STEVEN W. MYHRE 1 Acting United States Attorney District of Nevada Nevada Bar No. 9635 NICHOLAS D. DICKINSON 3 NADIA J. AHMED Assistant United States Attorneys ERIN M. CREEGAN Special Assistant United States Attorney 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 388-6336 6 steven.myhre@usdoj.gov nicholas.dickinson@usdoj.gov 7 nadia.ahmed@usdoj.gov erin.creegan@usdoi.gov 8 Attorneys for the United States 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 12 2:16-CR-00046-GMN-PAL Plaintiff, 13 **GOVERNMENT'S MOTION** TO DISMISS, WITHOUT PREJUDICE, v. 14 COUNTS ONE, TWO, FIVE, SIX, EIGHT, NINE, FOURTEEN AND TODD C. ENGEL, 15 FIFTEEN OF THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT AS TO DEFENDANT Defendant. 16 TODD C. ENGEL 17 **CERTIFICATION**: This motion is timely filed. 18 The United States, by and through the undersigned, respectfully seeks leave 19 under Fed. R. Crim. P. 48(a) to dismiss, without prejudice, Counts One, Two, Five, 20 Six, Eight, Nine, Fourteen and Fifteen of the Superseding Indictment as to 21 defendant Todd C. Engel (hereinafter "Engel"). As explained further in its 22 23 supporting Memorandum, the government seeks this dismissal solely to save the

24

Court and the government the time and expense of a second trial, verdicts of guilty having been entered on two of the ten counts against Engel. Accordingly, dismissal without prejudice is appropriate.

MEMORANDUM

A. Background

On February 6, 2017, the Court commenced a joint jury trial of defendant Engel and five other co-defendants¹ on ten counts of a Superseding Indictment ("Indictment") (ECF No. 27), all of the counts arising from allegations that Engel participated as a gunman in a massive armed assault against federal law enforcement officers on April 12, 2014. Specifically, the Indictment charged Engel with: Conspiracy to Commit an Offense Against the United States (Count 1; 18 U.S.C. § 371); Conspiracy to Impede or Injure a Federal Officer (Count 2; 18 U.S.C. § 372); Assault on a Federal Officer (Count 5; 18 U.S.C. §§ 111(a)(1),(b) and 2); Use and Carry of a Firearm in Relation to a Crime of Violence (Counts 6, 9, and 15; 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c) and 2); Threatening a Federal Law Enforcement Officer (Count 8, 18 U.S.C. §§ 115(a)(1)(B) and 2); Obstruction of the Due Administration of Justice (Count 12; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1503 and 2); Interference with Interstate Commerce by Extortion (Count 14, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1951 and 2); and, Interstate Travel in Aid of Extortion (Count 16, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1952 and 2).

On April 13, 2017, and after receiving the evidence and instructions on the law, the jury began deliberations. After several days, and on April 24, 2017, the jury returned guilty verdicts as to Engel on Count Twelve (Obstruction of Justice) and Count Sixteen (Interstate Travel in Aid of Extortion), but announced that they were deadlocked on Counts One, Two, Five, Six, Eight, Nine, Fourteen and Fifteen (hereinafter referred to as the "deadlocked counts"). After declaring a mistrial on the deadlocked counts as to Engel, the Court ordered that the re-trial of those counts commence on June 26, 2017. The government now seeks to dismiss the deadlocked counts as to defendant Engel.

B. Discussion.

Rule 48(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provides:

The government may, with leave of court, dismiss an indictment, information, or complaint. The government may not dismiss the prosecution during trial without the defendant's consent.

The government's power to dismiss under Rule 48(a) extends to individual counts in an indictment. *In re United States*, 345 F.3d 450, 452 (7th Cir. 2003); *United States v. Delagarza*, 650 F.2d 1166, 1167 (10th Cir.1981); 3B Charles Alan Wright, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 811 (3d ed. 2004).

"Customarily, Rule 48(a) dismissals are without prejudice and permit the government to re-indict within the statute of limitations." *United States v. Raineri*, 42 F.3d 36, 43 (1st Cir. 1994); see also *United States v. Ortega-Alvarez*, 506 F.2d 455, 458 (2d Cir. 1974) (collecting cases and holding Rule 48(a) dismissal "is without prejudice to the government's right to reindict for the same offense, unless contrary

is expressly stated."). Further, consent to dismissal by the defendant is not required when the motion is made before trial even when the case has already been tried and a new trial has been ordered. See United States v. Friedman, 107 F.R.D. 736, 739-741 (N.D. Ohio 1985) (no consent required for Rule 48(a) dismissal after defendant obtained post-conviction relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2255).

The government seeks dismissal here simply as a matter of judicial economy. A jury has returned guilty verdicts as to Engel on Counts Twelve and Sixteen of the Superseding Indictment, making it impractical to re-try him on the deadlocked counts at this time, the incremental value of pursuing a conviction on those counts being outweighed by the potential cost of time and money to both the government and the Court.

The government nonetheless has a right to seek a superseding indictment following a mistrial caused by the jury's failure to reach a unanimous verdict. United States v. Flores-Perez, 646 F.3d 667, 669 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing Richardson v. United States, 468 U.S. 317, 326 (1984)) (holding that double jeopardy clause is not implicated when the government supersedes an indictment following a mistrial due to a hung jury). Thus, while the government does not intend to proceed with a second trial on the deadlocked counts at this time, it nonetheless expressly reserves its right to seek a superseding indictment if this Court (or, the Ninth Circuit) reverses or vacates the verdicts on the two extant counts of conviction. In that unlikely event, the government will seek to retry the deadlocked counts together

1 with any counts that need to be retried in the wake of any post-conviction ruling by 2 this Court or the Court of Appeals. 3 WHEREFORE, for all the foregoing reasons, the government respectfully 4 requests that the Court grant the government leave to dismiss Counts One, Two, 5 Five, Six, Eight, Nine, Fourteen and Fifteen and enter an Order of dismissal 6 without prejudice. For the Court's convenience, a draft proposed Order is attached 7 at Exhibit One. 8 **DATED** this 16th day of May, 2017. 9 Respectfully submitted, 10 STEVEN W. MYHRE Acting United States Attorney 11 12 //s// 13 NICHOLAS D. DICKINSON NADIA J. AHMED 14 **Assistant United States Attorneys** ERIN M. CREEGAN 15 Special Assistant United States Attorney 16 Attorneys for the United States 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 5 24

TO

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I certify that I am an employee of the United States Attorney's Office. A copy of the foregoing GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS, WITHOUT PREJUDICE, COUNTS ONE, TWO, FIVE, SIX, EIGHT, NINE, FOURTEEN FIFTEEN OF THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT AND **DEFENDANT TODD C. ENGEL** was served upon counsel of record, via Electronic Case Filing (ECF). **DATED** this 16th day of May, 2017. /s/ Steven W. Myhre STEVEN W. MYHRE Acting United States Attorney

EXHIBIT 1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 2:16-CR-00046-GMN-PAL Plaintiff, 5 6 PROPOSED ORDER v. 7 TODD C. ENGEL, 8 Defendant. 9 This matter coming before the Court on the government's Motion to Dismiss, 10 Without Prejudice, Counts One, Two, Five, Six, Eight, Nine, Fourteen, and Fifteen 11 of the Superseding Indictment as to defendant Engel, the premises therein having 12 been considered, and good cause showing, the government's Motion is hereby 13 GRANTED. 14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Counts One, Two, Five, Six, Eight, Nine, 15 Fourteen, and Fifteen of the Superseding Indictment shall be, and are, 16 17 **DISMISSED** without prejudice, as to defendant Engel. 18 IT IS FUTHER ORDERED that the trial date of June 26, 2017, is hereby 19 **VACATED** as to defendant Engel. 20 **DATED** this _____ day of May, 2017. 21 22 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge United States District Court 23 24