

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

APR 26 2016

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

CHRISTOPHER FORD, et al.,

Defendants.

Criminal No. 15-0025 (PLF)

ORDER

For the reasons stated in the accompanying Opinion issued this same day, it is
hereby

ORDERED that Fenwick's motion to suppress, Dkt. 101, is DENIED as moot; it
is

FURTHER ORDERED that Simmons's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED;
it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Grant's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as
moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Hager's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED; it
is

FURTHER ORDERED that Sanders's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED; it
is

FURTHER ORDERED that Leach's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as
moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Ford's motion to dismiss, Dkt. 121, is DENIED; it is
FURTHER ORDERED that Simmons's adopting motion to dismiss is DENIED;

it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Grant's adopting motion to dismiss is DENIED as

moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Fenwick's adopting motion to dismiss is DENIED as

moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Hager's adopting motion to dismiss is DENIED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Sanders's adopting motion to dismiss is DENIED; it

is

FURTHER ORDERED that Leach's adopting motion to dismiss is DENIED as

moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Ford's motion to suppress, Dkt. 124, is DENIED;

FURTHER ORDERED that Simmons's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED;

it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Grant's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as

moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Fenwick's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED

as moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Hager's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED; it

is

FURTHER ORDERED that Sanders's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Leach's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Sanders's motion to suppress, Dkt. 127, is DENIED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Grant's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Fenwick's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Hager's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Leach's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Simmons's motion to suppress, Dkt. 128, is DENIED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Grant's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as moot; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Hager's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED;
and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Leach's adopting motion to suppress is DENIED as
moot.

SO ORDERED.


PAUL L. FRIEDMAN
United States District Judge

DATE: 4/26/16