

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

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**v.**

**SABINO GOMEZ,**

**Defendant.**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CASE NO:  
7:25-cr-15-WLS-ALS-1**

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant's Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial in the Interest of Justice (Doc. 32) ("Motion"). The Government recently provided Defense Counsel with a proposed plea agreement and additional time is needed for her to review and discuss the ramifications of the proposed agreement with Defendant. Defense Counsel represents that she conferred with Government's counsel, Assistant United States Attorney, Monica Daniels, who does not oppose the Motion. (*See* also Doc. 33 (representing that Government's counsel joins in request for continuance)).

Defendant further states 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 that the period of delay in continuing the trial **to the beginning of the next term** be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act 18 U.S.C. § 3161. As Defense Counsel is aware, the Court may schedule multiple criminal trials during a term of Court and thus finds that the period of delay in continuing the trial **through the conclusion of the next Valdosta trial term** is excludable under the Speedy Trial Act.

Based on the Defendant's stated reasons, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the Defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A)-(B). Therefore, the Motion (Doc. 32) is **GRANTED**.

The Court hereby **ORDERS** that the trial in the above-referenced matter be **CONTINUED** to the Court's Valdosta Division May 2026 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, is **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 and would deny Defense Counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation for trial, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (iv).

**SO ORDERED**, this 26th day of November 2025.

/s/W. Louis Sands  
**W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**