

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATHENS DIVISION

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

KEYDERMAN JOSE BLANCO  
VILLAMIZAR, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

CRIMINAL ACTION NO.  
3:24-cr-00035-TES-CHW

---

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE

---

Before the Court is Defendant Ricardo Ramon Rangel Lopez's Unopposed Motion to Continue [Doc. 80]. On May 14, 2025, the Grand Jury returned a three-count First Superseding Indictment [Doc. 60] charging Defendant with Conspiracy to Commit Bank Fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1349. Defendant was arrested on May 21, 2025, pled not guilty at his arraignment on June 18, 2025, and remains detained pending trial. [Doc. 74]; [Doc. 77]. The Court has previously continued this case five times, and most recently scheduled the Pretrial Conference for July 7, 2025, and the trial for August 11, 2025. [Doc. 70].

Defense counsel for this newly indicted Defendant seeks his first continuance, explaining that he will need "a substantial period of time" to review discovery in this case, which he has not yet received but understands to be "approximately 2 terabytes of material." [Doc. 80, ¶ 2]. Additionally, defense counsel states that because Defendant

Rangel Lopez only speaks Spanish, “the process of reviewing discovery with him will take more time than usual.” [*Id.*]. The Government does not oppose the requested continuance. [*Id.* at ¶ 3].

The Court finds that granting Defendant’s request serves the ends of justice. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The ends of justice served by continuing this case outweigh the interests of Defendant and the public in a speedy trial. *See id.* Because the discovery in this case involves voluminous digital evidence from multiple devices—much of which is in a foreign language—concerning multiple alleged bank fraud schemes spanning several jurisdictions, failure to grant the requested continuance would deny all parties “the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.” *Id.* at § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant’s Motion [Doc. 80]. Additionally, since “the time for trial has not yet run” with respect to his co-defendants and “no motion for severance has been granted,” *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(6), the Court **CONTINUES** the Pretrial Conference until **August 4, 2025**, and the trial of this matter until **September 22, 2025, as to all Defendants** as the Court expects the parties to shortly file a motion asking the Court to declare the case complex and allowing the parties to confer and jointly submit a comprehensive scheduling order. The delay occasioned by this continuance shall be deemed excludable pursuant to the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

**SO ORDERED**, this 3rd day of July, 2025.

S/ Tilman E. Self, III

**TILMAN E. SELF, III, JUDGE**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**