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Motion for Disclosure of Exculpatory Material (Doc. #416) is DENIED.

Done this 24th day of February, 2011.

/s/ Wallace Capel, Jr.
WALLACE CAPEL, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE