

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <div style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</div> vs. EARL ANTHONY CHANG, <div style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</div>))))))))))	8:06CR323 ORDER
--	--	--------------------------------------

This matter is before the court on the motion for an extension of time by defendant Earl Anthony Chang (Chang) (Filing No. 22 - Sealed). Chang seeks until February 2, 2007, in which to file pretrial motions in accordance with the progression order (Filing No. 12). Chang's counsel represents that government's counsel has no objection to the motion. Chang has filed an affidavit wherein he consents to the motion and acknowledges he understands the additional time may be excludable time for the purposes of the Speedy Trial Act (Filing No. 20). Upon consideration, the motion will be granted.

IT IS ORDERED:

Defendant Chang's motion for an extension of time (Filing No. 22 - Sealed) is granted. Defendant Chang is given until **on or before February 2, 2007**, in which to file pretrial motions pursuant to the progression order. The ends of justice have been served by granting such motion and outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The additional **time** arising as a result of the granting of the motion, i.e., the time between **November 16, 2006 and February 2, 2007**, shall be deemed **excludable** time in any computation of time under the requirement of the Speedy Trial Act for the reason defendant's counsel requires additional time to adequately prepare the case, taking into consideration due diligence of counsel, and the novelty and complexity of this case. The failure to grant additional time might result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B).

DATED this 16th day of November, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

s/Thomas D. Thalken
United States Magistrate Judge