

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRIMINAL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cr-00091-ODW

Date November 8, 2024

Title *United States of America v. Alexander Smirnov*

Present: The Honorable Otis D. Wright, II, United States District Judge

Sheila English

Not reported

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not present

Not present

Proceedings:

In Chambers

On October 19, 2024, Defendant Alexander Smirnov filed a motion to compel production of discovery. (Mot. Compel (“Motion” or “Mot.”), ECF No. 139.) The United States filed an opposition, and Defendant submitted a reply in support of the Motion. (Opp’n, ECF No. 141; Reply ISO Mot. (“Reply”), ECF No. 145.)

Defendant fails to clearly articulate to the Court what discovery he is seeking to compel. Instead, Defendant reprints a letter he sent to the United States, without providing the Court additional detail or context. (Mot. 4–6.) For example, Defendant states the following:

“I. March 5 letter (no discovery in response to request by paragraph)

- ¶7 [No discovery.]”

(*Id.* at 5.) Additionally, Defendant provides a general discussion of the law, but fails to explain why the law supports his specific discovery requests. (*See* Mot.) Defendant bears the burden to identify to the Court what discovery he is seeking and argue why the law supports his request. The Court will not dig through the record and Defendant’s past correspondence with the United States to decipher what discovery Defendant is requesting. (*See* Mot. Exs. 1–5 (correspondence between Defendant and the United States). Even Defendant’s Reply would require the Court to sift through past correspondence to deduce what discovery Defendant is requesting. (Reply.) It also fails to provide a legal basis for the requests. (*See id.*)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRIMINAL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cr-00091-ODW

Date November 8, 2024

Title *United States of America v. Alexander Smirnov*

At bottom, the Court refuses to guess at what discovery Defendant seeks and develop arguments on his behalf. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Defendant’s Motion to Compel. (ECF No. 139.)

Initials of Preparer _____ : _____ 00
SE _____