

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**v.**

**CLEMSON MAURICE GRAHAM and  
JESSIE JAMES GRAHAM,**

**Defendants.**

**CASE NO:  
7:24-cr-26-WLS-ALS**

**ORDER**

At the Pretrial Conference held on January 7, 2025, Clemson Maurice Graham (“C. Graham”) and Jessie James Graham (“J. Graham” and together with C. Graham, “Defendants”), through their respective counsel, Timothy J. Saviello and D. Nicole Williams, requested that the trial of this matter be continued to permit the C. Graham to file a motion to suppress evidence. Sonja J. Profit, Assistant United States Attorney, stated she did not oppose the continuance. Thus, the Court granted the continuance, contingent on Defendants filing a motion requesting the continuance with Defendants’ agreement that the period of delay in holding the trial is excludable under the Speedy Trial Act 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

Presently before the Court is Defendants’ Unopposed Motion for Continuance in the Interest of Justice (Doc. 52) (“Motion”). Therein, Mr. Saviello and Ms. Williams request that the trial of Defendants be continued to the next available trial term for the reasons stated at the Pretrial Conference. The Defense Counsel state on behalf of Defendants that the period of delay should be excludable under the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161, *et seq.*, through any trial date that may be set upon allowance of this motion, and that the ends of justice served by granting the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the United States Attorney’s Office<sup>1</sup> in a speedy trial. (*Id.* at 2).

---

<sup>1</sup> To satisfy 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A)-(B), the Court assumes Defense Counsel intended to state that the ends of justice served by granting the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the *Defendant* in a speedy trial, and the Court so finds based on the statements in the Motion.

Based on the stated reasons, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the Defendants in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A)-(B). Therefore, the Unopposed Motion for Continuance in the Interest of Justice (Doc. 52) is **GRANTED**. The Court hereby **ORDERS** that the trial in the above-referenced matter be **CONTINUED** to the Valdosta Division **May 2025** trial term, and its conclusion, or as may otherwise be ordered by the Court.

Furthermore, it is **ORDERED** that the time lost under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, be **EXCLUDED** pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) because the Court has continued the trial in this case and finds that the failure to grant a continuance would likely result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).

**SO ORDERED**, this 9th day of January 2025.

/s/W. Louis Sands

**W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**